

PROTECTION OF CHILDREN'S RIGHTS IN THE PROCESS OF MEDIA COVERAGE Part I

RUBINA PETROSYAN¹

Yerevan State University

Abstract. As a result of various global changes and the widespread expansion of digital media, the activity of family influencers on social media has evolved into a multi-billion-dollar industry, often centered around children. Lacking a clearly defined legal status and excluded from negotiating or consenting to either labor or civil contracts, children ultimately become the performers or service providers under such agreements. This article analyzes the concept of “sharenting” and its potential dangers, including identity theft, psychological harm, and the deprivation of a child’s ability to shape their own identity. Within the boundaries of parental autonomy, the article proposes the legal recognition of a child’s “right to be forgotten,” enabling individuals, upon reaching adulthood, to request the removal of their images and personal information from monetized content. This approach aims to protect both parental rights and reduce the long-term risks of exploitation and harm to children.

Keywords - *children's rights, Monetized content, Influencer, Sharenting, Right to be forgotten, Social media, Personal data Protection, Identity theft, Parental autonomy.*

Due to the various changes taking place in the world, the widespread dissemination of digital media and the activities of family influencers on social media have turned into a multi-billion-dollar industry, at the center of which children often stand. Lacking a clearly defined legal status and thus not participating, in one case, in the negotiation process of employment contract terms, and in another case, in the negotiation process of civil-law contract terms and their alignment, they ultimately become the performer of the work or the service provider envisaged under those

¹ **Rubina Petrosyan** - Ph.D. in Law, Chair of Civil Law, Yerevan State University, Email - rubina.petrosyan@ysu.am, ORCID - <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4734-046X>

The article received 14 October 2025,
reviewed 27 November 2025,
accepted for publication 21 December
2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

© The Author(s) 2025

contracts, as a result of which, sometimes, a number of fundamental rights of children are violated. Social networks and mass media (hereinafter – Media) play an active role in the protection of these violated rights of children and in raising public awareness in that regard. Today, more than ever, social media shape public opinion, influences people’s behavior, and even becomes the basis for the competent or responsible authority to take appropriate action or to initiate proceedings. In such cases, it is the Media’s coverage of the issue and the content thereof that change society’s perception of the problem.

Publications by the Media relating to children, or posts made in social networks by other persons relating to or involving the participation of a child, may have a harmful effect from the perspective of the latter’s safety, integration into society, and the formation of his or her own identity.

UNICEF, recognizing the enormous potential of media in the protection of children’s rights, in raising awareness about the responsibility of all stakeholders in the realization of those rights, in the effectiveness of the strategies developed and the tactics implemented by the media in shaping public opinion, and in the mobilization of society to take into account the child’s opinion in matters concerning him or her, at the same time emphasizes that, as stipulated in the *Convention on the Rights of the Child*² (hereinafter also “Convention”) and in its relevant protocols, the media bears responsibility for the protection of children³. According to Article 17 of the Convention:

“States Parties recognize the important role of the mass media and shall ensure that the child has access to information and materials from a diversity of national and international sources, especially those that are aimed at promoting the child’s social, spiritual and moral well-being and physical and mental health. To this end, States Parties shall:

(a) encourage the mass media to disseminate information and material that are of social and cultural benefit to the child and in accordance with the spirit of Article 29;

(b) encourage international cooperation in the production, exchange and dissemination of such information and material from a diversity of cultural, national and international sources; ...

² Adopted on 20 November 1989, entered into force on 22 July 1993. UN OHCHR 2008/Special Edition.

³ See *Child Protection Policy in the Media: Ethical Guidelines to Safeguard the Best Interests of Children*, page 15: Available via the following link <https://www.unicef.org/eca/media/ethical-guidelines>, as of 05 May 2025.

(e) taking into account the provisions of Articles 13 and 18, encourage the development of appropriate guidelines for the protection of the child from information and material injurious to his or her well-being.”

