



All Theses and Dissertations

2013-06-18

The Contribution of Family Leisure to Family Functioning and Family Satisfaction Among Urban Russian Families

Mikale N. Williamson

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Recreation Business Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Williamson, Mikale N., "The Contribution of Family Leisure to Family Functioning and Family Satisfaction Among Urban Russian Families" (2013). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 4068.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/4068>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

The Contribution of Family Leisure to Family Functioning and Family Satisfaction
Among Urban Russian Families

Mikale Clark Williamson

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

Ramon Zabriskie, Chair
Gilbert Fellingham
Keith Barney

Department of Recreation Management

Brigham Young University

June 2013

Copyright © 2013 Mikale Clark Williamson

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The Contribution of Family Leisure to Family Functioning and Family Satisfaction Among Urban Russian Families

Mikale Clark Williamson
Department of Recreation Management, BYU
Master of Science

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between family leisure involvement and family leisure satisfaction to aspects of family functioning and satisfaction with family life among urban Russian families. Specifically, this study examined how both family leisure involvement (core and balance) and family leisure satisfaction contributed to the explanation of variance in family functioning and satisfaction with family life. The behavioral factor of family alcohol consumption was also included in the analysis. Furthermore, because the data were nested in families, and because most family leisure research has been limited to individual-level analyses, this study accounted for family-level variance by incorporating mixed modeling in addition to accounting for individual level variance. The sample consisted of 597 families residing in urban Russia with a child between the ages of 11 and 15. The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP) was used to measure family leisure involvement. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale (FACES II) was used to measure family functioning. Mixed model analysis indicated core family leisure satisfaction was the single strongest predictor of all aspects of family functioning as well as satisfaction with family life from the family perspective. There were also positive relationships between both core and balance family leisure involvement to various aspects of family functioning. Analysis further indicated a significant negative relationship between alcohol consumption and both family functioning and satisfaction with family life. These relationships were significant even when accounting for the variance explained by demographic variables of age, income, marital status, and ethnicity. Findings support existing family leisure research. This study, however, goes beyond existing research by accounting for family-level variance as well as accounting for the role alcohol consumption plays when explaining variance in family functioning and satisfaction with family life. Findings provide implications for urban Russian families, scholars, professionals, and policy makers.

Keywords: urban Russia, family functioning, family leisure, family leisure satisfaction, alcohol use

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe sincere and earnest thankfulness to Dr. Ramon Zabriskie who has been a mentor and a friend. Thank you for your enthusiasm, your unwavering faith in me, and for the countless hours and resources that were devoted to making me successful. Your guidance has made this a rewarding journey. I would also like to thank my thesis committee of Dr. Keith Barney and Dr. Gil Fellingham for their support and time on my behalf. In addition, Dr. Peter Ward has provided valuable research and scholastic experience. It has been an honor to work with all of you.

Thank you to Irina Kuznetsova for sharing with me your passion for the Russian people, for introducing me to your home, for inspiring me with your extraordinary work ethic, and for your continued friendship. I pray this project helps you get one step closer to your dream.

I express gratitude to my parents and family for advice, prayers, and for instilling in me the values of curiosity, service, and commitment. This thesis would not have been possible without the confidence and unceasing dedication of my husband, Ammon. I started this process a new wife and finished a new mother. Thank you for your tolerance during the chaotic times and your thoughtfulness and love during the times I desperately wanted to quit. We finish this side by side. To my sweet baby Kai, thank you for accompanying me to Russia and for the tender kicks at times I felt utterly alone that provided the motivation to press forward through this process.

Most especially, I thank my Heavenly Father for guiding me down the unexpected educational paths I have chosen. Having seen the results of my labors, I know that trusting in the Lord and leaning not unto my own understanding has lead me to experiences that have refined me, and to people who have molded me. I express gratitude to Him for instilling in me a passion for youth and families, and for an understanding that improving the quality of life in the home is the most practical contribution and service we can give to the youth of this world.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
The Contribution of Family Leisure to Family Functioning and Family Satisfaction	
Among Urban Russian Families	
Introduction	1
Review of Literature	2
Methods	13
Findings	20
Discussion and Implications	22
References	34
Appendix A: Prospectus	47
Introduction	48
Review of Literature	59
Methods	74
References	82
Appendix A-1: Instruments	92
Appendix B: Consent Forms	121

List of Tables

Tables

1. Means of Dependent and Independent Variables. 44
2. Independent Variables Estimating Variance in Family Functioning45
3. Independent Variables Estimating Variance in Satisfaction with Family Life46

The Contribution of Family Leisure to Family Functioning and Satisfaction
Among Urban Russian Families

The modern family in Russia has been largely overlooked in decades of family and leisure literature. Fascination with Russian culture and ongoing social and economic changes have made its people the focus of social science research targeting adolescent and adult low life-satisfaction, alcohol consumption, health, suicide, poverty, and unemployment—all of which are issues plaguing the country and affecting the family (Andreeva, Ermakov, & Brenner, 2008; Ardichvili, 2009; Kaylen & Pridemore, 2010; Kolenikov & Shorrocks, 2005; Ryan et al., 1999). Limited literature addresses the family specifically, however, and what does exist lacks potential solutions to the decay of strong families (Kozhevnikov, 2003; Zubkov, 2007). Considering urban Russia is home to more than 40 million families, this lack of knowledge concerning Russian family leisure behaviors and their relationship to family functioning and satisfaction with family life warrants immediate scholarly work (Institute for Demographic Research, 2010).

Referring to strong families, Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) stated, “Besides family crisis, shared leisure may be one of the few experiences that bring family members together for any significant amount of time today” (p. 287). Families who have joint, purposeful leisure together have seen benefits, including enhanced family cohesion, moral values passed on, and increased satisfaction with family life (Orthner & Mancini, 1991; Shaw & Dawson, 2001; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). Family leisure health has been severely understudied, however, in countries that have undergone the kind of pervasive and abrupt transitions as have been made in Russia over the past 30 years. A fundamental concern is whether the constructs of family leisure show similar meanings across cultures where social norms differ extensively, individual life satisfaction is characteristically low (OECD, 2012), and little emphasis has historically been placed on leisure activities.

Previous research submits leisure is the single most important force in developing positive, cohesive, healthy relationships between family members. Additionally, it promotes family interactions, encourages social support, and promotes an overall positive outlook on life within the family unit (Couchman, 1988, as cited in Canadian Parks/Recreation Association, 1997, as cited in Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003; Driver, 1992). Still, similar results cannot be assumed, particularly where an outside variable of alcohol consumption is closely linked to family functioning and may have a relationship to both leisure variables and the functioning and satisfaction of the family. The impact of alcohol consumption on satisfaction with life may be an important addition with implications that merit a closer look (Kaylen & Pridemore, 2010).

Freysinger (1997) suggests researchers begin to examine the “quieter” voices in family leisure research, claiming the “rich and varied meanings and experiences of family are interwoven with social class, ethnicity, and culture, and our understanding of leisure and families is incomplete” without taking these voices into account (p. 2). The impact of family leisure involvement and family leisure satisfaction on family functioning and satisfaction with family life could influence the quality of family life among Russian families. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the contribution of family leisure variables to family functioning and satisfaction with family life among urban Russian families, accounting for the behavioral factor of family alcohol consumption.

Review of Literature

Families are an important component of the greater network of society, and spending time and interacting together within families are central values of most cultures (Orthner, 1998; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). Studies of family leisure and family functioning have primarily been executed within the United States and other English-speaking, westernized countries, including the United Kingdom, Australia (Poff et al., 2010a), and New Zealand (Poff, Zabriskie,

& Townsend, 2010c). To date, only two studies from this framework have been carried out in transformational societies (Aslan, 2009; Fotu, 2007). While characteristics of family functioning, such as cohesion, adaptability, and communication, have previously been detected as influential to a family's well-being and have not been culturally specific, the impact of family leisure on family functioning and satisfaction in urban Russia may be unique. Nearly 103 million people (about three-fourths of Russia's population) reside in urban cities. Urban Russia is home to more than 160 nationalities and a colorful array of cultures, ethnicities, and religions (Pridemore, 2005). Its diversity provides meaningful variation to the factors influencing family life. Equally significant is the country's unique history, family structure, and value system that demand consideration in any serious study of the culture and the variables affecting family life.

The Russian Context

Post-Soviet Russian history is particularly distinct due to the dramatic shift in governance and ideology it has experienced in the past 30 years. This shift has dramatically affected the way family, work, and leisure are perceived (Pridemore, 2002; Tartakovsky, 2010). During the Soviet period (1917-1990), family practices promoted strengthening communal ties rather than promoting individual or family identity (Bronfenbrenner, 1970). Work was considered the dominant value, and leisure was looked at with suspicion (Ryabov and Kurbagaleeva, 2003). The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990 and the process of social, economic, and political transformation that followed caused enormous uncertainty and subsequent stress as Russia's people attempted to transition through a large-scale economic depression, social turmoil, and the reinvention of cultural values (Svejnar, 2002). During that period, Russia underwent a transition from a centrally planned economy and communist government to a free market, presidential-parliamentary democracy (Graham, Eggers, & Sukhtankar, 2004). Nearly half the population

has lived on incomes below the poverty line since 1990, which has had an enormous impact on emotional life (Schyns, 2001). There was also a significant decline in life expectancy, with males in particular experiencing a decline in life expectations driven by increased early deaths of middle-aged males, who were the most exposed to financial stress and resorted to heavy alcohol consumption (Svejnar, 2002). Svejnar (2002) also provides evidence that the transition period had a strong negative effect on both marriage formation and fertility.

Even decades later, the impact of these financial and family stressors are still burdens on Russian families. Studies have shown, however, that values have begun shifting. Family and order rank as leading values in Russia today (Lapin, 2004). Employees generally feel it is more important to spend time with their families than their work (Ardichvili, 2009), and value placed on children is growing (Zubkov, 2007). Today, experts attribute the country's current social predicaments to family instability, disruption, and confusion about social and family norms as a result of the Soviet Union's collapse (Englund, 2012; Goodwin & Emelyanova, 1995; Kozhevnikov, 2003). Tartakovsky (2010) addressed the issue by stating, "Parental practices and interpersonal relationships in society depend not only on the socioeconomic conditions, but also on the values and cultural norms which prevail in the country, and these values and norms are resistant to change" (p. 35). Because this is a relatively recent cultural shift away from the work-centered lifestyle, while transformation among contemporary families seems to be welcomed, the development of skills necessary to build healthy and functional family relationships seems to have remained largely unrealizable for many families.

Family structure and values. While Russia is carrying out many reforms with potential to lead to positive results, the unstable economy and decline in standard of living since the fall of the Soviet Union has produced a family structure that parallels the confusion in social and

economic settings (Kozhevnikov, 2003). Social institutions such as the family have been weakened by the collapse of the Soviet welfare system and ongoing transformation that has followed (Kim & Pridemore, 2005). Declining birth rates and increasing divorce rates define the new dynamics of family structure. Several generations of family members often depend upon one another both emotionally and materially as younger generations encounter difficulty finding employment to become independent from parents; child care is difficult to find and afford; and an early death rate in men often causes mothers to bear heavy burdens (Zubkov, 2007). Grandparents are often involved in raising both children and grandchildren, causing boundaries between subsystems of the family to be nebulous and unstructured (Bebtschuk, Smirnova, & Khayretdinov, 2012). The elderly may still hold collectivist values while children have adopted individualistic ideals (Chirkov & Ryan, 2001).

In addition to a shifting family structure, several lingering effects of the post-Soviet transition impair family functioning. Studies of both adults and adolescents have observed persistent confusion over cultural norms concerning prosperity, health promotion, education, interpersonal relationships, and support for freedom, independence, and initiative (Cockerham, Snead, & DeWaal, 1999; Lapin, 2004; Tartakovsky, 2010). Lack of affordable, positive leisure activities is oppressive, employment opportunities are scarce, and alcohol and drug abuse are rampant (Goodman, Slobodskaya, & Knyazev, 2005; The United Nations Children's Fund, 2012). Effective social policy protecting families is largely absent (Lapin, 2004; Zubkov, 2007). Many adolescents feel the worth of their contributions in an unstable society is negligible (Pridemore, 2002), a possible explanation for an increase in the demand for alcohol among younger Russians (Kaylen & Pridemore, 2010). Research on families in the United States

suggests the same type of economic hardship and disarray found in Russia fuels family stress and poor well-being of youth and of families (Elder, Van Nguyen, & Caspi, 1985).

Alcohol. While often considered a leisure activity, the prevalence of alcohol consumption and abuse is a major concern of those anxious to facilitate change in Russia. Levels of alcohol consumption are among the highest in the world, due to easy accessibility, low cost, and permissive social attitudes toward drunkenness (Andreeva et al., 2008). Scholars claim the increased demand for alcohol is related to increasing rates of depression and deprivation of opportunities. Adults and adolescents use alcohol to temper the effects of poor economic conditions, unpredictability of unemployment, and violence (Pridemore, 2006; Pridemore & Kim, 2007; White, 1995). These stressors greatly diminish the development of positive, healthy relationships, nurturing family interactions, and an overall positive outlook on life in general and within the family unit (Grant et al., 2006; Leon & Shkolnikov, 1998). Drinking disrupts family relationships and accounts for more than 51% of divorces in Russia (Bebtschuk et al., 2012).

Since alcohol has been related to lower functioning within family relationships, and family leisure is related positively to family functioning, it is likely that satisfying family leisure would have associations to alcohol consumption within the family. It is important to examine these variables in the context of alcohol consumption, particularly when family cohesion, open communication about stressful situations, and a positive emotional climate are key elements to dealing with stress inside a family (Hartup, 1996), and leisure researchers consistently report positive relationships between leisure and similar variables.

In a world of social institution dysfunction, the family is ideally the place to find sanctuary. These crises, however, undermine the family and actually compound the social challenges. Examination of family functioning, family leisure, and family satisfaction will lay a

foundation for future studies to offer solutions that promote greater well-being and survival. Families with adequate “internal resources for their own stability and development” are the families who overcome the turbulence of society (Zubkov, 2007, p. 367). Acquiring those internal resources through the enabling influence of family leisure may be an initial step toward stability with crucial implications for families in Russia.

Family Well-Being and Leisure in Urban Russia

Conditions in urban Russia do not typically lend themselves to facilitating purposive leisure time, with parents intentionally planning activities to promote bonding and valued relationships (Shaw & Dawson, 2001). Schools make high demands on children and parents to be involved in academic matters (Holloway, Mirny, Bempechat, & Li, 2008). Out of necessity, most family members work long hours to maintain a decent financial position and standard of living, making family time together excessively difficult to orchestrate. Previous research has clearly observed home-based activities to be more relevant to families in transitional societies (Zabriskie & Aslan, 2012), but leisure attitudes suggest Russian families’ leisure is less intentional. Watching television has become the leading family activity, while visits to cultural and relaxation establishments have decreased (Patrushev, 2003; Patrushev, Artemov & Novohatskaya, 2001). Because of the high prices of tickets, Russians seldom go to cinemas, theatres, and concert halls, and few attend sporting events (Zubkov, 2007). While any leisure is better than no leisure, passive, home-based pastimes left to chance do not often carry the same advantages as those where promotion of leisure is deliberate (Buswell et al., 2012; Harrington, 2005). Intentional interaction within the family provides a context with the potential to play a substantial role in fostering meaningful relationships, helping develop skills and competencies, and influencing all aspects of the family environment (Ward & Zabriskie, 2011). Cross-cultural

research suggests that increasing these competencies through engaging in family leisure correspondingly aids family functioning, including communication, cohesion, and adaptability (Aslan, 2009; Poff et al., 2010a).

Tartakovsky (2010) submitted that “positive changes in the moral conduct of countries undergoing rapid economic development may be crucial in ensuring the psychological well-being of their citizens” (p. 35). Family leisure provides opportunities for families to develop and attain these fundamental attributes to improve their quality of life and gives them the resources they need to build stable and successful family relationships between husband and wife, and between parents and children (Shaw & Dawson, 2001; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Family Leisure and Family Functioning

Studies of family leisure have consistently identified a positive relationship between quality time spent together in family leisure and improved family functioning (Baldwin, Ellis, & Baldwin, 1999; Holman & Epperson, 1984; Orthner & Mancini, 1991; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). Family leisure includes recreation and leisure activities that family members participate in with other family members. It is made up of both leisure involvement (frequency and duration), and leisure satisfaction (quality). Leisure satisfaction is often a better predictor of family functioning than involvement alone (Hodge, Zabriskie, & Poff, 2012; Poff et al., 2010b). Positive interaction within the family provides a context for experiences that foster meaningful relationships, help develop skills and competencies, and influence all aspects of a family member’s environment (Ward & Zabriskie, 2011).

Family systems theory is a widely accepted framework utilized to understand family behaviors. This framework suggests that each individual in the family affects the whole, while the whole family affects each individual member (White & Klein, 2008). Olson and DeFrain

(1997) have attempted to capture the dynamics of family systems using the Family Circumplex Model. Three main dimensions are embodied in the Family Circumplex Model: (a) cohesion, (b) adaptability, and (c) communication. Cohesion is based on dimensions of emotional bonding and closeness, while adaptability is based on the capacity to adjust to changes in the family environment (Olson, 2000). The third dimension, communication, allows the family to move through levels of cohesion and adaptability. The model suggests family functioning is at its height when families participate in activities allowing them to achieve the right balance between cohesive and adaptive experiences together (Olson & DeFrain, 1997).

Families both affect and are affected by their environment and the feedback passed through the family system (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). This is why many leisure researchers, who are increasingly aware of the importance of family leisure to high-functioning families, have examined the relationship between families who have joint, purposive leisure, and their associations to family outcomes (Orthner & Mancini, 1991). Studies show recreational activities foster both the adaptability and cohesion inherent in family functioning, since during leisure the family system must learn to interact in the face of new inputs within the family and in the environment (Olson, 2000). A detailed examination of the Core and Balance framework will aid in understanding whether these patterns and outcomes exist among urban Russian families.

Core and Balance Model. To further explain the relationship between family leisure involvement and family functioning, Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) developed the Core and Balance Model of Family Leisure Functioning. Using this framework, scholars have reported direct relationships between family leisure involvement and family cohesion and adaptability, suggesting a relationship between family leisure patterns and family functioning (Dodd, Zabriskie, Widmer, & Eggett, 2009; Hornberger, Zabriskie, & Freeman, 2010). The model

suggests family leisure meets the needs for both stability and change by engaging in patterns of core (common) and balance (novel) family leisure. Core family activity patterns promote family cohesion by providing routine, low-cost, predictable, and personal activities to family members. Balance activities, in contrast, tend to provide more challenging and novel experiences requiring more resources and time away from home. Research suggests both categories are essential, and families who regularly participate in both core and balance types of family leisure activities report higher levels of family functioning than those who participate in high or low amounts of either category (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003).

Consistent evidence from researchers has shown shared recreation experiences, rather than individual experiences, are related to higher family satisfaction and promote quality of family life (Orthner, 1998). Of particular importance for this study is research suggesting core family leisure satisfaction to be a stronger predictor of satisfaction with family life than family leisure involvement alone (Agate et al., 2009; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). Hodge et al. (2012) reported their analyses of youth respondents across five different countries indicating that, although both core and balance variables were significant predictors of variance in satisfaction with family life, when family leisure satisfaction variables were entered into the equation, core leisure satisfaction became the single most explanative variable in the model. Potential increases in the quality of core family leisure specifically could positively affect family functioning by increasing a vital component of family life – family satisfaction.

