316.3

Happiness and Well-Being as Seen by Children and Young People in Georgia

Rayya El Zein[1], Mariam Kobaladze[2], Kristina Vacharadze[3]

[1,2,3] Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC)-Georgia. 1 Ramaz Chkhikvadze Street, 0179 Tbilisi, Georgia

Abstract:

The question of child and youth well-being and happiness has been approached by sociologists and educators via an analysis of institutions, social services, quality of education and the experience of poverty. This qualitative study (interviews and focus groups) conducted by CRRC-Georgia in November 2014 focuses on views of children and young people themselves – their own experiences and understanding of what well-being and happiness means. Findings of the study are largely not surprising, with children relating health of parents and doing well in school to happiness and teenagers relating increased independence and opportunity as intrinsic to well-being. CRRC-Georgia's research noted differences in definitions of happiness and well-being between children (aged 10-12) and teenagers (aged 15-18). The latter group is more attentive to social and cultural problems they see in Georgia, including discrimination, access to education, and opportunity. The former seem more content with conditions in Georgia, as long as the family unit and its members are healthy.

Keywords: youth well-being, self-realization, youth perceptions of Georgian society

1. INTRODUCTION

A recent qualitative study of children and young people in Georgia concludes that for children well-being mostly consists of parents and school while for teenagers, friends, independence, freedom and success constitute happiness and well-being. The study further explores opinions of children and young people about their understanding of well-being, major domains of well-being, both now and in the future, their satisfaction with life and their views of the society they live in. The study was conducted by CRRC-Georgia in November 2014 and consisted of four focus groups and twenty interviews with children and young people aged 10-19. The qualitative study was part of the EU-funded MYWEB (Measuring Youth Well Being) project, which united thirteen universities and research organizations from eleven European countries in a consortium to work jointly on child and youth well-being issues.

The Georgian government has shown a commitment to support youth development and it has placed young people high on the national agenda. For example, the National Youth Policy Document and its Action Plan were developed and adopted by the Government of Georgia in 2014 and 2015 respectively. The policy document sets as its number one principle to take informed decisions based on reliable data, knowledge and experience. It stresses the importance of research of youth. In this context, it is very important to have studies that not only focus on children and young people in Georgia but collect data about their views directly from them.

This article summarizes results of the qualitative study and is largely based on CRRC-Georgia's report "WP4: Direct engagement with children and young people (CYP); Deliverable 4.1: Country level reports on interviews and focus groups," which describes findings of the qualitative study in detail. Information about the project can be found at: http://fp7-myweb.eu/.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW- GEORGIAN YOUTH IN CONTEXT

Over the past decade, scholars and researchers in a number of different fields have addressed the challenges Georgian young people face. Studies have explored transition, inequality, and opportunity for young people in Georgia and neighboring countries in the context of both economic and social changes in the post-Cold War period and the further exacerbating effects of the 2008 worldwide financial downturn. A number of approaches have been used in this literature, each of which prioritizes different sets of qualitative and quantitative data. This section will sketch the horizon of published literature within which CRRC's own original, qualitative data that follows can be read.

2.1 Youth in Post-Soviet Societies

Childhood, youth, and adolescence in post-Soviet contexts have received more and more attention of late. Many of these are conducted within a framework of understanding "transition" [Roberts 2009; Gugushvili 2015; Walker & Stephenson 2012], especially as a part of frameworks of "nation-building" and "state formation" [Roberts 2010]. More recently, scholarship has begun to push back on some of this structure that constructs post-Soviet youth as victims of structural and socio-political change [La Cava & Michael 2006]. Some new scholarship constructs youth in post-Soviet societies as experimenting agents, provocateurs, and political mobilizers in their own right [Kirmse & Stefan 2012]. In this vein, recent research has also focused on the similarities of a connected "political generation" across new national boundaries [Nikolayenko 2007]. Many of these trace the patterns leading to significant changes in sociality in accompanying political change, some of it significantly mobilized by youth [Walker & Stephenson 2012; Didkowsky 2007]. Transition, nation-building, state-formation, formation of political generations, and youth mobilization are all frameworks within which youth have been studied. Happiness and well-being are often part of these, though usually not the main focus.

