

INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILD CARE IN ARMENIA: STRUCTURAL-ORGANIZATIONAL, OR VALUE-SYSTEMIC APPROACH?

MIRA ANTONYAN

Discussions on the transformation of social issues, particularly the lack of a viable approach to responding to the shortcomings of family care from the Soviet era, are still relevant thirty years later. In particular, education, childcare, and protection of children in institutions and to accommodate changing practices used in the process of forming a latent attitude system based on children's rights, non-formal resistance discussion interesting to understand what potential they have undertaken an organizational structural transformation of values desired to bring about change. Will these transformations influence the changing practices of helping children in need outside of the family environment, something that continues to be the subject of unspoken agreement between the three parent-decision-making parties today, ignoring children's rights and interests?

Key words: reorganization of institutions, reforms, reunification, latent resistance, structural-organizational changes, value-systemic changes

Theoretical conceptualization

In modern societies children are no longer seen as "parents' private property"; the state has a clear role to play in organizing child protection in the event that a child's parents fail in their "natural" commitment to represent their own children's rights. Such a dichotomous situation of responsibility for the child has gone through a long, sometimes contradictory evolutionary path, from the absolute power of the parents to the absolute power of the state. Nevertheless, the public / private dichotomy has been a powerful structuring frame, subsuming the child within the family, and locating the family at a distance from a range of agencies with an interest in children's welfare. Two powerful convergent refrains map the family onto the private realm and the state onto the public realm¹. Such polarization has been "democratized" by third-party helper buffers created by professional intervention ready to work with parents, but the existence and effectiveness of third parties depend directly on policy decisions.

A discursive approach is concerned with how actors' claims about truth, knowledge and action are determined by what is "sayable" about a particular

¹ See **Fahey, T.** (1995). Privacy and The Family: Conceptual and Empirical Reflections. *Sociology*, 29(4), 687–702. **West, A., Lewis, J. and Currie, P.** (2009) Students' Facebook 'friends': Public and private spheres. *Journal of Youth Studies* 12 (6): 615–27, DOI: 10.1080/13676260902960752

social reality in a given socio-historical context. The question then becomes how certain forms of the family, the nature of appropriate family relationships, and the position of the family in relation to the state, are both enabled and constrained by larger socio-historically situated discourses of child welfare². **Brannen claims**, that "Caring for vulnerable children is a paid job but needs to be theorized as more than work. Two sets of conceptualizations are relevant here³. He substantiates this claim by referring to other authors. "The first concerns the ethics of care⁴. A second theorization concerns the "capacity to care", which, as Hollway discusses, relates to notions of subjectivity and intersubjectivity⁵.

A potential aspect of recent research interest directly challenges the role of the state as a "caregiver", highlighting the "inability of adults to care for" children⁶. Based on the assertion that "children as passive subjects of social structures and processes"⁷, he agrees with James' assertion that "It defined a new research perspective towards children and opened a space for new study topics concerning children's competencies and influence in shaping the social world and taking an active part in it"⁸.

The exercise of children's role-playing competence is usually more relevant when dealing with families'/parents' multiple social problems, whose unresolved issues make the need for state intervention imperative and raise ethical issues, depending on the delicacy of the intervention, almost in all cases. Explaining the phenomenon of family poverty would mean being superficial. People in poverty have only quite recently been recognized by researchers for their own relevant perspectives on poverty⁹. To develop an understanding of how families respond to environmental factors, Axford has helpfully differentiated between the nature of structural forces in the creation of stressors and the role of human agency in determining the reaction to such stressors. Exclusion is, consequently,

² Verhallen, T., Hall, C.J., Slembrouck, S. (2019) Family support and child protection approaches. Historicising perspectives on contemporary discourses of social work. *Qualitative Social Work*. 18 (2): 1-16. doi: 10.1177 / 1473325017712798, page 4.

³ Brannen, J., Mooney, A., Statham, J. (2009) Childhood Experiences. a Commitment to Caring and Care Work with Vulnerable Children. *Childhood*. 16 (3): 377-393. doi: 10.1177 / 0907568209335317), page 378.

