

Volumen 6 - Número Especial
Abril/Junio 2019

REVISTA INCLUSIONES

REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

ISSN 0719-4705

Investigación para el siglo XXI

EDITORIAL CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Los Lagos, Chile

Subdirectores

Mg © Carolina Cabezas Cáceres

Universidad de Las Américas, Chile

Dr. Andrea Mutolo

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Brasil

Drdo. Maicon Herverton Lino Ferreira da Silva

Universidade da Pernambuco, Brasil

Editor Ruropa del Este

Dr. Alekzandar Ivanov Katrandhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Traductora: Portugués

Lic. Elaine Cristina Pereira Menegón

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Sr. Felipe Maximiliano Estay Guerrero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dra. Carolina Aroca Toloza

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Mg. Keri González

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Mg. Cecilia Jofré Muñoz

Universidad San Sebastián, Chile

Mg. Mario Lagomarsino Montoya

Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanesio

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Dra. Patricia Virginia Moggia Münchmeyer

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Mg. David Ruete Zúñiga

Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, Chile

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra
Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz
Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov
South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía
Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu
Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie
Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar
Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo
Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, México

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto
Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo
Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandia
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar
Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau
Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg
Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez
Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire
Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera
Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre
Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

Dr. Miguel León-Portilla
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura
Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel", España

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros
Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández
Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango
Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut
Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa
Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Honduras

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Mg. Paola Aceituno

Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, Chile

Ph. D. María José Aguilar Idañez

Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, España

Dra. Elian Araujo

Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Romyana Atanasova Popova

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa

Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal

Centro de Estudos Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Alina Bestard Revilla

*Universidad de Ciencias de la Cultura Física y el
Deporte, Cuba*

Dra. Noemí Brenta

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Rosario Castro López

Universidad de Córdoba, España

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel

Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik

Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec

INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant

Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalén, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro

Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Dra. Claudia Lorena Fonseca

Universidad Federal de Pelotas, Brasil

Dra. Ada Gallegos Ruiz Conejo

Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Perú

Dra. Carmen González y González de Mesa

Universidad de Oviedo, España

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez

Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Patricio Quiroga

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio

Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Per

Dr. Carlos Manuel Rodríguez Arrechavaleta

Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. Vivian Romeu

Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. María Laura Salinas

Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dr. Stefano Santasilia

Universidad della Calabria, Italia

Mg. Silvia Laura Vargas López

Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, México

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo

Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dr. Evandro Viera Ouriques

Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro, Brasil

Dra. María Luisa Zagalaz Sánchez

Universidad de Jaén, España

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec

Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía

Santiago – Chile

Representante Legal

Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad de Concepción



BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN

**THE TYPES OF RELIGIOSITY AS A FACTOR OF INFLUENCE
ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE TRADITIONAL FAMILY**

**LOS TIPOS DE RELIGIOSIDAD COMO FACTOR DE INFLUENCIA
SOBRE LA ACTITUD HACIA LA FAMILIA TRADICIONAL**

Elvira M. Zagirova

Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

Madina B. Gimbatova

Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

Zaid M. Abdulagatov

Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

Maysarat K. Musaeva

Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

Fatima A. Gadzhalova

Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

Olga B. Khalidova

Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

Tevriz M. Akhmedova

State Technical University, Russia

Fecha de Recepción: 03 de noviembre de 2018 – **Fecha Revisión:** 29 de diciembre de 2018

Fecha de Aceptación: 22 de febrero de 2019 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de abril de 2019

Abstract

The reflection of the type of religiosity on the family behavior of the Dagestan peoples is important to characterize the modern traditional Dagestan family, the process of its transformation, as well as crisis phenomena in this sphere. The results of the sociological study showed the importance of religious affiliation of the marriage partner. The most respondents among women had the negative attitude to polygamy. They were in subgroup of "hesitant", "non-believers" and "strongly non-believers". They had a negative assessment of this phenomenon with the motivation of its "immorality" and the ability to destroy the traditional family.

Keywords

Traditional family – Family behavior – Family and marriage sphere – Dagestan peoples – Polygamy

Para Citar este Artículo:

Zagirova, Elvira M.; Gimbatova, Madina B.; Abdulagatov, Zaid M.; Musaeva, Maysarat K.; Gadzhalova, Fatima A.; Khalidova, Olga B. y Akhmedova, Tevriz M. The types of religiosity as a factor of influence on the attitude towards the traditional family. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 6 num 2 (2019): 268-277.