2.2. Approaches to Youth Well-Being and Happiness

Studies of youth that deal centrally with questions of well-being and happiness have approached this aspect of childhood and adolescence in different ways. Ethnographic and anthropological approaches have dissected experiences of "marginality" among Caucasian, Central Asian, and Post-Soviet youth, theorizing the different experiences of liminality produced by political, economic, and social transition and change and the experience of living along contested borders [Frederiksen & Knudsen 2015; Mühlfried 2014]. Sociologists and educators have approached the question of youth well-being and happiness via an analysis of institutions, social services, quality of education, and the experience of poverty [Dudwick et al. 2002]. Still other social scientists have explored youth experience in Caucasian and post-Soviet contexts through a narrative familiar to questions of globalization in other regions of the world [Kirmse & Stefan 2012; Molodikova & Watt 2014]. In the latter, youth well-being and happiness is traced through the navigation of tension between forces of modernization and tradition, especially in regions where ethnic conflict factor into local dynamics. The following paragraphs explore these different approaches in more detail.

2.2.1. Marginality

Marginality has been invoked in ethnographic studies the world over to describe the processes of inclusion and exclusion that mark human experience. Socially marginalized populations struggle to gain access to or to participate in social life. The barriers to be overcome may be cultural, economic, geographic, or political. Recent anthropological studies have built on theoretical work on marginalization with ethnographic fieldwork to paint innovative portraits of Georgian youth [Frederiksen 2014]. Frederiksen argues for a recognition of temporal liminality as well as geographic exclusion to theorize how young men navigate expectation, hope, and frustration on Georgia's Black Sea coast. Others continue to develop notions of affect attached to the experience of marginality among different age groups residing in the Georgian territory. Gotfredsen

for example writes about "marginal longing." [Gotfredsen 2013] This theoretical approach is being taken up by other researchers and allows for a consideration of the affective dynamics that govern young Georgian lives [Khalvashi 2015]. Besides this qualitative ethnographic research, other studies have focused on more tangible and measurable aspects affecting youth in Georgia, like schools, employment opportunities and expectations, and poverty – in addition to considerations of institutional reform thread through each.

2.2.2. Education, Employment, and Poverty

As part of the transition from socialist to capitalist societies, sociologists have tracked youth employment and integration into the market as one way of assessing youth well-being in the Caucasus [Blokker & Dallago 2008]. The obvious accompaniment to this, studies of poverty, have also figured prominently in assessments of youth and adolescent happiness in Georgia [Dudwick et al., 2002]. Approaches to both employment and poverty figure youth and adolescent well-being as a reflection of material resources like shelter, security, nourishment, and to a lesser extent familial conditions.

A related strategy of assessing youth's economic well-being has been to consider new class divisions emerging among Georgian youth [Roberts & Pollock 2009]. These class differences are manifest both in analysis of youth mobility and access to institutional resources [Boskakova 2007]. In addition, scholars have considered youth happiness and well-being via the contradictions stimulated by new patterns of (especially adolescent) leisure and consumption [Roberts et al., 2009].

Another important final approach to youth well-being in Georgia has been via an assessment of state institutions and services. Considerable research has been conducted on reform in state institutions dealing with youth services [Silova & Steiner-Khamsi 2008]. Finally, because societal transitions in Georgia and its neighboring countries have so gravely affected public education (privatization stripping public funding from state services, especially education), youth well-being is increasingly being traced by researchers in changes to Georgia's education system [Heyneman & DeYoung 2004]. Researchers have remarked on the effects of increases in and the introduction of tuition on access and perceptions of equality; on the decrease in the quality of education [Boskakova 2007]; and on the relationship between education and employment opportunity as affected by the privatization of education [Gotfredsen 2014].

2.2.3 Modernization vs. Tradition

A final interesting approach to youth well-being and happiness in the Caucasus considers both cultural and economic considerations and is specifically attentive to how these changes are felt by young people. In this way, this approach borrows from both affective ethnographic and socio-economic models for conducting research on youth. This approach frames youth experience as navigating between modernization and tradition. Research using this approach has proved productive for understanding changing ethnic tensions in the Caucasus and Central Asia in particular [Molodikova & Watt 2004; Heyneman & DeYoung 2004], the role of religion in young people's lives amid these changes [Yarlykapov 2008], and the changing forms of globalization and cosmopolitanism as lived by urban youth in Tbilisi [Humphrey & Skirskaja 2012]. It is worth noting that this framework links study on Georgian youth to studies on youth elsewhere across the Global South.