⁴ Sevenhuijsen, S. (1998) *Citizenship and the Ethics of Care*. London: Routledge. Tronto, J. (1993) *Moral Boundaries. A Political Argument for the Ethics of Care*. London: Routledge.

⁵ See Hollway, W. (2006) *The Capacity to Care. Gender and Ethical Subjectivity*. London: Routledge.

⁶ See Heine, S.J. (2001) Self as cultural product. An examination of East Asian and North American selves. *Journal of Personality* 69 (6): 882-906; Hofstede, G. (1991) *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.

⁷ Prout, A. and James, A. (1990) A new paradigm for the sociology of childhood? In: James A. and Prout A. (eds.) *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood*. London: Falmer Press, p. 8.

⁸ Qvortrup, J., Corsaro, W. A., & Honig, M.-S. (2009) *The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 34-45.

⁹ Lister, R. (2004) *Poverty*. Cambridge: Polity Press; Redmond, G. (2009) Children as actors. How does the child perspectives literature treat agency in the context of poverty? *Social Policy and Society* 8 (4): 541-550; Ridge, T., Saunders, P. (2009) Introduction: Themed section on children's perspectives on poverty and disadvantage in rich and developing countries. *Social Policy and Society* 8 (4): 499-502.

not a de facto result of unemployment or other adverse social circumstances but a mediation via individual response¹⁰.

This multiplication of problems increases the risk of the children of such families experiencing multiple adversities in adulthood¹¹. Consequently, as Axford argues, it has actually proved very difficult to talk about socially excluded children without referring in the same breath to their multi-faceted and complex needs¹².

In most cases, children might have experienced some kind of significant trauma in their early life¹³. For many, this is likely to be because of parents who either significantly lacked the ability to look after their children appropriately (perhaps because of their own childhood experiences) or, for a variety of reasons, have purposely hurt or neglected them. It is through consistently poor care and lack of parental attachment in the child's early years that children's unhelpful responses to the world around them become ingrained and habitual¹⁴.

Given the complexity and density of the event, the subject of this article is the forms of state intervention that involve the removal of children from their families and their placement in childcare facilities. This ethically minimal way of "interfering" with family issues is mixed, in the case of our country, with some social practical experience, but which has some elements of being considered "traditional" in the sense that institutions existed in the practice of Armenians very early (Nerses the Great¹⁵), but for children suffering from complicated family circumstances due to the loss of statehood, family accommodation options were the only solution before the genocide and the Sovietization of the country. Therefore, it would be better to associate childcare in institutions with social experience rather than tradition.

To understand the context of political preferences, public attitudes, parent-child care responses to the process of reorganizing care facilities over the last fifteen years, it is important to study the evolution of institutions on the one hand and a retrospective study of their reorganization in some cases on the other hand.

In the post-independence period, Armenia, bearing the influence of the Soviet-Socialist period of guaranteeing the welfare of children and organizing their social protection, continues to rely on vocalized educational and social

¹⁰ **Feinstein, L., Sabates, R.** (2006) Predicting adult life outcomes from earlier signals: Identifying those at risk. Center for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning. London: Institute of Education; Axford, N. (2010). Is social exclusion a useful concept in children's services? *British Journal of Social Work*, 40 (1), 737–754.

¹¹ **Feinstein, L., Sabates, R.** (2006), *ibid.*

¹² **Axford, N.**, *ibid.*, p. 749.

¹³ **Nicholson, C., Dwivedi, K.N., Irwin, M.** (2010) *Children and Adolescents in Trauma. Creative therapeutic approaches.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

¹⁴ **Nicholson, C., Dwivedi, K.N., Irwin, M.** (2010), *ibid.*; **Ward, A., Kajetan, K., Pooley, J., Worthington, A.** (eds) (2003) *Therapeutic Communities for Children and Young People.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

¹⁵ **Antonyan, M.** (2015). The Social Cost of Caring for Genocide Orphans. *Genocide Studies in the Focus of the Social Sciences.* Collection of articles, YSU Publishing House, Yerevan, pp. 120-134.

institutions in organizing the care and education of children from poor and disadvantaged families. Based on the 60s of the last century, such institutions were specialized¹⁶ for children with specific needs, especially children with mental disorders, children from "poor families", disabled¹⁷ children, etc.