Introduction

There are significant changes in the functioning of basic social institutions in modern society. The family institute is also undergoing changes, experiencing the trends of the new information age under the influence of globalization processes. These trends are quite clearly manifested depending on the region, its ethno-cultural and confessional peculiarities, as well as on the migration processes in modern Russian society in the researchers note that the Institute of family is characterized by changes in the value-normative space, the emergence and spread of new types of families and family relations, the transformation of functional relations between society and the family in modern Russia¹, as well as the structure of functions is not unambiguous for different types of families.

Family and marriage sphere is one of the most important. It is the object of close attention of Western and native researchers. The theoretical thought of both foreign and Russian scientists is strongly influenced by the existing scientific paradigms in recent decades. Different sociological schools developed formed ideas about certain aspects of the functioning of the family as a social institution and a small group. These ideas have become stereotypes that prevent the identification of the latest trends and patterns in the development of marriage and family relations. In this regard, theoretical and methodological analysis of the family as a social structure in the transformation of Russian society is not only timely, but also extremely necessary.

If we analyze the approaches of the Soviet and Russian researchers G. A. Kharchev revealed the social essence of marriage and the family, continue the tradition of the evolutionary approach to the development of family relations, as well as new for Russian sociology functional approach to the family². M. S. Matskovsky developed a tradition of functional approach. He adopted a systematic approach and showed the relationship between the economic conditions of society and the nature of the functions performed by the family, their hierarchy³. S. I. Golod was one of the first in Russian sociology to raise the issue of preservation of monogamous family in the new conditions, not just nuclear family⁴. A. G. Vishnevsky linked the family's performance of its reproductive function with the life cycle of not only the family itself, but also women, showing differences in the demographic interests of society and the non-demographic interests of the family⁵. Antonov and V. M. Medkov continued to move towards the study of the internal structure of the family. They turned to the microsociology of the family⁶.

¹ A. V. Vereschagina; N. X. Gafiatullina and S. I. Samygin, "The Spiritual aspects of national identity formation: a sociological analysis of threats to social health and spiritual security of Russia", *Engineering Journal of Don* num 3 (2015).

² A. G. Kharchev, *Marriage and family in the Soviet Union* (Moscow: Mysl, 1979).

³ M. S. Matskovsky, *Sociology of the family: the problems of theory, methodology and methodics* (Moscow: Science, 1989).

⁴ S. I. Golod, "Modern family: pluralism of models", *Sociological Journal* num 3-4 (1996): 99-108 y S. I. Golod, *Family and marriage: Historical and sociological analysis* (Saint-Petersburg: Too TK "Petropolis", 1998).

⁵ A. G. Vishnevskiy, *The Demographic revolution* (Moscow: Statistics, 1976).

⁶ A. I. Antonov, A. I. and V. M. Medkov, *Sociology of the family* (Moscow: Izd-vo Moskow University, 1996); A. I. Antonov, *Microsociology of the family: research methodology of structures and processes* (Moscow: Publishing House "Nota Bene", 1998) y A. I. Antonov, and S. A. Sorokin, *The Fate of Russia of the XXI century* (Moscow: Publishing House "Graal", 2000).

According to L. V. Kartseva, the family model is variable in modern Russian society. It can unite spouses with children who are in a registered or unregistered marriage and a couple "mother and child" and childless partners who are not married and lead a joint household; a polygamous union based on religious customs or new moral norms, as well as same-sex actual marriage⁷.

There are declining birthrate and small families transition to a family model as the dominant, high divorce rate and, as a consequence, single-parent families, the spread of families of group of "risk" and, accordingly, youth and adolescents deviation, a rapid decline in social health, family and youth, which is seen by scientists as a manifestation of the spiritual crisis of the society in institution of family in contemporary Russia. This is characterized from the standpoint of manifestation of the crisis in most cases⁸.