2.3. Existing Policy Work and Recommendations

Considerable policy work, recommendations, and resources on and for Georgian youth exist in Georgian and other languages. Resources advocating for the rights of IDP youth and women [IDPWA 2014] and on youth integration in civil society (Europe Foundation – YIP), among others are available to both individuals and institutions. In addition, policy briefs on a series of issues relating to children and youth well-being and happiness include: assessments of government policy vis-à-vis violence against children [Abashidze, Arganashvili & Gogichaishvili 2016]; analysis of

continued child marriage practices and implications for EU membership [Abashidze 2015]; evaluation of health care needs of juveniles in detention facilities [Talakvadze, Sasania, & Azmaiparashvili et al. 2010]; and assessments of social work in combatting domestic violence [Pataria 2016], among others. Finally, policy recommendations on education reform is extensive [see for example Mamukadze, Karaulashvili, & Khadjalia 2008].

In policy work published outside of Georgia, frameworks link challenges facing Georgian youth to other regions, especially Europe and Central Asia. It is worth noting that in this work, much of the precarity associated with Georgian, other Central Asian, and post-Soviet youth is cast as potential risk to either Europe. Sometimes this is construed in terms of literal security and the sanctity of Europe's borders [Phlipot 2010; LaCava 2006]. More often it is addressed in terms of youth labor and employment [Arias & Sánchez-Páramo 2014; O'Higgins 2010], considering the potential impact of unemployment and disenfranchisement on Europe's periphery. However, not all policy briefs adopt this approach. For example, reports considering inclusion of ethnic minorities [UNICEF 2016a] and gender in education [UNICEF 2016b] and social protection of children's rights [UNICEF 2015] compare institutional success across the Caucasus, Central Asia, and Eastern Europe.

3. MYWEB-CRRC QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

For the MYWEB (Measuring Youth Well Being) project funded by the European Union, CRRC-Georgia collected data on the well-being and happiness of children and young people in Georgia. MYWEB was a joint project of thirteen universities and research organizations from eleven European countries (Germany, Great Britain, Spain, Estonia, Latvia, Portugal, Greece, Georgia, Slovakia, Hungary and Croatia) and it aimed to identify the information already available about the topic, the policy priorities for children and young people's well-being and specific challenges of conducting and longitudinal study.

Data collection in Georgia included four focus groups and twenty interviews with children aged 10-12 and young people aged 15-19, conducted between November 12-20, 2014 in Tbilisi Georgia. Contact was made with children from a public school and young people aged 15-16 from a private school. Two contrasting schools were selected for this purpose: Public School #82, located in the suburbs of Tbilisi and the private Waldorf Free School, located in the city centre. Young people aged 17-19 were selected outside these schools, based on their social involvement and participation in clubs, volunteer organizations, art and music circles, etc. For comparison, a group of young people were also selected based on non-involvement in extra-curricular activities.

3.1 Participant Selection

To give a little background about schools and study participants, Public School #82 (PS82) is located about 1.5 hours from the city centre by public transport, and generally is quite well organized. The school building was recently renovated and it is quite large. It has a large yard. The principal of the school and teachers were friendly, enthusiastic and ready to help with organizational issues. In PS82, the focus group participants and interview respondents were aged 10-12. In total, CRRC-Georgia conducted one focus group with nine participants and five interviews in PS82.

The Waldorf Free School is a private school located in a central district of Tbilisi, about 15-20 minutes from the city centre by public transport. It is easily accessible. The Waldorf Free School building is relatively small and has not been renovated recently. Teachers were also friendly and helpful, but less organized than in PS82. In the Waldorf Free School, the focus group participants and interview respondents were aged 15-16. In total, CRRC-Georgia conducted one focus group with five participants and five interviews in the Waldorf Free School.

Apart from these two schools, the CRRC-Georgia team conducted one focus group and five interviews with young people actively engaged in extracurricular activities and one focus group and five interviews with young people not engaged in extracurricular activities. These focus groups (2

in total) and interviews (10 in total) were conducted at the CRRC-Georgia office, located in a central district of Tbilisi. The snowball method was used in selecting participants and respondents.