The fact that such a "legacy" was digested in social practice in the post-Soviet years, allowed the practice of removing children from their families to continue in the face of various problems that were difficult to reconcile with the education process: poverty, child disability, orphanhood, orphanage, family, and other factors. In fact, the above model of centralized education of children with special education in isolated families, and, in some cases, with the centralized care and upbringing of orphans, was as common and desirable, even publicly demanded, as the model of general education.

Several stages can be distinguished in the development of child-care and protection institutions since independence:

First stage. 1990-2004 period: unprecedented increase in the number of children accommodated in institutions. Transformation phase of departmental subordination. In post-Soviet Armenia, immediately after independence, there were a total of about 1,000 children in institutions belonging to various departments. The largest number of children in institutions was registered during the first crisis, when the country, under the simultaneous influence of war, earthquake, and economic blockade, had an unprecedented increase in the number of children begging for daily bread. New institutions were opened to respond quickly, bringing the 29 registered in 1990 to 65 in the 2000s, and the number of children in care multiplied several times. Such a sharp increase in the number of institutions is explained by the fact that the only known, current model of state support for children in need was the placement of children in institutions. At this stage, without any special fixing, a significant change took place in the current model. The approach of accommodating children of target groups in a specific institution in accordance with their "special" needs was gradually pushed into the background. By "adjusting" the children's social status to the institution's admission criteria, a large number of children were placed in institutions due to poverty. Due to the rapid filling of the capacity of existing special educational institutions, new so-called "poverty specialization" institutions were hastily created (following the Soviet-era "Special School for Orphans and Children Deprived of Parental Care" model¹⁸). Whether the placement concerns related to a special need, however, for most of the accommodating children, the problem was the poverty of the families, the inability of the parents to provide the minimum living conditions for the children. Admittedly, such an approach, albeit with great distortions, allowed to somehow solve the problem of the basic

¹⁶ By "specialized" we mean not so much the effective satisfaction of the needs of vulnerable children as the concentration of children with similar problems in one place.

¹⁷ Boarding schools for children with special talents are beyond the scope of this article.

¹⁸ These facilities were renamed "Orphans, Child Care Facilities for Abandoned Children".

necessities of life for thousands of children.

Due to poverty, the placement of children in centralized institutions as a state support approach, without resistance, was rapidly digested by social practice. The mentioned situation was conditioned by the following "favorable" factors:

1. The support was provided by the state, and in the memory of the Soviet era, state support was the most prestigious, in demand, reliable, even when it comes to removing children from families. Parents, specialists, the society did not have the opportunity to make judgments about the quality of institutions during the crisis. The number of "alternative" institutions set up by international or non-governmental organizations was small, the number of children cared for was insignificant, and private institutions were quickly closed¹⁹ or reorganized into state institutions. The new institutions were thus created by the inertia of the existing models, so they did not raise any questions.

2. In essence, supporting children and their families by accommodating children in institutions was seen as "providing social guarantees", which did not cause any conflict of values, as social protection and social security systems continued to operate on the basis of vulnerability from the Soviet era.

3. The number of non-governmental organizations for the protection of children's rights was very small, and although the country had acceded to a number of international conventions in the 1990s, the rights-based approaches were still in their infancy.

However, this practice has raised many social issues, in particular:

- As a result of these processes, at the beginning of the first decade of post-independence, the number of children registered in institutions increased 12 times, reaching 12,000.
- Responding to child neglect by accommodating them in institutions, including free food provision, clothing, school supplies, etc.,²⁰ caused considerable confusion among the children in care, both in the former and newly opened institutions.