Thus, the Convention confirms the media’s role as an important platform from the perspective of promoting the realization of children’s rights and of strengthening their capacity to express themselves, to gain self-confidence, to develop critical thinking, and to participate in social life. At the same time, the Convention obliges the States Parties to ensure the implementation of the child’s right to freely express his or her opinion in matters affecting him or her and, for that purpose, in particular, to provide the child with the opportunity, in accordance with the procedural norms of national legislation, to be heard in any judicial or administrative proceedings affecting him or her, either directly or through a representative or an appropriate body (Convention, Article 12).

In the context of UNICEF’s child protection policy, guiding principles⁴ (hereinafter – Principles) have been developed for the media and journalists, according to which it is necessary to:

1. Encourage children to express freely and safely their opinions and views on issues concerning them;
2. Refrain from direct or indirect interviews with children who are in psychologically difficult situations. These children must be given the opportunity to recover before presenting their stories to the public;
3. Conduct direct interviews with a child who has experienced a violation of rights only if he or she personally wishes to tell about it and to make his or her voice heard, while preserving child protection policy;
4. Take into account the safety measures to be undertaken, especially when it concerns a child who has experienced a violation of rights;
5. Encourage discussions and dialogues on the protection of children’s rights with the participation of sectoral specialists engaged in child protection, thereby addressing the responsibility of stakeholders;
6. Treat the interests of children as a paramount concern, beyond the framework of individual stories.

The above-mentioned Principles apply to all media outlets that have direct or indirect contact with children, and extend to all individuals and organizations that disseminate messages or images relating to children in social media and other public platforms.

⁴ See UNICEF, *Child Protection Policy in the Media*, UNICEF, “Ethical Guidelines for Reporting on Children”, 2018, cited work, pp. 9–10.

The study of international practice shows that a number of adopted documents serve as important benchmarks for the definition of children's rights in general and, in particular, for matters concerning the rights of the media in relation to those rights. Among them are: the *Ethical Guidelines on Responsible Reporting on Children*⁵ developed by UNICEF in 2018; the *Child-Friendly Media 2016 Document*⁶ published by the Arab League and the Arab Council for Childhood and Development, which emphasizes professional principles for Arab media when covering issues related to children's rights; the *Ethical Charter on Media Interaction with Children*⁷ published in 2014 by the Higher Council for Childhood of Lebanon, which establishes standards of professional ethics for media in reporting on children and their juvenile affairs; the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* adopted in 1989 by the United Nations General Assembly, which proclaims the mandatory primacy of "the best interests of the child" and guarantees the protection of children's rights and their right to private life; and the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* adopted in December 1948, whose Article 19 proclaims the right to freedom of expression and the right to seek, receive and impart information from the media.

For the assurance of the primacy of the best interests of the child and the protection of the right to defense, the following guiding principles developed by UNICEF are fundamental:

- The primacy of the child's interest, when any discussion in the Media related to a child may affect or endanger him or her;
- Avoiding interviews with children during protests, military actions, or the coverage of crimes-while in all cases preserving the child's anonymity;
- Demonstrating moral responsibility in direct or indirect media interaction with children-when obtaining information, clarifications, photographs, conducting live broadcasts or recorded programs-by ensuring the child's protection from any form of violence resulting from media exposure;
- Voluntarily refraining from publishing any news, story, or photograph that may endanger the child, his or her siblings, family, or peers;
- Avoiding the coverage of cases of child abuse that include degrading or private details, since such coverage may become an additional violation of the child's rights;

⁵ See UNICEF, "Ethical Guidelines for Reporting on Children", 2018. Available at the following link: www.unicef.org/eca/media/ethical-guidelines, as of 05 May 2025.

⁶ See Child-Friendly Media: Document of Professional Principles for Arab Media's Handling of Child Rights Issues (2016). Cairo, Arab Council for Childhood and Development.