Information on focus groups and interviews are provided in the tables below. All focus group and interview participants received incentives. In the quotes that follow, names of respondents are changed in order to keep their anonymity.

Table 1.1
Focus group participants and interview respondents

	Interviews	**Focus groups**
Pupils from primary school	5 – 10-12 years old 2 girls, 3 boys 5 – lived in the neighbourhood of the school (in the suburbs of Tbilisi) 4 ethnic Georgians, 1 – ethnic Armenian.	9 – 10-12 years old 2 girls, 7 boys 9 – lived in the neighbourhood of the school (in the suburbs of Tbilisi) All ethnic Georgians.
Pupils from secondary school	5 – 15-16 years old 2 girls, 3 boys 5 – lived in different parts of Tbilisi including central districts and suburbs All ethnic Georgians.	5 – 15-16 years old 3 girls, 2 boys 5 – lived in the same district of the school, Saburtalo (a central district of Tbilisi) All ethnic Georgians.
Non-involved young people	5 – 17-18 years old 4 girls, 1 boy All ethnic Georgians. All high school students, in their last year of school.	6 – 17-19 years old 3 girls, 3 boys All ethnic Georgians. 5 university students, 1 school student.
Involved young people	5 – 17-18 years old 3 girls, 2 boys All ethnic Georgians. 2 university students, 3 students in their last year of school. One seasonally employed. Involvement of young people: School orchestra, Girl Scouts Organization, Dance and Art School, Chess Club, Volunteer Organization "Helping Hand".	5 – 17-18 years old 2 girls, 3 boys All ethnic Georgians. 4 university students, 1 student in the last year of school. Involvement of young people: School orchestra, Urban Explorer, Volunteer Organization "Helping Hand", European Youth Parliament, Pioneer Film Studio.

4. MAIN FINDINGS

The main focuses of the study was to understand what well-being and happiness meant for children and young people and how they understood these terms and concepts. Interestingly, definitions of well-being and happiness were similar, they were often used interchangeably or as constituents of each other.

4.1 Well-being and Happiness Now

Well-being, for children aged 10-12, centred on parents and school: good grades, health of their parents, spending time with family. As some of the students said, "[Well-being is] when I get good grades and I spend time with my family" (Focus group, Tengiz, male, 11 years old); "When you and your family members are healthy" (Interview, Duru, male, 10 years old).

Unlike children, young people (aged 15-18) prioritized personal relationships, financial stability, and independence. As one student noted, "For me, well-being is independence, doing what I want. I feel well because no one restricts me from doing the things I like" (Focus group, Lazare, male, 16 years old); while another reported, "Well-being is health, being with people you love who are well and healthy, a good job, and career success" (Focus group, Eter, female, 19 years old, non-organized). In addition, being a full-fledged member of society was an essential component in their sense of well-being. One teenage respondent noted, "Well-being is when you feel comfortable, when you are a part of a community and can freely express your opinions/feelings" (Interview, Tinatin, female, 16 years old).

Often, children and young people needed the same for happiness as for well-being. Children had modest requirements for feeling happy, such as spending time with their parents, having fun with their friends, and enjoying toys and candy. In contrast, young people reported that they need the company of friends and people they enjoy being with, success in the world of work and self-fulfilment through doing things they love in order to be happy.

4.2. Well-being and Happiness in the Future

The future was commonly viewed as something positive. Respondents of all ages pictured themselves having families and children in the future, being healthy, having jobs and careers, and taking care of their own children. Notably, this is what they reported well-being looked like at their parents' age.

All of the children were positive about their future, and they thought that the future held better things for them. When they grew up and reached their parents' age, they thought they would have families of their own. One boy stated that, "First of all having a wife and children will play a big role in my well-being" (Focus group, Bondo, male, 10 years old). They also believed that successful careers would largely determine their well-being. One child noted, "When I become a businessman and own my own company [my well-being will be high]" (Focus group, Kakha, male, 11 years old).

Similarly, when talking about future well-being and factors related to this, young people associated this with building a family and having children. In addition, respondents said they wanted to 'have more' when they reached the age of their parents. Focus group participants also mentioned self-realization and being valued as determinants of future well-being. One teenager noted:

Of course, children are the most important [for well-being]. I hope everyone will have children and their well-being is important and also, most important will be self-realization, when you will be valued and when you achieve something in your profession...
(Focus group, Mimoza, female, 18 years old, involved).