The beginning of reforms: Until the 2000s, according to the tradition of organizational management from the Soviet period, the institutions were located under the management of several departments: education, social affairs, health, police (internal affairs), etc. As a result of the first contacts with international organizations, particularly with the United Nations Children's Fund, governance was first optimized. Thus, due to the expediency of managing with single handwriting, the mentioned institutions were rearranged under two departments: Social Affairs and Education. A key role in the transition was played

¹⁹ At least two orphanages founded by individuals in Meghri and Vanadzor came under the attention of special services and were quickly closed or transformed without special analysis (based on distrust of a private institution, such as the Vanadzor orphanage, Zatik orphanage, etc.).

²⁰ Suffice it to say that 19 new institutions were set up in the area for "orphans and children deprived of parental care", referring to so-called "social orphanhood" and poverty.

by the UNICEF's promise to improve the physical condition of institutions and to develop staff capacity. As the first experience of cooperation with international organizations, managers rushed to "adapt" to the requirements of management optimization. This transformation provoked serious resistance from the departments "losing institutions". The main argument was the uniqueness of their own approaches, assessing it as the one best suited to the needs of the children in care, specific only to the department. As for the staff of the institutions, the resistance was relatively latent. Other actors of the society were not involved in the mentioned process to any extent. However, the first stage of the reforms took place mainly in the conditions of the rapid overcoming of the "elite-kitchen" resistance. A possible counterargument to the opposition was not to miss the opportunity to somehow improve the situation of children in institutions, especially in the absence of a state budget.

Second stage. 2005-2010 ("Unloading" of institutions²¹ start of the process): Within the framework of its international commitments, the Government of the Republic of Armenia will start taking steps in the period 2005-2010 to minimize the placement of children in institutions due to unnecessary or just poverty. At the same time, efforts were made to evacuate children already in institutions for the above-mentioned reasons in all possible cases, to reunite them with their families, thus trying to resolve the already entrenched confusion in the institution of children in institutions²². These efforts, being a precondition for receiving international commitments, in particular possible budget support, were built solely on the potential of administrative leverage, without any dialogue with the professional community in general. The processes of this stage were planned in such a way that, on the one hand, the requirements of international obligations were met, on the other hand, they did not cause any shocks either among the staff or the parents. The so-called "buffer atmosphere" of the "half-step" reform was formed around the institutions, so that for the investing companies it seemed to be a step forward to ensure the imitation of the reform, on the other hand, the new situation for the staff and parents was not so different. From the previous situation, there were no special reasons for resistance.

The main resistance came from the Ministry of Education, which managed the 19 institutions for transforming "orphaned, deprived of parental care" children, as a result of which the ministry "lost" nine institutions, which started to operate under the coordination of the Ministry of Social Affairs. By its nature, however, that resistance against the developments was mainly within the ruling elite again. At times, they escalated issues in open discussions, involving influential political elites. In fact, they were paying off quickly due to the general agreement reached by the governing bodies on the priority of imple-

²¹ This was the name of the first phase of the reforms.

²² "Child Protection Strategic Plan", 2005-2009, & "Child Protection Strategic Plan", 2010-2013 & "Child Protection Strategic Plan", 2018-2023.

menting the preconditions for possible budget support. Thus, in the second, main stage of the reform, the process of "unloading" the institutions is a buffer-soft reform process of conflicting interests²³.

In this context, there were generally no shocks for the following reasons:

- Despite strong reservations about the quality of staff work, in fact, the first two stages of reorganization of the institutions were carried out in a pre-designed way to reduce resistance by solving the problem of staffing at the expense of children²⁴. Therefore, there was almost no resistance from the staff, as the special educational institutions were simply renamed and given new functions while retaining the same staff.

- The parents did not particularly resist for several reasons. First, they were interested in receiving financial and material support from international charities; second, if they wished, they could use the services of other similar institutions instead of closed ones.

- The public attitude was expressed through private discussions over one or two cautious articles.

By the end of the second phase, in 2010, through the reorganization or liquidation of institutions, the number of children in institutions had gradually decreased from 12,000 to 6,000 and the number of institutions from 65 to 32.

Third stage, 2010-2018 (*the institutional reforms, structural changes in the protection of children and ebbs district*): At this stage, deeper processes began, in particular, the reunification of children with families, the expansion of the first pilot program of family support, efforts to develop alternative family care options and so on. Transformations were made to meet the preconditions for external assistance, but in a series of gradual, cautious steps (without reducing the budget numbers and staff): first trying to separate education from care and then, if possible, returning children to their families.