⁷ See Code of Ethics for Media Dealing with Children (2013). Beirut, Lebanese Ministry of Social Affairs.

- Avoiding compelling the child, especially victims of violence, to recount the incident, in order not to cause them further harm;
- Avoiding forcing the child to relive or repeat painful experiences;
- Providing the child with the opportunity to agree to or to refuse media coverage-without intimidation, coercion, or threats;
- Relying on reliable and substantiated information obtained from the competent state authorities and organizations-instead of personal interpretations;
- Avoiding the use of children's issues for political purposes;
- Avoiding portraying children solely as victims and instead focusing more on their achievements and potential for development;
- Verifying the accuracy of the child's account by comparing it with the views of other children or adults, preferably with both at the same time;
- Covering the general situation of children in the same status, rather than the individual story of a single child⁸.

In certain situations, the disclosure of a child's identity may be in his or her best interests. Nevertheless, when the child's identity is disclosed, it is necessary to undertake appropriate measures to protect him or her from possible harm, danger, or targeting, and to provide support in the event of any labeling or retaliation. Thus, the preservation of the right to privacy in publications is of primary importance, and no information should be published that may reveal the identity of a minor and subsequently have a stigmatizing effect, thereby creating obstacles to the realization of other rights of the child (the right to work, the right to education, the right to free movement, etc.).

At the same time, the issue under discussion must be considered in both legal and ethical dimensions. The Convention, the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia, and the Law of the Republic of Armenia "On the Rights of the Child"⁹ provide provisions that address the protection of the child's honor and dignity. The foundation of these legal acts is the principle of the best interests of the child and the principle of non-harm. A guiding mechanism in covering children is the *Ethical Principles of Reporting on Children*¹⁰ adopted by the United Nations, which state that the child's identity should not be disclosed unless it is justified by the public

⁸ See UNICEF, **CHILD PROTECTION POLICY IN THE MEDIA**, UNICEF, "Ethical Guidelines for Reporting on Children", cited work, p. 17.

⁹ Adopted on 29 May 1996. Entered into force on 31 May 1996. RA Official Gazette 1996/10 (1110), 31 May, Art. 124, 31 May 1996.

¹⁰ See **Ethical Guidelines for Reporting on Children: The Media and Children's Rights**. Available at the following link: <https://www.unicef.org/montenegro/en/ethical-guidelines-reporting-children>, as of 05 May 2025.

interest. It is impermissible to present a child in humiliating or degrading conditions, so as to avoid the risk of that same child being stigmatized later, especially by his or her peers.

The necessity to protect children from possible violations by the Media becomes even more pressing when the coverage concerns juvenile offenders. The United Nations Minimum Standard Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice – the “Beijing Rules”¹¹ – establish the most basic guarantees of due process during the adjudication of juvenile cases: “8. Protection of Privacy. 8.1 The right of juveniles to have their privacy respected shall be respected at all stages in order to avoid unnecessary publicity or labeling of the girl or boy. 8.2 In principle, no information that may lead to the identification of a juvenile offender shall be published.”

In this respect, it should be noted that the Armenian legislator has perhaps been satisfied with enshrining in Article 11(1) of the Law of the Republic of Armenia “On the Protection of Personal Data”¹² the following provision: “When obtaining the consent of the data subject, the processor shall inform him or her of: (1) the purpose of the processing of personal data; (2) the name and location (residence) of the processor; (3) information on the subjects to whom or to which the personal data are or may be provided; (4) the personal data subject to publication in publicly available sources.” Thereafter, according to Article 15 of the same Law, persons who violate the legislation on personal data bear responsibility in accordance with the procedure established by law. Article 32(1)(14) of the Law of the Republic of Armenia “On Audiovisual Media”¹³ provides: “Regulatory State Body carries out continuous monitoring of the activities of broadcasters and operators.” This implies the monitoring of broadcast programs, the identification and recording of violations of children’s rights, and the presentation of appropriate solutions. However, due to the absence of criteria, such monitoring has not yet been carried out. In this area, there is a lack of law-enforcement practice, and there are no judicial precedents relating to cases of violation of children’s rights by the Media in the course of carrying out its professional activities. The reasons are several: the absence of monitoring standards, the absence of accountability mechanisms, the inaction of competent and responsible entities for the protection of children’s rights, and, in many cases, the fact that the disclosure of the child’s personal data is carried out by