4.3 Life- Satisfaction and Perceptions of Inequality

Children mostly expressed satisfaction with their lives. They had the things they needed and were surrounded by people they loved and people who took care of them. In contrast, satisfaction with life was not overwhelmingly high among young people. Some claimed that the standard of living in Georgia did not meet their needs, and this resonated with their dissatisfaction in life. For instance, respondents cited young people's lack of access to many things, when discussing poor standards of living. They said there were very many talented young people who might not be able to continue their studies at university, because they would not receive scholarships and could not afford tuition, since it was quite expensive. To them, this resulted in reduced chances of self-realization as well as non-voluntary career choices that were forced by the underdevelopment of some spheres, such as, sports, for example. "In our country, there are no opportunities in regard to sports. To achieve something in this field, you have to be one of the best and very lucky." (Interview, Rezo, male, 18 years old, involved).

In addition to lack of opportunities due to low standards of living, young people spoke of different environments that people lived in and inequality of access they had to financial resources. Financial prosperity was named as one of the factors that led to inequality of well-being. "There is no equality in well-being as some have more [financial] abilities, others less. Those who have less, have lower chances of [maintaining/reaching] well-being" (Interview, Natia, female, 17 years old, involved).

4.4 Perceptions of Georgian Society

While discussing well-being, happiness and life satisfaction, young people often mentioned the society they lived in – their integration in society as well as their interaction or interaction of others with the society.

Young people were not happy with the society that often failed to hear their opinions, give them freedom to express themselves or give them independence. Interviewed teenagers spoke of the fear of "freely expressing your views, because you feel the negative attitude of society" (Focus group, Nestan, female, 17 years old). They generally thought the society was "closed" and "such a society might interfere in achieving your goals" (Focus group, Ia, female, 16 years old).

In fact, teenagers were unhappy with the way people in Georgia treated those who were different including representatives of other ethnic groups and migrants with different skin colours. "I have seen how people address [black people] – 'Hey you're 'n-----' or to other foreigners 'You are from Iraq', and I do not like this. Ethnicity and skin colour should not matter" (Focus group, Bondo, male, 10 years old). Young people expressed sadness that, dissenting opinions were often criticized and condemned by society.

> *We are all different here, but we have never faced problems at school in this regard. However, as soon as we leave the school building, the situation changes dramatically. There is a big problem in our society. You cannot freely say what you think or behave the way you want, because you may be criticized for this and may even lose [a] close friend. People in Georgia do not respect different opinions.*
> *(Focus group, Ia, female, 16 years old).*

Young people also disapproved of gender discrimination in the form of more intensive criticism of girls than boys for the same behaviours. One teenager noted, "What irritates me is that we, girls, are more likely to be criticized for smoking than boys" (Focus group, Ia, female, 16 years old). Furthermore, young people claimed that the older generation did not accept the independence of young people in Georgia and it was the established way in the society. They spoke about how mothers always want to take care of their children, even when these children are already grown-ups. A respondent noted:

> *For whatever reason, people who are 18 are still considered children in Georgia. It is understandable that for parents their children are always too little or something like that... but abroad, there are also mothers, but they do not think this way. When someone turns 18... they give [them] the opportunity to move out, to live separately. I have a friend who has an apartment, but does not live there. It is not like they are renting the apartment out... It is just that his/her mom does not want him to live there [separately]. She thinks that he/she is still little, even though he/she is already 20, and [hence] they live together. I don't know what it is. It is an issue of mentality. (Focus group, Mimoza, female, 18 years old, involved).*

5. CONCLUSION

CRRC focus groups and interviews with children and young people in Tbilisi as part of the MyWeb program explored what young people and children think of "happiness" and "well-being"

in Georgia and participants' own relativity to these concepts. Findings of the study are largely not surprising, with children relating health of parents and doing well in school to happiness and teenagers relating increased independence and opportunity as intrinsic to well-being. CRRC research noted differences in definitions of happiness and well-being between children (aged 10-12) and teenagers (aged 15-18). The latter group are more attentive to social and cultural problems they see in Georgia, including discrimination, access to education, and opportunity. The former seem more content with conditions in Georgia, as long as the family unit and its members are healthy. Ultimately, the surveyed groups in this study are too small to make larger generalizations about Georgian youth and notions of happiness and well-being. Future research might consider larger focus groups with representatives both in and outside the capital.

