

3.

— .
 : ,
 — — ,
 ,
 ,
 , .

4.

’ .
 , —
 , ,
 , —
 .

5.

’ .
 , ,
 , .
 — .

6.

’ . , — , —
 , — , .
 , ,
 , ,
 , .
 :
 , , ,
 , .
 .
 , ,

)	
	,	1	,	5
	,	5	,	2
-	,	4		10
	.	7	,	1
		9	- ,	7
		2	-	3

1,

,

-

,

,

.

,

,

.

-

,

,

,

.

1. – .: , 2004. – 224
2. – .: , 1996. – 348
3. – .: , 1996. – 304
4. :
 . – .: , 1975. – 181
5. – .: , 1991. –
 158
6. :
 . – .: , 1988.
7. //
 (. . . . ,) – ., 1981. – .44–49
8. – .: , 1978. – 223
9. – .: , 2000. – 512

10. . . . /
 – : – , 2007. – 496
11. . . . , – ., 1990. –
674

The author of the article has considered the social-psychological peculiarities of a contemporary family. Much interest of a society to the solving of a family crisis, connected with the necessity to pay attention to complex intrafamily phenomena, which influence the condition of families as a whole, and psychological well-being of its separate members, has been pointed out.