¹¹ See United Nations Minimum Standard Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice – “Beijing Rules.” Available at the following link: <https://www.arlis.am/hy/acts/18505>, as of 05 May 2025.

¹² Adopted on 18 May 2015. Entered into force on 01 July 2015., RA Official Gazette 2015.06.18/35(1124) Art. 462.

¹³ Adopted on 16 July 2020. Entered into force on 07 August 2020, Unified Website 27 July 2020 – 09 August 2020.

the parent himself or with his consent when he gives permission for the preparation of a report with the participation of his child—thereby rendering the Media publication and the journalist’s activity ostensibly lawful.

Over the past two decades, social media platforms such as YouTube, Instagram, and TikTok have drastically changed people’s modes of entertainment¹⁴. Ordinary citizens may gain significant income¹⁵ and the status of “public person”¹⁶, while research shows that there are now more than 50 million monetized content creators worldwide¹⁷, with family influencers and children constituting part of this group. In this context, attention should be drawn to the widely spread phenomenon known as “sharenting”¹⁸, whereby parents share photographs and videos of their children online. For many influencer parents and their children, creating an image on the Internet implies numerous followers and tangible income from advertising. The children of these families, although playing a central role in the success of the content published online, are, in fact, not protected from a legislative standpoint with respect to receiving remuneration for the work performed or having control over the material published with their participation. Sharing details of children’s lives in the online sphere raises particular problems, conditioned by the relative permanence of online content and the potential for mass dissemination. Sharenting subjects children to risks of which parents are often unaware, the most common of which are cases of identity theft¹⁹ (theft of personal data, depriving the child of the opportunity to shape his or her own identity). As a result of sharenting, parents may inadvertently make their children’s images accessible to sexual predators. For example, the Australian Commissioner for Children’s e-Safety has reported that on certain websites used by pedophiles—one of which contained more than 45 million

¹⁴ See MAKING MEDIA: PRODUCTION, PRACTICES, AND PROFESSIONS, Amsterdam University Press, Edited by Mark Deuze and Mirjam Prenger, 2019, pg 363:

¹⁵ See The Creator Economy Explained: How Companies Are Transforming the Self-Monetization Boom, CB INSIGHTS (June 15, 2021): Available at the following link: <https://www.cbinsights.com/research/report/what-is-the-creator-economy/>, as of 05 May 2025.

The creative economy includes a variety of businesses created by independent creators—from bloggers to influencers and writers—who monetize their skills or creations. It also includes those companies that provide services to such creators, ranging from content creation tools to the provision of analytical platforms.

¹⁶ See **Kate Hamming**, Comment, *A Dangerous Inheritance: A Child’s Digital Identity*, 43 SEATTLE U.L. REV. 1033, 1038 (2020).

¹⁷ See **Andy Karuza**, *Make the Most of the Creator Economy*, FORBES (July 18, 2022): Available at the following link: <https://www.forbes.com/councils/theyec/2022/07/18/make-the-most-of-the-creator-economy/>, as of 05 May 2025.

¹⁸ This term does not yet have an Armenian equivalent.

