

УДК 76(56)(045)

DOI 10.24919/2519-058x.3.101052

Victoria LYSAK,

orcid.org/0000-0001-5567-1387

PhD hab. (History), Professor

Kateryna TRYMA,

orcid.org/0000-0002-5011-4263

PhD (Political Sciences), Mariupol State University Senior Librarian
(Ukraine, Mariupol) katerynatryma@gmail.com

RURAL FAMILY IN UKRAINE IN THE SOVIET WAY OF LIFE IN THE 1950s – 1960s

This article shows the features of the functioning of Ukrainian rural family under the Soviet reality conditions in the 1950s – 1960s. The aim of the article is to study rural family in the Soviet way of living in the 1950 – 1960s. The authors thought it expedient to analyze possible sources of budget replenishment in single parent families, families of orphans and consider the financial status of such families. The problem of functioning of the family as a trace element of rural society requires studying, including the peculiarities of parenting and socialization of children in terms of the Soviet way of life.

Special attention is paid to the characteristics of social security benefits to single parent families and orphans, the possibilities of their material and spiritual consumption. Considerable attention is paid to family functions, parenting and socialization of children. The authors came to the point that rural family in the 1950s – 1960s preserved the patriarchy and traditional elements of the nation's spiritual values. First of all, this is evidenced by the functional duties of the family, that is its reproduction and processes of parenting and socialization of children.

Statistical materials consistently show that in the mid-twentieth century rural population prevailed in Ukraine. According to the social and economic conditions of those days, most peasants were united in collective farms with reference to the particular form of the production process. The peasant and his family, the possibilities of the material and spiritual consumption were entirely dependent on the working conditions, its effectiveness and capacity of rural infrastructure to ensure the needs of its residents.

The sources of this article are the documents stored in the central and the regional state archives of Ukraine. In particular, they are reporting documentation and statistical reports of regional and district social security departments on kolkhoz mutual aid funds; letters and complaints of rural citizens; oral history materials; annual statistical compilations of the national economy, census materials etc.

Thus, in the 1950 – 1960s rural family preserved patriarchy and traditional elements of spiritual values of the nation. First of all, this is evidenced by the functional responsibilities of the family, that is its reproduction and processes of parenting. Nevertheless, we may not say that conditions for the rural family existence were generally favorable to convey important knowledge for the further practical life of a village. A significant factor in the quality and level of spiritual values consumption that have to be performed by the family was the presence of parental guardianship and care. Statistics shows that in rural areas of the USSR there were many single parent families. Moreover, it was not the worst situation as smallest opportunities to transfer cultural values were typical of orphans' families.

Key words: *Ukrainian rural family, Soviet way of life, parenting, socialization of children, duties of the family, peasant.*
Ref. 20.

Вікторія ЛИСАК,

доктор історичних наук, професор

Катерина ТРИМА,

кандидат політичних наук, старший викладач,

Маріупольський державний університет

(Україна, Маріуполь) katerynatryma@gmail.com

СІЛЬСЬКА РОДИНА УКРАЇНИ В РАДЯНСЬКОМУ СПОСОБІ ЖИТТЯ 1950 – 1960-х рр.

Висвітлено особливості функціонування сільської родини України в умовах радянської дійсності 1950 – 1960-х років. Прیدілена увага особливостям соціального забезпечення неповних родин та родин сиріт, мож-

ливості їх матеріального та духовного споживання. Значна увага приділена функціям родини, вихованню та соціалізації дітей. Зроблено висновки, що сільська родина у 1950–1960-х рр. зберігала патріархальність і традиційні елементи духовних цінностей народу. Перш за все про це свідчать функціональні обов'язки родини, тобто її репродуктивність та процеси соціалізації й виховання дітей.

Ключові слова: Українська сільська родина, радянський спосіб життя, виховання, соціалізації дітей, обов'язків в родині, селянин.

Лит. 20.