If we put the question about it is possible to have a happy marriage in the era of the sexual revolution, then we get it. Brykova T.Yu. characterized the modern institute of marriage as excessively free of any obligations of partners to each other, seeking to satisfy their needs in the most positive emotions, self-realization, and sexual relations⁹ [Brykova T.Yu., 2011]. We agreed with opinion that the happiness of spouses depends on the level of satisfaction of spouses with family life, in which the emotional and sexual aspects are of high importance in the modern world. We still believe that this characteristic is too critical as well as the crisis assessment of the institution of family in Russia especially about the absence of obligations from spouses. The basis for this conclusion is the existence of different views on this problem. Despite the fact that the crisis position dominates among Russian surnames, the evolutionary paradigm is attractive to the assessment of changes in the institution of the family, as well as the transformational one, according to which the two processes traditionally presented in the sociology of the family as opposed in their ideological and conceptual positions. The crisis and the evolution of the family are considered as interrelated and interdependent. We are talking about the fact that in the institutional space of the family there are both destructive (crisis) and risk-taking moments, and evolutionary generated by the crisis, as the emergence of new types of family relationships and values, as well as family types is possible only in the process of crisis and destruction of the traditional foundations of family relations in Russian society. This process has become much more intense in the post-Soviet transformation and inclusion in the global globalization space. We set a purpose to show the reflection of the types of religiosity on the transformation of the traditional family, the factors of the crisis of the modern Dagestan family, the family-marriage behavior of Dagestan believers, self-identifying as "convinced believers", "believers", "wavering", "unbelievers" and "convinced unbelievers" on the basis of the classification of the main worldview groups N. P. Alekseeva¹⁰ in this article.

Research results

Before we get to the presentation of sociological material, it should be noted that the author understands the immediate or nuclear family (father and mother married, and

⁷ L. V. Kartseva, "Family Model in the conditions of transformation of the Russian..."

⁸ A. V. Vereschagina; N. X. Gafiatullina and S. I. Samygin, "The Spiritual aspects of..."

⁹ T. Yu Brykova, "Is it possible to have a happy marriage in the era of the sexual revolution?", Sociological research num 11 (2011): 140-145.

¹⁰ N. P. Alekseev, "Methods and results of the study of religiosity of the rural population (on the materials of the Orel region)". Questions of scientific atheism Issue 3 (1967): 131-150.

their children) under the traditional type of family in the article. As time has shown the transformation of pre-existing types of social relations, the emergence of new civil relations has not only positive but also negative consequences for the preservation of the institution of the family¹¹. The famous Dagestan ethnographer Gadzhiyeva S. Sh. considers the changes in the family institute that took place at different historical stages of the development of Dagestan society very detailed. She noted that undivided family in Dagestan consisted of two, three and more generations of close relatives both descending, and lateral, and also their wives in the second half of XIX – the beginning of XX century. The process of family division was usually perceived as a result of economic and household difficulties¹². The author considers the present situation of the Dagestan family. Starting point for her opinion are previously existing family forms either disappeared altogether or underwent significant changes.

The parameters selected for analysis allow revealing principles of family functioning in modern Dagestan society with the spread of polygamy, tolerance of polygamy, the orientation of modern young men, however, as well as unmarried women to create a "second family", whose status is not officially fixed, but at the same time appeal to the Islamic factor, etc. Moreover, we can be assumed that the informal family competes quite well with the official one.

The author proceeds from the assumption that ethnic and religious factors play an important role in the family and marriage sphere in this study. There are other positions. L. V. Kartseva notes that there is no dependence of marital and family status on national and religious affiliation at the present stage of development of the Russian society and its family and marriage sphere. It's confirmed by her opinion about reducing the role of ethno-religious factor in the functioning of the family in Russia¹³. The author can't fully agree with her statement regarding the decline in the importance of ethnicity for indicators of demographic behavior of the family: type of marriage, divorce rate, the number of children in families and etc. It may be this factor is not significant for other Russian regions. But these indicators are very different in the conditions of the traditional culture of the Dagestan peoples demonstrating attachment to traditional forms of marriage and family having many children as the ideal of the family structure and etc. Officially registered marriage could not be registered in the mountainous regions of Dagestan. The main thing was the conclusion of a Muslim marriage. There have been noticeable changes in the family and marriage life of Dagestan people maybe not as dramatic as the peoples of the European part of Russia¹⁴.