¹⁹ According to Barclays’ assessment, by 2030 sharenting will be the cause of two-thirds of identity theft cases directed at young people and will cost more than 900 million U.S. dollars annually. See **Sean Coughlan**, ‘Sharenting’ Puts Young at Risk of Online Fraud, BBC (May 20, 2018). Available at the following link: <https://www.bbc.com/news/education-44153754>, as of 05 May 2025.

images—almost half of the pictures had been taken directly from parents’ social media accounts²⁰. Although sexual predators sometimes use Photoshop programs to superimpose children’s faces onto the naked bodies of others, they mostly upload unedited photographs and classify them with expressions such as “children at the beach” and “handsome boys playing in the river”²¹. On this matter, Canadian human rights defender Sharon Kirkey stated: “What a healthy and sober person sees as an innocent phenomenon, a person with sexual interest in children turns into a deeply perverted phenomenon”²².

This problem collides with the concept of “parental autonomy.” Thus, the Armenian legislator, in the Family Code of the Republic of Armenia²³, establishes the principle of the primacy of childrearing within the family, the parents’ preferential right over all other persons to raise their children (Family Code of RA, Art. 51(1)). Consequently, the exclusive right to raise children and the forms and methods of exercising that right are determined independently by the parents within the scope of their “parental autonomy.” Therefore, parents may freely decide whether or not to publish online their child’s photograph or a video with his or her participation, and no one may restrict that right. An essential role in controlling parental behavior is played by the principle enshrined in Article 1(7) of the Family Code of the Republic of Armenia, elevated to the level of a legal principle, on “ensuring the best interests of the child,” according to which any action concerning the child must derive from his or her best interests, and therefore any action that does not derive from or infringes upon the best interests of the child is impermissible. In essence, the Armenian legislator proceeds from the presumption that the parent is conscious of the “best interests of the child” and acts accordingly, while “absolute parental autonomy” is restricted by the impermissibility of actions that do not derive from or that infringe upon the best interests of the child.

The study of international practice shows that, for example, in the United States, the parent enjoys pronounced “broad parental autonomy,” which makes it difficult,

²⁰ See **Lucy Battersby**, Millions of Social Media Photos Found on Child Exploitation Sharing Sites, SYDNEY MORNING HERALD (Sept. 30, 2015): Available at the following link: <https://www.smh.com.au/national/millions-of-social-media-photos-found-on-child-exploitation-sharing-sites-20150929-gjxe55>, as of 05 May 2025.

²¹ See *id.*

²² See **Sharon Kirkey**, *Do You Know Where Your Child’s Image Is? Pedophiles Sharing Photos from Parents’ Social Media Accounts*, NAT’L POST (Apr. 18, 2017): Available at the following link: <https://nationalpost.com/news/canada/photos-shared-on-pedophile-sites-taken-from-parents-social-media-accounts>, as of 05 May 2025.

²³ Adopted on 09 November 2004. Entered into force on 19 April 2005. RA Official Gazette 2005.01.19/4(376), Art. 60.

through legal regulation, to provide real protection for the children of influencer families. Historically, the U.S. Supreme Court has maintained the position that the right of parents “to direct the upbringing of their children” is considered one of the most stable and fundamental constitutional rights. In 1923, the U.S. Supreme Court for the first time explicitly recognized that the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution—protection of personal liberty—also includes the freedom to raise children²⁴. Two years later, in the case of *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, it was affirmed that the freedom to raise children also includes the right to direct the upbringing and education of the child²⁵. On the basis of these two cases, a tradition of strong parental autonomy developed in the United States, which is based on the conviction that as long as parents provide minimum care for children and there are no facts proving them to be abusive or neglectful, there is no need for the state to interfere in family-private matters or in the decisions made by the parent during the upbringing of the child. In U.S. legislation, the idea of family is anchored in the conviction that parents have sufficient maturity, experience, and judgment to make complex decisions concerning the life of the child—capacities which the child still lacks.