Викторія ЛЫСАК,
доктор исторических наук, профессор
Екатерина Трима,
кандидат политических наук, старший преподаватель,
Мариупольский государственный университет
(Украина, Мариуполь) katerynatryma@gmail.com

СЕЛЬСКАЯ СЕМЬЯ УКРАИНЫ В РАМКАХ СОВЕТСКОГО ОБРАЗА ЖИЗНИ 1950 – 1960-х гг.

Освещены особенности функционирования сельской семьи Украины в условиях советской действительности 1950 – 1960-х годов. Уделено внимание особенностям социального обеспечения неполных семей и семей сирот, возможности их материального и духовного потребления. Значительное внимание уделено функциям семьи, воспитанию и социализации детей. Сделаны выводы, что сельская семья в 1950 – 1960-х гг. Сохраняла патриархальность и традиционные элементы духовных ценностей народа. Прежде всего об этом свидетельствуют функциональные обязанности семьи, то есть ее репродуктивность и процессы социализации и воспитания детей.

Ключевые слова: Украинская сельская семья, советский образ жизни, воспитание детей, социализация детей, обязанности в семье, крестьянин.

Лит. 20.

Problem Statemen. In the general history of the Ukrainian people, the Soviet period was rather short. However, its meaning to the Ukrainian society life of that time and the subsequent impact on the situation of the people are indisputable. The positive thing was the unification of ethnic Ukrainian lands within one Soviet Republic. Another feature was the increase of industrial enterprises and urban populations. Soviet policy was controversial as it was primarily focused on supporting the development of urban infrastructure.

Statistical materials consistently show that in the mid-twentieth century rural population prevailed in Ukraine. According to the social and economic conditions of those days, most peasants were united in collective farms with reference to the particular form of the production process. The peasant and his family, the possibilities of the material and spiritual consumption were entirely dependent on the working conditions, its effectiveness and capacity of rural infrastructure to ensure the needs of its residents.

The aim of the article. The article is aimed to study rural family in the Soviet way of living in the 1950 – 1960s. The authors considered it expedient to analyze possible sources of budget replenishment in single parent families, families of orphans and consider the financial status of such families. The problem of functioning of the family as a trace element of rural society requires studying, including the peculiarities of parenting and socialization of children in terms of the Soviet way of life.

Source analysis. Family, family relations and social security attracted the attention of scientists, such as L. V. Chuyko, A. H. Volkov, V. A. Byelova, V. A. Malanchuk, L. V. Kovyak, L. M. Shevchenko [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. On the whole, works where was analyzed the position of the Soviet family, all the more rural one, have theoretical and sociological nature and provide a brief description of the intra-family relationships, parenting etc.

The sources of this article are the documents stored in the central and the regional state archives of Ukraine. In particular, they are reporting documentation and statistical reports of regional and district social security departments on kolkhoz mutual aid funds; letters and complaints of rural citizens; oral history materials; annual statistical compilations of the national economy, census materials etc.

Content. In rural areas of the USSR, according to the census materials in 1959, there were 5.78 million of families, representing 54.4% of all families of the republic [7, 200]. The quality of performing functions assigned to the family, the preservation of spiritual values entirely dependent on the financial means of the family as well as moral and psychological atmosphere. Mutual help, family support, division of labor, cooperation in the upbringing the younger generation and in housekeeping had an impact on setting and eking out the family budget. The quality of the family was of considerable importance. Large single parent families had few opportunities to perform positively its functions.

The existence in the Soviet society of incomplete, financially weak families demanded from the government to create appropriate mechanisms to assist families and establish more or less favorable conditions for raising children. However, in this case, the social security of kolkhozniks was carried out by the collective farms and depended on their economic status, as well as on the establishment in each artel the procedure for granting pensions and aid [5, 44]. By decision of the general meeting of kolkhozniks some part of the production was to be allocated from the income to establish an aid fund for disabled members of the artel. From the latter half of the 1950s farms began to deduct 2% of their products and money to the aid fund for disabled. In 1953, these funds operated at 85% of the USSR kolkhozes with a total share of households reached 41.5%. 19 748 orphans were taken under the patronage of kolkhoz funds for disabled; they were given material aid with money and products amounting to 2 million 125 thousand rubles. Thus, for each child in the republic in rural areas on average there were 107 rubles accounted. In 1955, there were 14 thousand of kolkhoz mutual aid funds, which covered 4/5 of all kolkhozes. Members of these funds were more than 3 million kolkhozniks [6]. In some cases, kolkhozes assisted with production in kind. It was received by disabled, women giving birth, orphans. However, the system was imperfect. In 1955 from 1.8 million disabled and elderly people, and those who needed constant financial assistance, only 600 thousand were provided by kolkhoz funds, i.e. a third of socially disadvantaged villagers. In money terms 30 million rubles were paid, that is on the average 50 rubles per person [5, 45].