The results of empirical study are shown that a religious factor has a significant influence on the attitude to interethnic marriages and the formation of attitudes towards interethnic marriage. What is the attitude of believers and non-believers to interethnic marriage? The distribution of answers in relation to religion shows that the opinion "nationality in marriage does not matter if the husband (wife) observes the customs of my people" occupies the first rank place (30,3%). There is "would prefer a person of his nationality, but would not object" (26,1 %) on the second place. A little less respondents

¹¹ Zagirova, E. M. "Traditional family: theoretical aspects of sociological research", *The Caucasus and the world. International Scientific Journal* num 20 (2015): 158-165.

¹² S. Sh. Gadzhiyeva, *Family and marriage among the Dagestan peoples in the XIX-early XX century* (Moscow: Science, 1985).

¹³ L. V. Kartseva, "Family Model in the conditions of transformation of the Russian..."

¹⁴ S. Sh. Gadzhiyeva, *Family and marriage among the Dagestan...*

emphasize the undesirability of interethnic marriage (21,3 %). Unbelievers said of the possibility of interethnic marriage in the strengthening of tolerant plants among peoples. The believers have a positive attitude towards interethnic marriage as his son (56,1 %) and daughters (43,3 %). Non-believers found it difficult to assess their attitude to the mixed marriage of their son (90,1 %) with a positive attitude to the marriage of their daughter (87,3 %). The share is higher among the believers who are negatively related to interethnic marriage their daughters (34,4 %) and sons (25,3%). We can be assumed that the respondents with their characteristic internationalism clearly separate different spheres of interaction (labor, friendship and etc.) from the family and household way of life. There is some conservatism with the position that it is easier to live with a representative of their national, religious affiliation, because the common language, lifestyle, traditions and customs help to overcome the difficulties arising in family life.

When we were studying the frequency of the prevalence of interethnic marriage in a multinational environment, it is important to identify the role of the religious component in this process. The readiness to interethnic interaction and communication in various spheres of human life (business, informal, including family) is influenced by many factors. For example, the attitude to ethnic contacts can be formed as a competition for jobs in the production sphere, especially prestigious, including in the power structures that provide access to property. There were statements to interethnic communication in the family and marriage sphere. They are strongly influenced by national traditions. They often closely related to religious prescriptions: the peoples of Muslim culture with a good disposition to communicate with the Russians, even the prestige of such communication in Soviet times, the norm was endogamous marriages¹⁵. Here we had to clarify that we is considered not only the possibility of marriage with a representative of Russian nationality in this context, but also with others professing other beliefs. Moreover, when the Russian teachers, engineers, doctors and etc. arrival in Dagestan that marriage with a representative of this people was very prestigious. Such marriages were most often concluded.

The respondents were asked: "Does it matter for you the religious affiliation of a person when choosing a future spouse (s)/when choosing a spouse (s) of your children?" with purpose to determine the role of the religious factor in the marriage process. It would be identify a mindset in the Dagestan people.

Empirical data show that more than half of the respondents emphasize the need to take into account the religious affiliation of the future spouse (s) for deciding to marry both their relatives and their own decision, as opposed to every fifth respondent. And you can see noticeable differences, which show that respondents with different types of religiosity. There was a high share of those who note the importance of the marriage partner's confessional affiliation among the "convinced believers" (86,9 %) and "believers" (72,5%). More than half of "non-believers" hold a similar opinion. The cohort of "strongly non-believers" notes the insignificance of religious affiliation of a person at the conclusion their own and their children's marriage. If religious affiliation is an important factor in the conclusion of marriage, but it is not essential for the respondents in other areas of ethnic contact. On the one hand, the respondents said about the importance of the confessional affiliation of the marriage partner. On the other, respondents see in the "presence of a large number of inter-ethnic and inter-religious marriages" (23,8 %) opportunities for the formation of friendly relations between Dagestan people.

¹⁵ Sociology of interethnic tolerance. Moscow: Publishing House of the Institute of sociology, RAS. 2003).