Influencers engaged in activities on online platforms frequently involve their children in their filmed advertising videos and published photographs. Two questions arise from this: first, whether such actions carried out within the framework of “parental autonomy” derive from “the best interests of the child”; and second, whether as a result of such actions the requirements set by the Labor Code of the Republic of Armenia²⁶ concerning the regulation of employment relations with the participation of minors are not being violated. Specifically, according to Article 17.1(2) of the RA Labor Code, persons under fourteen may only be involved in the creation (creative work) or performance of works in cinematography, sports, theater or concert organizations, circuses, television, or radio. According to Article 17.1(3), with persons under sixteen, a temporary employment contract may be concluded, if it does not hinder their compulsory education process. According to Article 17.1(4), persons under eighteen may only be involved in work that does not endanger their health (including physical and mental development), morality, does not threaten their safety, and does not hinder their compulsory education. In all these cases, a written employment contract must be concluded, which, in the case of workers under sixteen, is concluded by drafting

²⁴ See **ERWIN CHEMEIRINSKY**, CONSTITUTIONAL LAW 942 (6th ed. 2020):

²⁵ See *Pierce*, 268 U.S. at 534: Available at the following link:

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/268/510/>, as of 05 May 2025.

²⁶ Adopted on 09 November 2004. Entered into force on 21 June 2005. RA Official Gazette 2004.12.21/69(368), Art. 1385.

a single document signed by one of the parents, foster parents, adoptive parents, or the guardian (RA Labor Code, Article 85(1)).

Drawing parallels between the situation existing in practice and the legal regulations enshrined in the RA Labor Code, we obtain the following picture: currently, in most cases, influencer parents on Instagram or TikTok involve their children under sixteen in their own blogging work—online content—exclusively within the framework of their “parental autonomy,” while contractual relations are formed and an employment contract is concluded, for example, between the advertiser (in this case—the employer) and the influencer (the Contractor) only. Later, however, the influencer’s minor child also participates in the performance of the advertising order, without having concluded an employment contract²⁷. Furthermore, the content created on Instagram or TikTok is not included in the category of creative work provided for in Article 17.1(2) of the RA Labor Code. Thus, *de facto*, the minor becomes a participant in labor relations, contributes to the performance of the work, but *de jure* has no legal status and is not remunerated for the work performed.

This situation is not rectified even when the influencer parent concludes a service contract with the advertiser. Thus, under Article 29 of the RA Civil Code²⁸, a minor under the age of fourteen cannot independently conclude a transaction, and transactions on their behalf may only be concluded by their parents, adoptive parents, or guardians. Under Article 30 of the RA Civil Code, minors between the ages of fourteen and eighteen may conclude transactions with the written consent of their legal representatives—parents, adoptive parents, or trustees. In both cases, the contractual party and the person remunerated for the service which is the subject of the contract is the influencer parent²⁹.

Consequently, a situation arises in which the work is performed, the service is rendered, or direct participation in the performance is carried out by the minor, but the remuneration for the performance of the work envisaged by the contract is received *de jure* by the person who concluded the contract—in this case, the parent. At first glance, the situation falls within the concept of “parental autonomy,” proceeding from the presumption that the influencer or blogger parent, as the contracting party, acted in accordance with the principle of ensuring “the best

²⁷ We are witnessing vivid examples on Instagram and TikTok platforms, where numerous influencers and bloggers publish various advertising videos featuring their children.

²⁸ Adopted on 05 May 1998. Entered into force on 01 January 1999. RA Official Gazette 1998.08.10/17(50).

²⁹ Within the framework of this article, we do not address the activities carried out by influencer or blogger children themselves and the existing problems thereof, since that is a subject for separate study.

interests of the child” when filming or publishing the advertising video. Parallel to this, however, in reality, there are not few cases when the content of the video implies filming in certain conditions (for example, cold or hot weather, dark settings) or performing certain actions which may present some difficulty or danger for the child, but which are necessary for filming the video envisaged by the contract. In such a case, the situation is subject to evaluation in the light of “the best interests of the child.” First, whether causing the child certain physical or psychological discomfort in order to achieve the result envisaged by the contract does not violate the principle of ensuring “the best interests of the child”; second, who evaluates the conformity of the service provided under the contract with “the best interests of the child”; and third, who bears responsibility for the violation of the principle of ensuring “the best interests of the child.” The addressee of all these questions, the evaluator of the situations, and the bearer of responsibility is the Contractor, i.e., the influencer or blogger parent.