This stage was distinguished by the manifestation of various resistances:

- first of all, it refers to the open criticism of the nature of transformations by non-governmental organizations, considering the ongoing reforms as contradictory approaches based on the rights of children. In fact, this stage was a tumultuous period for NGOs to express their views, sometimes even with bold expressions. The main message was about the need for systemic, radical reforms instead of efforts for cosmetic transformations of institutions.

- The resistance by the staff of the institutions was openly aggressive. The reduction in the number of children implied a reduction in the budget, subsequent reductions, or final liquidation. Attempts were also made to politi-

²³ In the first sub-phase, 19 special schools were transformed . 10 institutions were transformed into secondary schools and 9 became "Child Care and Protection Institutions" for children who could not return to their families. In the second sub-phase, one orphanage located in Yerevan was transformed into a day care center.

²⁴ Only the closure of one of the orphanages met with serious resistance, and the decision was canceled three times, using various schemes of relationships and the dramatization of children's situations.

cize the issue or dramatize the children's situation in order to draw public attention to it.

- As for the parents, they shared the resistance efforts of the staff of the institutions, having common interests in that case. The parents have learned that the state "naturally" has to share the care with the family, and the only way to do that is to take the child to a childcare institution, from which they try to "deprive" him. Thus, at this stage, it is the turn of those children whose parents in various ways "benefit" the child to stay in the institution. From this position, they exploit their economic and housing conditions and set preconditions for the readmission of their own children in exchange for their possible consent. This behavior is explained by a number of factors. A kind of "social order" has been formed, which implies sheltering children in problematic, non-standard, unfavorable family situations in closed institutions out of sight. It is: a) mutually beneficial order, which implies a constant flow of children in such institutions, b) regular, not modest funding of the state and c) generous donations from various donors.

- The above-mentioned circumstance mutually determines the expectations of the staff of the institution. The staff expects to be appreciated (even honored), even in the case of poor-quality care, as they make "sacrifices" by keeping "other people's unwanted children". Accordingly, the staff unnecessarily tragically "turns the cases of children into a melodrama, exploiting their vulnerability", thus, artificially exaggerating the irreplaceability of their role²⁵. After all, due to the processes that took place, as of September 1, 2018, there are different types²⁶. The number of children cared for in institutions is 3,600, including 1,300 in social institutions.

Current, fourth phase of reforms, 2018 - to date: The changes in the system of protection and care of children after the change of power are distinguished by their radical and abrupt nature. Moreover, the reform processes²⁷ in the field, took a unique approach, provoking resistance from parents, caregivers, and especially staff, fueling public discontent, something that had been skillfully avoided in earlier stages of the institution's liquidation and transformation.

The new government applied a more radical approach, that is, instead of the "soft" way, which is the reorganization, another way, that is, liquidation of institutions was adopted, on the one hand, on the other hand, in newly established services government does not want to see the operation of institutions possessing by the "old" personnel from the previous schemes. As a counterattack, the staff used the well-known mechanisms used in tragic cases of

²⁵ That is why, in the case of one of the orphanages, the decision to close was canceled and postponed indefinitely, at least three times.

²⁶ As a result of many transformations in the country, there are currently two types of institutions: care and protection institutions (orphanages and boarding schools) and special education, including special upbringing, which combine the organization of children's education and their care.

²⁷ Recently, about 300 children have been removed from the institution and reunited with their families through the liquidation of five institutions.

children, parents' hopelessness, overestimation of their role, extortion of feelings from the society, which had been used in relatively small doses before. Due to the activation of social networks, the general public began to discuss the process of reform, sometimes with sharply polarized views on the issue.

The behavior of parents is a subject of a separate analysis. In fact, during the previous three stages of removing children from institutions, almost in all possible cases had already been reunited; most of the children remaining in the institutions came from families with less potential for reunification, in particular:

- Family situations, housing conditions are not favorable for taking children back,
- The amount and volume of assistance provided in the case of return to the family and the range are significantly lower than the offer of the institution, especially the cases of children with severe disabilities.