Family Leisure and Satisfaction with Family Life

It is not simply the amount of involvement families spend in leisure activities that is related to greater family functioning, but rather leisure provides a context through which meaningful and satisfying interactions may take place, which in turn predict greater family

functioning (Johnson, Zabriskie, & Hill, 2006). Scholars have recently found a positive relationship between family leisure satisfaction and satisfaction with family life (Agate et al., 2009; Buswell et al., 2012). In other words, while the overall domain of satisfaction with family life is positively influenced by being involved in family leisure, the inclusion of an indication of *quality*, or the individual's satisfaction with that leisure, is also important for accounting for variance related to conflict, contradictions, and possible family stress reported in earlier qualitative family studies (Larson, Gillman, & Richards, 1997; Shaw, 1997; Shaw & Dawson, 2001). By doing this, individual value judgments related to family leisure involvement are accounted for, whether negative, positive, or otherwise (Buswell et al., 2012).

In their study of father involvement in family leisure, Buswell et al. (2012) found satisfaction with family involvement in everyday, core family leisure activities to be a stronger predictor of family functioning scores than the amount of involvement when considering various aspects of family functioning:

“Rather than the occasional expensive family vacation alone, the satisfaction with regularly occurring home-based family activities such as eating dinner together, participating in hobbies, informal sports and yard activities together, watching television together, or playing games together ... was the single strongest predictor of all aspects of family functioning, particularly from the youth perspective.” (p. 186)

Several additional studies in this line have pointed to core leisure satisfaction as the single greatest contributor to all aspects of family and marital functioning (cohesion, adaptability, and overall family functioning) and satisfaction with family and married life, even after controlling for sociodemographic variables (Agate et al., 2009; Hodge et al., 2012). Satisfaction within the family unit is integral to overall life satisfaction (Alfonso, Allison, Rader, & Gorman, 1996;

Cummins 2005), and therefore the relationship between family leisure involvement and increased family satisfaction may have effects more far-reaching than previously suggested.

Life Satisfaction. The construct of life satisfaction is commonly measured as an aggregate of individual life domains, with satisfaction with family life showing a positive association with scores on a global measure of life satisfaction (Alfonso et al., 1996). Some scholars submit satisfaction with family life makes the greatest single impact on satisfaction with life in various phases of the life cycle (Medley, 1976). This suggests fulfillment, or lack thereof, with family life may relate to similar feelings with life overall.

Russians express extremely low levels of self-esteem, self-actualization, and positive attitudes toward life compared to other countries (Lapin, 2004; OECD, 2012; Ryan et al., 1999). For adolescents in particular, low life-satisfaction has been attributed to the decreased capacity of youth to maintain a sense of mastery due to their inability to rely on cultural norms (Tartakovsky, 2010). According to Family Systems Theory, a single family member's satisfaction with life will likely be influential on broader family outcomes, such as family functioning and satisfaction with family life (White & Klein, 2008). If personal unhappiness is related to lower family satisfaction, then increases in family satisfaction linked with family leisure could not only influence personal life satisfaction, but also could have a reinforcing effect on family satisfaction as the individual members' improved satisfaction positively impacts the family as a whole.

Family leisure studies consistently report relationships between family leisure and increased family functioning. This relationship, however, has not been examined in the context of an economically disadvantaged country where leisure has been undervalued and levels of life satisfaction are remarkably low. Current cultural, economic, and family conditions in Russia

plead for immediate leisure research observing families and how they have been affected by lingering and developing attitudes regarding the relative undervaluing of leisure. Implications for how to encourage commitment to family relationships and address the lack of valued family interaction may impact other countries with similar struggles and shed light on how to strengthen families in this unique situation. Because widespread alcohol use in Russia is of great concern, this initial study including alcohol consumption as a variable is crucial to see if future study on the potential relationship between family leisure and alcohol consumption is merited. A relationship found between family leisure variables and satisfaction with family life could temper the consumption of alcohol for Russian families (Alfonso et al., 1996). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the contribution of family leisure variables (family leisure involvement and family leisure satisfaction) to family functioning and satisfaction with family life among urban Russian families, accounting for the behavioral factor of family alcohol use.

Methods

Data Collection Procedures

Participants were recruited in cooperation with Survey Sampling International (SSI), an online survey sampling company that draws subjects from a multi-source Internet panel of millions of households worldwide. The online questionnaire was distributed through SSI to randomly drawn Russian families residing in cities with a population greater than 50,000. Each family who agreed to participate completed a two-part survey: one portion by a parent, and one portion by a child between the ages of 11 and 15 years. They were asked to independently complete the questionnaire so as not to contaminate answers. Online data collection has similar limitations to other methods of self-report data collection, including poor memory, intentional deception, or misunderstanding of questions (Ward, Clark, Zabriskie, & Morris, 2012).

Additionally, limitations due to difficulties obtaining a representative sample, potential measurement errors, and technological difficulties were considered and understood.

Sample

Respondents ($n = 1190$) consisted of 597 families residing in urban Russian cities. The majority of parent respondents were female (61.2%) and ranged from 26 to 72 years of age with a mean age of 39.28 ($SD = 5.82$). Youth respondents were a slight majority male (50.7%) and ranged in age from 11 to 15 years old with a mean age of 12.97 years ($SD = 1.42$). Seventy-five percent of the sample parents reported being currently married, 4% were single/never married, 2% were separated, 9.5% were divorced, 2.7% were widowed, and 6.9% were not married but living with a partner. A history of divorce was reported by 36.9% of parents.

The majority of respondents were Russian (91.3%) with minority ethnicities represented by Ukrainian (1.7%), Tartar (1.6%), Chuvash (0.7%), Bashkir (0.7%), Armenian, (0.5%), and other ethnicities (3.5%). The average family size was 2.83 people ($SD = .97$) with the reported range from 2 to 8 family members. The annual household income ranged from less than 5,000 Russian rubles (RUB) monthly to more than 105,000 RUB monthly with a mean category of 35,001 to 45,000 RUB and a mode of 25,001 to 35,000 RUB.

When compared with census data for urban Russia, Russian ethnicity of this sample (91.3%) was higher than census data (82.8%). Minority ethnicities, however, were nationally reflective of census data with the exception of the undefined “other” category (Countries of the World, 2007; National Population Census, 2010). Furthermore, the current sample was reflective of the national monthly average income for households, which was 35,741.21 RUB in 2011 (Federal State Statistics Service, 2011; OECD, 2012). The percentage of married adults was slightly higher in our sample, with 75% married as opposed to the national average of 60.7%

of urban adults married (2010 Census). Parents in the sample also reported a slightly lower history of divorce than recent census data (37.4% compared to 43.3%) (World Divorce Statistics, 2012). The current average family size for urban Russian households is 2.5 people (National Population Census, 2010). Aside from the high level of Russian respondents, overall the current sample was generally reflective of Russia's population.

Instrumentation

The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP) was used to measure family leisure involvement in core and balance family leisure (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). The embedded Family Leisure Satisfaction (FLSS) Scale measured satisfaction with current involvement in each of the family leisure activity categories. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales (FACES II) provided a measure of the family's perceptions of cohesion and adaptability, and an overall indicator of family functioning (Olson et al., 1992). The Satisfaction with Family Life Scale measured satisfaction with family life (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003; Zabriskie & Ward, in press). Finally, demographic variables were collected to accurately describe the sample.

Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP). The FLAP is a 16-item activity inventory measuring involvement in family leisure activities as they are categorized within the Core and Balance framework (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). Respondents identified leisure activities done together with family members across 16 activity categories. Eight categories were representative of core family leisure (e.g., family dinners, routine activities, games, and religious activities), and eight categories were representative of balance family leisure (community-based events and outdoor activities). To clarify the distinction between these in the context of this study, examples of possible activities for each category were provided. Each of the questions had three parts: (a) a dichotomous indicator of participation in the particular category (yes/no);

(b) an ordinal indicator of frequency asking approximately how often participation occurs (*daily, weekly, monthly, annually*); and (c) an ordinal indicator of duration asking about how long participation lasts each time (*less than one hour up to three weeks or more*). Family leisure involvement scores were calculated by multiplying each item's frequency and duration and then summing the ordinal index scores of questions 1 to 8 for core and questions 9 to 16 for balance. Parent and youth samples have demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties including construct validity and test-retest reliability for core ($\alpha = .74$), balance ($\alpha = .78$), and total family leisure involvement ($\alpha = .78$) (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Family Leisure Satisfaction Scale (FLSS). The FLSS is embedded into the FLAP and measured satisfaction with current involvement, or lack of involvement, in each of the family leisure categories. Responses were indicated on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Scores were calculated by summing core and balance family leisure satisfaction items. Acceptable psychometric properties have been reported including internal consistencies of $\alpha = .90$ from both parents and youth (Agate et al., 2009).

Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales II (FACES II). Elements of family functioning were measured using the FACES II, a 30-item scale measuring perceptions of family cohesion and family adaptability based on Olson's Circumplex Model (Olson, 1986). The scale (Olson et al., 1992) uses a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 ("almost never") to 5 ("almost always") to measure cohesion (16 items) and family adaptability (14 items). After calculating total cohesion and adaptability scores, linear scoring interpretation procedures were used to obtain an indicator of overall family functioning. Acceptable psychometric properties have been reported for this instrument (Olson et al., 1992). Articles featuring the Core and Balance framework have consistently reported adequate Cronbach's alpha coefficients for

parents ranging from $\alpha = .76$ to $\alpha = .89$ for cohesion (Hornberger et al., 2010), and $\alpha = .71$ to $\alpha = .83$ for adaptability (Smith, Freeman, & Zabriskie, 2009; Townsend & Zabriskie, 2010).

Cronbach's alpha for youth have also been consistently reported in the acceptable ranges, from $\alpha = .72$ to $\alpha = .88$ for cohesion (Dodd et al., 2009), and $\alpha = .77$ to $\alpha = .86$ for adaptability (Townsend & Zabriskie, 2010). Although a curvilinear relationship has been theorized, this instrument has consistently demonstrated a linear relationship between the dimensions (Olson, Gorall, & Tiesel, 2004).

Satisfaction with Family Life (SWFL). The SWFL scale is a modified version of the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), with the words *family life* replacing the word *life* in each item. The SWFL scale provides a brief, psychometrically sound, and widely applicable option for measuring satisfaction with family life regardless of country or parent/youth perspective (Zabriskie & Ward, in press). The SWFL asked participants to respond to 5 items on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Data collected from parents and adolescents in several different family samples that vary across time, place, and culture have reported a consistent, unidimensional factor structure with a Cronbach's alpha ranging from $\alpha = .943$ to $\alpha = .790$. Acceptable psychometric properties have been reported for this scale, including construct validity, internal consistency, and test-retest reliability ($r = .89$) (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003; Zabriskie & Ward, in press).

Other behavioral and demographic information. Because Russia has exceptionally low levels of overall life satisfaction, and this has been linked to high rates of alcoholism (Kaylen & Pridemore, 2010), the study included an analysis of alcohol consumption as a behavioral variable to account for impact on family functioning and satisfaction with family life. Specific questions to measure alcohol use among family members were developed based on two

self-report alcohol screening questionnaires used to detect hazardous drinking, including the Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (MAST; Skinner, 1979), and Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test (AUDIT; Bohn, Babor, & Kranzler, 1995). For the purposes of our analysis, these three questions were added together to form one variable (0–3) based on the number of times the respondent answered “yes” to dichotomous items asking about personal and family alcohol use and if it had affected the family dynamic. The analysis also included demographic information, including age, gender, ethnicity, previous marital history, family income, and family size. Income was analyzed by grouping incomes into three categories: low (less than 5,000 RUB to 25,000 RUB monthly), medium (25,001 RUB to 75,000 RUB monthly), and high (75,001 to more than 105,000 RUB monthly). Demographic information was included to identify the underlying characteristics of the sample.

Translation

The research questionnaire with all related instruments (FLAP, FACES II, and SWFL) was translated into Russian through a double translation process (Christenson, Zabriskie, Eggett & Freeman, 2006). This process was performed by two bilingual Russian individuals who worked independently of each other. The instrument was first translated from English to Russian by a Russian native individual. Next, a careful analysis of content and meaning was conducted to ensure the Russian version expressed the meaning intended behind original items. A third party bilingual Russian translator was then hired to back-translate the instrument from Russian to English. The instrument was again examined by the researchers to compare the original English version to the newly back-translated Russian version. The researchers found a few small discrepancies in word meanings between the translations, which were corrected before the questionnaire was distributed. Two minor wording changes were also made with activity item

examples based on cultural sensitivity and were adapted to reflect more common Russian descriptions of the same category. Clarification about intent, construct, and meaning were again discussed and clarified between the translators and researcher.

Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20.0 computer software and R version 11.1 (R Development Core Team, 2010). The lme4 library was loaded in R so the lmer() function could be used to analyze the linear mixed effects models (Pinheiro & Bates, 1996).

Data were first cleaned by eliminating questionnaires with missing responses or implausible answers. For example, a report that a family experienced 20 hours of family dinner every day of the week would have been considered implausible and excluded from the study. Next, basic descriptive statistics and scores from each scale were calculated in SPSS, including the mean and median values of the independent and dependent variables. Because the data were collected from members of a dyad (i.e., parent-child relationship), this study used a mixed model to appropriately account for family-level variance in addition to accounting for individual variance components. That is, while most family leisure research has been limited to individual-level analyses, this analysis accounted for both within and between family member variability since family behavior, including family functioning, is best understood by viewing the family as a unit rather than just individual parts (Poff et al., 2010b).

This data was considered to be hierarchically structured, because children and parents were nested within a family. Hierarchical data can create analytical challenges (Cronbach, 1976; Burstein, 1980) when other statistical procedures are utilized. First, scores from two members of a dyad are nearly always related, leading to underestimation of standard errors and increased

Type 1 error if the observations are treated as independent. A second challenge is the dilemma of how to test variables reflecting common circumstances, such as family functioning. Last, researchers who ignore the hierarchical data may fail to see important phenomena such as cross-level interaction effects. A mixed model offers solutions to all of these analytical challenges (Newsom, 2002) through clustering, which allows the modeling of both dyad-level and individual-level variables.

A first model was created with family functioning as the dependent variable, with core family leisure involvement, balance family leisure involvement, core family leisure satisfaction, and balance family leisure satisfaction as independent variables. A second model was created with satisfaction with family life as the dependent variable and the same independent variables. These models also included alcohol consumption and demographics in addition to the leisure independent variables. These models allowed for partitioning of variance explained by each variable to determine the nature of the relationship between those variables and family functioning. Initially, all demographic and other independent variables were included in the models used to predict the dependent variables. The models were then reduced using likelihood ratio tests until only significant independent variables remained as implemented in the lmer function included in the lme 4 package in the R statistical program (R Development, 2010).

Findings

The following descriptive statistics were calculated for each family (one parent and one child ages 11 to 15): (a) family leisure involvement, (b) family leisure satisfaction, (c) family functioning, and (d) satisfaction with family life. Scores for these scales fell within normal parameters. Multicollinearity as indicated by $r > .90$ (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996) was not found between any of the independent variables.

Mixed Model

The relationship between core and balance family leisure involvement, core and balance family leisure satisfaction, and family functioning was assessed using a mixed model to appropriately account for the multiple sources of variance inherent in this data: individual-level variance and family-level variance. The Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) (ratio of between vs. total variation) was approximately 62.7% [$1.06/1.69 = \text{var}(\text{family})/(\text{var}(\text{family}) + \text{var}(\text{error}))$] and represents shared variance in the responses of family, or in other words, how strongly individuals in the same family resemble each other. This is a notably higher ICC than in previous studies completed in the United States, perhaps suggesting children reflect the attitudes of their parents to a greater degree in Russia, or that there was potential contamination of children's responses by parents. Significant variables for family functioning included core family leisure involvement, balance family leisure involvement, core family leisure satisfaction, alcohol consumption, and age (see Table 2). Core family leisure satisfaction was the strongest significant predictor of variance in family functioning ($t = 11.862$, $t_{crit} = 1.96$, $df = 500$, $\beta = .079$). There was also a positive relationship between core family leisure involvement and family functioning ($t = 4.694$, $t_{crit} = 1.96$, $df = 500$, $\beta = .012$), and between balance family leisure involvement and family functioning ($t = 3.655$, $t_{crit} = 1.96$, $df = 500$, $\beta = .007$). Alcohol consumption had a negative relationship to family functioning ($t = -3.044$, $t_{crit} = 1.96$, $df = 500$, $\beta = -.126$). No other demographic variables were significant.

A second model was developed to assess the relationship between leisure variables and satisfaction with family life. This model reported an ICC of approximately 55.2% [$18.76/33.98$] and included significant variables of core family leisure involvement, core family leisure satisfaction, balance family leisure satisfaction, alcohol consumption, marital status, and income

(see Table 3). Core family leisure satisfaction was the strongest significant predictor of satisfaction with family life ($t = 8.37$, $t_{crit} = 1.96$, $df = 500$, $\beta = 0.32$). Core family leisure involvement and balance family leisure satisfaction were also positive predictors. Alcohol consumption had a negative relationship to satisfaction with family life ($t = -4.30$, $t_{crit} = 1.96$, $df = 500$, $\beta = -.82$), as well as to age ($t = -3.81$, $t_{crit} = 1.96$, $df = 500$, $\beta = -.03$), unmarried status ($t = -4.97$, $t_{crit} = 1.96$, $df = 500$, $\beta = -.258$), and income ($t = -3.75$, $t_{crit} = 1.96$, $df = 500$, $\beta = -2.71$).

Discussion and Implications

The purpose of this study was to examine the contribution of family leisure variables to family functioning and satisfaction with family life among urban Russian families. Specifically, this study examined the relationship of two independent variables—family leisure involvement and family leisure satisfaction—accounting for the behavioral factor of family alcohol consumption. Because the data were nested in families, and because much of family leisure research has been limited to individual-level analyses, this study incorporated a mixed model approach which accounted for family-level and individual-level variance in the data analysis. There were several key findings from this study. First, results indicated that satisfaction with core family leisure was the single strongest positive contributor to the explanation of variance in both dependent variables (family functioning and satisfaction with family life). Second, core and balance family leisure involvement were significantly positively related to family functioning. Third, alcohol consumption and all dependent variables were significantly negatively related.

Core Family Leisure Satisfaction, Family Functioning, and Family Satisfaction

Consistent with family research conducted in other countries, the strongest positive predictor of both family functioning and family satisfaction was core family leisure satisfaction. In other words, the family's perception of the quality of their home-based, everyday leisure with

each other was the single strongest contributor to the explanation of variance in both family functioning and satisfaction with family life. Both family-level and individual-level variance were accounted for, as well as variance due to gender, age, ethnicity, marital status, family income, and alcohol consumption. Of particular importance was the size of the relationship between these variables (see Tables 2 & 3). These findings emphasize that the quality of family leisure activities is more important than the amount of time spent together or the amount of leisure involvement itself. Families in Russia that were satisfied with their core leisure together, regardless of the frequency or category of involvement, were more satisfied with their family life, and reported greater family functioning than those who were less satisfied.

Previous research regarding well-being among Russians has focused on the reciprocal relationship between life satisfaction and behaviorally driven, socioeconomic, and demographic variables (e.g., income, marriage, age, education, gender, and social contacts) (Frijters, Geishecker, Haisken-DeNew, & Shields, 2006; Saris, 2001). This study found similar relationships between satisfaction with family life and marital status, as well as anticipated significant negative relationships between alcohol consumption and satisfaction with family life. Interestingly, this study found significant negative relationships between income and satisfaction with family life, which require further examination. One interpretation of this finding may be that higher income is associated with higher education levels and access to media, resulting in a greater awareness of the lack of opportunities in Russia, and therefore, diminished satisfaction. Similarly, larger incomes are often associated with decreased leisure and family time, due to escalated amounts of time spent working. This, too, could potentially explain the negative relationship to satisfaction with family life. Whatever the explanation, there was clear empirical evidence that satisfaction with core family leisure was the strongest significant positive

contributor to overall satisfaction with family life, a variable with clear ties to subjective life satisfaction (Alfonso et al., 1996).