The Armenian legislator has envisaged, as a sanction for parental behavior not deriving from “the best interests of the child,” deprivation or restriction of parental rights. However, these cannot be applied to the situations mentioned above, since the grounds for deprivation of parental rights are exhaustively set forth in Article 59 of the Family Code, and under Article 63 of the Family Code, the restriction of parental rights is permitted only if leaving the child with the parents or with one of them is dangerous for the child due to circumstances independent of the parents (mental or other chronic illness, existence of severe circumstances, etc.). Consequently, in essence, there is no legal assessment of, nor mechanisms restraining, the actions of an influencer or blogger parent which do not derive from “the best interests of the child” but which involve lesser risks and cause certain inconveniences.

In this respect, the legislation of the United States is of interest. Despite the fact that broad “parental autonomy” is enshrined even in the Constitution, the traditional entertainment industry is one of the areas in which parental rights are sometimes limited³⁰. Nevertheless, the legal regulations enshrined in the state laws of the United States do not extend to the children of influencer families, due to two circumstances: first, influencers are not considered representatives of the

³⁰ In the legislation of a number of U.S. states, this term is used in relation to work performed in the fields of theater, cinema, radio, or television. For example, under the legislation of the State of California, rather strict requirements are set for children working in this field—specific working hours and compliance with educational standards. For more detailed information, see Celine Simone, *When Parents Decide That All the World’s a Stage: Expanding Publicity Rights to Protect Children in Monetized Social Media Content*, *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems*, Vol. 58, Issue 1, 2024, pp. 78–79.

entertainment industry, and second, in this case the children of influencers are regarded as working in a family business, and the laws regulating that sphere do not apply to such business activities.

Thus, the study of domestic legislation of the Republic of Armenia and of international practice shows that the involvement of children in the activities of influencers falls outside the subject matter of labor law regulation; the work performed by children in that sphere is not considered the creation or performance of creative work, but bears the characteristics of entrepreneurial activity. Therefore, children do not enjoy the rights envisaged for employees under the Labor Code, and consequently cannot benefit from the means of protection of labor rights. While traditional creative work or entertainment industry work is carried out in a studio or theater, monetized family content is largely created within the home, where the parents simultaneously perform multiple roles—acting as director, producer, scriptwriter, consultant. The total absence of legal regulation at the legislative level and the lack of sector-specific standards grant parents broad autonomy and exclusive control to decide when, where, for how long the children will work, and in what content they will be involved. Such a situation is excluded both in the context of Article 17.1(2) of the RA Labor Code, in the case of minors performing creative work, and under the state laws of the United States in the context of children’s work within the “entertainment industry.”

Summarizing all the above, we can state that:

- In international legal documents and in the RA Family Code, the legal obligation of everyone to act in accordance with “the best interests of the child,” together with UNICEF’s developed policies and published guiding principles intended to facilitate its implementation, do not fully exclude violations of children’s rights by the Media during their activities;
- At the legislative level, due to the absence of monitoring criteria, and the impossibility of giving proper legal assessment, within the framework of existing regulations, to the actions of infringing Media, influencer or blogger parents in their activities that do not derive from the “best interests of the child,” there is no established law enforcement practice, and no judicial precedents;
- The concept of “parental autonomy” grants influencer or blogger parents absolute autonomy in involving their children in their activities. As a result, de facto the minor becomes a participant in labor relations, contributing to the work carried out by the parent, but de jure having no legal status and not receiving remuneration for the work performed, since the content created on

social networks is not included in the category of creative works envisaged by Article 17.1(2) of the RA Labor Code;

- Taking into account the established practice, available statistics, and identified problems, the cases, order, and conditions of involving children in the activities of influencers should draw the legislator's attention, receive legal regulation, and become subject to the regulation of labor law—thus granting children the opportunity to benefit from the rights envisaged for workers under the Labor Code and the means of protection of labor rights.