There is important for identification of the relations of Dagestan people to not marital unions in the study. The obtained data show the prevalence in the attitudes of respondents of a negative position with the motivation "our religion does not allow premarital relations" (27,3%). and it is by Every third respondent from the subgroup "strongly believers" and every fourth among the "believers" and followed it. Every sixth respondent "strongly unbelievers" also shares this opinion. The opinion "positively, our religion allows to conclude marriage according to Islamic instructions, and it is more important than marriage registration in the Registry office" (26,9 %) is on the second place. Every second respondent among "convinced believers" and every fourth among "believers" are followed it. The share of those is significantly reduced in the evaluation of unregistered marriage in other subgroups. Every fifth respondent shares the opinion "positively, the stamp in the passport does not matter if they love each other and they are well together". This opinion is closer to every third respondent in the subgroup of "hesitant" and "unbelievers", but to every fourth respondent among "strongly unbelievers". The opinion "is negative if the relations are not formed according to one of the possible variants (or according to religious prescriptions, or according to the law)" to the closest subgroup of "convinced believers" (every fourth respondent) and "believers" (every fifth respondent). There is their low share in other subgroups. Among those who chose the opinion "positively, if some reasons do not allow people to formalize their relationship" respondents stand out as self-identifying "hesitant" (29,1 %) and "non-believers" (29,2 %). There is the position "negatively, the possibility of cohabitation, under the guise of civil marriage, contributes to the loss of the importance of the family, family values and forms immorality in the behavior of the young generation" in the subgroup of "non-believers". That position is close to every third respondent and every fifth among "believers" and every sixth respondent among "believers", "hesitant" and "believers with conviction". In other words, the analysis shows the importance for the interviewed Dagestan people the conclusion of a marriage to religious canons and the prevalence of a negative attitude to the institution of civil marriage in general regardless of the type of religiosity. It should be noted that the conclusion of a Sharia marriage is more important than an officially registered marriage for Muslim peoples. They are less in a civil marriage, because this does not allow, firstly, the Islamic religion. Secondly, that fact is condemned by society. The respondents also focus to observe morality. They motivated by the fact that cohabitation helps to reduce moral attitudes.

It was touched upon the issue about attitude of different worldview groups to the institution of polygamy in our study. The opinion "negative, it can destroy the family, because not every woman to agree with the desire of her husband to have a" second wife "(49,8 %) is prevails for respondents. It is shared by respondents regardless of the type of religiosity. The more respondents hold the opinion "negative, under polygamy trying to cover immorality" (26,5 %) in subgroups "fluctuating" (31,1%), "non-believers" (41,7 %) and "convinced non-believers" (50,0 %). It should be noted that those who evaluate positively polygamy with the motivation "we have fewer men than women, and every woman deserves happiness" (22,3 %), "if a man does not leave the "first" family and provides it" (24,4 %) and "our religion allows polygamy" (25,4 %) relatively more in the subgroup "convinced believers". Attention is drawn to the position of every fourth respondent in the subgroups of "non-believers" and "strongly non-believers", every fifth respondent among the self-identifying as "believers" and "hesitant", who called polygamy "a relic of the past" in comparison with "strongly believers". The results of the gender-based survey show that the position "negative, it can destroy the family, because not every woman to agree with the desire of her husband to have a "second wife" shares every third respondent among men (33,8 %) and more than half of the women surveyed (56,2 %).

The proportion of those who note that "under polygamy trying to cover immorality" significantly more among women (30,4 %) and twice smaller among men (15,7 %). Every third respondent noted the opinion "positively, our religion allows polygamy" (31,4 %) in the subgroup of men. The proportion among women is only 9,7 % with that opinion. The position "positively, we have fewer men than women, and every woman deserves happiness" was noted by 23,3% of men. The proportion among women is twice smaller (10,6 %) with that opinion. The opinion "if a man does not leave the "first" family and provides it" is held by 28,5% of men and 13,5% of women. In other words, the gender analysis shows a generally negative attitude of the interviewed women to polygamy, with a positive assessment of it by the interviewed Dagestan men.