In sum, welfare services for vulnerable groups of rural population, especially kolkhozniks, was rather complicated. The state transferred the responsibility for those rural citizens who needed financial aid to kolkhozes, and they, in turn, to the kolkhoz mutual aid funds, but the returns to such funds entirely depended on the profitability of farms.

It should be noted that in the post-war society, government assistance for physically weak, single people was a very important matter. For example, in 1954 220 children needed patronage in the Kherson region. They were the children left without parents and transferred to the foster families. Such children were assisted in the sum of 99 996 rubles, which amounted 37 rubles per child per month [8, 5]. In 1955 the Kherson region in the presence of 192 orphans the assistance was provided in the sum of 126 719 rubles, amounting 54 rubles per child per month [9, 3]. During the following years, the number children needed help had lessened. In 1961, in kolkhoz villages in Kherson region, there were 127 children and 10 rubles per month were allocated to each them. [10, 3].

In 1961 exemplary Statute on Procedure for Assignment and Payment of Pensions and Benefits to kolkhozniks was developed. It noted that pensions and benefits were given in terms of old age, disability and survivors. There were provisions for personal pensions, aid for temporary disability, lump sum in the event of birth and death of a family member, lump sum on the prosthesis [11, 1]. In the welfare system of socially disadvantaged kolkhozniks social security bodies, rural councils, kolkhoz mutual aid funds were involved. Upon the attainment of the age of 65 and 60 men and women were entitled to a pension. Thereby, the rules determining amounts were also cited in the Statute. In terms of labor days, minimum – 5 labor days, maximum – 30 labor days. The experience of the labor in the kolkhoz was also taken into account (percent of income): 5 years – 15% and over 30 years – 70% of earnings. If in the family there were disabled dependents they received supplement to the pensions. If there is one dependent – 10%, 2 and more – 15%. The «shock work» in the public economy was also considered. If a person was once marked by the kolkhoz administration, he/she was added 5% to the pension, 2 times – 10%, 3 times – 15%. The Statute stated that pension shall be paid from the 1st day of the month and for life. Disabled persons of groups I and II were paid disability pensions if had confirmation of medical boards. Disabled persons of the III group were transferred to work by the advice of doctors. To the women giving birth kolkhoz granted 56 days' vacation before delivery and 56 – after it, and in case of abnormal

birth or the birth of the second and third child – 70 days. Assistance to women giving birth depended on the length of work at the kolkhoz, regardless of membership in the kolkhoz mutual aid fund [11, 13]. It was assumed, that 100 rubles on child mother received if worked out necessary minimum labor days and asked for help no later than six months after giving birth [11, pp. 14]. Funeral benefit amounted to 50–100 rubles depending on the number of years of work in the kolkhoz: 10 years – 50 rubles, over 10 years – 100 rubles [11, 15]. On the whole, kolkhoz mutual aid funds provided diverse support, such as money, grains, milk, fats, vegetables, trips to rest house, sanatorium.

Pension provision of kolkhozniks was due to the length of the work. For example, in 1956 in the Statute of one of the kolkhozes in Kherson region pensions for kolkhozniks unable to work amounted in the norm from 50 to 150 labor days. For male kolkhozniks above 60 and females aged 55 years, who had worked since the establishment of the kolkhoz – 150 labor days per year, from 15 years – 100 labor days, from 20 to 25 years – 125 labor days per year. Men above 65 years old and women over 60 years, who worked from 5 to 15 years, the pension was equal to 75 labor days per year, from 2 to 5 years – 50 labor days [12, 10].