In fact, being away from children for a long time significantly damaged the parent-child emotional bond; most parents have already overcome the stages of guilt, survival, and justification in such a way that they have "liberated" themselves from the need for their child to be naturally present in the family.

Thus, it turns out that children become a means for parents to expect some support from the state - solutions, and to have a job for the staff. Moreover, leaving aside the cases of objectively impossible, for the most part, the fact that children are cared for in institutions is an additional opportunity for parents and staff chief to receive support from the state and charities.

As a result of the urgent steps taken in the dismantling of institutions and services at the current stage, the delay of practical steps in the development of alternative support forms, the principle of continuity of services was violated for most of the children discharged from the institution. The children who were taken out received regular support only in the first stage. In a country with almost 61% multidimensional child poverty, providing special assistance to some 300 children (just because they have been in care for some time) is at least unjustified. Such disproportionate treatment by donors could raise a justified wave of outrage among thousands of children living in poverty and their parents, as well as former students of institutions whose signs are already visible in the example of former orphanage graduates.

The problem is that the above-mentioned behavior of the staff and parents, mixed with the expectations of the society, has formed a kind of informal "institutional look", the transformation of which is in the field of values, will not change easily. According to Auzan, such informal institutions, especially inefficient ones, have a syndrome of longevity, usually appear in a "closed orbit"²⁸. It is possible to get out of that orbit only in the parallel value system by creating

²⁸ **Korneitchuk B.V. Auzan A.** Economics of everything. How institutes determine our life. M., 2014 reviewed by B.V. KORNEITCHUK. Sotsiologicheskije issledovaniya [Sociological Studies]. 2015. № 1, p. 152-155.

other formal-informal institutions called the same problem.

As for the non-governmental organizations, influenced by such drastic steps (which had been propagated with great intensity before), they considered their agenda exhausted, otherwise ceasing to have a scrutiny of the processes taking place, thus condensing the uncertainty turned into a Brownian movement in the area under discussion.

The staff of the care and protection institutions, continuing to operate in a formal structure, has formed informal alliances with almost all the forces opposing the reforms, the former ruling circles, the media, and the opponents of the reforms. Thus, being an organic part of the state institution, the employees of the institutions have publicly used various tricks to mislead the students about the tragedy of their situation, their role, the inevitability of the existence of the institutions, trying to create an anti-reform mood, questioning the logic of reform.

In fact, the reform has reached a deadlock due to a false agenda created for the unjustified protection of the distorted social effect, which is spiced with certain veils of values and emotions.

What are the drawbacks?

In contrast to the sharp and rapid change of the political elite in the post-revolutionary period, changes in various social structures, including social protection, are more inertial and slower.

Daron A. and James A. Robinson argues that "by adapting to the new system, the economic elites and social systems can survive for a long time to come, without undergoing particularly significant changes; by subordinating those systems to their goals over time²⁹".

The process of dismantling informal institutions should begin with the interpretation of overtly covert schemes of the "family-child placement decision-making staff" triangle. In particular, there is a need to raise the issues of vulnerable children involved in institutions, the abuse of falsely exaggerated factors, and quality of care for children in the institution, and the real impact on their social prospects. Moreover, it is possible to prove in a language understandable to the public the incompatibility of the invested resources - money, material means, and extorted feelings - with the results obtained.

In fact, in the absence of the desired institutions or the immediate opportunities for their construction, the introduction or use of intermediate institutions can really be a way out³⁰. However, this trick can only have a temporary effect. Delays in detailed planning of the process, informing the public, revealing the "opposite side of the coin", methodological and value system clarifications

²⁹ See **Acemoglu, D., James A. R.**, (2008). Persistence of Power, Elites, and Institutions. American Economic Review 98 (1). 267–293 <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.98.1.267>

³⁰ See **Pulterovich, V.**, (2012). «Reform design. How to Search for Interim Institutions», MPRA Paper 41043, University library of Munich, Germany.

for non-standard and difficult situations related to children's lives can thwart reform, causing irreparable damage to all stakeholders in the process, including the reputation of reform.