REFERENCES:

1. Vacharadze, K., Kobaladze, M. & Khoshtaria, T. (2015). "WP4: Direct engagement with children and young people (CYP); Deliverable 4.1: Country level reports on interviews and focus groups." Caucasus Research Resource Centers, Tbilisi, Georgia.
2. Roberts, K. (2009). *Youth in Transition: Eastern Europe and the West*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Gugushvili, A. (2015). "Self-Interest, Perceptions of Transition and Welfare Preferences in the New Eastern Europe and the South Caucasus." *Europe-Asia Studies*, vol. 67, 718-746.
4. Walker, C. & Stephenson, S. (2012). *Youth and Social Change in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
5. Roberts, K. (2010). "Post-Communist Youth: Is there a Central-Asian Pattern?" *Central Asian Survey*, vol. 29, 537-549.
6. La Cava, G. & Michael, S. (2006). *Youth in the Northern Caucasus: From Risk to Opportunity*. World Bank, Washington, DC.
7. Kirmse, S.B., ed. (2012). *Youth in the Former Soviet South: Everyday Lives between Experimentation and Regulation*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
8. Nikolayenko, O. (2007). "The Revolt of the Post-Soviet Generation: Youth Movements in Serbia, Georgia, and Ukraine." *Comparative Politics*, vol. 39, 169-188.
9. Didkowsky, N. (2007). *From Bearers of Change to Agents of Change: Exploring Youth-Led Community Organizations in Post-Soviet Russia.* Halifax, Canada: Dalhousie University Press.
10. Frederiksen, M.D & Knudsen, I. H. (2015). *Ethnographies of Grey Zones in Eastern Europe.* London, UK: Anthem Press.
11. Mühlfried, F. (2014). *Being a State and States of Being in Highland Georgia.* New York, NY: Bergham Books.
12. Dudwick, N. et al., Eds. (2002). *When Things Fall Apart: Qualitative Studies of Poverty in the Former Soviet Union*. The World Bank, Washington, DC.
13. Molodikova, I. and Watt, A. (2014). *Growing Up in the North Caucasus: Society, Family, Religion, and Education*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
14. Frederiksen, M.D. (2014). "To Russia with Love: Hope, Confinement and Virtuality on the Georgian Black Sea Coast". *Focaal*, issue 70, 26–36
15. Gotfredsen, K.B. (2013). *Evasive Politics: Paradoxes of History, Nation, and Everyday Communication in the Republic of Georgia*. PhD Dissertation, Copenhagen, Denmark, University of Copenhagen.
16. Khalvashi, T. (2015). *Peripheral Affects: Shame, Publics, and Performance on the Margins of the Republic of Georgia*. PhD Dissertation, Copenhagen, Denmark University of Copenhagen.
17. Blokker, P. & Dallago, B. (2008). *Youth Entrepreneurship and Local Development in Central and Eastern Europe*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing.

18. Roberts, K. & Pollock, G. (2009). "New Class Divisions in the New Market Economies: Evidence from the Careers of Young Adults in Post-Soviet Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia." *Journal of Youth Studies*, vol. 12, 579-596.

19. Roberts, K., Pollock, G., Tholen, J., & Tarkhnishvili, L. (2009). "Youth Leisure Careers during Post-Communist Transitions in the South Caucasus." *Leisure Studies*, vol. 28, 261-277.

20. Silova, I., & Steiner-Khamsi, G. Eds. (2008). *How NGOs React: Globalization and Education Reform in the Caucasus, Central Asia, and Mongolia.* Bloomfield, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

21. Heyneman, S. P. & DeYoung, A.J. eds. (2004). *The Challenge of Education in Central Asia*. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

22. Gotfredsen, K.B. (2014). "Void Pasts and Marginal Presents: On Nostalgia and Obsolete Futures in the Republic of Georgia." *Slavic Review*, vol. 73, 246-264.

23. Yarlykapov, A. A. (2008). "'Fold Islam' and Muslim Youth of the Central and Northwest Caucasus." *Anthropology and Archeology of Eurasia*, vol. 46, 9-35.