Only in 1964 Union fund of social security of kolkhozniks was established, it was formed from the kolkhozes contributions and interkolkhoz businesses and organizations. Retirement, disability and survivor pensions were paid from this fund as well as payments to women giving birth and for children from low-income families [5, 49].

Checking the status of families with many children in 1952 in the kolkhozes of Poltava region showed that such families were living in scarce financial terms. The children did not have individual beds, mattresses, pillows. All together, they slept on the oven [13, 66]. Families with many children and with one breadwinner received aid from the kolkhoz, which was not enough for the normal functioning of the family. For example, the farm has allocated only 217 kg of bread to the family with four children for six months. That is, 300 grams of bread per child per day. By the way, statistical averages indicate that in 1952, 158 kg of flour and of bread were accounted for one person per year, i.e. 430 grams per day [14, 16]. Low-income families lacked high-calorie foods. However, kolkhozes helped families with many children, both with money and food, but this aid, as evidenced by the inspections was not enough. For example, to buy clothes and shoes artel allocated 300 rubles to families with many children; for the construction of houses – wood, reed, brick and 100 kg of wheat [13, 89–91].

Orphans were of special indigence. In the postwar period, there were many families with children left without parental care due to death of parents. Such children did not even have clothes to go to school [15]. In 1952, one of the members of such families, addressing party authorities, pointed out that his father died at the front in 1943, and his mother died from heavy works in 1951. All children in the family were of school age, the oldest went to the 10 form. That is, there was nobody to earn for living. They lived in the apartment and paid 35 rubles per month. «We all study at school, but for the new school year we have no books, shoes, clothes or school supplies. Before that we have not seen a single drop of milk, they give us a little fats [...] We sleep on the floor, and in winter all five of us and two hosts sleep on the bare boards or bricks» [13, 65]. Thus, the children-orphans were without sufficient intake of bread that in lack of other food products and money led to a constant feeling of hunger.

As we can see, rural families lived under different conditions regarding financial security. It was directly associated with quality indicators of work of kolkhozes, labour payment according to labour days, possibilities of family members to perform physical exertion, the number of able to work, dependents, disabled, pensioners and with the amounts of their pensions and government payments.

In modern native science, there distinguished functions that ensure the full existence of the family as a social institution, social and psychological group, they are: business and economic, generative and educational, cultural and recreational [2, 16]. Parenting or socialization of children was of particular importance. This process was closely linked to the daily practice of family life, the attitude of its members to each other and, in general, spiritual values of the nation, their preservation.

In the USSR in the 1950 – 1960s rural family as a social unit of Soviet society played an important role in the process of parenting and socialization of children. It should be noted that in rural areas this process by itself had several typical components conditioned upon the peculiarities of rural society. Firstly, it's giving to the child practical knowledge and skills that make business and economic education

component. The bases of labor education of children were labor and personal example of parents, as well as sex and age division of labor. Secondly, it's mental, physical, moral and ethical education based on both national traditions and religious beliefs, and included a component of school and ideological education that at that time was closely linked to school attendance.

In the labor education of children, the relationship between family members played the primary role. As far as clever and proper organization of economic activities, division of responsibilities among all family members, mutual aid and cooperation allowed to improve the conditions of material and cultural life. As people of working age were usually involved in the public economy, the household chores, feeding and caring for livestock, cooking for the family mainly involved teenagers and the older generation. It is known that the main flows of livestock production in the household were provided by livestock. Thus, among main issues of family life was the division of responsibilities among its members. From an early age, children performed various works in the household, such as herding geese, livestock, fed animals and participated in storing forage. The girls cleaned the house and looked after the juniors. Everybody worked – children and adults, only with different load [16; 17; 18]. While involving children in chores their socialization, gaining practical skills and knowledge, that could be required in future work activity, took place.