This finding is particularly noteworthy for families with considerable leisure constraints. For families in urban Russia, coordinating time together is difficult and family activities out of the home are often limited and inaccessible. This study suggests that, while the constraints of time, access, and finances are ever-present, families are still able to obtain benefits of family leisure. Instead of focusing only on increased time spent in family leisure activities, the impact of identifying individual family members' specific expectations for family leisure time and addressing those expectations could be instrumental for improving family functioning as well as satisfaction. The benefits of family leisure—developing positive, cohesive, healthy relationships, exploring and strengthening communication skills, learning to adapt in the face of challenges, and many more—can be achieved if efforts are made to provide more intentional and meaningful family leisure experiences that are individually valuable, satisfying, and enjoyable.

Russia's drastic economic, social, cultural, and political changes forced millions below the poverty line and impacted emotional, physical, and mental well-being (Schyns, 2001). Overall family functioning needs to be addressed through leisure not only because leisure has the potential to influence family and individual well-being (Agate et al., 2009), but also because dedication to improving family leisure programming has the potential to address numerous social needs. Leisure provides communities as well as financially burdened families the tools to confront family concerns and achieve positive family outcomes in affordable, natural ways where other solutions may be much more expensive and contrived. Because of the strong positive relationship found between perceived quality of core family leisure and family functioning as well as satisfaction with family life, educating families and practitioners on ways

to foster quality involvement in home-based, routine activities (games, crafts, watching other family member's performances, bike rides, etc.) *with other family members* could substantially improve communication, decrease stress, foster resiliency, and strengthen the family unit.

Family Leisure Involvement and Family Functioning

The second key finding from this study was the significant positive relationship between both core and balance family leisure involvement (frequency and duration) and family functioning. Existing literature has found that families who report more family leisure involvement tend to function at higher levels than those who report less, and families who participate in both core and balance family leisure fare better than those who report participation in only one or the other (Dodd et al., 2009; Hornberger, et al., 2010; Zabriskie & McCormick 2001). Scholars have also reported families who participate in relatively equal amounts of both core and balance family leisure activities are likely to function better than those who participate in high or low amounts in either category (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003).

These findings suggest that the relationship between equal amounts of core and balance activities and family functioning may be more complex than previously perceived. The reported amount of involvement in core family leisure activities in this sample was comparable to the reported core leisure activities of a variety of family types in previously studied countries (Aslan, 2009; Fotu, 2007; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). The mean scores for balance family leisure involvement, however, were considerably less than other samples from previously studied countries (see Table 1), and in particular the variety of balance activities was notably low. Notwithstanding this minimal involvement, after adjusting for age, gender, marital status, ethnicity, and income, both constructs were statistically significant (see Table 2). It would appear that for some families, a small amount of balance family leisure involvement goes a long

way and contributes to the explanation of variance in family functioning in a similar way as high quantities of core family leisure.

In context of Russian families and the economic, social, family, and leisure constraints present, these findings have several implications. First, findings suggest that families still have a need for both core and balance family leisure involvement, even if availability is limited or overlooked. Some of the reported family leisure involvement seemed to be coming out of necessity (gardening, yard work, etc.), but families still reported it as leisure. Similar to other periods of cultural transition, the family need for involvement together still exists and transcends cultural and economic restraints. It would be easier for families not to participate in both core and balance leisure activities, but even with limitations, they find it necessary to have both.

Furthermore, in the presence of few opportunities, even a small amount of participation in balance family leisure activities is impactful for developing skills of family functioning (cohesion, adaptability, and communication). It could be that the contrast between leisure time and daily living is so stark that an escape from the monotony of day-to-day tasks is enough to facilitate the stability, familiarity, and structure inherent through core family leisure as well as the challenge and novelty found through balance family leisure.

Alternatively, these findings may suggest adaptability, a characteristic of family functioning that has been detected as influential to a family's well-being (Olson, 2000), is being captured in some significant way other than through balance family leisure for this sample. The necessity of fostering challenge and novelty through leisure and recreational activities might not be seen by these families as an important component for attaining adequate family well-being due to some other variable that is promoting similar characteristics within the family environment. It would be interesting to investigate families in circumstances similar to those in

urban Russia to see if this finding is validated, and if so, to explore variables that may contribute to the development of adaptability in ways similar to leisure. For instance, the influence of intimate lifelong relationships with extended family has not been examined to see the impact of generations of family in close proximity and frequent interaction. This structure may expose families to conditions that promote adjustment and challenge different than other family structures that have been studied. Russian families' environment and history are vastly different from the circumstances of subjects of similar studies, and it is possible that there are unique variables contributing to family functioning that have not yet been identified.

As noted previously, the variety of balance family leisure activities reported was limited. Analysis of the specific activities families reported participating in revealed that the highest quantity core activities were (a) having dinner at home with their family; (b) home-based indoor activities, such as watching TV/videos, listening to music, reading books, and singing; (c) home-based outdoor activities, such as gardening, playing with pets, and walks; and (d) crafts, cooking, and/or hobbies. Only three of the eight balance categories reported any substantial participation, and even these had minimal frequencies and durations. They were (a) community-based social activities, such as going to restaurants, attending parties, shopping, visiting friends/neighbors, and having picnics; (b) spectator activities, such as going to movies, concerts, plays or theatrical performances; and (c) community-based special events, such as visiting museums, zoos, theme parks, and fairs. Increasing availability of balance leisure opportunities *geared toward the family* seems to be a logical next step in helping families achieve greater well-being. If these few balance activities are contributing significantly to the explanation of variance in family functioning, increasing accessibility to balance family leisure—including outdoor adventure

activities, recreation centers, family vacations, and more—may yield increases in family adaptability, and subsequent family functioning, for a greater variety of families across Russia.

Alcohol, Leisure, and the Family

There was a significant negative relationship between alcohol consumption and both family functioning and family satisfaction. This finding is an important indicator of the nature of the relationship between alcohol consumption (to the extent that alcohol use causes the user to fail to do what is normally expected of them) and individual family members' satisfaction with family life. As one or more family members' alcohol consumption increased, general contentment with the family dynamic decreased for one or more members of the same family. Given that the average family size for this sample was 2.83 people, it is reasonable to presume that even one member's use or abuse of alcohol could easily disturb the entire family system, particularly since according to family systems theory, each individual in the family affects the whole, while the whole family affects each individual member (White & Klein, 2008). This framework suggests that each individual in the family affects the whole, while the whole family affects each individual member (White & Klein, 2008).

Several scholars have investigated the relationship between alcohol use and family functioning (Goodman et al., 2005; White, 1995) and found clear inverse relationships. This particular association between alcohol use and satisfaction with family life has been studied on a more limited basis. Though heavy drinking is not universal among Russians, Russia has one of the highest rates of alcohol consumption in the world. For example, it has been estimated that more than 30% of deaths in Russia can be attributed, directly or indirectly, to alcohol compared to only 4% in European Union countries (Nemtsov, 2005). These findings substantiate the negative associations found in previous studies between alcohol use and satisfaction with family

life by suggesting family members perceive decreased fulfillment at home and decreased confidence in family attributes when alcohol is present. This is valuable information for families and family members who may not be fully aware of the dangers drinking behaviors pose to the family unit due to the prevalence of drinking among Russians (Kaylen & Pridemore, 2010; Nemtsov, 2005). This negative relationship may have further implications by suggesting increases in satisfaction with family life could result in lower levels of alcohol consumption throughout the country. With the family and society in crisis, many use alcohol to provide a sense of security and control, to combat depression and deprivation, to boost confidence, and to substitute for positive relationships. If family members had these needs fulfilled by engaging in satisfying relationships in the home, the perceived need for heavy drinking could decline greatly.

Because family leisure is a major contributor to satisfaction with family life, increasing availability and accessibility of family leisure opportunities could provide the context for building the types of satisfying relationships within the family that could drastically alter drinking behaviors. Family leisure provides options for entertainment and personal growth. Those opting to drink due to lack of opportunity, employment, or absence of positive relationships could find new, healthier outlets that promote family leisure involvement and subsequent satisfaction. As previously mentioned, under-utilized balance leisure activities with family members (e.g., outdoor activities, adventure activities, and tourism) may be more potent antidotes to issues alcohol is currently used to resolve. Recreation facilities, for example, are in dire need of attention and rehabilitation across the country. These facilities could be locations of extensive family programming. Of equal importance, the power in educating families to take part in things already accessible to them should not be overlooked. These results should encourage government entities, social service groups, and others who assess and work with

families under stress to become providers and educators of family leisure opportunities in Russia where none may currently exist.

The findings of this study also go one step further than much of the existing family leisure research because the statistical analysis accounted for family-level variance in estimating family functioning and family satisfaction. Focus on individual-level effects only obscures larger societal-level effects. Leisure researchers have called for research to account for group or macro-level variance in addition to individual or micro-level variance. Poff et al. (2010b) noted the lack of family leisure research accounting for family-level variance, and has called for models that incorporate such statistical analysis. By accounting for family-level variance, the models in this study begin to fill this gap in the literature.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

This study provided evidence indicating a positive relationship between family leisure variables and both family functioning and satisfaction with family life; and conversely, a negative relationship between alcohol consumption and both family functioning and satisfaction with family life. Therefore, this study adds to the existing leisure literature by identifying the nature of the relationship between family leisure, family functioning, and satisfaction with family life for families in unique and volatile environments.

Limitations, however, must be recognized in the current study. First, although this study was delivered to a large, nationally representative group, online data collection inherently excludes certain populations from the study, such as those without computer access. Because the sample was limited to urban Russian families with adolescent children between the ages of 11 and 15, generalizability is limited to families with similar structures. Future research should consider incorporating random sampling techniques and examining family leisure variables at

various life stages and child respondent ages, particularly because Russian families are often made up of several generations (Zubkov, 2007).

Second, because Russian participants were responding to instruments developed in the United States and translated into Russian, limitations in measurement may have misrepresented actual family leisure practices. Despite empirical evidence suggesting that levels of leisure involvement and life satisfaction are discouragingly low in Russia, some of the means for leisure satisfaction, satisfaction with family life, and family leisure involvement were unusually high. Leisure activities in Western culture are sometimes irrelevant in other cultures, and examples presented on the instrument may have been confusing to respondents. Implementation of this instrument in another similar transformational society, however, acquired routine results (Agate, 2009). Examinations of other cultures dealing with challenges similar to Russia's may offer a clearer view to confirm whether reported scores denote actual family leisure values, and also to increase the cultural sensitivity and relevance of the instruments used in this framework, establishing the validity and reliability of instruments across a variety of cultures.

Third, a number of perfect scores were reported for leisure satisfaction and satisfaction with family life. This has not been observed in other studies from this line, which leads to questions of validity in answering questions. Additionally, the influence of the parent on the child completing the online questionnaire could not be controlled or measured, although they were told through instructions to complete the survey independently. The high ICC (representing how strongly individuals in the same family resemble each other) may signify contamination of responses between parent and child, or may merely reflect high levels of corroboration between family member's perceptions. Implementation of other data collection methodologies could mitigate errors common in online data in regards to legitimacy of scores.

Particularly important to this study is the magnitude of core family leisure satisfaction's influence on family functioning and satisfaction with family life. Scholars should attempt to gain a more in-depth understanding of this relationship and why these activities are meaningful to the Russian culture. Qualitative methods may be beneficial in examining specific core activities and behaviors at the individual and family levels to decipher which activities and behaviors are making a difference to perceptions of satisfaction. Future research may also benefit by collecting data from all family members to gain a complete view of family leisure involvement and satisfaction, since possible societal factors may contribute to the importance of and satisfaction with certain activities and those may differ between family members. In addition, future studies may consider having families keep detailed journals of activities, since this study relied on recall from the past year.

International data sets allow for examination of the differences in family leisure and related family constructs between various countries, allowing researchers to explore the role family leisure plays in diverse cultural lifestyles, and, therefore, findings from this study are likely to have both comparative and predictive value for families, scholars, and practitioners. This is the first in this line of study to specifically examine urban families in any culture. There is potential that findings from this sample in Russia could have similar application for urban families worldwide, and particularly for those who are low-income. Families in urban areas across the globe confront material hardships, which can have negative long-term social and emotional consequences. Applying this model to other family cultures in urban areas is recommended to see if these constructs show similar meaning for other urban families. Furthermore, because the majority of impoverished families live in rural areas (World Resources

Institute, 2005), cultural comparisons of rural and urban families from similar cultures may help scholars interpret the rich and varied meanings of leisure and family.

Family functioning and satisfaction with family life for the family as a whole have been examined only on a limited basis (Hodge et al., 2012). While this study helps to fill this gap by effectively employing a mixed-models analysis to explain family level variance, family leisure researchers should continue to expand their analyses to include family-level effects. For example, in the case of multiple respondents in one family (i.e., parents and children), an average of each individual's score could be taken to estimate a family score. These family scores could then be used to estimate family level effects; however, statistically speaking, this may result in a loss of the richness of data. Therefore, continued research using mixed models or hierarchical linear models (HLM) to analyze groups of individuals is recommended.

References

- Agate, J., Zabriskie, R., Agate, S., & Poff, R. (2009). Family leisure satisfaction and satisfaction with family life. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(2), 205-223.
- Alfonso, V. C., Allison, D. B., Rader, D. E., & Gorman, B. S. (1996). The extended satisfaction with life scale: Development and psychometric properties. *Social Indicators Research, 38*(3), 275-301.
- Andreeva, E., Ermakov, S., & Brenner, H. (2008). The socioeconomic aetiology of suicide mortality in Russia. *International Journal of Environment and Sustainable Development, 7*(1), 21-48.
- Ardichvili, A. (2009). The relationship between meaning of working and socioeconomic transformations: The case of post-communist Russia. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11*(2), 218-234.
- Aslan, N. (2009). An examination of family leisure and family satisfaction among traditional Turkish families. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(2), 157-176.
- Baldwin, J. H., Ellis, G. D., & Baldwin, B. M. (1999). Marital satisfaction: An examination of its relationship to spouse support and congruence of commitment among runners. *Leisure Sciences, 21*(2), 117-131.
- Bebtschuk, M., Smirnova, D., & Khayretdinov, O. (2012). Family and family therapy in Russia. *International Review of Psychiatry, 24*(2), 121-127.
- Bohn, M. J., Babor, T. F., & Kranzler, H. R. (1995). The alcohol use disorders identification test (AUDIT): Validation of a screening instrument for use in medical settings. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 56*(4), 423.

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1970). Reaction to social pressure from adults versus peers among Soviet day school and boarding school pupils in the perspective of an American sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15*(3), 179.
- Burstein, L. (1980). The analysis of multilevel data in educational research and evaluation. *Review of Research in Education, 158-233*.
- Buswell, L., Zabriskie, R., Lundberg, N. & Hawkins, A. (2012). The relationship between father involvement in family leisure and family functioning: The importance of daily family leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 34*(2), 172-190.
- Canadian Parks/Recreation Association. (1997). *The benefits catalogue*. Gloucester, Ontario, Canada: Author.
- Chirkov, V.I., & Ryan, R.M. (2001). Parent and teacher autonomy-support in Russian and U.S. adolescents: Common effects on well-being and academic motivation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*, 618–635.
- Christenson, O., Zabriskie, R., Eggett, D., & Freeman, P. (2006). Family acculturation, family leisure involvement, and family functioning among Mexican-Americans. *Journal of Leisure Research, 38*(4), 475-495.
- Cockerham, W. C., Snead, M. C., & DeWaal, D. F. (2002). Health lifestyles in Russia and the socialist heritage. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 43*(1), 42-55.
- Countries of the World. (2007). *Ethnicity and Race by Countries*. Infoplease. Pearson Education, Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0855617.html#ixzz2Qw8pSop8>
- Cronbach, L. J. (1976). *Research on classrooms and schools: Formulation of questions, design and analysis*. Occasional paper of the Stanford Evaluation Consortium. Stanford, CA.

- Cummins, R. A. (2005). The domains of life satisfaction: An attempt to order chaos. *Citation Classics from Social Indicators Research*, 26, 559-584.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- Dodd, D., Zabriskie, R., Widmer, M., & Eggett, D. (2009). Contributions of family leisure to family functioning among families that include children with developmental disabilities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(2), 261-286.
- Driver, B. L. (1992). The Benefits of Leisure. *Parks and Recreation*, 27(11), 16-23.
- Elder, G. H., Van Nguyen, T., & Caspi, A. (1985). Linking family hardship to children's lives. *Child Development*, 56(2), 361-375.
- Englund, W. (2012, March 7). Teens choosing death in Russia. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/>
- Federal State Statistics Service. (2011). *Information on the socio-economic situation of Russia*. Retrieved from <http://www.gks.ru/z>
- Fotu, I. (2007). *Family leisure involvement and family functioning in Samoa*. Unpublished master's thesis. Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Freeman, P., & Zabriskie, R. (2003). Leisure and family functioning in adoptive families: Implications for therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 37(1), 73-93.
- Freysinger, V. J. (1997). Redefining family, redefining leisure: Progress made and challenges ahead in research on leisure and families. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29(1), 1-4.
- Frijters, P., Geishecker, I., Haisken-DeNew, J. P., & Shields, M. A. (2006). Can the large swings in Russian life satisfaction be explained by ups and downs in real incomes? *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 108(3), 433-458.

- Goodman, R., Slobodskaya, H., & Knyazev, G. (2005). Russian child mental health across-sectional study of prevalence and risk factors. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 14*(1), 28-33.
- Goodwin, R., & Emelyanova, T. (1995). The perestroika of the family? gender and occupational differences in family values in modern day Russia. *Sex Roles, 32*(5), 337-351.
- Graham, C., Eggers, A., & Sukhtankar, S. (2004). Does happiness pay?: An exploration based on panel data from Russia. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 55*(3), 319-342.
- Grant, K. E., Compas, B. E., Thurm, A. E., McMahon, S. D., Gipson, P. Y., Campbell, A. J., Westerholm, R. I. (2006). Stressors and child and adolescent psychopathology: Evidence of moderating and mediating effects. *Clinical Psychology Review, 26*(3), 257-283.
- Harrington, M. (2005). Family leisure and parents' subjective identities: Gendered ways of being a "good parent." In T. Delamere, C. Randall, & D. Robinson (Eds.), *Abstracts of papers presented at the Eleventh Canadian Congress on Leisure Research, May 17–20* (pp. 233–236). Waterloo: Canadian Association for Leisure Studies.
- Hartup, W. W. (1996). The company they keep: Friendships and their developmental significance. *Child development, 67*(1), 1-13.
- Hodge, C., Zabriskie, R., & Poff, R. (2012). International family leisure functioning: A comparative study. *Abstracts from the 2012 Leisure Research Symposium*, Ashburn, VA; National Recreation and Park Association.
- Holloway, S. D., Mirny, A. I., Bempechat, J., & Li, J. (2008). Schooling, peer relations, and family life of Russian adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 23*(4), 488-507.
- Holman, T., & Epperson, A. (1984). Family leisure: A review of the literature with research recommendations. *Journal of Leisure Research, 16*(4), 277-294.

Hornberger, L. B., Zabriskie, R. B., & Freeman, P. (2010). Contributions of family leisure to family functioning among single-parent families. *Leisure Sciences, 32*(2), 143-161.

Institute for Demographic Research (2010). The current demographic situation in the Russian Federation (analytical data). Retrieved at Demografiya.ru/

Johnson, H. A., Zabriskie, R. B., & Hill, B. (2006). The contribution of couple leisure involvement, leisure time, and leisure satisfaction to marital satisfaction. *Marriage & Family Review, 40*(1), 69-91.

