

DOI: 10.12731/2218-7405-2013-8-14

**TENDENCIES IN PREVENTIVE WORK WITH FAMILIES IN A
“RISK GROUP” AND SOCIALLY DANGEROUS POSITION IN THE
CENTRE OF SOCIAL HELP FOR FAMILY AND CHILDREN IN
MAGNITOGORSK”**

Gafarov T.H., Kulikova J.S.

The article describes preventive work connected with admonition of infant neglect. This kind of work is performed by the department of infant neglect prevention in MU “Centre of social help for family and children”. According to statistical data analysis the author presumes that the level of family marginalization in Magnitogorsk is increasing and the part of wealthy families in a common family stratification is decreasing. It’s mentioned that it’s necessary to perform preventive measures in regard to families in a “risk group”. The work with specified group of families is more effectual than that with families in the “Centre of social help for families and children”.

Keywords: neglect and homelessness of infants; marginalization of family; families in a “risk group”; families in a socially dangerous position.

**ТЕНДЕНЦИИ В ПРОФИЛАКТИЧЕСКОЙ РАБОТЕ С СЕМЬЯМИ
«ГРУППЫ РИСКА» И НАХОДЯЩИМИСЯ В СОЦИАЛЬНО ОПАСНОМ
ПОЛОЖЕНИИ В МУ «ЦЕНТР СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ПОМОЩИ СЕМЬЕ И
ДЕТЯМ Г. МАГНИТОГОРСКА»**

Гафаров Т.Х., Куликова Ю.С.

Статья содержит описание профилактической работы по предупреждению безнадзорности несовершеннолетних, которую проводит отделение профилактики безнадзорности несовершеннолетних МУ «Центр социальной помощи семье и детям г. Магнитогорска». На основе анализа статистических данных делается вывод о маргинализации института семьи в Магнитогорске, уменьшении доли благополучных семей в структуре семейной стратификации. Отмечается необходимость осуществления профилактической деятельности в отношении семей «группы риска», которая является более эффективной, нежели работа с семьями в социально опасном положении.

Ключевые слова: безнадзорность и беспризорность несовершеннолетних; маргинализация института семьи; семья «группы риска»; семья в социально опасном положении.

Introduction

Family is the basic part of society. Its prosperity defines situation in it. Due to family socialization a human gets initial social skills and the experience of preceding generations. Child comprehends the ideas of civicism and patriotism in the family. Besides, family is the basic ground for life and spare time of people.

Thus the prior direction in social policy of each state is to keep families prosper.

At the same time modern research works of Russian family show the crisis condition which started in early 90-s. It was caused by the number of factors. Firstly,

it's an objective process – matrimonial relations in all economically developed countries have changed a lot; secondly, Russian family in Soviet period has its own way of development. Finally, it's a modern state of Russian society.

Considerable number of families is in difficult life situations and is exposed to negative social factors. Those families who can't resist this kind of situation themselves get to a category 'risk group families' and in a socially dangerous position. All members in the 'risk group families' aren't able to analyze social situation that's why they aren't ready to change their behavior for the better. Moreover people in such families have strong negative emotions, connected with love, care, and mutual help. Finally we can also mention predisposition to alcohol and drugs in 'risk group families'.

These circumstances aggravate life of infants in families. As a rule these children also get into the 'risk group'. There are different reasons for it: alcohol addiction of parents, their asocial behavior, and hang-out for criminals in the flat; murder of one of the parents by the other in the child's presence; cruel treatment of children (e.g. beating); escape from home, conflicts with coevals.

As it was mentioned above, families in the 'risk group' and in the socially dangerous position can't cope with problems themselves. That's why special organizations were founded where such families can get help. In particular in April 2010 there was established a department of infant neglect prevention (DINP) in MU "Centre of social help for family and children". Specialists here work at prevention of infant neglect, systematization and coordination of infant homeless condition and neglect. So the competence of Centre specialists includes database with 'risk group families' and those in the socially dangerous position. This database was earlier curated by Complex social service centers.

Research Goal – to reveal tendencies, typical for preventive work with families in the 'risk group' and in the socially dangerous position in Magnitogorsk, using data of DINP.

Methods of Research – in the present article we use statistic data for 2010-2011 because it's a starting period of DNIP work. It can certainly help to reveal tendencies in this field and make conclusion. We also use sociological method of quantitative and qualitative analysis of documents and statistic method of information processing.