The significant role played organizational and control aspects. Parents necessarily checked the work done by children. By the way, it was not only the educational aspect, but also the appropriate way of rural life, a great physical exertion for adults and catastrophic lack of free time, especially at a time of intense seasonal work in the kolkhoz. Children were formed by severity. As a rule, for failure to perform tasks they were punished. Parents gave children a daily job. If the father worked in the tractor brigade and he spent several weeks at the field camp during agricultural works, he left sons a list of tasks that need to be performed in his absence. When back on the weekend, he checked the work. Physical punishment was in the form of strapping. One witness of rural life of that time told that after they tried to compete with the father and son won, this father never picked belt [17].

The workload for children was rather heavy. For example, in the villages of Khmelnytsky region children responsibilities included tending cattle in the herd. At 5 a.m. mother woke the child and he tended kolkhozniks' cows. Participants of life of that time tell: «I wanted to sleep badly. So I bind a rope to the cow and my hand and go to sleep nearby. It tends, moves slowly and drags me on a rope» [17]. Different unforeseen situations occurred with children («I went to tend geese, taking along a book. Geese were tending, I was reading, fell asleep and poultry by itself went home and neighbors drove it to the henhouse»). When the «herder» came back his mother was waiting for him with a milkmaid's yoke. He had to run away and hide until night. In such cases, grandmothers were the conciliators. It was already late at night when the grandmother came out of the house, saw his grandson in front of the house across the street and called him home [17].

Children from an early age were involved in the work in the kolkhoz [16; 17; 18]. In summer they helped their parents in brigades, and even received a salary. They worked together with father on the tractor or mother – in the field teams, participated in weeding beets and so on. When the mother was ill, teenage girls worked instead. For example, at the silage [15]. The work was hard, people had to stand on top of the unit and it was cold. As the witness said, «poor working conditions and cold wind at the silage caused a head cold for the rest of my life».

As the father was mostly involved in work at the kolkhoz, the mother provided main care after the child and the household. She got up at 5 a.m., milked cattle before pasture in a herd, quickly cooked breakfast and went to work. As came home from the work, she was cooking dinner, working in the garden, was busy at the household. In winter she got up at 6 a.m., kindled oven, cooked the meal, prepared «snacks» for children to take to school and started to do chores: twice a week she baked bread and cooked meals, once a week she washed and ironed. At that time irons were heavy and made of iron or cast iron. They were heated on the fire or filled with hot coals. Naturally, it was time consuming. In addition, children needed the attention. The juniors should be bathed, combed, got changed their clothes, put to sleep. Such concerns took the days, months, years and a lifetime. That is right – by daily example – family labor education of children was made. Senior girls helped mother, but the main workload was on the woman. There was no time for leisure [15]. Parents' main concern was to feed the children. Women's life was a constant look after children, husband and older parents. In families with many children,

all children had to pay attention to their behavior. Parents instructed children to live in friendship, to be honest, do not steal and share with each other.

The physical health of children, perhaps, was the main concern of the family. Women mainly used folk remedies and hygiene. During illness (measles or cold), they gave the children more sweets, tightly closed the light as believed that measles is afraid of darkness. They gave warm milk to drink and said to gargle with soda. The family inculcated children the sanitation and hygiene: to keep clean body and clothing, bed and house. The boys were hardened. Every Saturday they had baths. Since there were no special premises for bathrooms, the trough was simply placed in the house, people heated water and had a wash, then put on clean clothes. At the beginning of the 1950s head lice, bedbugs, fleas were a common thing. People eradicated them using traditional methods, for example by the wormwood. Bedbugs were flooded with boiling water. Later there was poison DDT. According to the rural citizens words, children brought head lice from school, and at home they deloused them with a comb. In the postwar period, there were no detergents in the village that is why family ordinary used traditional methods: they diluted sunflower ash for water softening. And in the 1950s laundry soap and toilet soap were used, with time washing powders «Lotos», «Donbass», «Vesna» and others appeared. [15].

In families, children were taught both to be hard-working and physically healthy. An important role played moral and ethical education. As before, in villages, children respectfully treated elders. They respectfully referred to the father, mother and other relatives, as well as strangers with formal «you». This tradition was spread across all regions. Tradition of referring to parents with formal «you» was typical for Ukrainian ethnic families, while in rural families of Russians and Greeks, they used informal «you» [15; 19; 17].