Kaylen, M. T., & Pridemore, W. A. (2010). Societal heavy drinking and suicide mortality among Russian youth. *Contemporary Drug Problems, 37*, 449.

Kim, S. W., & Pridemore, W. A. (2005). Poverty, socioeconomic change, institutional anomie, and homicide. *Social Science Quarterly, 86*, 1377-1398.

Kolenikov, S., & Shorrocks, A. (2005). A decomposition analysis of regional poverty in Russia. *Review of Development Economics, 9*(1), 25-46.

Kozhevnikov, E. (2003). A state family policy is needed. *Russian Education & Society, 45*(8), 16-25.

Lapin, N. I. (2004). How the citizens of Russia feel and what they are striving for. *Russian Social Science Review, 45*(6), 4-21.

Larson, R. W., Gillman, A., & Richards, M. (1997). Divergent experiences of family leisure: Fathers, mothers, and young adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research, 29*(1), 78-97.

Leon, D. A., & Shkolnikov, V. M. (1998). Social stress and the Russian mortality crisis. *JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association, 279*(10), 790-791.

Medley, M. L. (1976). Satisfaction with life among persons sixty-five years and older: A causal model. *Journal of Gerontology, 31*(4), 448-455.

- National Population Census. (2010). *Results of the Census*. Retrieved from <http://www.perepis-2010.ru/>
- Nemtsov, A. (2005). Russia: Alcohol yesterday and today. *Addiction, 100*(2), 146-149.
- Newsom, J. T. (2002). A multilevel structural equation model for dyadic data. *Structural Equation Modeling, 9*(3), 431-447.
- Olson, D. H. (1986). Circumplex model VII: Validation studies and FACES III. *Family Process, 25*, 337-351.
- Olson, D. H. (2000). Circumplex model of marital and family systems. *Journal of Family Therapy, 22*(2), 144-167.
- Olson, D. H., & DeFrain, J. (1997). Understanding family relationships. In D. H. Olson & J. DeFrain (Ed.), *Marriage and the family: Diversity and strengths* (pp. 65-97). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Olson, D. H., Gorall, D., & Tiesel, J. (2004). *Faces IV package*. Minneapolis, MN: Life Innovations.
- Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H. I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1992). *Family inventories: 2nd revision*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2012). *Better Life Index*. Data retrieved from <http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/>
- Orthner, D.K. (1998). Strengthening today's families: A challenge to parks and recreation. *Parks and Recreation, 87-98*.
- Orthner, D. K., & Mancini, J. A. (1991). Benefits of leisure for family bonding. In B. L. Driver, P. J. Brown, & G. L. Peterson, (Eds.), *Benefits of Leisure* (pp. 215-247). State College, PA: Venture.

Patrushev, V. D. (2003). The time budget of the urban working population of the USA and Russia (1980-1990 years). *Sociological Studies*, 12, 32-39.

Patrushev, V. D., Artemov, V. A. & Novohatskaya, O.V. (2001). The analysis of time budgets in Russia in the 21st century. *Sociological Studies*, 6, 112-120.

Poff, R.A., Zabriskie, R. B., & Townsend, J. (2010a). Australian Family Leisure: Modeling parent and youth data. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 13(3), 420-438.

Poff, R. A., Zabriskie, R. B., & Townsend, J. (2010b). Modeling family leisure and related family constructs: A national study of US parent and youth perspectives. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 42(3), 365-391.

Poff, R., Zabriskie, R., & Townsend, J. (2010c). New Zealand family leisure: Modeling parent and child perspectives. In Ian Patterson, Shane Pegg, and Katina Franzidis (Eds.) *Abstracts of papers presented at the 9th ANZALS Conference "Exploring new ideas and new directions"*. Brisbane, Queensland, Australia: School of Tourism, University of Queensland.

Pridemore, W. A. (2005). Social structure and homicide in post-soviet Russia. *Social Science Research*, 34(4), 732-756.

Pridemore, W. A., & Kim, S. W. (2007). Socioeconomic change and homicide in a transitional society. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 48(2), 229-251.

R Development Core Team. (2010). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Ryabov, A. V., & Kurbagaleeva, E. (2003). *Core values of Russian citizens: Societal attitudes, life strategies, symbols, and myths*. Moscow: Tomskaya Iniziativa.

- Ryan, R. M., Chirkov, V. I., Little, T. D., Sheldon, K. M., Timoshina, E., & Deci, E. L. (1999). The American dream in Russia: Extrinsic aspirations and well-being in two cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(12), 1509-1524.
- Saris, W. E. (2001). What influences subjective well-being in Russia? *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 2(2), 137-146.
- Schyns, P. (2001). Income and satisfaction in Russia. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 2(2), 173-204.
- Shaw, S.M. (1997) Controversies and contradictions in family leisure: An analysis of conflicting paradigms. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29(1), 98.
- Shaw, S., & Dawson, D. (2001). Purposive leisure: Examining parental discourses on family activities. *Leisure Sciences*, 23(4), 217-231.
- Skinner, H. A. (1979). A multivariate evaluation of the MAST. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 40(9), 831.
- Smith, K. M., Freeman, P. A., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2009). An examination of family communication within the core and balance model of family leisure functioning. *Family Relations*, 58(1), 79-90.
- Svejnar, J. (2002). Transition economies: Performance and challenges. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(1), 3-28.
- Tabachnick, B. & Fidell, L. 1996. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Tartakovsky, E. (2010). Children of perestroika: The changing socioeconomic conditions in Russia and Ukraine and their effect on the psychological well-being of high-school adolescents. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 45(1), 25-37.

The United Nations Children's Fund 2012. (2012) The State of the World's Children 2012:

Children in an Urban World. Retrieved from

http://www.unicef.org/sowc/files/SOWC_2012-Main_Report_EN_21Dec2011.pdf

Townsend, J. A., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2010). Family leisure among families with a child in mental health treatment: Therapeutic recreation implications. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 44*(1), 11-34.

Ward, P., Clark, T., Zabriskie, R., & Morris, T. (2012). Paper/pencil versus online data collection: an exploratory study. *Journal of Leisure Research, 44*(4), 507-530.

Ward, P. J., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2011). Positive youth development within a family leisure context: Youth perspectives of family outcomes. *New Directions for Youth Development, 2011*(130), 29-42.

White, J., & Klein, D. (2008). The systems framework. In J. M. White & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Family theories* (pp. 151-177). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

White, S. (1995). *Russia Goes Dry: Alcohol, state and society*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.

World Divorce Statistics. (2012). *Divorce Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.divorcemag.com/statistics/statsWorld.shtml>

World Resources Institute. (2005). *The wealth of the poor: Managing ecosystems to fight poverty*. World Resources Institute, Washington, D.C: UNEP/UNDP/WRI/World Bank.

Zabriskie, R. B. (2000). *An examination of family and leisure behavior among families with middle school aged children*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Zabriskie, R., & Aslan, N. (2012) Family Leisure Functioning Among Turkish Families: An Official Report. Unpublished Manuscript.

Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2001). The influences of family leisure patterns on perceptions of family functioning. *Family Relations*, 50(3), 281-289.

Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2003). Parent and child perspectives of family leisure involvement and satisfaction with family life. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 35(2), 163-189.

Zabriskie, R. & Ward, P. (In press). The satisfaction with family life scale.

Zubkov, V. (2007). Russian families. *Marriage & Family Review*, 41(3-4), 361.

Table 1

Means of Dependent and Independent Variables

Dependent Variables	Respondent	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Family Functioning	Parent	5.64	1.46		
	Child	5.12	1.61		
Satisfaction With Family Life	Parent	25.14	7.00		
	Child	26.10	6.65		
Independent Variables	Respondent	Russian Means	USA Means	Russia Std. Dev.	USA Std. Dev.
Core Family Leisure Involvement	Parent	44.08	44.21	17.55	15.90
	Child	38.56	42.37	17.58	38.56
Balance Family Leisure Involvement	Parent	43.98	51.30	22.89	25.68
	Child	43.60	52.50	25.06	25.91
Total Family Leisure Involvement	Parent	88.06	95.51	34.10	35.54
	Child	82.33	94.87	37.43	37.43
Core Family Leisure Satisfaction	Parent	31.66	29.97	6.14	5.20
	Child	31.55	30.24	5.67	4.66
Balance Family Leisure Satisfaction	Parent	29.65	29.11	6.53	5.13
	Child	29.91	28.98	6.25	4.97

Note: Independent variables compared to a United States National Sample (Agate et al., 2009)

Table 2

Independent Variables Estimating Variance in Family Functioning

Variable	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value
(Intercept)	1.822	0.212	8.584
Core Family Leisure Involvement	0.012	0.002	4.694
Balance Family Leisure Involvement	0.007	0.002	3.655
Core Family Leisure Satisfaction	0.079	0.007	11.862
Alcohol Consumption	-0.126	0.041	-3.044
Age	0.016	0.002	8.341

$t_{crit} = 1.96, df = 500$

Table 3

Independent Variables Estimating Variance in Satisfaction with Family Life

Variable	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value
(Intercept)	14.72	1.17	12.60
Core Family Leisure	0.03	0.01	2.81
Involvement			
Core Family Leisure	0.32	0.04	8.37
Satisfaction			
Balance Family Leisure	0.09	0.03	2.71
Satisfaction			
Alcohol Consumption	-0.82	0.19	-4.30
Not Married	-2.58	0.52	-4.97
Income mid	-1.15	0.59	-1.93
Income high	-2.71	0.72	-3.75

$t_{crit} = 1.96, df = 500$

Appendix A

Prospectus

The Contribution of Family Leisure to Family Functioning and Satisfaction
Among Urban Russian Families

The modern family in Russia has been tremendously overlooked in decades of family, and leisure literature. Fascination with the Russian culture, traditions, and contemporary changes to the social and economic structures since the Soviet Era have made its people the focus of social science research targeting adolescent and adult low life satisfaction, (Eckersley & Dear, 2002; Ryan et al., 1999), alcohol consumption, health, and suicide (Andreeva, Ermakov, & Brenner, 2008; Kaylen and Pridemore, 2010), poverty and unemployment, (Ardichvili, 2009; Kolenikov & Shorrocks, 2005), and violence (Lapin, 2004)— all of which are issues plaguing the country and affecting the family. The limited family literature has focused on changes to the structure of the family but is severely lacking potential solutions to the decay of strong families (Kozhevnikov, 2003; Zubkov, 2007). When considering urban Russia is home to more than 40 million families (Institute for Demographic Research, 2010), it is important to gain an understanding of what may influence higher family functioning to address these concerns.

Family functioning is described by Olson (2000) as a delicate balance between family cohesion or closeness and family adaptability or the capacity to be flexible and adapt to challenges and changes both within the family and within their environment. While it is true that the family unit is a universal concept recognized by peoples of all ethnicities, the significance of family in Russia has a unique history. A collection of studies edited by Ryabov and Kurbagaleeva (2003) suggests both in the Soviet era and throughout 1990s, work was the dominant value for Russian adults and attention to family was secondary. Experts have since related the country's social predicaments to family instability, disruption, and confusion about social and family norms as a result of the Soviet Union's collapse (Englund, 2012; Goodwin &

Emelyanova, 1995; Kozhevnikov, 2003; Tartakovsky, 2010). Although more recent studies show family again ranking as the top priority, (Ardichvili, 2005; Ardichvili, 2009; Kim & Pridemore, 2005), Tartakovsky (2010) addressed the issue by stating, “Parental practices and interpersonal relationships in society depend not only on the socioeconomic conditions, but also on the values and cultural norms which prevail in the country, and these values and norms are resistant to change” (p. 35). Because this is a relatively recent cultural shift away from the work-centered life, the transformation among contemporary families seems to be welcomed, but the development of skills necessary to build healthy and functional family relationships has remained largely unrealizable for many families.

Having recently traveled to Russia, I observed family functioning among rural families and recognized the immense benefit participation in family leisure activities could have on the promotion of family interaction, healthy communication, and time spent together between husband and wife and between parents and children - issues leisure professionals claim recreation is most equipped to remedy (Couchman, 1988; Holman & Epperson, 1984; Orthner & Mancini, 1991; Shaw & Dawson, 2001; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). Families who have joint, purposeful leisure have seen benefits of enhanced family cohesion, a strong sense of family, (Orthner & Mancini, 1991), moral values passed on (Shaw & Dawson, 2001), development of life skills (Mactavish & Schleien, 1998), and increased satisfaction with family life (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). The preconceptions I brought with me to Russia about family leisure’s influence, however, seemed foreign and irrelevant in a place where parents and children alike appeared to be completely consumed with work and subsistence. Whether this same mentality translates to urban families, who are the focus of this study, is yet to be determined. Urban families face different challenges in terms of resources and opportunities

available, finances, and vulnerability to harmful substances, but the high uncertainty and instability common among Russia's citizens may be linked to leisure's triviality country-wide.

Several studies examining the contributions of family leisure have used the Core and Balance Framework (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001) to help explain family leisure variables and outcome variables such as family cohesion, adaptability, overall family functioning, and satisfaction with family life. The relevance of satisfaction with family life (SWFL) is of particular importance given its connection to life satisfaction, a domain where Russians rank considerably low on scales of well-being (OECD, 2012). Core family leisure, or routine, low-cost leisure, specifically, has been shown to be a stronger predictor of satisfaction with family life than family leisure involvement alone (Agate, Zabriskie, Agate, & Poff, 2009), and potential increases in core family leisure activities positively affect family functioning. While this model has been used to measure and analyze family functioning for various family structures in various countries (Aslan, 2009; Fotu, 2007; Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003; Poff, Zabriskie, & Townsend, 2010a, 2010b), fitting this model for urban Russia has specific implications that warrant investigation. While we would anticipate core leisure satisfaction to be a leading predictor of higher family functioning as it has consistently been found to be cross-culturally, this line of study has not yet observed a culture of families where both family satisfaction and the value placed on leisure are abnormally low. Similar results cannot be assumed, particularly where an outside variable of alcohol consumption is closely linked to family functioning and may have a relationship both to leisure variables and the functioning and satisfaction of the family. Alcohol consumption's impact on satisfaction with life may be an important addition to the puzzle and carry a significant impact which merits a closer look (Kaylen & Pridemore, 2010).

The urgency for studies targeted at understanding and assisting families in urban Russia, home to nearly three-fourths of Russia's population, to achieve healthy, cohesive relationships cannot be overstated. Freysinger (1997) suggests researchers begin to examine the voices of those not recognized in family leisure research, claiming "the rich and varied meanings and experiences of family are interwoven with social class and race, ethnicity, or culture, and our understanding of leisure and families is indeed incomplete when these voices are missing" (p. 2). The moderating impact of family leisure involvement and family leisure satisfaction on family functioning, cohesion, adaptability, and satisfaction with family life could have substantial practical implications for influencing the quality of family life among Russian families.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to examine the contribution of family leisure variables to family functioning and satisfaction with family life among urban Russian families with at least one adolescent child. Specifically, this study will attempt to examine how both family leisure involvement (core and balance) and family leisure satisfaction contribute to the explanation of variance in family cohesion, family adaptability, family functioning, and satisfaction with family life. Additionally, other behavioral factors including family alcohol consumption will be included in the analysis. Because the data is nested in families, and because most family leisure research has been limited to individual-level analyses, this study will account for family-level variance in addition to accounting for individual level-analysis.

Purpose of the Study

Little is known about Russia's family leisure behaviors and their relationship to family functioning and satisfaction with family life. Insufficient leisure research has been carried out in countries with such a pervasive and abrupt transition and immediate scholarly work is warranted to understand the impacts on family leisure health. The purpose of this study is to examine the

relationship between family leisure involvement and family leisure satisfaction to aspects of family functioning and satisfaction with family life among urban Russian families. Resulting information will (a) provide researchers, families, governments, and service providers with direction on how to improve elements of family well-being in Russia, (b) contribute to cultural studies by providing a cultural comparison from which to analyze common family behaviors for families in similar circumstances to Russia, and (c) evaluate the potential impact of other outside variables such as alcohol consumption to family well-being variables.

Significance of the Study

This study examining the relationship between family leisure involvement and family functioning (adaptability and cohesion) is not only important in terms of addressing a significant lack in the scholarly family literature relating to Russia, but findings are likely to have both comparative and predictive value. The quality and satisfaction of family leisure time is linked to satisfaction with family life, which is notably low among Russian families, and, in particular, adolescents (OECD, 2012; Ryan et al., 1999). This could potentially be a cause for higher stress, which has been related to alcoholism and other health and family related issues (Kaylen & Pridemore, 2010). Positive interaction within the family provides a context with the potential to play a significant role when considering experiences that can foster meaningful relationships, help develop skills and competencies, and influence all aspects of a youth's environment (Ward & Zabriskie, 2011). When considering family life, Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) stated, "Besides family crisis, shared leisure may be one of the few experiences that bring family members together for any significant amount of time today" (p. 287).

Post-Soviet Russia is distinct in its history with its shift in governance and ideology in the past 30 years. This shift has dramatically affected the way family, work, and leisure are

perceived. Undoubtedly, subsequent studies would be needed to fully understand the ever changing dynamics of the country and subsequent variables that play a part in family satisfaction and functioning. Current cultural, economic, and family conditions in Russia, however, plead for immediate leisure research observing families and how they have been affected by lingering and developing attitudes regarding the importance of work and the relative undervaluing of leisure. Implications for how to encourage commitment to family relationships and address the lack of valued family time felt by the majority of Russian families may impact other countries with similar histories and shed light on how to strengthen families in this unique situation.

This study will gather information from urban cities in Russia, where experiences of families, including ethnic minorities, may be quite different than those of rural adolescents and parents in terms of resources available, finances, and risks unique to city life (The United Nations Children's Fund, 2012). It will also provide additional knowledge to the growing body of literature examining family leisure in ethnic and cultural families, as urban Russia is home to over 160 nationalities (Pridemore, 2005). Examinations of other cultures can increase the cultural sensitivity and relevance of the instruments used in this framework, establishing the validity and reliability of instruments across a variety of cultures. Additionally, international data sets allow for an examination of the differences in family leisure involvement and related family constructs between the United States and other countries, allowing researchers to explore the role leisure involvement plays in diverse cultural lifestyles. A study of urban Russian families and leisure variables holds value for scholars and practitioners, where it could spark subsequent family or family leisure research in an overlooked area of the world where important implications to strengthen families could be produced. Additionally, this study could encourage government entities, social service groups, and others who look for ways to assess and work with

families under stress to become providers of family leisure opportunities in Russia where none may exist currently. These agencies would gain valuable knowledge by understanding the relationship of involvement with family leisure on family processes and greater social outcomes.

Delimitations

The scope of this study is delimited to the following:

1. The study will include families with adolescent children between the ages of 11 years to 15 years old (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2004).
2. The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP), which includes the imbedded Family Leisure Satisfaction Scale (FLSS) will be used to measure family leisure patterns (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).
3. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES II) will be used to measure family functioning, or cohesion and adaptability (Olson, 2000).
4. The Satisfaction with Family Life scale (SWFL) will be used to measure satisfaction with family life.
5. Data will be collected starting November 2012, until 800 families have responded.
6. Responses will be collected from one parent and one child in each household.
7. All responses will be collected using an online survey sampling company that draws subjects from a multi-source Internet panel of millions of households worldwide.
8. Subjects will comprise a representative sample of urban Russian households willing to participate in online research based on Survey Sampling International's (SSI) eligibility standards.