Research Results

In April 2010 there were 317 families/ 566 infants registered in the Centre wherein 76 families/ 135 infants were in the socially dangerous position; 214 families/ 431 infants were in the 'risk group'. In eight months staff in DINP put on record 110 families/ 177 infants wherein 19 families/ 150 infants were in the 'risk group'. During the same period 33 families/ 49 infants were deregistered wherein 16 families/ 26 infants were in the socially dangerous position and 17 families/ 23 infants – in the 'risk group'.

As the result according to statistics as of January 1, 2011 the number of families in the socially dangerous position and in the 'risk group', registered in the Centre, is – 394 families/ 694 infants wherein 79 families/ 136 infants were in the socially dangerous position (20.1%); 315 families/ 558 infants were in the 'risk group' (79.9%).

The total number of registered families (less than a year of DINP work) increased by 77 families/ 128 infants. Regarding 'risk group' families – 74 families/ 127 infants. The total number of families in the socially dangerous position increased by 3 units.

We can explain this identified dynamics in a following way: on the one hand, it's a negative tendency which shows family marginalization process in Magnitogorsk, as a result the rate of prosperous families in family stratification is decreasing. On the other hand, these data can be explained by a successful work of DINP specialists. We can surely talk about qualitative and harmonious work of Centre staff with specialists from partner institutions in the sphere of unfortunate family detection. We work with every family to improve socio-economic, household

conditions of living and upbringing children in families and normalization of psychosocial climate among family members. We also work to prevent socially dangerous position and it's deterioration in society

We suppose that both conclusions are just. Socio-economic situation in our country is aggravating, living standards are declining. All this caused family institution destruction. Many families get into the 'risk group'. If we don't conduct targeted work with all these families, they will get into the socially dangerous position. But according to statistics, the majority of registered families (nearly 80%) are referred to the 'risk group' and only the fifth of them is in the socially dangerous position. This fact proves that the work of Centre specialists is done at a high level.

We can also confirm this conclusion with statistic data for 2011. For the period from January to September, 1 2011 specialists in DINP registered 102 families/ 175 infants wherein 24 families/ 41 infants were in the socially dangerous position; 78 families/ 134 infants were in the 'risk group'. In the same period they deregistered 88 families/ 153 infants wherein 17 families/ 31 infants were in the socially dangerous position; 71 families/ infants were in the 'risk group'.

We may determine several reasons for deregistering families:

1. In connection with improved and stabilized situation in families 41 families/ infants were deregistered; families/
2. In connection with change of residence – infants;
3. On the grounds of annulment – 17 families/ 26 infants;
4. In connection with majority attainment – 13 families/ 22 infants;
5. Other reasons – 9 families/ 22 infants.

Inference

When we analyze reasons for deregistering families in DINP, we can make conclusion. We conducted comparative analysis of registering/deregistering families in the 'risk group' and in the socially dangerous position. We obtained the following data.

Concerning the 'risk group' families:

1. Reason – propensity for alcohol consumption – 13 families in the 'risk group' (50%) were deregistered due to improving and stabilization situation in families.

2. Reason – families where parents neglect children education because they are unemployed – 4 cases are stabilized.

3. Reason – conflicts in families – 3 cases (42.8%)

4. Besides we can see positive trend in such aspects as 'conflicts in families' (42.8%), improper parental duties, child unattended (30.7%), immoral behavior of parents (33%).

Unfortunately we can't see positive trend regarding families in the socially dangerous position. If we consider the category 'alcohol consumption' or 'improper parental duties' we notice that 14.2% of families are deregistered because of residence change; 28.5% – because of annulment, full age or death of parents. If we consider the category 'immoral behavior, unemployment/temporary jobs, poor conditions for living and upbringing children', we can see that 50% of families are deregistered because children came of age, 23.4% – because of parents' death.

Thus we state that preventive work with 'risk group' families is more effective than that with families in the socially dangerous position. It's also necessary to focus on

Social correction of families in the 'risk group' is directed at their transfer into 'prosperous group' and preventing their transition into socially dangerous position. We should say this kind of work has already been successfully performed: for eight months of 2010 six 'risk group' families were deregistered due to improvement of situation; during the same period in 2011 there were 37 such families.

References

1. Analiticheskij vestnik № 20 (176) Detskaja besprizornost' i beznadzornost': problemy, puti reshenija. – M., 2002. – 123 p.