During social and cultural education, expressive and recreational function of the family played a crucial role. It shaped emotional and psychological climate, calmed tension in internal family relationships and stressful situations. Significant role in creating a favorable climate first of all was played by friendly attitude to each other, joint resolving of any issues. Witnesses say that parents never quarreled, at least in front of children [20]. Money were mainly at husband's hands, but spent by mutual agreement. In Ukrainian families it was the husband who was responsible to plan future family life, house improvement, family celebrations organization, arranging children for study. Perhaps this was due to the lack of literacy of Ukrainian rural women, because where the mother had education, the role in solving vitally important issues was higher [19].

In rural family as well as in the rural way of life, a Woman Mother, a Woman Hostess, Woman Worker was of a defining role. Considering numerical superiority of women in rural areas of the republic, their employment in the kolkhozes, long working hours, of great importance in the household sustenance and generally in the functioning of the family, it is clear that the main role in the rural lifestyle belonged to the rural women.

Conclusions. In the 1950 – 1960s rural family preserved patriarchy and traditional elements of spiritual values of the nation. First of all, this is evidenced by the functional responsibilities of the family, that is its reproduction and processes of parenting and socialization of children. Nevertheless, we may not say that conditions for the rural family existence were generally favorable to convey important knowledge for the further practical life of a village. A significant factor in the quality and level of spiritual values consumption that had to be performed by the family was the presence of parental guardianship and care. Statistics shows that in rural areas of the USSR there were many single parent families. Moreover, it was not the worst situation as smallest opportunities to transfer cultural values were typical of orphans' families.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ І ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Чуйко Л. В. Браки и разводы / Л. В. Чуйко – М.: Статистика, 1975. – 176 с.
2. Волков А. Г. Семья – объект демографии / А. Г. Волков. – М.: Мысль, 1986. – 271 с.
3. Белова В. А. Число детей в семье / В. А. Белова – М.: Статистика, 1975. – 176 с.
4. Маланчук В. А. Нове в культурі і побуті колгоспного селянства / В. А. Маланчук. – К.: Наукова думка, 1970. – 189 с.
5. Ковпак Л. В. Соціально-побутові умови життя в 2-й пол. XX ст. (1945 – 2000) / Л. В. Ковпак. – К.: Інститут історії України НАНУ, 2003 – 250 с.
6. Шевченко Л. М. Соціальне забезпечення сільського населення України в роки хрущовської «відлиги» / Л. М. Шевченко // Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені

Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Історія: Збірник наукових праць / [за заг. ред. проф. П. С. Григорчука]. – 2009. – Вип. 15. – С. 65–69.

7. Итоги Всесоюзной переписи населения 1959 года. Украинская ССР. – М.: Госстатиздат, 1963. – 210 с.
8. Державний архів Херсонської області (далі – ДАХО). – Ф. р. 2137. – Оп. 2. – Спр. 262. – 70 арк.
9. ДАХО. – Ф. р. 2137. – Оп. 2. – Спр. 286. – 59 арк.
10. ДАЛО. – Ф. р. 2137. – Оп. 2. – Спр. 460. – 38 арк.
11. ДАЛО. – Ф. р. 2137. – Оп. 2. – Спр. 434. – 16 арк.
12. ДАЛО. – Ф. р. 1953. – Оп. 3. – Спр. 14. – 325 арк.
13. Держархів Полтавської області. – Ф. 25. – Оп. 3. – Спр. 142. – 503 арк.
14. Центральний державний архів вищих органів влади та управління України. – Ф. 582. – Оп. 24. – Спр. 438. – 209 арк.
15. Особистий архів автора. Свідчення про життя. Гребенюк Валентина Леонідівна. Сmt. Володарське Донецької області. 1939 рік народження.
16. Особистий архів автора. Свідчення про життя. Данік Надія Іванівна. Село Вчорайше Ружинського району Житомирської області. 1938 рік народження.
17. Особистий архів автора. Свідчення про життя. Лисак Феофан Андрійович. Хутір Сатурин Деражнянського району Хмельницької області. 1937 рік народження.
18. Особистий архів автора. Свідчення про життя. Білогривий Василь Федорович. Село Семенівка Чернігівської області. 1938 рік народження.
19. Особистий архів автора. Свідчення про життя. Галалу Ніна Георгіївна. Село Мало-Янісоль Донецької області. 1929 рік народження.
20. Особистий архів автора. Свідчення про життя. Елагіна Марія Володимирівна. Село Очеретувате Токмацького району Запорізької області. 1942 рік народження.