Limitations

The scope of this study is limited by the following:

1. The influence of the parent on the child completing the online questionnaire cannot be controlled or measured, although they are told through instructions to complete the survey independently.
2. Some people may be excluded from the study due to the nature of the online survey, such as those without access to a computer.
3. Because of the nature of correlational analysis, causal relationships and directionality cannot be determined without further study.
4. Because this is not a true random sample due to the nature of data collection, broad generalizations to the population may not be possible.
5. Because Russian participants will be responding to instruments developed in a Western culture and translated into Russian, there may be some limitations in measurement.

Assumptions

The study will be based on the following assumptions:

1. Participants will answer to the best of their abilities and be honest in completing the questionnaire.
2. The FLAP (Family Leisure Activity Profile), which includes the imbedded Family Leisure Satisfaction Scale (FLSS), will provide a valid and reliable measure of family leisure involvement and family leisure satisfaction (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).
3. The FACES II instrument (Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales) will provide a valid and reliable measure of family functioning (Olson et al., 1992).
4. The SWFL instrument (Satisfaction with Family Life) will provide a valid and reliable measure of satisfaction with family life (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003).

5. The translation of the instruments into Russian was done accurately so that the instruments are reliable and valid.

Hypotheses

The study is designed to test the following hypotheses:

H01: Family leisure involvement, family leisure satisfaction, and alcohol consumption will not significantly contribute to variance in family functioning variables, when controlling for other sociodemographic variables.

H02: Family leisure involvement, family leisure satisfaction, and alcohol consumption will not significantly contribute to variance in satisfaction with family life, when controlling for other sociodemographic variables.

H03: There is no interaction effect between family leisure variables and alcohol consumption with the relationship with family functioning and satisfaction variables.

Definition of Terms

1. *Balance family leisure involvement*: Balance family leisure is depicted by activities that occur less frequently, are more out of the ordinary, usually not home-based, and require more time, planning, and resources. These may include family vacations, outdoor adventure activities such as camping, fishing, or hunting, or attending sporting events in the community (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). Such experiences expose family members to unfamiliar stimuli from the environment and new challenges within a leisure context requiring them to learn, adapt, and progress as a family unit (Poff et al., 2010b).
2. *Core family leisure involvement*: Core family leisure is depicted by activities that are home-based, relatively accessible, low-cost, and common or every day. This may include activities such as family dinner, playing games, or watching TV. Such activities often

require minimal planning and resources, can be spontaneous or informal, and provide a safe, consistent, and typically positive context in which family relationships tend to be enriched and feelings of family closeness increased (Poff et al., 2010b).

3. *Family adaptability*: Family adaptability is the family's ability to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress (Olson, Portner, & Bell, 1982).
4. *Family cohesion*: Family cohesion refers to the emotional bonding between family members (Olson et al., 1982).
5. *Family functioning*: Regularly examined and interpreted through a family systems theoretical perspective, focusing on family dynamics including relationships, power, structures, boundaries, family roles, and communication patterns (Buswell, Zabriskie, Lundberg, & Hawkins, 2012). Both family cohesion and family adaptability are measured as the defining characteristics of healthy family functioning (Olson & DeFrain, 1997).
6. *Family leisure involvement*: "All recreation and leisure activities family members participate in with other family members, including both core and balance family leisure patterns" (Zabriskie, 2000, p. 7).
7. *Family leisure satisfaction*: Family leisure satisfaction is derived from the summed satisfaction scores from the Family Leisure Activity Profile and indicates individual's self-report levels of satisfaction with leisure participation, or lack thereof, with family members (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).
8. *Satisfaction with family life*. Satisfaction with family life is derived from the total scores on the SWFL and indicates individuals' self-report of level of satisfaction with family

life. It was designed to assess an individual's global judgment of family satisfaction, which is theoretically predicted to depend on a comparison of family life circumstances to one's own standards and expectations (Pavot & Diener, 2003).

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The problem of this study is to examine the contribution of family leisure variables to family functioning and satisfaction with family life among urban Russian families with at least one adolescent child. Specifically, this study will attempt to examine how both family leisure involvement (core and balance) and family leisure satisfaction contribute to the explanation of variance in family cohesion, family adaptability, family functioning, and satisfaction with family life. Because Russia has seen exceptionally low levels of overall life satisfaction and this has been linked to high rates of alcoholism (Kaylen & Pridemore, 2010), the study will include an analysis of the behavioral variable of alcohol consumption to account for the impact on family functioning and satisfaction with family life. Furthermore, the data will be nested in families, and because most family leisure research has been limited to individual-level analyses, this study will account for family-level variance in addition to accounting for individual level-analysis.

Families are an important component of the greater network of society (Orthner, 1998; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003) and spending time and interacting together are central values of most cultures. Studies of family leisure and family functioning using the Core and Balance framework have primarily been accomplished within the U.S. and other English speaking, westernized countries including Australia (Poff et al., 2010a), New Zealand (Poff, Zabriskie, & Townsend, 2010c), and the United Kingdom. To date, only two studies from this framework have been carried out in developing societies (Aslan, 2009; Fotu, 2007). While characteristics of family functioning such as cohesion, adaptability, and communication have previously been detected as influential to a family's well-being and have not been culturally specific, the impact of family leisure on family functioning and satisfaction in urban Russia may be quite unique.

Post-Soviet Russian history is particularly distinct due to the dramatic shift in governance and ideology it has experienced in the past 30 years. This shift has dramatically affected the way family, work, and leisure are perceived (Pridemore, 2002; Tartakovsky, 2010). Little leisure research has been carried out in countries with such a pervasive and abrupt transition and immediate scholarly work is warranted to understand the impacts on family leisure health. A fundamental concern is whether the constructs of family leisure show similar meanings across cultures where social norms differ extensively, individual satisfaction with life is characteristically low, and little emphasis is placed on leisure activities overall. Findings from previous family leisure research does suggest these concerns can be addressed, particularly when leisure professionals submit leisure is the single most important force in developing positive, cohesive, healthy relationships between family members and promoting family interactions, social support, and an overall positive outlook on life within the family unit (Couchman, 1988, as cited in Canadian Parks/Recreation Association, 1997, as cited in Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003; Driver, 1992). Robust strengthening of the family plays a stabilizing role and could enable the country to re-enter a period of stable social and economic development, which is of particular consequence in Russia today (Kozhevnikov, 2003).

For organizational purposes, the literature is presented under the following topics: (a) The Russian Context; (b) Russian Families and Family Functioning (c) Family Leisure and Family Functioning; (d) Family Leisure and Satisfaction with Family Life.

The Russian Context

Urban Russia has a population of over 103 million people and over 40 million families (Bebtschuk, Smirnova, & Khayretdinov, 2012). One of the most multinational countries in the world, it is home to more than 160 nationalities and a colorful array of cultures, ethnicities, and

religions (Pridemore, 2005). This diversity provides meaningful variation to the factors influencing family life. Equally significant, however, is the country's unique history, family structure, and value system that demand consideration in any serious study of the culture and the variables affecting family life.

History. During the Soviet period (1917-1990), family practices promoted strengthening communal ties rather than promoting individual or family identity (Bronfenbrenner, 1970). Work was considered to be the most honored activity for the Russian citizen, even above family, and anything associated with leisure was looked at with suspicion (Ardichvili, 2009). The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990 and the process of social, economic, and following political transformation that followed caused enormous uncertainty and subsequent stress for the Russian people as they attempted to transition through a large-scale economic depression, social turmoil, and the reinvention of their cultural values (Svejnar, 2002). Even decades later, financial stress is still one of the major burdens of Russian families, but many values of the Russia citizen look quite different, particularly where family is concerned. In what he referred to as the Stable Nucleus of Russians' Values, Lapin (2004) found order, family, and associations were the leading values in Russian society. Employees generally feel it is more important for them to spend time with their families than their work (Ardichvili, 2009) and high value is placed on children (Zubkov, 2007).

Family structure. While Russia is carrying out many reforms with potential to lead to positive results, the unstable economy and decline in standard of living of many families has produced a family structure that parallels the major changes occurring in social and economic settings (Kozhevnikov, 2003). Conventional Soviet institutions are gone and enduring social institutions such as the family have been weakened by the collapse of the Soviet welfare system

and ongoing transformation that has followed (Kim & Pridemore, 2005). Declining birth rates, increasing divorces, and fewer children in families defines the new dynamics of family structure (Zubkov, 2007). It is typical to have several generations of family members dependent upon one another, not only emotionally, but also materially as younger generations have difficulty finding employment enough to become independent from their parents; child care is difficult to find and afford; and an early death rate in men often causes mothers to bear the heavy burden of both work and childcare (Zubkov, 2007). Often grandparents are involved in raising both their children and grandchildren, causing the boundaries between subsystems of the family to be nebulous and unstructured (Bebtschuk et al., 2012). The elderly may still hold collectivist values while their children have adopted individualistic ideals (Chirkov & Ryan, 2001). Gender roles have shifted slightly as women have begun to call upon previously withdrawn fathers to take on some of the load of parenting in addition to providing (Goodwin & Emelyanova, 1995).

Value system. In addition to a shifting family structure, several lingering effects of the post-Soviet transition impair family functioning in addition to the financial problems mentioned earlier. Studies of both adults and adolescents have observed persistent confusion over their cultural norms and values concerning prosperity, health promotion, education, interpersonal relationships, and support for liberal values such as freedom, independence, and initiative (Cockerham, Snead, & DeWaal, 1999; Lapin, 2004; Tartakovsky, 2010). Criminality is abundant and lack of affordable, positive leisure activities is oppressive (The United Nations Children's Fund, 2012). Employment opportunities are scarce, effective social policy protecting families is largely absent, and alcohol and drug abuse are rampant (Goodman, Slobodskaya, & Knyazev, 2005; Lapin, 2004; Zubkov, 2007). Many adolescents feel there is such little stability that the worth of their contributions in society is negligible (Pridemore, 2002). Kaylen and

Pridemore (2010) observed many of these factors increase the overall demand for alcohol among younger Russians, and research in the United States suggests the type of economic hardship and disarray found in Russia can fuel family stress and poor well-being of youth and families (Elder, Nguyen, & Caspi, 1985).

In a world of social institution dysfunction, the family is ideally the place to find sanctuary. These crises, however, undermine the fundamentals of the family as an institution and actually compound the social challenges. Examination of family functioning and family leisure will lay a foundation for future studies to answer the call for greater well-being and survival. Families with adequate “internal resources for their own stability and development” (Zubkov, 2007, p. 367) are the families who overcome the turbulence of society. Acquiring those internal resources through the moderating and enabling effects of family leisure may be an initial step toward stability with crucial implications for families in Russia.

Family Well-Being and Leisure of Urban Russian Families

Increases in family distress in Russia have sparked recent national recognition, attributed largely by the media to low overall satisfaction with life (Englund, 2012; Ryan et al., 1999). Russian family literature has focused on family problems triggered by economics and subsequent alcoholism, but the deficiency in information available on increasing satisfaction with life as a motivation for higher family functioning is inadequate. With the numerous challenges Russian families face, Kozhevnikov (2003) addressed the need for Russians to “raise the family’s moral and psychological role in the self-realization of the individual, the upbringing of new generations, and the strengthening of the legal and spiritual foundations of society” (p. 25). Family leisure has been shown to address many of these moral issues (Hebblethwaite & Norris, 2011; Shaw & Dawson, 2001). Cross-cultural research assessing increases in family functioning

and satisfaction related to increased family leisure suggest families who engage in higher levels of family leisure correspond to families with higher functioning scores including communication, cohesion, and adaptability (Aslan, 2009; Poff et al., 2010a). Many urban Russian families have distinct circumstances related to family well-being that could lead to noticeable implications for this study. Closer investigation of those issues and current struggles with family functioning is necessary.

Alcohol Abuse. The prevalence of alcohol abuse is a major concern of those anxious to facilitate change in Russia as levels of alcohol consumption and associated suicide in the nation are among the highest in the world (Andreeva et al., 2008). Easy accessibility, low cost, and permissive social attitudes toward drunkenness have led to conditions that steer adults and adolescents alike to use alcohol to temper the effects of stress, the unpredictability of poor economic conditions, unemployment, and violence (White, 1996; The United Nations Children's Fund, 2012). Scholars claim the increased demand for alcohol is related to increasing rates of depression and deprivation of opportunities (Pridemore, 2006; Pridemore & Kim, 2007). These stressors greatly diminish the development of positive, cohesive, healthy relationships, nurturing family interactions, social support, and an overall positive outlook on life and within the family unit (Grant et al., 2006; Leon & Shkolnikov, 1998). Whatever the reasons for alcohol abuse, drinking upsets family relationships and accounts for more than 51% of divorces in Russia (Bebtschuk et al., 2012). Parent's drinking habits have substantial influence on their children's usage, and at a time when individualism and autonomy for children is highly encouraged, healthy and appropriate standards are often sidestepped (Mäkelä, 1996; Ryan et al., 1999).

Though in recent years the country's high suicide rate has been slightly moderated, suicides remain three times the world's average, with adolescent suicides ranking third in the

world (Värnik, 2012; Wasserman, Cheng, & Jiang, 2005). Scholars have attributed these shockingly high rates, in part, to alcohol abuse with a recent article suggesting "a population equivalent to a town is being lost to suicide" annually in Russia (Andreeva et al., 2008, p. 22; Kaylen & Pridemore, 2010). Interestingly, scholars have correspondingly found measures of individualism and happiness among youth were stronger predictors of suicide than alcohol use or socioeconomic measures (Eckersley & Dear, 2002). In other words, minimal social constraints on drinking seem to be one reason for excessive alcohol use, but there may be stronger, underlying explanations of low life satisfaction and unhappiness driving Russians to abuse alcohol and leading adolescents, in particular, to alcoholism and suicide as they attempt to cope with stress.

Since alcohol has been found to be related to lower functioning within family relationships, and family leisure is related positively to family functioning, it is likely that family leisure involvement would have associations to alcohol consumption within the family. It is important to examine these variables in the context of alcohol consumption for Russian families, particularly when family cohesion, open communication about stressful situations, and a positive emotional climate are key elements to dealing with stress inside a family (Hartup, 1996), and leisure researchers consistently report positive relationships between family leisure and similar variables. A relationship found between family leisure variables and satisfaction with family life could moderate the consumption of alcohol in the future for families in Russia (Alfonso, Allison, Rader, & Gorman, 1996).

Current family leisure time. For many families, particularly in western cultures, leisure time is purposive, with parents intentionally planning activities to promote valued relationships and bonding (Shaw & Dawson, 2001). The conditions in urban Russia, however, do not

typically lend themselves to facilitating this level of planning. Out of necessity, most members of families work long hours, at times on several jobs, to maintain a decent financial position and standard of living for the rest of the family (Zubkov, 2007). Schools make high demands on children and parents to be involved in academic matters (Holloway, Mirny, Bempechat, & Li, 2008). Orchestrating family time together is daunting, and scheduling purposive leisure as a family has become excessively difficult. While the value of family is important to the culture, previous research has clearly observed home-based activities to be more relevant to the culture (Zabriskie & Aslan, 2012), but leisure attitudes suggest Russian families' leisure is less intentional.

Holloway et al. (2008) found during discretionary time, all urban adolescents from their sample spent at least some time interacting with parents during leisure time, but the nature of contact depended on work schedules. Watching television has become the leading leisure family activity, while studies have seen a reduction in visits to cultural and relaxation establishments (Patrushev, 2003; Patrushev, Artemov & Novohatskaya, 2001). Because of the high prices of tickets, Russians seldom go to cinemas, theatres and concert halls, and few attend sporting events. Summer months lend themselves to greater leisure opportunities, but coordinating family activities is still difficult when some members are working long hours (Zubkov, 2007). Passive, home-based pastimes left to chance do not often carry the same advantages as those where participants are satisfied and promotion of leisure is deliberate (Buswell et al., 2012; Harrington, 2005; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003).

Another circumstance affecting current levels of Russian family leisure involvement is the relative unfamiliarity of choosing and passing down healthy lifestyle behaviors. Those whose parents grew up during the Soviet era were accustomed to high levels of patronage

fostering dependency on the state. A strong sense of individual initiative and a personal responsibility for health were not encouraged and a sense of responsibility has taken time to develop after socialism's fall because of the lack of established norms (Cockerham et al., 1999). Since leisure time was previously seen as unjustified and unessential (Ardichvili, 2009), perhaps time reserved for family leisure involvement is omitted and the subsequent family functioning is being sacrificed due to a persistent unawareness of leisure's precious benefits.

Family Leisure and Family Functioning

Studies of family leisure span several decades from the early 1900s and have consistently identified a positive relationship between quality time spent together in family leisure and improved family functioning (Baldwin, Ellis, & Baldwin, 1999; Holman & Epperson, 1984; Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003; Orthner & Mancini, 1991; Poff et al., 2010b; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001, 2003). Family leisure includes recreation and leisure activities family members participate in with other family members, including both core and balance family leisure patterns (Zabriskie, 2000). Family leisure is made up of both leisure involvement (frequency and duration), as well as leisure satisfaction (quality), which is often a better predictor of family functioning than involvement alone (Agate et al., 2009; Hodge, Zabriskie, & Poff, 2012; Poff et al., 2010b; Smith, Freeman, & Zabriskie, 2009; Zabriskie & Freeman, 2004).

Family systems theory is a widely accepted framework utilized to understand family behaviors. This framework suggests that each individual in the family affects the whole, while the whole family affects each individual member (White & Klein, 2008). Olson and DeFrain (1997) have attempted to capture the dynamics of family systems using the Family Circumplex Model. Three main dimensions are embodied in the Family Circumplex Model: (a) cohesion, (b) adaptability, and (c) communication. Cohesion is based on dimensions of emotional bonding,

boundaries, decision-making, interests and recreation, while flexibility is the ability to adjust to changes in the family environment (Olson, 2000). The third dimension, communication, allows the family to move through levels of cohesion and adaptability. The Model suggests family functioning is at its height when families participate in activities allowing them to gain a balanced amount of cohesive and adaptive experience together. Allowing for both family closeness as well as the ability to adjust to changes within the family and in their environment is vital (Olson & DeFrain, 1997).

Families both affect and are affected by their environment and the feedback passed through the system (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). This is why many leisure researchers, who are increasingly aware of the importance of family leisure time to high functioning families, have closely examined the relationship between families who have joint, purposeful leisure and their associations to enhanced family communication and a strong sense of family (Orthner & Mancini, 1991). Family leisure activities, in particular, have been shown to foster both the adaptability and cohesion inherent in family functioning since during leisure, the family system must learn to interact in the face of new inputs within the family and in the environment (Olson, 2000; Orthner & Mancini, 1991). Recreation time is also an ideal setting for moral values to be passed on (Shaw & Dawson, 2001) and for the development of life skills such as dealing with tension and gaining self-confidence (Mactavish & Schleien, 1998). Among other things, family leisure has the potential to instill family values and identity, which certainly impact moral conduct of families. Tartakovsky (2010) submitted “positive changes in the moral conduct of countries undergoing rapid economic development may be crucial in ensuring the psychological well-being of their citizens,” and particularly for adolescents in these countries (p. 35). Family leisure provides time and circumstance for families to develop and attain these fundamental

attributes to improve their quality of life and gives them the resources they need to build stable and successful family relationships between husband and wife, and between parents and children (Shaw & Dawson, 2001; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

In a recent study of family leisure in Turkey (Aslan, 2009), scholars assumed family leisure patterns would revolve primarily around home-based activities, or core leisure involvement, with little if any participation outside of the home in balance types of family leisure activities. They found, however, patterns were comparable to other family samples and included considerable participation in balance activities, even though spending time with family members was highly valued and leisure awareness was not as developed as in Western societies. Clearly, leisure perception and attitudes in a transformational society cannot always predict family leisure patterns and more information is needed to understand the patterns and outcomes of leisure among Russian families. A detailed examination of what the Core and Balance Framework suggests may inform family functioning in the Russian culture.