2. Antonov A. I. Mikrosociologija sem'i (metodologija issledovanija struktur i processov). – M.: Izdatel'skij Dom «Nota Bene», 1998. - 360 p.
3. Pavlenok P.D. Teorija, istorija i metodika social'noj raboty. – M.: Izdatel'sko-torgovaja korporacija «Dashkov i K», 2005. - 476 p.
4. Psihologicheskoe soprovozhdenie lic, perezhivshih nasilie v sem'e: Nauchno- metodicheskoe posobie / Pod red. prof. Ju.P. Platonova. – SPb.: Sankt-Peterburgskij gosudarstvennyj institut psihologii i social'noj raboty, 2002. -234 p.
5. Osnovy psihologii sem'i i semejnogo konsul'tirovanija / Pod. N.N. Posysoeva. – M.: Izdatel'stvo VLADOS-PRESS, 2004. – 328 p.
6. Rabzhaeva M.V. Semejnaja politika v Rossii XX v.: istoriko-social'nyj aspekt / M.V. Rabzhaeva // Obshhestvennye nauki i sovremennost'. – 2004. – №2. – pp.166-176.
7. Rozelli N. Social'naja rabota / N. Rozelli. – M.: Socinnovacija, 1994. – 94p.
8. Rostovskaja T.K. Molodaja sem'ja v sovremennom rossijskom obshhestve / T.K. Rostovskaja. – Ivanovo: Izd-vo Ivan. Gos. Un-ta, 2005. – 107 p.
9. Sem'ja i semejnye otnoshenija: sovremennoe sostojanie i tendencii razvitija. – N.Novgorod: Izdatel'stvo NISOC, 2008. – 583 p.
10. Shnejder L.B. Semejnaja psihologija / L.B. Shnejder. – M.: Akademicheskij proekt. Delovaja kniga, 2006. – 786 p.

Список литературы

1. Аналитический вестник № 20 (176) Детская беспризорность и безнадзорность: проблемы, пути решения. – М., 2002. – 123 с.
2. Антонов А. И. Микросоциология семьи (методология исследования структур и процессов) / А.И. Антонов. – М.: Издательский Дом «Nota Bene», 1998. - 360 с.
3. Павленок П.Д. Теория, история и методика социальной работы / П.Д. Павленок. – М.: Издательско-торговая корпорация «Дашков и К», 2005. - 476 с.

4. Психологическое сопровождение лиц, переживших насилие в семье: Научно- методическое пособие / Под ред. Ю.П. Платонова. – СПб.: Санкт-Петербургский государственный институт психологии и социальной работы, 2002. – 234 с.
5. Основы психологии семьи и семейного консультирования / Под. Н.Н. Посысоева. – М.: Издательство ВЛАДОС-ПРЕСС, 2004. – 328 с.
6. Рабжаева М.В. Семейная политика в России XX в.: историко-социальный аспект / М.В. Рабжаева // Общественные науки и современность. – 2004. – №2. – С.166-176.
7. . Розелли Н. Социальная работа / Н. Розелли. – М.: Социнновация, 1994. – 94с.
8. Ростовская Т.К. Молодая семья в современном российском обществе / Т.К. Ростовская. – Иваново: Изд-во Иван. Гос. Ун-та, 2005. – 107 с.
9. Семья и семейные отношения: современное состояние и тенденции развития. – Н.Новгород: Издательство НИСОЦ, 2008. – 583 с.
10. Шнейдер Л.Б. Семейная психология / Л.Б. Шнейдер. – М.: Академический проект. Деловая книга, 2006. – 786 с.

DATA ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Gafarov Timur Hakimyanovich, social worker, Ph. D. in Philosophy Science
MU “Centre of Social Help for Family and Children in Magnitogorsk”
6/1, Metallurgov Street, Magnitogorsk, Chelyabinsk Region, 455000, Russia
kaddafi81@mail.ru

Kulikova Juliya Sergeevna, Head of organization and Methodological Department,
Ph. D. in Philology Science
MU “Centre of Social Help for Family and Children in Magnitogorsk”
6/1, Metallurgov Street, Magnitogorsk, Chelyabinsk Region, 455000, Russia
kulik-j@yandex.ru

ДАННЫЕ ОБ АВТОРАХ

Гафаров Тимур Хакимьянович, специалист по социальной работе, кандидат философских наук

МУ «Центр социальной помощи семье и детям г. Магнитогорска»

пр. Metallургов, д. 6/1, г. Магнитогорск, 455000, Российская Федерация

kaddafi81@mail.ru

Куликова Юлия Сергеевна, заведующая организационно-методическим отделением, кандидат филологических наук

МУ «Центр социальной помощи семье и детям г. Магнитогорска»

пр. Metallургов, д. 6/1, г. Магнитогорск, 455000, Российская Федерация

kulik-j@yandex.ru