A "control question" "Would you like to have a "second" wife?" was asked in the study. The same proportion of men surveyed said "Yes, if the first marriage will not have children, but I do not want to part with his wife" and "no, I would not want to destroy his family" (29,1 %). The first opinion was shared by the respondent on the religion type in the subgroup "hesitant" (every seventh respondent), "strongly believers" (every tenth respondent), "believers" (every eleventh respondent). The second opinion was shared by the respondent on the religion type among "strongly non-believers" (every third respondent) and among "non-believers" (every sixth respondent) and among "strongly believers" (every tenth respondent). 13,9 % of men noted the opinion "our religion allows a man to have 4 wives". This opinion was shared by 10,8 % of respondents who identify themselves as "strongly believers". 11,5% of men surveyed, 12,5% of self-identifying as "non-believers" and 16,7% of "strongly non-believers" characterize polygamy as manifestation of immorality. A small proportion of male respondents are willing to take a "second wife" with remark "if I fall in love with another woman, but do not want to destroy my first family" (6,8%). 6,0% of men surveyed said that "financial situation does not allow to have a "second wife".

We revealed the attitude of respondents to the emergence of the Dagestan site "Looking for a second wife" in our study. They were asked a question which allows you to define attitudes in the mind. There is opinion "is negative, it will lead to the destruction of the first family" (41,5 %) as dominate in all the area. The proportion sharing this point of view significantly more in the subgroup "with conviction of the unbelievers" (66,7 %), in contrast to the subgroup "with conviction of the faithful". By gender this position was shared 31,7 % of men and considerably more women (45,0 %). There is a negative attitude to the appearance of the site "Looking for a second wife" with the motivation "this will lead to an increase in divorces and an increase in the number of single-parent families" in the second position. The results of our study showed that this position is closer to every third respondent regardless of the religion type and every fourth respondent among men (25,1 %) and every third respondent among women (37,0 %). There is the answer "negative, it will lead to the destruction of the foundations of the traditional family" on the third place. This opinion was shared by every second respondent in the subgroup of "convinced unbelievers", every fourth respondent among "convinced believers" and "believers", every third respondent in the sub-group of "hesitant" and "non-believers". By gender this opinion were shared by 27,5% of men and 30,8% of women. Thus every fifth respondent in the subgroup of "hesitant", every fourth respondent among the "unbelievers" and "conviction of the believers", every third respondent among "believers", every second respondent among the "conviction of the unbelievers" as well as 19,4% of respondents of men and 32,2 % of women believe that the appearance of the site contributes to the fact that "man will not be able to fully devote attention to the education of children in both families". The opinion "positively, this will allow people, without violating religious

commandments, to have marital relations and maintain morality in society" more was chosen among the "convinced believers" (every fourth respondent). There is less with that opinion in the subgroups of "believers", "unbelievers" and "hesitant". The answer "Yes, it will help young people to create a happy family" is closer to every sixth respondent in the subgroup of "unbelievers" and "believers", every ninth among the "hesitant", every tenth respondent among the "believers" and least of all among the "believers". You can see significant percentage differences in the positions of the surveyed men and women assessing the site "Looking for a second wife" positively. The men surveyed note the position "positively, it will help young people to create a happy family" (19,6 %) as opposed to 8,6% of women surveyed, as well as "positively, it will allow people, without violating religious precepts, to have marital relations and maintain morality in society" (26,4 %). Only 10,1% of women were agree with that opinion. Thus, we can conclude noticeable differences in the positions of the interviewed men and women in the designation of their attitude to the appearance of the site "Looking for a second wife". If the former see a positive moment, the latter are mostly negative with the motivation of the destruction of the foundations of the traditional family, the loss of traditional values and foundations, difficulties in raising children, the growth of divorces and the number of single-parent families.