Core and Balance Model. To further explain the relationship between family leisure involvement and family functioning, Zabriskie and McCormick (2001) developed the Core and Balance Model of Family Leisure Functioning. This model applies the concept of proper balance of cohesion and adaptability, required for family functioning, to family leisure involvement. The model specifically suggests family leisure meets these same needs for both stability and change by engaging in patterns of core (common) and balance (novel) family leisure. Using this framework, scholars have reported direct relationships between family leisure involvement and family cohesion, adaptability, and overall family functioning, suggesting a relationship between family leisure patterns and family cohesion and adaptability (Dodd, Zabriskie, Widmer, & Eggett, 2009; Hornberger, Zabriskie, & Freeman, 2010).

Zabriskie & McCormick (2001) found there are two main types of family leisure, core and balance. Core family activity patterns promote family cohesion by providing routine, low-cost, predictable and personal activities to family members. Balance activities, in contrast, tend to be more challenging and novel experiences requiring more resources and time away from home. Research suggests both categories are essential and families who regularly participate in both core and balance family leisure activities report higher levels of family functioning than those who participate in high or low amounts of either category (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003).

Consistent evidence from researchers has shown shared recreation experiences are related to higher family satisfaction and promote quality of family life (Orthner, 1998). Of particular importance for this study, however, is research suggesting core family leisure to be a stronger predictor of satisfaction with family life than family leisure involvement alone (Agate et al., 2009; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). Hodge et al. (2012) reported their analyses of youth respondents across five different countries indicating that although both core and balance family leisure involvement variables were significant predictors of variance in satisfaction with family life, when the family leisure satisfaction variables were entered into the equation, core leisure satisfaction became the single most explanative variable in the model. Potential increases in core family leisure activities specifically could positively affect family functioning by increasing a vital component of family life – family satisfaction.

Family Leisure and Satisfaction with Family Life

It is not simply the amount of involvement families spend in leisure activities that is related to greater family functioning, but rather leisure provides a context through which quality, meaningful, and satisfying interactions may take place, which in turn predict greater family functioning (Johnson, Zabriskie, & Hill, 2006). Scholars have recently found a positive

relationship not only between family leisure *involvement* and satisfaction with family life, but have reported a stronger relationship between family leisure *satisfaction* and satisfaction with family life (Agate et al., 2009; Buswell et al., 2012). In other words, while the overall domain of satisfaction with family life is positively influenced by simply being *involved* in family leisure, the inclusion of an indication of *quality* or the individual's satisfaction with that leisure is also important so researchers can account for some variance possibly related to the conflict, contradictions, and possible family stress reported in some earlier qualitative family studies (Larson, Gillman, & Richards, 1997; Shaw, 1997; Shaw & Dawson, 2001). By doing this, individual value judgments related to family leisure involvement are accounted for, whether negative, positive, or otherwise (Buswell et al., 2012).

In their study of father involvement in family leisure, Buswell et al. (2012) found satisfaction with family involvement in everyday, core family leisure activities to be more important, or be a stronger predictor of, family functioning scores than the amount of involvement when considering various aspects of family functioning.

“Rather than the occasional expensive family vacation alone, the satisfaction with regularly occurring home-based family activities such as eating dinner together, participating in hobbies and informal sports and yard activities together, watching television together, or playing board games and video games together... was the single strongest predictor of all aspects of family functioning, particularly from the youth perspective.” (p. 186)

Several additional studies in this line have pointed to core leisure satisfaction as the single greatest contributor to all aspects of family and marital functioning (cohesion, adaptability, and

total family functioning) and satisfaction with family and married life, even after controlling for sociodemographic variables (Agate et al., 2009; Hodge et al., 2012; Poff et al., 2010b).

Examination of the construct of satisfaction with family life across cultural boundaries, and particularly in Russia, could have remarkable implications not yet considered. Satisfaction within the family unit is integral to overall life satisfaction (Alfonso et al., 1996; Cummins 2005), and therefore the relationship between family leisure involvement and increased family satisfaction may have effects more far reaching than previously suggested.

Life Satisfaction. The construct of life satisfaction is commonly measured as an aggregate of individual life domains, with satisfaction with family life showing a positive association with scores on a global measure of life satisfaction (Alfonso et al., 1996). Some scholars even submit satisfaction with family life makes the greatest single impact on satisfaction with life in particular phases of the life cycle (Medley, 1976). This suggests fulfillment, or lack thereof, with family life may relate to similar feelings with life in general.

Studies in the last decade have revealed Russians are less dissatisfied with their lives and are more confident in the future (Lapin, 2004), perhaps as a result of transitioning away from paternalist traditions. Nevertheless, they still show low levels of self-esteem, self-actualization, and positive attitudes toward life compared to those in other countries (OECD, 2012; Ryan et al., 1999). For adolescents in particular, scholars have attributed low life-satisfaction to the decreased ability of youth to maintain a sense of mastery due to their inability to rely on cultural norms (Tartakovsky, 2010). According to the Family Systems Theory, a single family member's satisfaction with life will likely be influential on broader family outcomes, such as family functioning and satisfaction with family life (White & Klein, 2008). If personal unhappiness is related to lower family satisfaction, then increases in family satisfaction linked with family

leisure involvement could influence not only personal life satisfaction, but family's as well. Helping the country's family health professionals become aware of the potential effects of increases in family well-being leisure brings could have notable impacts on Russian society.

Family leisure studies have consistently reported relationships between family leisure and increased family functioning. This relationship, however, has not been examined in the context of an economically disadvantaged country where leisure has been undervalued and levels of life satisfaction are remarkably low. The Core and Balance Model would suggest higher rates of involvement and satisfaction in family leisure will be related to broader family outcomes, including family functioning and satisfaction with family life. We would anticipate families who are involved in more family leisure are likely to report higher levels of family functioning than those who participate in less. Because the alcohol epidemic in Russia is of great concern, this initial study including alcohol consumption as a variable is crucial to see if future study on the potential relationship between family leisure and alcohol consumption is merited. If the amount of family leisure involvement and satisfaction is comparable to others in this line of study, then alcohol may be a variable that has significant impact and implications. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the contribution of family leisure variables of involvement and family leisure satisfaction to family functioning and satisfaction with family life among urban Russian families, accounting for the behavioral factor of family alcohol consumption.

Chapter 3

Methods

The problem of this study is to examine the contribution of family leisure variables to family functioning and satisfaction with family life among urban Russian families with at least one adolescent child. Specifically, this study will attempt to examine how both family leisure involvement (core and balance) and family leisure satisfaction (quality of leisure) contribute to the explanation of variance in family cohesion, family adaptability, family functioning, and satisfaction with family life. Additionally, other behavioral factors including family alcohol consumption will be included in the analysis. The conduct of the study includes the following organizational steps: (a) selection of subjects; (b) translation; (c) instrumentation; (d) data collection procedures, and (e) analysis.

Sample

Participants for this study will be recruited in cooperation with SSI, an online survey sampling company that draws subjects from a multi-source Internet panel of millions of households worldwide. Subjects will comprise a representative sample of urban Russian households willing to participate in online research based on the following criteria set by the researcher. We will collect data until we reach a sample of at least 800 families which must contain at least one parent and at least one youth (11 years - 15 years old), to enable comparison between these findings and normative samples (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003). It has also been suggested that children at this age are psychologically beginning to individuate from parents, yet still rely heavily on the secure base of parents and other family members (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). Each responding family will be required to submit two completed responses, one from a parent and one from the youth. Including perspectives of both a parent

and a child has been suggested in previous research in an effort to approach a systems perspective and provide greater understanding of family functioning and satisfaction with family life (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Translation

The research questionnaire with all related instruments (FLAP, FACES II, and SWFL) was translated into Russian through a double translation process, as demonstrated by Christenson, Zabriskie, Eggett and Freeman (2006). This process was performed by two bilingual Russian individuals who worked independently of each other. The instrument was first translated from English to Russian by a Russian native individual. Next, a careful analysis of content and meaning was conducted to ensure the Russian version expressed the meaning intended behind items in the original instrument. Following this step, a third party bilingual Russian translator was hired to back-translate the instrument from Russian to English. The instrument was then again examined by the researchers to compare the original English version to the newly back-translated English version. The researchers found a few small discrepancies in word meanings between the translations, which were corrected before the questionnaire was distributed. Two minor wording changes were also made with activity item examples in the questionnaire based on cultural sensitivity and were adapted to reflect more common Russian descriptions of the same category. Clarification about intent, construct, and meaning were again discussed and clarified between the translators and researcher.

Instrumentation

The variables of interest in this study are family leisure involvement, family functioning, and satisfaction with family life, along with demographic and behavioral information including information on alcohol consumption. There will be four scales used to measure these variables

(see Appendix A). The Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP) will be used to measure family leisure involvement in core, balance, and overall family leisure (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). The embedded Family Leisure Satisfaction Scale will measure satisfaction with current involvement in each of the family leisure activity categories. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scales (FACES II) will provide a measure of the family's perceptions of cohesion, adaptability, and an overall indicator of family functioning (Olson et al., 1992). The Satisfaction with Family Life scale will measure satisfaction with family life (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003; Zabriskie & Ward, under review). Lastly, other relevant behavioral and demographic questions will be included.

Family Leisure Activity Profile (FLAP). The FLAP is a 16-item activity inventory measuring involvement in family leisure activities as they are categorized within the Core and Balance framework (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001). Respondents identify leisure activities done together with family members across 16 activity categories. Eight categories are representative of core family leisure (e.g., family dinners, routine activities, games, crafts, and religious/spiritual activities), and eight categories are representative of balance family leisure (e.g., community-based events, outdoor activities, water-based activities). To clarify the distinction between these in the context of this study, examples of possible activities for each category will be provided. Each of the 16 questions has three parts: (a) a dichotomous indicator of participation in the particular category (yes/no); (b) an ordinal indicator of frequency asking approximately how often participation occurs (*daily, weekly, monthly, annually*); and (c) an ordinal indicator of duration asking about how long participation lasts each time (*less than one hour up to three weeks or more*). Family leisure involvement scores will be calculated by multiplying each item's frequency and duration and then summing the ordinal index scores of

questions 1 to 8 for core and questions 9 to 16 for balance (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Parent and youth samples have demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties including construct validity and test-retest reliability for core ($\alpha = .74$), balance ($\alpha = .78$), and total family leisure involvement ($\alpha = .78$) (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2001).

Family Leisure Satisfaction Scale (FLSS). The FLSS is embedded into the FLAP and measures satisfaction with current involvement, or lack of involvement, in each of the family leisure activity categories. Responses are indicated on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Scores are calculated by summing the core and balance family leisure satisfaction items. Acceptable psychometric properties have been reported including internal consistencies of $\alpha = .90$ from both parent and youth perspectives (Agate et al., 2009).

Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales II (FACES II). Elements of family functioning will be measured using the FACES II, a 30-item scale measuring perceptions of family cohesion and family adaptability based on Olson's Circumplex Model (Olson, 1986). The scale (Olson et al., 1992) uses a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 ("almost never") to 5 ("almost always") to measure cohesion (16 items) and family adaptability (14 items). After calculating total cohesion and adaptability scores, linear scoring interpretation procedures (Olson et al., 1992) are used to obtain an indicator of overall family functioning. Acceptable psychometric properties have been reported for this instrument (Olson et al., 1992). Articles featuring the Core and Balance framework have consistently reported adequate Cronbach's alpha coefficients for parents ranging from $\alpha = .76$ to $\alpha = .89$ for cohesion (Freeman & Zabriskie, 2003; Hornberger et al., 2010), and $\alpha = .71$ to $\alpha = .83$ for adaptability (Smith et al., 2009; Townsend & Zabriskie, 2010). Cronbach's alpha for youth have also been consistently reported

in the acceptable ranges, from $\alpha = .72$ to $\alpha = .88$ for cohesion (Dodd et al., 2009; Townsend & Zabriskie, 2010), and $\alpha = .77$ to $\alpha = .86$ for adaptability (Zabriskie & Freeman, 2004). Although a curvilinear relationship has been theorized, this instrument has consistently demonstrated a linear relationship between the dimensions (Olson, Gorall, & Tiesel, 2004).

Satisfaction with Family Life (SWFL). The SWFL scale is a modified version of the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), with the words *family life* replacing the word *life* in each item. The SWFL scale provides a brief, psychometrically sound, and widely applicable option for measuring satisfaction with family life regardless of country or parent/youth perspective (Zabriskie & Ward, under review). The SWFL asks participants to respond to 5 items on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) and is embedded as part of the FLAP. Data collected from parents and adolescents in several different family samples that vary across time, place, and culture have reported a consistent, unidimensional factor structure with a Cronbach's alpha ranging from .943 to .790. Acceptable psychometric properties have been reported for this scale, including construct validity, internal consistency, and test-retest reliability ($r = .89$) (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003; Zabriskie & Ward, under review).

Other behavioral and demographic information. Specific questions to measure alcohol consumption among family members were developed for this study based on a series of self-report alcohol screening questionnaires used to detect hazardous drinking. These include the Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (MAST; Skinner, 1979), and Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test (AUDIT; Bohn, Babor, & Kranzler, 1995). These screening questionnaires are known for being rapid, inexpensive, and easy to administer tests dependent upon a reliable report by the drinker. Some of the questions have been altered to include a self-reported measure

of family alcohol consumption in addition to personal consumption. There are four categorical items asking about personal and family alcohol consumption frequency, and three dichotomous questions asking about the influence of alcohol consumption on family behaviors. Socio-demographic questions will be included to provide potential controlling factors and identify primary characteristics of the sample. Examples of demographic data collected are family income, ethnicity, family size, marital status, history of divorce, and age and gender of both the parent and the youth.

Data Collection Procedures

An online questionnaire, designed using Qualtrics software, will be used to collect data beginning November 2012. Responses will be distributed and collected through Survey Sampling International (SSI) until we have 800 participating families from urban cities in Russia who have a youth ages 11 years to 15 years. Confidentiality will be assured using a consent disclosure included at the beginning of the Qualtrics survey. By completing the questionnaire, the participant is consenting to be involved in the study (see Appendix B). Once 800 families have responded, data will be cleaned and examined.

Analysis

Data will be analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 18.0 computer software and R version 11.1 (R Development Core Team, 2010). Data will first be cleaned by eliminating those questionnaires that had inconsistent responses regarding the same information, implausible responses, outliers, or missing responses. Next, basic descriptive statistics and scores from each scale will be calculated in SPSS, including the mean and median values of the dependent and independent variables.

Family behavior, including family functioning, is best understood by viewing the family as a unit rather than just individual parts (Poff et al., 2010b). Data will be collected from members of a dyad (i.e. parent-child relationship) and, therefore, will be nested data (i.e. parents and youth nested in families) by using a mixed model. Use of this model will appropriately account for both individual and family variance components. This data is considered to be hierarchically structured, because children and parents are nested within a family.

Hierarchical data can create analytical challenges (Cronbach, 1976; Burstein, 1980) when other statistical procedures are utilized. First, scores from two members of a dyad are nearly always related, leading to underestimation of standard errors and increased Type 1 error if the observations are treated independently. A second challenge is the dilemma of how to test variables reflecting common circumstances, such as family functioning. Last, researchers who ignore hierarchical data may fail to see important phenomena such as cross-level interaction effects. A mixed model offers solutions to all of these challenges (Newsom, 2002) through clustering, which allows the modeling of both dyad and individual-level variables.

Independent variables will include core and balance family leisure involvement, core and balance family leisure satisfaction, and alcohol consumption, with the dependent variable of family functioning, including both adaptability and cohesion, while controlling for socio-demographic variables. The R function `lmer()` will be used to produce the analysis. In addition, because we expect these independent variables also contribute to the explanation of variance in satisfaction with family life, we will fit another mixed model with the dependent variable of satisfaction with family life and the independent variables of core and balance family leisure involvement, core and balance family leisure satisfaction, and alcohol consumption, while controlling for socio-demographic variables.

The resulting coefficients will be examined for each model at an alpha level of 0.05. The relative contribution of each variable in significant models will be determined with standardized regression coefficients (β).

References

- Agate, J., Zabriskie, R., Agate, S., & Poff, R. (2009). Family leisure satisfaction and satisfaction with family life. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(2), 205-223.
- Alfonso, V. C., Allison, D. B., Rader, D. E., & Gorman, B. S. (1996). The extended satisfaction with life scale: Development and psychometric properties. *Social Indicators Research, 38*(3), 275-301.
- Andreeva, E., Ermakov, S., & Brenner, H. (2008). The socioeconomic aetiology of suicide mortality in Russia. *International Journal of Environment and Sustainable Development, 7*(1), 21-48.
- Ardichvili, A. (2005). The meaning of working and professional development needs of employees in a post-communist country. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 5*(1), 105-119.
- Ardichvili, A. (2009). The relationship between meaning of working and socioeconomic transformations: The case of post-communist Russia. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11*(2), 218-234.
- Aslan, N. (2009). An examination of family leisure and family satisfaction among traditional Turkish families. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(2), 157-176.
- Baldwin, J. H., Ellis, G. D., & Baldwin, B. M. (1999). Marital satisfaction: An examination of its relationship to spouse support and congruence of commitment among runners. *Leisure Sciences, 21*(2), 117-131.
- Bebtschuk, M., Smirnova, D., & Khayretdinov, O. (2012). Family and family therapy in Russia. *International Review of Psychiatry, 24*(2), 121-127.

- Bohn, M. J., Babor, T. F., & Kranzler, H. R. (1995). The alcohol use disorders identification test (AUDIT): Validation of a screening instrument for use in medical settings. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 56(4), 423.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1970). Reaction to social pressure from adults versus peers among Soviet day school and boarding school pupils in the perspective of an American sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 15(3), 179.
- Burstein, L. (1980). The analysis of multilevel data in educational research and evaluation. *Review of Research in Education*, , 158-233.
- Buswell, L., Zabriskie, R., Lundberg, N. & Hawkins, A. (2012). The relationship between father involvement in family leisure and family functioning: The importance of daily family leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, 34(2), 172-190.
- Canadian Parks/Recreation Association. (1997). *The benefits catalogue*. Gloucester, Ontario, Canada: Author.
- Chirkov, V.I., & Ryan, R.M. (2001). Parent and teacher autonomy-support in Russian and U.S. adolescents: Common effects on well-being and academic motivation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 618–635.
- Christenson, O., Zabriskie, R., Eggett, D., & Freeman, P. (2006). Family acculturation, family leisure involvement, and family functioning among Mexican-Americans. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 38(4), 475-495.
- Cockerham, W. C., Snead, M. C., & DeWaal, D. F. (2002). Health lifestyles in Russia and the socialist heritage. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 43(1), 42-55.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1976). *Research on classrooms and schools: Formulation of questions, design and analysis*. Occasional paper of the Stanford Evaluation Consortium. Stanford, CA.

- Cummins, R. A. (2005). The domains of life satisfaction: An attempt to order chaos. *Citation Classics from Social Indicators Research*, 26, 559-584.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- Dodd, D., Zabriskie, R., Widmer, M., & Eggett, D. (2009). Contributions of family leisure to family functioning among families that include children with developmental disabilities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(2), 261-286.
- Driver, B. L. (1992). The Benefits of Leisure. *Parks and Recreation*, 27(11), 16-23.
- Eckersley, R., & Dear, K. (2002). Cultural correlates of youth suicide. *Social Science & Medicine*, 55(11), 1891-1904.
- Elder, G. H., Van Nguyen, T., & Caspi, A. (1985). Linking family hardship to children's lives. *Child Development*, 56(2), 361-375.
- Englund, W. (2012, March 7). Teens choosing death in Russia. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/>.
- Fotu, I. (2007). *Family leisure involvement and family functioning in Samoa*. Unpublished master's thesis. Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Freeman, P., & Zabriskie, R. (2003). Leisure and family functioning in adoptive families: Implications for therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 37(1), 73-93.
- Freysinger, V. J. (1997). Redefining family, redefining leisure: Progress made and challenges ahead in research on leisure and families. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29(1), 1-4.
- Goodman, R., Slobodskaya, H., & Knyazev, G. (2005). Russian child mental health across-sectional study of prevalence and risk factors. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 14(1), 28-33.