In addition to the actions required by the well-known classical schemes for the implementation of reforms (strategic planning, action plan, decision-making, etc.), in the new realities of Armenia, there is a need to take additional actions. They relate primarily to the analysis of the structure, material, and especially information flows of informal institutions that openly or covertly resist. Based on this analysis, it will then be necessary to identify the gaps and weaknesses that the protesters deliberately conceal by trying to distort or influence public positions on the process.

Reforms in children's institutions can only achieve their goal in the context of the simultaneous introduction of modern alternative models of child care, their development, the renewal of values in child-family-state relations, and the simultaneous implementation of efforts to professionalize the field.

ՄԻՐԱ ԱՆՏՈՆՅԱՆ – Երեխաների խնամքի հաստատությունների ինստիտուցիոնալ զարգացումը ՀՀ-ում. կառուցվածքային-կազմակերպական, թե՛ արժեհամակարգային մոտեցում – Սոցիալական հիմնախնդիրների և մասնավորապես ընտանեկան խնամքի թերացումներին արձագանքելու խորհրդային շրջանից եկող ու դեռևս կենսունակ մոտեցումների վերափոխման շուրջ քննարկումները մնում են արդիական: Մասնավորապես կարևոր է կրթական, խնամքի ու պաշտպանության հաստատություններում երեխաներին տեղավորելու պրակտիկայի փոփոխմանն ու երեխաների իրավունքների վրա հիմնված համակարգի ձևավորման գործընթացներում դրսևորվող լատենտ, ոչ ձևայնացված դիմադրության քննարկումը հասկանալու, թե ձեռնարկվող կազմակերպական-կառուցվածքային վերափոխումները արժեհամակարգային ցանկալի փոփոխությունների ինչպիսի ներուժ ունեն: Արդյո՞ք այդ վերափոխումները կարող են նպաստել կարիքի մեջ գտնվող երեխաներին ընտանիքից դուրս օգնելու արատավոր պրակտիկայի վերացմանը, ինչը մեր օրերում շարունակում է լինել երեք՝ *ձեռք-որոշում ընդունող-հանրություն* կողմերի միջև ոչ ձևայնացված համաձայնության առարկա՝ անտեսելով երեխաների իրավունքներն ու շահերը:

Բանալի բառեր – *հաստատությունների վերակազմակերպում, բարեփոխումներ, վերամիավորում, լատենտ (թաքնված) դիմադրություն, կառուցվածքային-կազմակերպական փոփոխություններ, արժեհամակարգային փոխություններ*

МИРА АНТОНЯН – Институциональное развитие учреждений по уходу за детьми в Армении: структурно-организационный, или ценностно-системный подход? – Дискуссии о трансформации социальных проблем, особенно при отсутствии жизнеспособного подхода к устранению недостатков семейного ухода, с советских времен и по прошествии тридцати лет независимости Армении по-прежнему остаются актуальными. В частности, необходимо обсудить латентное, не озвученное сопротивление привычному помещению детей в образовательные

учреждения, в учреждения по уходу за детьми и по их защите, а также возникновение скрытого, не озвученного сопротивления в системах, основанных на правах ребенка. Такое обсуждение важно для понимания потенциала предпринятых организационно-структурных преобразований по достижению желаемых изменений в системе ценностей. Смогут ли эти реорганизации повлиять на меняющуюся практику помощи нуждающимся детям вне семьи, что по-прежнему является предметом неформального соглашения между тремя сторонами: родитель – принимающее решения лицо – общество, игнорируя права и интересы детей?

Ключевые слова: *реорганизация учреждений, реформа, воссоединение, интеграция, латентное сопротивление, структурно-организационные изменения, ценностно-системные изменения*

Abstract

Discussions on the transformation of social issues, particularly the lack of a viable approach to responding to the shortcomings of family care, from the Soviet era are still relevant thirty years later. In particular, education, care and protection of children in institutions and to accommodate changing practices used in the process of forming a latent attitude system based on children's rights, non-formal resistance discussion interesting to understand what potential they have undertaken an organizational structural transformation of values desired to bring about change. Will these transformations be able to influence the changing practices of helping children in need outside of the family environment something that continues to be the subject of unspoken agreement between the three parent-decision-making parties today, ignoring children's rights and interests?