24. Humphrey, C. & Skvirskaja, V. (2012). *Post-Cosmopolitan Cities: Explorations of Urban Coexistence.* London, UK: Berghahn.

25. Abashidze, A., Arganashvili, A. & Gogichaishvili, N. (2016). *The Government's Compromise on Violence against Children*. Open Society Georgia Foundation, Tbilisi, Georgia. Accessed August 16, 2016
   from http://www.osgf.ge/files/2016/EU%20publication/Angarishi_A4_Children_Rights_ENG.pdf.

26. Abashidze, A. (2015). *The Phenomenon of Child Brides and its Impact on Georgia's EU Integration*. Open Society Georgia Foundation, Tbilisi, Georgia. Accessed August, 16, 2016 from http://www.osgf.ge/files/2015/Publication/EU-Geirgia%20Association%20/Angarishi_A4_4.pdf.

27. Talakvadze, A., Sasania, I., Azmaiparashvili, Z., Makhashvili, N. & Tsiskarishvili, L. (2010). *Health Care Needs Assessment in Juvenile Special Facility*. Open Society Georgia Foundation, Tbilisi, Georgia. Accessed August 9, 2016
   from http://www.osgf.ge/files/publications/2011/Research_English.pdf.

28. Pataria, B. (2016). S*ocial Work: The Missing Puzzle Piece in Combatting Domestic Violence in Georgia*. Open Society Georgia Foundation, Tbilisi, Georgia: Accessed August 16, 2016 from http://www.osgf.ge/files/2016/EU%20publication/Equality_ENG_(5).pdf.

29. Mamukadze, S., Karaulashvili, A. & Khajhalia, T. Principles of Inclusive Education. [in Georgian] (2016). Open Society Georgia Foundation, Tbilisi, Georgia. Accessed August 9, 2016 from http://www.osgf.ge/files/publications/2009/gagoshidza-2008-bolo_LdAHjvaJMB.pdf.

30. Phlipot, C. (2010). "The North Caucasus: Russian Roulette on Europe's Borders." *Parameters*, vol. 40, 87-100.

31. Arias, O.S. & Sánchez-Páramo, C. (2014). *Back to Work: Growing with Jobs in Europe and Central Asia.* The World Bank, Washington, DC.

32. O'Higgins, N. (2010). *Youth Labor Markets in Europe and Central Asia*. Institute for the Study of Labor, Bonn, Germany. Accessed August 9, 2016 from http://ftp.iza.org/dp5094.pdf.

33. United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF). (2016a). *Focus on Children from Ethnic and Linguistic Minorities in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia*. UNICEF: Geneva, Switzerland. Accessed August 9, 2016
   from http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/2016_Children_from_minorities.pdf.

34. ____. (2016b). *Rapid Review on Inclusion and Gender Equality in Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia*. UNICEF, Geneva, Switzerland. Accessed August 9, 2016 from http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/Rapid_Review_Report_web.pdf.

35. ____. (2015). *Social Monitor: Social Protection for Child Rights and Well-Being in Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia*. UNICEF: Geneva, Switzerland. Accessed August 16, 2016 from http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/Social_Monitor_Regional_Report.pdf.

OTHER ARTICLES AND WEB RESOURCES:

Horowitz, T.R., et al. (2003). *From Pacesetters to Dropouts: Post-Soviet Youth in Comparative Perspective*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Kirmse, K.B. (2010). "Bridging the Gap: the Concept of 'Youth' and the Study of Central Asia and the Caucasus." *Central Asian Survey,* vol. 29, 381-387.

Nikolayenko, O. (2011). *Citizens in the Making in Post-Soviet States*. London and New York: Routledge.

Consent, Internally Displaced Women's Association (IDPWA). http://www.idpwa.org.ge/ge/.

Europe Foundation, Youth Integration Project. http://www.epfound.ge/georgian/mimdinare-programebi/youth-bank.html.

Georgian National Youth Policy Document (2014)., Ministry of Sports and Youth Affairs of Georgia, Tbilisi, Georgia. Accessed August 31, 2016 from http://pjpeu.coe.int/documents/1017981/7110688/Georgian+Naitonal+Youth+Policy2014.pdf/c09e9ff5-6c86-467b-b4c9-fb5b102b3b90

UNICEF, Central and Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States. http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/media_6398.html.