- Goodwin, R., & Emelyanova, T. (1995). The perestroika of the family? gender and occupational differences in family values in modern day Russia. *Sex Roles, 32*(5), 337-351.
- Grant, K. E., Compas, B. E., Thurm, A. E., McMahon, S. D., Gipson, P. Y., Campbell, A. J., Westerholm, R. I. (2006). Stressors and child and adolescent psychopathology: Evidence of moderating and mediating effects. *Clinical Psychology Review, 26*(3), 257-283.
- Harrington, M. (2005). Family leisure and parents' subjective identities: Gendered ways of being a "good parent." In T. Delamere, C. Randall, & D. Robinson (Eds.), *Abstracts of papers presented at the Eleventh Canadian Congress on Leisure Research, May 17–20* (pp. 233–236). Waterloo: Canadian Association for Leisure Studies.
- Hebblethwaite, S., & Norris, J. (2011). Expressions of generativity through family leisure: Experiences of grandparents and adult grandchildren. *Family Relations, 60*(1), 121-133.
- Hodge, C., Zabriskie, R., & Poff, R. (2012). International family leisure functioning: A comparative study. *Abstracts from the 2012 Leisure Research Symposium*, Ashburn, VA; National Recreation and Park Association.
- Holloway, S. D., Mirny, A. I., Bempechat, J., & Li, J. (2008). Schooling, peer relations, and family life of Russian adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 23*(4), 488-507.
- Holman, T., & Epperson, A. (1984). Family leisure: A review of the literature with research recommendations. *Journal of Leisure Research, 16*(4), 277-294.
- Hornberger, L. B., Zabriskie, R. B., & Freeman, P. (2010). Contributions of family leisure to family functioning among single-parent families. *Leisure Sciences, 32*(2), 143-161.
- Institute for Demographic Research (2010). The current demographic situation in the Russian Federation (analytical data). Retrieved at Demografiya.ru/.

- Johnson, H. A., Zabriskie, R. B., & Hill, B. (2006). The contribution of couple leisure involvement, leisure time, and leisure satisfaction to marital satisfaction. *Marriage & Family Review, 40*(1), 69-91.
- Kaylen, M. T., & Pridemore, W. A. (2010). Societal heavy drinking and suicide mortality among Russian youth. *Contemporary Drug Problems, 37*, 449.
- Kim, S. W., & Pridemore, W. A. (2005). Poverty, socioeconomic change, institutional anomie, and homicide. *Social Science Quarterly, 86*, 1377-1398.
- Kolenikov, S., & Shorrocks, A. (2005). A decomposition analysis of regional poverty in Russia. *Review of Development Economics, 9*(1), 25-46.
- Kozhevnikov, E. (2003). A state family policy is needed. *Russian Education & Society, 45*(8), 16-25.
- Lapin, N. I. (2004). How the citizens of Russia feel and what they are striving for. *Russian Social Science Review, 45*(6), 4-21.
- Larson, R. W., Gillman, A., & Richards, M. (1997). Divergent experiences of family leisure: Fathers, mothers, and young adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research, 29*(1), 78-97.
- Leon, D. A., & Shkolnikov, V. M. (1998). Social stress and the Russian mortality crisis. *JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association, 279*(10), 790-791.
- Mactavish, J., & Schleien, S. (1998). Playing together growing together: Parents' perspectives on the benefits of family recreation in families that include children with a developmental disability. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 32*(3), 207-230.
- Mäkelä, P. (1996). Alcohol consumption and suicide mortality by age among Finnish men, 1950-1991. *Addiction, 91*(1), 101-112.

- Medley, M. L. (1976). Satisfaction with life among persons sixty-five years and older: A causal model. *Journal of Gerontology, 31*(4), 448-455.
- Newsom, J. T. (2002). A multilevel structural equation model for dyadic data. *Structural Equation Modeling, 9*(3), 431-447.
- Olson, D. H. (1986). Circumplex model VII: Validation studies and FACES III. *Family Process, 25*, 337-351.
- Olson, D. H. (2000). Circumplex model of marital and family systems. *Journal of Family Therapy, 22*(2), 144-167.
- Olson, D. H., & DeFrain, J. (1997). Understanding family relationships. In D. H. Olson & J. DeFrain (Ed.), *Marriage and the family: Diversity and strengths* (pp. 65-97). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Olson, D. H., Gorall, D., & Tiesel, J. (2004). *Faces IV package*. Minneapolis, MN: Life Innovations.
- Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H. I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., & Wilson, M. (1992). *Family inventories: 2nd revision*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Olson, D. H., Portner, J., & Bell, R. Q. (1982). FACES II. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2012). *Better Life Index*. Data retrieved from <http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/>.
- Orthner, D.K. (1998). Strengthening today's families: A challenge to parks and recreation. *Parks and Recreation, 87*-98.
- Orthner, D. K., & Mancini, J. A. (1991). Benefits of leisure for family bonding. In B. L. Driver, P. J. Brown, & G. L. Peterson, (Eds.), *Benefits of Leisure* (pp. 215-247). State College, PA: Venture.

Patrushev, V. D. (2003). The time budget of the urban working population of the USA and Russia (1980-1990 years). *Sociological Studies*, 12, 32-39.

Patrushev, V. D., Artemov, V. A. & Novohatskaya, O.V. (2001). The analysis of time budgets in Russia in the 21st century. *Sociological Studies*, 6, 112-120.

Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2003). Well-being (Including life satisfaction). In *Encyclopedia of psychological assessment* (Vol. 2, pp. 1097-1101). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Poff, R.A., Zabriskie, R. B., & Townsend, J. (2010a). Australian Family Leisure: Modeling parent and youth data. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 13(3), 420-438.

Poff, R. A., Zabriskie, R. B., & Townsend, J. (2010b). Modeling family leisure and related family constructs: A national study of US parent and youth perspectives. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 42(3), 365-391.

Poff, R., Zabriskie, R., & Townsend, J. (2010c). New Zealand family leisure: Modeling parent and child perspectives. In Ian Patterson, Shane Pegg, and Katina Franzidis (Eds.) *Abstracts of papers presented at the 9th ANZALS Conference "Exploring new ideas and new directions"*. Brisbane, Queensland, Australia: School of Tourism, University of Queensland.

Pridemore, W. A. (2005). Social structure and homicide in post-soviet Russia. *Social Science Research*, 34(4), 732-756.

Pridemore, W. A., & Kim, S. W. (2007). Socioeconomic change and homicide in a transitional society. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 48(2), 229-251.

R Development Core Team. (2010). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

- Ryabov, A. V., & Kurbagaleeva, E. (2003). *Core values of Russian citizens: Societal attitudes, life strategies, symbols, and myths*. Moscow: Tomskaya Iniziativa.
- Ryan, R. M., Chirkov, V. I., Little, T. D., Sheldon, K. M., Timoshina, E., & Deci, E. L. (1999). The American dream in Russia: Extrinsic aspirations and well-being in two cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(12), 1509-1524.
- Shaw, S.M. (1997) Controversies and contradictions in family leisure: An analysis of conflicting paradigms. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29(1), 98.
- Shaw, S., & Dawson, D. (2001). Purposive leisure: Examining parental discourses on family activities. *Leisure Sciences*, 23(4), 217-231.
- Skinner, H. A. (1979). A multivariate evaluation of the MAST. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 40(09), 831.
- Smith, K. M., Freeman, P. A., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2009). An examination of family communication within the core and balance model of family leisure functioning. *Family Relations*, 58(1), 79-90.
- Svejnar, J. (2002). Transition economies: Performance and challenges. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(1), 3-28.
- The United Nations Children's Fund 2012. (2012) The State of the World's Children 2012: Children in an Urban World. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/sowc/files/SOWC_2012-Main_Report_EN_21Dec2011.pdf
- Tartakovsky, E. (2010). Children of perestroika: The changing socioeconomic conditions in Russia and Ukraine and their effect on the psychological well-being of high-school adolescents. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 45(1), 25-37.

- Townsend, J. A., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2010). Family leisure among families with a child in mental health treatment: Therapeutic recreation implications. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 44*(1), 11-34.
- Värnik, P. (2012). Suicide in the world. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 9*(3), 760-771.
- Ward, P. J., & Zabriskie, R. B. (2011). Positive youth development within a family leisure context: Youth perspectives of family outcomes. *New Directions for Youth Development, 2011*(130), 29-42.
- Wasserman, D., Cheng, Q., & Jiang, G. X. (2005). Global suicide rates among young people aged 15-19. *World Psychiatry, 4*(2), 114.
- White, J., & Klein, D. (2008). The systems framework. In J. M. White & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Family theories* (pp. 151-177). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- White, S. (1995). *Russia Goes Dry: Alcohol, state and society*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Zabriskie, R. B. (2000). *An examination of family and leisure behavior among families with middle school aged children*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Zabriskie, R., & Aslan, N. (2012) Family Leisure Functioning Among Turkish Families: An Official Report. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Zabriskie, R. B., & Freeman, P. (2004). Contributions of family leisure to family functioning among transracial adoptive families. *Adoption Quarterly, 7*(3), 49-77.
- Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2001). The influences of family leisure patterns on perceptions of family functioning. *Family Relations, 50*(3), 281-289.

Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2003). Parent and child perspectives of family leisure involvement and satisfaction with family life. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 35(2), 163-189.

Zabriskie, R. & Ward, P. (Unpublished manuscript under review). The satisfaction with family life scale.

Zubkov, V. (2007). Russian families. *Marriage & Family Review*, 41(3-4), 361.

Appendix A-1: Instruments

Опрос о качестве семейного досуга.

Следующие вопросы посвящены мероприятиям, в которых вы участвуете вместе с членами вашей семьи. Пожалуйста, отвечая на вопросы, примите во внимание, что нас интересует период времени от одного года до прлутора лет. Обратите внимание на то, что мероприятия объединены в несколько групп. Отвечая на вопросы, пожалуйста, учитываете не отдельное мероприятие, а всю группу, к которой данное мероприятие относится. Некоторые вопросы могут потребовать от вас приблизительного ответа. Не беспокойтесь о том, чтобы дать абсолютно точный ответ. Просто постарайтесь ответить так точно, как вы можете.

Уделите несколько минут чтобы посмотреть на нижеприведенный пример. Это поможет вам более полно разобраться в том как заполнять ваши ответы в соответствующий бланк.

ВОПРОС: Вы проводите время дома с членами вашей семьи (например, совместный просмотр телевизора/видео, совместное прослушивание музыки, чтение книг, пение и т.д.)?

Во-первых, участвуете

ли вы в таких совмесных мероприятиях \longrightarrow ДА X НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?		Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
По крайней мере, ежедневно		<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	X
По крайней мере, еженедельно	x	3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно		6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов	
По крайней мере, ежегодно		9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день	

Во-вторых, как часто вы проводите такие мероприятия или участвуете в подобных мероприятиях?

В-третьих, как долго, в среднем, проходит каждое из этих мероприятий?

В-четвертых, ответьте, насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием в совместных семейных мероприятиях? Если в вашей семье не проводятся такие совместные мероприятия, удовлетворены ли вы таким положением дел?

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён			3		Очень удовлетворён
1	2			4	5

Символы

< - меньше, чем (пример, < 1 час читается как 'меньше, чем 1 час')

>- больше, чем (пример, > 10 часов читается как 'больше, чем 10 часов')

1. Ужинаете ли вы дома совместно с членами вашей семьи ?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?	
По крайней мере, ежедневно	
По крайней мере, еженедельно	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно	
По крайней мере, ежегодно	

Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	
3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

2. Вы проводите время дома с членами вашей семьи (например, совместный просмотр телевизора / видео, совместное прослушивание музыки, чтение книг, пение и т.п.)?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?	
По крайней мере, ежедневно	
По крайней мере, еженедельно	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно	
По крайней мере, ежегодно	

Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	
3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	
6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов	
9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести) Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

3. Участвуете ли вы в играх (например, игральные карты, настольные игры, видеоигры, дартс, бильярд и т.п.) вместе с членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?		Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
По крайней мере, ежедневно		<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	
По крайней мере, еженедельно		3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно		6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов	
По крайней мере, ежегодно		9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

4. Участвуете ли вы в изготовлении поделок, приготовлении пищи, есть ли у вас хобби (например, рисунок, оформление фотоальбомов, выпечка печенья, шитье, живопись, резьба по дереву и т.п.) вместе с членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да то как часто?		Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
По крайней мере, ежедневно		<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	
По крайней мере, еженедельно		3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно		6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов	
По крайней мере, ежегодно		9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

5. Участвуете ли вы в домашних мероприятиях на свежем воздухе (например, наблюдение за звездами, садоводство, огород, посадка цветов, игры с домашними животными, прогулки и т.п.) вместе с членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да то, как часто?		Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
По крайней мере, ежедневно		<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	
По крайней мере, еженедельно		3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно		6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов	
По крайней мере, ежегодно		9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

6. Участвуете ли вы в домашних спортивных мероприятиях или в игровых видах деятельности (например, футбол, вляпки, баскетбол, фрисби, велосипедные прогулки, занятия фитнесом и т.п.) вместе с членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?		Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
По крайней мере, ежедневно		<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	
По крайней мере, еженедельно		3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно		6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов	
По крайней мере, ежегодно		9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

7. Посещаете ли вы мероприятия, в которых участвуют члены вашей семьи? (например, помогать им и поддерживать их в спортивных мероприятиях, музыкальных представлениях и т.п.)?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?		Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
По крайней мере, ежедневно		<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	

По крайней мере, еженедельно		➔	3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно			6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов	
По крайней мере, ежегодно			9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

8. Участвуете ли вы в религиозных / духовных мероприятиях (например, посещение церкви или воскресной школы, чтение Священного Писания и т.п.) совместно с членами вашей семьи?
 ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?	Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
По крайней мере, ежедневно		<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа
По крайней мере, еженедельно		3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов
По крайней мере, ежемесячно		6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов
По крайней мере, ежегодно		9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

9. Участвуете ли вы в таких мероприятиях, как, например, поход в ресторан, вечеринка, шопинг, посещение друзей / соседей, выезд на природу/на дачу и т.п. совместно с членами вашей семьи?
 ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?	Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
По крайней мере, ежедневно		<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа
По крайней мере, еженедельно		3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов
По крайней мере, ежемесячно		6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов
По крайней мере, ежегодно		9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

10. Участвуете ли вы в мероприятиях в качестве зрителя (например, поход в кино, спортивные мероприятия, концерты, спектакли и театральные представления и т.п.) вместе с членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?		➔	Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
По крайней мере, ежедневно			<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	
По крайней мере, еженедельно			3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно			6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов	
По крайней мере, ежегодно			9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

11. Участвуете ли Вы в таких спортивных мероприятиях как например, боулинг, гольф, плавание, катание на коньках и т.д.) вместе с членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?		➔	Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
По крайней мере, ежедневно			<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	
По крайней мере, еженедельно			3-4 часа		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно			6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов	
По крайней мере, ежегодно			9-10 часов		> 10 часов		> 1 день	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

12. Участвуете ли Вы в общинных специальных мероприятиях (например, посещение музеев, зоопарков, парков, ярмарок и т. д.) вместе с членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?	
По крайней мере, ежедневно	
По крайней мере, еженедельно	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно	
По крайней мере, ежегодно	



Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)			
<1 часа	1-2 часа	2-3 часа	
3-4 часов	4-5 часов	5-6 часов	
6-7 часов	7-8 часов	8-9 часов	
9-10 часов	> 10 часов		
1 день	8 дней	15 дней	
2 дня	9 дней	16 дней	
3 дня	10 дней	17 дней	
4 дня	11 дней	18 дней	
5 дней	12 дней	19 дней	
6 дней	13 дней	20 дней	
Неделю	Две недели	3 недели и более	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

13. Участвуете ли Вы в мероприятиях на свежем воздухе (например, походы, пешие прогулки в горы, охота, рыбалка и т.п.) вместе с членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?	
По крайней мере, ежедневно	
По крайней мере, еженедельно	



Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)			
<1 часа	1-2 часа	2-3 часа	
3-4 часов	4-5 часов	5-6 часов	

По крайней мере, ежемесячно	
По крайней мере, ежегодно	

6-7 часов	7-8 часов	8-9 часов	
9-10 часов	> 10 часов		
1 день	8 дней	15 дней	
2 дня	9 дней	16 дней	
3 дня	10 дней	17 дней	
4 дня	11 дней	18 дней	
5 дней	12 дней	19 дней	
6 дней	13 дней	20 дней	
Неделю	Две недели	3 недели и более	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

14. Занимаетесь ли вы в водными видами спорта, например, водными лыжами, катанием на катере, парусным спортом, греблей и т. п. совместно членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ ___

Если да, то как часто?	
По крайней мере, ежедневно	
По крайней мере, еженедельно	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно	
По крайней мере, ежегодно	



Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)			
<1 часа	1-2 часа	2-3 часа	
3-4 часов	4-5 часов	5-6 часов	
6-7 часов	7-8 часов	8-9 часов	
9-10 часов	> 10 часов		
1 день	8 дней	15 дней	
2 дня	9 дней	16 дней	
3 дня	10 дней	17 дней	
4 дня	11 дней	18 дней	
5 дней	12 дней	19 дней	

6 дней		13 дней		20 дней	
Неделю		Две недели		3 недели и более	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

15. Участвуете ли вы в мероприятиях-приключениях на свежем воздухе (например, скалолазание, рафтинг, гонка внедорожников, подводное плавание и т.п.) вместе с членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ___

Если да, то как часто?	
По крайней мере, ежедневно	
По крайней мере, еженедельно	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно	
По крайней мере, ежегодно	



Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)					
<1 часа		1-2 часа		2-3 часа	
3-4 часов		4-5 часов		5-6 часов	
6-7 часов		7-8 часов		8-9 часов	
9-10 часов		> 10 часов			
1 день		8 дней		15 дней	
2 дня		9 дней		16 дней	
3 дня		10 дней		17 дней	
4 дня		11 дней		18 дней	
5 дней		12 дней		19 дней	
6 дней		13 дней		20 дней	
Неделю		Две недели		3 недели и более	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

16. Участвуете ли вы в туристических мероприятиях (например, отдых с семьей, путешествие, посещение исторических мест, посещение других республик и областей / национальных парков и т.п.) совместно с членами вашей семьи?