Author

Mira Antonyan - PhD in Sociology, Associate Professor, Executive Director, "Children's Support Center" Foundation, and President, Armenian Association of Social Workers, "Children's Support Center" Foundation

E mail: mira.antonyan@asw.org

Keywords

reorganization of institutions, reforms, reunification, latent resistance, structural-organizational changes, value-systemic changes.

References

- Acemoglu, D., James A. R., (2008). Persistence of Power, Elites, and Institutions. *American Economic Review* 98 (1). 267-293 DOI: 10.1257/aer.98.1.267
- Antonyan, M. (2015). "The Social Cost of Caring for Genocide Orphans, Genocide Studies in the Focus of the Social Sciences." Collection of articles, YSU Publishing House, Yerevan, pp. 120-134.
- Auzan, A. (2017). "Economics of everything. How do the institutes determine our life?". Mann, Ivanov and Ferber.
- Axford, N. (2010). Is social exclusion a useful concept in children's services? *British Journal of Social Work*, 40 (1), 737-754. DOI: 10.1093/bjsw/bcn121
- Brannen, J., Mooney, A., Statham, J. (2009) Childhood Experiences. a Commitment To Caring and Care Work With Vulnerable Children. *Childhood*. 16 (3): 377-393. DOI: 10.1177 / 0907568209335317.
- Fahey, T. (1995). PRIVACY AND THE FAMILY: CONCEPTUAL AND EMPIRICAL REFLECTIONS. *Sociology*, 29(4), 687-702. DOI: 10.1177/0038038595029004008

-
- Feinstein, L., Sabates, R. (2006). Predicting adult life outcomes from earlier signals: Identifying those at risk. Center for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning. London: Institute of Education.
- Heine, S.J. (2001) Self as a cultural product. An examination of East Asian and North American selves. *Journal of Personality* 69 (6): 882-906. DOI: 10.1111/1467-6494.696168
- Hofstede, G. (1991) *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hollway, W. (2006) *The Capacity to Care. Gender and Ethical Subjectivity*. London: Routledge:
- Lister, R. (2004) *Poverty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Nicholson, C., Dwivedi, K.N., Irwin, M. (2010) *Children and Adolescents in Trauma. Creative therapeutic approaches*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Prout, A. and James, A. (1990) A new paradigm for the sociology of childhood? In: James A and Prout A (eds) *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood*. London: Falmer Press.
- Pulterovich, V., (2012). «Reform design. How to Search for Interim Institutions », MPRA Paper 41043, University Library of Munich, Germany:
- Qvortrup, J., Corsaro, W. A., & Honig, M.-S. (2009). *The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230274686
- Redmond, G. (2009) Children as actors. How does the child perspectives literature treat agency in the context of poverty? *Social Policy and Society* 8 (4): 541-550. DOI: 10.1017/S147474640999011X
- Ridge, T., Saunders, P. (2009) Introduction: Themed section on children's perspectives on poverty and disadvantage in rich and developing countries. *Social Policy and Society* 8 (4): 499-502. DOI: 10.1017/S1474746409990078
- Sevenhuijsen, S. (1998) *Citizenship and the Ethics of Care*. London: Routledge.
- Tronto, J. (1993) *Moral Boundaries. A Political Argument for the Ethics of Care*. London: Routledge.
- Verhallen, T., Hall, C.J., Slembrouck, S. (2019) Family support and child protection approaches. Historicizing perspectives on contemporary discourses of social work. *Qualitative Social Work*. 18 (2): 1-16. doi: 10.1177 / 1473325017712798.
- Ward, A., Kajetan, K., Pooley, J., Worthington, A., (2003) *Therapeutic Communities for Children and Young People*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- West, A., Lewis, J. and Currie, P. (2009) Students' Facebook 'friends': Public and private spheres. *Journal of Youth Studies* 12 (6): 615-27, DOI: 10.1080/13676260902960752