The position of the interviewed women to the institution of "second wife" is interest in the study. It was asked the question "You would agree to be the "second" wife?". There is negative attitude to the institution of "second wife" with the motivation of inadmissibility "to interfere in someone else's family and destroy it" among of respondents regardless of the religion type. Every third respondent shared that opinion. There is a subgroup of "believers", "hesitant", "non-believers" related to the status of "second wife" in the range from 36,9% to 39,9% negatively. The proportion of such is significantly less among "convinced believers". There are significantly more people who have chosen the judgment "it is immoral" in the same subgroups. This opinion follows every fourth Respondent from the subgroup "strongly unbelievers". Every sixteenth respondent would agree to have a status of "second" wife with the motivation "if I love a person". Respondents with this opinion are more in the subgroup of "believers". By family status the above opinion is shared by 5,4% of widows and 3,5% of unmarried women. 52,4 % of women surveyed and by family status more than half of unmarried women (55,8%) every second among widows (45,9 %) and married women (48,7 %) would not agree to become a "second wife" because "you can not interfere in someone else's family and destroy it". There is 23,6% of women across the array and 21,5% of married, 29,7% of widows and 25,3% of unmarried women in subgroups. They consider this act immoral. 8,0% of women surveyed across the entire array of respondents and 5,4% of widows and 3,5% of unmarried women on subarray agree to have the status of "second wife" with remark "if I love a man". 7,6% of women surveyed across the entire array of respondents and 13,5% of widows and 3,0% of unmarried women are ready to take this step in order to have a child.

Conclusion

Our study shows a negative attitude to interreligious marriage in the mind of the respondents. This opinion is more intense among the respondents with ideological attitudes to "believers" and "believers". The surveyed Dagestan people regardless of the religion type demonstrate a negative attitude to polygamy with the motivation of its potential for family destruction. "Not every woman agrees with the desire of her husband to have a "second wife". The respondents described polygamy as a desire to "cover immorality". It should be noted that the respondents consider the institution of polygamy as

a "relic of the past" in the ideological subgroups of "believers", "hesitant", "unbelievers" and "strongly unbelievers" in contrast to the subgroup of "strongly believers".

The respondents show a negative assessment of the site "Looking for a second wife" on various grounds of analysis. Its appearance can destroy the foundations of the traditional family, coupled with the erosion of traditional values and foundations. There is a negative attitude to the institution of "second wife" with the position "you can not interfere in someone else's family and destroy it" in the mind of Dagestan peoples. There are the respondent with that opinion in the subgroups of "believers", "hesitant", "non-believers" and significantly less among the "convinced believers". However, a statistically small proportion of women surveyed still agree to the status of "second wife" with the motivation "if I love a man" and "in order to have a child".

References

Alekseev, N. P. "Methods and results of the study of religiosity of the rural population (on the materials of the Orel region)". Questions of scientific atheism Issue 3 (1967): 131-150.

Antonov, A. I. and Medkov, V. M. Sociology of the family. Moscow: Izd-vo Moskov University. 1996.

Antonov, A. I. Microsociology of the family: research methodology of structures and processes. Moscow: Publishing House "Nota Bene". 1998.

Antonov, A. I. and Sorokin, S. A. The Fate of Russia of the XXI century. Moscow: Publishing House "Graal". 2000.

Brykova, T. Yu. "Is it possible to have a happy marriage in the era of the sexual revolution?" Sociological research num 11 (2011): 140-145.

Gadzhieva, S. Sh. Family and marriage among the Dagestan peoples in the XIX-early XX century. Moscow: Science. 1985.

Golod S. I. "Modern family: pluralism of models". Sociological Journal num 3-4 (1996): 99-108.

Golod S. I. Family and marriage: Historical and sociological analysis. Saint-Petersburg: Too TK "Petropolis". 1998.

Matskovsky, M. S. Sociology of the family: the problems of theory, methodology and methodics. Moscow: Science. 1989.

Kharchev, A. G. Marriage and family in the Soviet Union. Moscow: Mysl. 1979.

Sociology of interethnic tolerance. Moscow: Publishing House of the Institute of sociology, RAS. 2003.

Vereschagina, A. V.; Gafiatullina, N. X. and Samygin S. I. "The Spiritual aspects of national identity formation: a sociological analysis of threats to social health and spiritual security of Russia". Engineering Journal of Don num 3 (2015).

The types of religiosity as a factor of influence on the attitude towards the traditional family pág. 277

Vishnevskiy, A. G. The Demographic revolution. Moscow: Statistics. 1976.

Zagirova, E. M. "Traditional family: theoretical aspects of sociological research". The Caucasus and the world. International Scientific Journal num 20 (2015): 158-165.

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de la **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo debe hacerse con permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**.