Conflict of Interests

The author declares no ethical issues or conflicts of interest in this research.

Ethical Standards

The author affirms this research did not involve human subjects.

Reference list

1. Celine Simone, When Parents Decide That All the World's a Stage: Expanding Publicity Rights to Protect Children in Monetized Social Media Content, *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems*, Vol. 58, Issue 1, 2024, pp. 78–79.
2. CEF, “Ethical Guidelines for Reporting on Children”, cited work, p. 17.
3. Child-Friendly Media: Document of Professional Principles for Arab Media's Handling of Child Rights Issues (2016). Cairo, Arab Council for Childhood and Development.
4. Code of Ethics for Media Dealing with Children (2013). Beirut, Lebanese Ministry of Social Affairs.
5. **Erwin Chemerinsky**, *Constitutional Law* 942 (6th ed. 2020):
6. <https://www.unicef.org/eca/media/ethical-guidelines>, as of 05 May 2025.
7. <https://www.arlis.am/hy/acts/18505>
8. <https://www.cbinsights.com/research/report/what-is-the-creator-economy/>, as of 05 May 2025.
9. <https://www.forbes.com/councils/theyec/2022/07/18/make-the-most-of-the-creator-economy/>
10. <https://www.bbc.com/news/education-44153754>, as of 05 May 2025
11. <https://www.smh.com.au/national/millions-of-social-media-photos-found-on-child-exploitation-sharing-sites-20150929-gjxe55>
12. <https://nationalpost.com/news/canada/photos-shared-on-pedophile-sites-taken-from-parents-social-media-accounts>
13. <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/268/510/>
14. Kate Hamming, Comment, *A Dangerous Inheritance: A Child's Digital Identity*, 43 SEATTLE U.L. REV. 1033, 1038 (2020).
15. Labor Code of the Republic of Armenia, Adopted on 09 November 2004. Entered into force on 21 June 2005. RA Official Gazette 2004.12.21/69(368), Art. 1385.

16. MAKING MEDIA: PRODUCTION, PRACTICES, AND PROFESSIONS, Amsterdam University Press, Edited by Mark Deuze and Mirjam Prenger, 2019, pg 363:
17. The Law of the Republic of Armenia “On the Rights of the Child”, adopted on 29 May 1996. Entered into force on 31 May 1996. RA Official Gazette 1996/10 (1110), 31 May, Art. 124, 31 May 1996.
18. The Law of the Republic of Armenia “On the Protection of Personal Data”, Adopted on 18 May 2015. Entered into force on 01 July 2015., RA Official Gazette 2015.06.18/35(1124) Art. 462.
19. The Law of the Republic of Armenia “On Audiovisual Media”, adopted on 16 July 2020. Entered into force on 07 August 2020, Unified Website 27 July 2020 – 09 August 2020.
20. The Family Code of the Republic of Armenia, adopted on 09 November 2004. Entered into force on 19 April 2005. RA Official Gazette 2005.01.19/4(376), Art. 60.
21. RA Civil Code, Adopted on 05 May 1998. Entered into force on 01 January 1999. RA Official Gazette 1998.08.10/17(50).
22. UNICEF, Child Protection Policy in the Media, UNICEF, “Ethical Guidelines for Reporting on Children”, 2018, cited work, pp. 9–10.
23. UNICEF, Child Protection Policy in the Media, UNICEF, “Ethical Guidelines for Reporting on Children”, 2018, cited work, pp. 9–10.
24. www.unicef.org/eca/media/ethical-guidelines