ДА ___ НЕТ___

Если да, то как часто?	
По крайней мере, ежедневно	
По крайней мере, еженедельно	
По крайней мере, ежемесячно	
По крайней мере, ежегодно	



Продолжительность по времени каждого из мероприятий (Отметьте крестиком или галочкой только один вариант ответа)			
<1 часа	1-2 часа	2-3 часа	
3-4 часа	4-5 часов	5-6 часов	
6-7 часов	7-8 часов	8-9 часов	
9-10 часов	> 10 часов		
1 день	8 дней	15 дней	
2 дня	9 дней	16 дней	
3 дня	10 дней	17 дней	
4 дня	11 дней	18 дней	
5 дней	12 дней	19 дней	
6 дней	13 дней	20 дней	
Неделю	Две недели	3 недели и более	

Насколько вы удовлетворены вашим участием или неучастием в этих совместных семейных мероприятиях? (Нужное обвести)

Очень не удовлетворён				Очень удовлетворён
1	2	3	4	5

1. Do you have dinners, at home, with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?	
At least daily	
At least weekly	
At least monthly	
At least annually	

For about how long per time? (check only one)					
< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	

How satisfied are you with your participation or lack of participation, with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

1 2 3 4 5

2. Do you participate in home-based activities (for example watching TV/videos, listening to music, reading books, singing, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?	
At least daily	
At least weekly	
At least monthly	
At least annually	

For about how long per time? (check only one)					
< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
9-10 hours		>10 hours		> 1 day	

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

1 2 3 4 5

3. Do you participate in games (for example playing cards, board games, video games, darts, billiards, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?	
At least daily	
At least weekly	
At least monthly	
At least annually	

For about how long per time? (check only one)					
< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
9-10 hours		>10 hours		> 1 day	

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

1 2 3 4 5

4. Do you participate in crafts, cooking, and/or hobbies (for example drawing, scrap books, baking cookies, sewing, painting, ceramics, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?		For about how long per time? (check only one)					
At least daily		< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
At least weekly		3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
At least monthly		6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
At least annually		9-10 hours		>10 hours		> 1 day	

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

1 2 3 4 5

5. Do you participate in home-based outdoor activities (for example star gazing, gardening, yard work, playing with pets, walks, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?		For about how long per time? (check only one)					
At least daily		< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
At least weekly		3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
At least monthly		6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
At least annually		9-10 hours		>10 hours		> 1 day	

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

1 2 3 4 5

6. Do you participate in home-based sport/games activities (for example playing catch, shooting baskets, frisbee, bike rides, fitness activities, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?		For about how long per time? (check only one)					
At least daily		< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
At least weekly		3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
At least monthly		6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
At least annually		9-10 hours		>10 hours		> 1 day	

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

1 2 3 4 5

7. Do you attend other family members' activities (for example watching or leading their sporting events, musical performances, scouts, etc.)?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?	
At least daily	
At least weekly	
At least monthly	
At least annually	

For about how long per time? (check only one)					
< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
9-10 hours		>10 hours		> 1 day	

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied		Very Satisfied
1	2	5

8. Do you participate in religious/spiritual activities (for example going to church activities, worshipping, scripture reading, Sunday school, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?	
At least daily	
At least weekly	
At least monthly	
At least annually	

For about how long per time? (check only one)					
< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
9-10 hours		>10 hours		> 1 day	

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied		Very Satisfied
1	2	5

9. Do you participate in community-based social activities (for example going to restaurants, parties, shopping, visiting friends/ neighbors, picnics, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?	
At least daily	
At least weekly	
At least monthly	
At least annually	

For about how long per time? (check only one)					
< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
9-10 hours		>10 hours		> 1 day	

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied		Very Satisfied
1	2	5

10. Do you participate in spectator activities (for example going to movies, sporting events, concerts, plays or theatrical performances, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?	
At least daily	
At least weekly	
At least monthly	
At least annually	

For about how long per time? (check only one)					
< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
9-10 hours		>10 hours		> 1 day	

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied		Very Satisfied
1	2	5

11. Do you participate in sporting activities outside the home, such as bowling, golf, swimming, skating, etc. with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?	
At least daily	
At least weekly	
At least monthly	
At least annually	

For about how long per time? (check only one)					
< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
9-10 hours		>10 hours		> 1 day	

How satisfied are you with your participation with family members in these activities? (please circle one)

Very Dissatisfied		Very Satisfied
1	2	5

12. Do you participate in community events (for example visiting museums, zoos, theme parks, fairs, etc.) with family members?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES how often?	
At least daily	
At least weekly	
At least monthly	
At least annually	

For about how long per time? (check only one)					
< 1 hour		1-2 hours		2-3 hours	
3-4 hours		4-5 hours		5-6hours	
6-7 hours		7-8 hours		8-9 hours	
9-10 hours		>10 hours			
1 day		8 days		15 days	
2 days		9 days		16 days	
3 days		10 days		17 days	
4 days		11 days		18 days	
5 days		12 days		19 days	
6 days		13 days		20 days	
One week		Two weeks		3 or more weeks	

Шкала гибкости и сплоченности семьи.

Пожалуйста, ответьте на следующие вопросы касающиеся вашей семьи в настоящий момент. Пожалуйста, будьте настолько открытыми и честными насколько возможно. Все ответы являются строго конфиденциальными.

Используйте следующую шкалу:

1	2	3	4	5
Почти никогда	Редко	Иногда	Часто	Почти всегда

Опишите вашу семью:

1. Члены семьи поддерживают друг друга в трудные времена.
2. В нашей семье для всех легко выразить точку своего зрения.
3. Легче обсуждать проблемы с людьми за пределами семьи, чем с членами своей семьи.
4. Каждый член семьи делает вклад в решение важных семейных вопросов.
5. Наша семья любит собираться вместе в одной комнате.
6. Дети имеют право голоса в принятии решений, касающихся дисциплины в семье.
7. Мы все вместе принимаем участие в семейных мероприятиях.
8. Члены семьи совместно обсуждают проблемы и удовлетворены принятыми решениями.
9. В нашей семье каждый идет своим собственным путем.
10. Мы проявляем гибкость в выполнении наших обязанностей по дому.
11. Члены семьи знают близких друзей друг друга.
12. Трудно знать, какие правила существуют в нашей семье.
13. Члены семьи советуются друг с другом в принятии личных решений.
14. Члены семьи говорят то, что хотят.
15. У нас появляются трудности, когда нужно принять решение о том, как совместно провести время и чем семья будет заниматься.
16. При решении проблем, предложения детей учитываются.
17. Члены семьи чувствуют себя очень близкими друг другу.
18. Дисциплина является справедливой в нашей семье.
19. Члены семьи чувствуют себя ближе к людям за пределами семьи, чем к членам своей семьи.
20. Наша семья пробует новые способы в решении проблем.
21. Члены семьи поддерживают друг друга в совместных мероприятиях.
22. В нашей семье все разделяют обязанности.
23. Члены семьи любят проводить свое свободное время друг с другом.
24. В нашей семье правила не меняются.
25. Члены семьи дома избегают друг друга.
26. Когда возникают проблемы, мы идем на компромисс.
27. Мы одобряем друзей друг друга.
28. Члены семьи боятся говорить то, что они думают.
29. Члены семьи разделяются на пары вместо того, чтобы проводить время всем вместе.
30. Члены семьи имеют общие интересы и увлечения.

Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES II)

Please answer the following questions in reference to your family currently. Please be as open and honest as possible. All responses are strictly confidential.

Use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Almost never	Once in awhile	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost always

Describe your family:

- 1. Family members are supportive of each other during difficult times.
- 2. In our family, it is easy for everyone to express his/her opinion.
- 3. It is easier to discuss problems with people outside the family than with other family members.
- 4. Each family member has input regarding major family decisions.
- 5. Our family gathers together in the same room.
- 6. Children have a say in their discipline.
- 7. Our family does things together.
- 8. Family members discuss problems and feel good about the solutions.
- 9. In our family, everyone goes his/her own way.
- 10. We shift household responsibilities from person to person.
- 11. Family members know each other's close friends.
- 12. It is hard to know what the rules are in our family.
- 13. Family members consult other family members on personal decisions.
- 14. Family members say what they want.
- 15. We have difficulty thinking of things to do as a family.
- 16. In solving problems, the children's suggestions are followed.
- 17. Family members feel very close to each other.
- 18. Discipline is fair in our family.
- 19. Family members feel closer to people outside the family than to other family members.
- 20. Our family tries new ways of dealing with problems.
- 21. Family members go along with what the family decides to do.
- 22. In our family, everyone shares responsibilities.
- 23. Family members like to spend their free time with each other.
- 24. It is difficult to get a rule changed in our family.
- 25. Family members avoid each other at home.
- 26. When problems arise, we compromise.
- 27. We approve of each other's friends.
- 28. Family members are afraid to say what is on their minds.
- 29. Family members pair up rather than do things as a total family.
- 30. Family members share interests and hobbies with each other.

Шкала семейного общения.

Используя следующую шкалу, опишите вашу семью:

1	2	3	4	5
Никак не описывает нашу семью	Лишь слегка описывает нашу семью	Немного описывает нашу семью	Описывает нашу семью лишь в общих чертах	Очень хорошо описывает нашу семью

1. Члены семьи удовлетворены тем, как они общаются друг с другом.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Члены семьи очень хорошие слушатели.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Члены семьи выражают любовь друг к другу.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Члены семьи могут просить друг друга обо всем, в чем они нуждаются.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Члены семьи могут спокойно обсуждать проблемы друг с другом.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Члены семьи обсуждают свои идеи и убеждения друг с другом.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Когда члены семьи задают вопросы друг другу, они получают честные ответы.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Члены семьи пытаются понять чувства друг друга.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Когда сердятся, члены семьи редко говорят негативные вещи друг о друге.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Члены семьи выражают свои истинные чувства друг к другу.	1	2	3	4	5

Family Communication Scale

Using the following scale, describe your family:

1	2	3	4	5
DOES NOT describe our family at all	SLIGHTLY describes our family	SOMEWHAT describes our family	GENERALLY describes our family	VERY WELL describes our family

1. Family members are satisfied with how they communicate with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Family members are very good listeners.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Family members express affection to each other.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Family members are able to ask each other for what they want.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Family members can calmly discuss problems with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Family members discuss their ideas and beliefs with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
7. When family members ask questions of each other, they get honest answers.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Family members try to understand each other's feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
9. When angry, family members seldom say negative things about each other.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Family members express their true feelings to each other.	1	2	3	4	5

Ниже приведены пять утверждений, с которыми вы можете согласиться или не согласиться. Используя нижеприведенную шкалу от 1 до 7, сообщите о своем согласии с каждым пунктом, обведя соответствующую цифру в строку, следующей за каждым утверждением. Пожалуйста, будьте открыты и честны в своих ответах.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
категорически не согласен	не согласен	Немного не согласен	нейтрален	немного согласен	согласен	полностью согласен

1. В большинстве случаев моя семейная жизнь близка к идеальной	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Условия моей семейной жизни отличные	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Я доволен своей семейной жизнью	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. В настоящий момент в моей семейной жизни есть все необходимое	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Если бы я мог прожить свою семейную жизнь заново, я не изменил бы практически ничего	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Satisfaction With Family Life Scale

The questions in this section ask questions about you and your family. Please answer honestly, and remember that all answers are strictly confidential. Please circle the response that best describes your agreement with each item.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
1. In most ways my family life is close to my ideal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The conditions of my family life are excellent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I am satisfied with my family life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in my family life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. If I could live my family life over, I would change almost nothing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Вопросы в данном разделе касаются вас и вашей семьи.

Пожалуйста, ответьте на следующие вопросы относительно вашей нынешней семьи. Если вы являетесь родителем-одиночкой, пожалуйста, укажите, что вопросы о партнере не относятся к вам. Кроме того, пожалуйста, укажите кем вы и ваш партнер являетесь для каждого ребенка в семье. Пожалуйста, начните с вашего ребенка в возрасте от 11 до 15 лет, который также отвечает на вопросы этого опроса.

Возраст	Пол	Национальность	Проживают совместно с вами	Кем вы являетесь ребенку	Кем ваш партнер является ребенку
_____ лет	М или Ж	Р=Русский (ая) Т=Татарин/татарка К=Кавказские национальности Д=другое	Да / Нет	Р=Родной Родитель П=Приемный родитель С=Сводный Родитель ПН=Партнер родного, приемного или сводного родителя ребенка	
Вы					
Ваш партнер					
Ребенок в возрасте от 11 до 15 лет					
Другой ребенок					
Другой ребенок					
Другой ребенок					
Другой ребенок					
Другой ребенок					
Другой ребенок					

Количество населения в вашем населенном пункте

– Город/пригород (>50,000)

Населенный пункт сельского типа (<50,000)

Ваше семейное положение в настоящий момент:

_____ Холост/Незамужем (никогда не был(а) женат/замужем)

_____ Женат/Замужем—Сколько лет вы состоите в браке с вашим (вашей) настоящим(ей) супругом(ой)? _____ лет

_____ Проживаем раздельно—если да, то сколько лет вы проживаете раздельно друг от друга _____ лет

_____ Разведен(а)—если да, то сколько лет вы находитесь в разводе _____ лет

_____ Разведен(а) с родителем вашего ребенка подросткового возраста _____ лет

_____ Вдовец (вдова)—если да, то сколько лет вы являетесь вдовцом (вдовой) _____ лет

Другое—пожалуйста, уточните

Были ли вы когда-либо в разводе? Да _____ Нет _____

Пожалуйста, укажите количество людей проживающих вместе с вами на постоянной основе. _____

Пожалуйста, укажите примерный месячный доход вашей семьи.

_____	Меньше 5 000 руб.	_____	35 001 – 45 000 руб.	_____	75 001 – 85 000 руб.
_____	5 001 – 15 000 руб.	_____	45 001 – 55 000 руб.	_____	85 001 – 95 000 руб.
_____	15 001 – 25 000 руб.	_____	55 001 – 65 000 руб.	_____	95 001 – 105 000 руб.
_____	25 001 – 35 000 руб.	_____	65 001 – 75 000 руб.	_____	Выше 105 000 руб.

1. Был ли в вашей жизни такой случай за последний год, когда алкоголь помешал вам выполнить ваши обычные обязанности?

Да/Нет

2. Был ли в вашей жизни такой случай за последний год, когда алкоголь помешал одному из членов вашей семьи выполнить его/ее обычные обязанности?

Да/Нет

3. За последний год был ли в вашей жизни случай, когда употребление алкоголя вами или членом вашей семьи вызвало проблемы в вашей семье?

Да/Нет

4. Есть ли история суицида среди членов вашей семьи за последние 5 лет?

Да/Нет

Adult demographics

Please complete the following on your **current** family. If you are a single parent, please indicate that partner questions do not apply (NA). In addition, please indicate your (and your partner's) relationship to each child in your family. Please begin with your child in Middle-school who is completing this survey.

	Age	Sex	Ethnicity	Lives in your home	Your relationship to Child	Your partner's relationship to Child
	In Years	M or F	R- Russian T- Tatar U- Ukrainian B - Bashik C- Chuvash O- Other	Yes or No	B =Birth Parent A = Adoptive Parent S = Step-Parent P = Partner of child's birth, adoptive, or step-parent	
YOU						
Your Partner						
Middle-school Child						
Other Child						
Other Child						
Other Child						
Other Child						
Other Child						
Other Child						

Population of your place of residency:

- Urban/Suburban (>50,000)
- Rural (<50,000)

Marital status— Check all that apply to you **currently**:

- _____ Single—never married
- _____ Married -- If yes, how many years to current spouse? _____ (in years)
- _____ Separated -- If yes, how long have you been separated? _____ (in years)
- _____ Divorced -- If yes, how long have you been divorced? _____ (in years)
- _____ Divorced from your middle-school child's birth parent? _____ (in years)
- _____ Widowed -- If yes, how long have you been widowed? _____ (in years)
- _____ Other—please specify _____

Have you **ever** been divorced? Yes _____ No _____

Please indicate number of people currently living full-time in the home. _____

Please indicate the estimated monthly income for your household.

_____ Less than \$160 _____ \$1126-1446 _____ \$2411-2731

_____	\$160-460	_____	\$1447-1767	_____	\$2732-3050
_____	\$460-800	_____	\$1768-2090	_____	\$3051-3375
_____	\$801-1125	_____	\$2091-2410	_____	Over \$3375

1. During the past year, have you failed to do what was normally expected of you because of drinking alcohol?

Yes/No

2. During the past year, has one of your family members failed to do what was normally expected of them because of drinking alcohol?

Yes/No

3. During the past year, has alcohol consumption by you or a member of your family ever caused problems between family members?

Yes/No

4. Has there been a history of suicide among your family members over the past 5 years?

Yes/No

Adolescent demographics

Возраст (Age)

Пол (Gender)

1. Был ли в вашей жизни такой случай за последний год, когда алкоголь помешал вам выполнить ваши обычные обязанности?

Да/Нет

2. Был ли в вашей жизни такой случай за последний год, когда алкоголь помешал одному из членов вашей семьи выполнить его/ее обычные обязанности?

Да/Нет

3. За последний год был ли в вашей жизни случай, когда употребление алкоголя вами или членом вашей семьи вызвало проблемы в вашей семье?

Да/Нет

4. Есть ли история суицида среди членов вашей семьи за последние 5 лет?

Да/Нет

1. During the past year, have you failed to do what was normally expected of you because of drinking alcohol?

Yes/no

2. During the past year, has one of your family members failed to do what was normally expected of them because of drinking alcohol?

Yes/no

3. During the past year, has alcohol consumption by you or a member of your family ever caused problems between family members?

yes/no

4. Has there been a history of suicide among your family members over the past 5 years?

yes/no

Appendix B: Consent Forms

Informed Consent Statement

This research study is being conducted by Professor Ramon Zabriskie and Mikale Williamson to determine how family leisure affects family functioning among Russian families.

You and your child have been invited to participate because you reside in a city in Russia and are in a family that has a child ages 11-15. You will be asked to answer questions, and your child will be asked to answer the same questions independently and privately. By clicking continue, you are giving permission for your child to participate. Please give your child privacy in completing their portion of the questionnaire so that they can do so honestly and openly without feeling pressure in any way.

The study consists of approximately 80 questions and will take approximately 20-30 minutes for you to complete your portion, and then 20-30 minutes for your child to answer theirs. Please take the survey during a time that you can finish it in one sitting. You cannot go back and reopen the survey once you have closed it.

The questions ask about the activities you do with family members. You will give your best estimate of how often these activities occur, such as eating dinner or going on a vacation. You will also answer questions about how your family behaves when you are around each other. These answers may help the researchers learn how different families in different cultures recreate and if it changes how their family interacts together.

This survey involves very low risk to you, but you may feel uncomfortable, confused, or disappointed when answering certain questions. If this does occur and you do not wish to continue, you can stop answering questions at any time. There will be no reference to your individual identity, but we will ask you, as the parent, to fill out some demographic information such as your family size and marital status.

There are no direct benefits to you personally. Involvement in this research project is voluntary. You may withdraw at any time without penalty or refuse to participate entirely. There will be no reference to your identity or the identity of your child at any point in the research.

If you have questions regarding this study you may contact Ramon Zabriskie at zabriskie@byu.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in research projects, you may contact:

IRB Administrator
A-285 ASB
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT 84602
(801) 422-1461
irb@byu.edu

Child Assent Document

You are being invited to participate in this research study of Family leisure in urban Russian families. I am a graduate student at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah, USA and I am conducting this research under the supervision of Professor Ramon Zabriskie, Ph.D.

Your participation in this study will require you to answer the following questionnaire. This should take approximately 20-30 minutes of your time. Your participation will be anonymous and you will not be contacted again in the future. Your parent has already given permission for you to participate in filling out these questions. Please find a comfortable, private place to answer these questions so that you can do so openly and honestly.

You will answer “yes” or “no” to questions about the types of activities that your family does together, such as eating dinner or going on a vacation, and then how often those activities occur. You will also answer questions about how your family behaves when you are around each other. These answers may help the researchers learn how different families in different cultures recreate and if it changes how their family interacts together.

You will not be paid for being in this study. This survey involves very low risk to you, but you may feel uncomfortable, confused, or disappointed when answering certain questions. If this does occur and you do not wish to continue, you can stop answering questions at any time. You do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer for any reason.

We will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study. You may contact me, Mikale Williamson at mikalewilliamson@gmail.com or my advisor, Ramon Zabriskie, at zabriskie@byu.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the IRB Administrator at A-285 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, USA; irb@byu.edu; (801) 422-1461. The IRB is a group of people who review research studies to protect the rights and welfare of research participants.

The completion of this survey implies your consent to participate. If you choose to participate, please continue on to the first question.