REFERENCES

1. Chuyko L. V. Braki i razvody / L. V. Chuyko – М.: Statistika, 1975. – 176 s.
2. Volkov A. G. Semya – obekt demografi / A. G. Volkov. – М.: Mysl, 1986. – 271 s.
3. Belova V. A. Chislo detey v seme / V. A. Belova – М.: Statistika, 1975. – 176 s.
4. Malanchuk V. A. Nove v kulturi i pobuti kolhospnogo selianstva / V. A. Malanchuk. – К.: Naukova dumka, 1970. – 189 s.
5. Kovpak L. V. Sotsialno-pobutovi umovy zhyttia v 2-y pol. XX st. (1945 – 2000) / L. V. Kovpak. – К.: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NANU, 2003 – 250 s.
6. Shevchenko L. M. Sotsialne zabezpechennia silskoho naselennia Ukrainy v roky khrushchovskoi «vidlyhy» / L. M. Shevchenko // Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnogo universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Serii: Istorii: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats / [za zah. red. prof. P. S. Hryhorchuka]. – 2009. – Vyp. 15. – S. 65–69.
7. Ytohy Vsesoiuznoi perepysy naseleniya 1959 hoda. Ukraynskaia SSR. – М.: Hosstatyzdat, 1963. – 210 s.
8. Derzhavnyi arkhiv Khersonskoi oblasti (dali – DAKhO). – F. r. 2137. – Op. 2. – Spr. 262. – 70 ark.
9. DAKhO. – F. r. 2137. – Op. 2. – Spr. 286. – 59 ark.
10. DALO. – F. r. 2137. – Op. 2. – Spr. 460. – 38 ark.
11. DALO. – F. r. 2137. – Op. 2. – Spr. 434. – 16 ark.
12. DALO. – F. r. 1953. – Op. 3. – Spr. 14. – 325 ark.
13. Derzharkhiv Poltavskoi oblasti. – F. 25. – Op. 3. – Spr. 142. – 503 ark.
14. Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv vysshikh organiv vlady ta upravlinnia Ukrainy. – F. 582. – Op. 24. – Spr. 438. – 209 ark.
15. Osobystyi arkhiv avtora. Svidchennia pro zhyttia. Hrebenuk Valentyna Leonidivna. Smt. Volodarske Donetskoi oblasti. 1939 rik narodzhennia.
16. Osobystyi arkhiv avtora. Svidchennia pro zhyttia. Danik Nadiia Ivanivna. Selo Vchoraishe Ruzhynskoho raionu Zhytomyrskoi oblasti. 1938 rik narodzhennia.
17. Osobystyi arkhiv avtora. Svidchennia pro zhyttia. Lysak Feofan Andriiovych. Khutir Saturyn Derazhnianskoho raionu Khmelnytskoi oblasti. 1937 rik narodzhennia.
18. Osobystyi arkhiv avtora. Svidchennia pro zhyttia. Bilohryvyi Vasyl Fedorovych. Selo Semenivka Chernihivskoi oblasti. 1938 rik narodzhennia.
19. Osobystyi arkhiv avtora. Svidchennia pro zhyttia. Halalu Nina Heorhiivna. Selo Malo-Yanisol Donetskoi oblasti. 1929 rik narodzhennia.
20. Osobystyi arkhiv avtora. Svidchennia pro zhyttia. Elahina Mariia Volodymyrivna. Selo Ocheretuvate Tokmatskoho raionu Zaporizkoi oblasti. 1942 rik narodzhennia.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 8.03.2017 р.