

Современная наука и инновации.
2023. № 2(42). С. 226-235
Modern Science and Innovations.
2023; 2(42):226-235

Ольга Сергеевна Гилязова
[Olga S. Gilyazova]

ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ НАУКИ /
POLITICAL SCIENCE

Научная статья / Original article

УДК 323.2: 304.9/37
DOI: 10.37493/2307-910X.2023.2.25

Специфика молодежной политики
современной России в контексте
проблематизации принципа субъектности
молодежи

The a specific character of the contemporary
Russian youth policy in the context of
problematization of the youth subjectness
principle

Уральский федеральный университет, г. Екатеринбург, Россия /
Ural Federal University, Ekaterinburg, Russia, olga_gilyazova@mail.ru

Аннотация. Цель статьи состоит в рассмотрении специфики молодежной политики современной России путем анализа исторической ретроспективы становления молодежной политики в России, нормативно-правовой базы, ее основных теорий (а также видов и моделей), концептуализируемых в зависимости от особенностей восприятия молодежи (как проблемы или ресурса), места и роли молодежи (как субъекта или объекта). Методологической базой служит деятельностно-активистский подход, коренящийся на идеях ведущих социологов П. Бурдьё, Э. Гидденс, П. Штомпка. **Результаты:** выявляется зависимость молодежной политики от повестки дня главы государства, ее вторичность, этатически-патерналистская направленность, стремление к ужесточению контроля со стороны государства, дефицит публичности и информативности, обилие фикций и симуляций, архаизация, маркетинговая логика и т.п. Это объясняется тем, что молодежная политика подменяется ее подвидом – государственной молодежной политикой. В качестве мер по исправлению проблемных моментов молодежной политики предлагается сделать принцип субъектности молодежи реальным, а не голословным (через развитие институтов гражданского общества). **Вывод:** учитывая, что основным источником выявленных проблем является диссонанс между декларируемым в научно-теоретическом дискурсе и нормативно-правовом поле принципом субъектности молодежи в молодежной политике и отсутствием политической воли и условий для реализации этого принципа в практической деятельности, надежда на возможность существенного преобразования российской молодежной политики – является преждевременной.

Ключевые слова: государственная молодежная политика; молодежь; публичная политика; социализация; субъектность молодежи

Для цитирования: Гилязова О. С. Специфика современной российской молодежной политики в контексте проблематизации принципа субъектности молодежи // Современная наука и инновации. 2023. №2 (42): С. 226-235. <https://doi.org/10.37493/2307-910X.2023.2.25>

Abstract. The aim of the article is to consider the specific character of youth policy in contemporary Russia by retrospectively analyzing its establishment, its laws and regulations, its theories (types and models) conceptualized depending on youth perception patterns (as a problem or resource), the place and role of youth (as a subject or object). The action-activity-based approach, rooted in the ideas of leading sociologists P. Bourdieu, A. Giddens, P. Sztompka, serves as methodological framework. **Results:** The dependence of the youth policy on the president's agenda, its secondariness, its non-publicity and un informativity, governmental-paternalistic focus, abundant fictions and simulations, archaism, marketing logic, etc. have been revealed. These features are attributable to substitution of youth policy for its specific format – state (government)

youth policy. As corrective measures, it is proposed to make the youth subjectness principle real (through the development of civil society institutions). **Conclusion:** Considering that the identified problems stem from the dissonance between the youth subjectness principle declared in the scientific-theoretical discourse and regulatory environment and the absence of political will and conditions for actualizing this principle, the hope for fundamental transformation of the Russian youth policy is premature.

Key words: government youth policy; state youth policy; young people; youth; public policy; socialization; subjectivity; subjectness

For citation: Gilyazova OI. S. The specific character of the contemporary Russian youth policy in the context of problematization of the youth subjectness principle // *Modern Science and Innovations*. 2023;2(42):226-235. <https://doi.org/10.37493/2307-910X.2023.2.25>

Introduction. One should not predict the future, but rather make it possible (Antoine de Saint-Exupery, 1900-1944). This famous maxim of the famous French writer justifies the relevance of the topic of youth policy (see for example: [1]). The upbringing of young people has been given attention throughout nearly all the historical periods (by sharing the personal life experience in families, at schools, through doctrinal teachings, etc.). Yet, youth policy (YP) as a special area in activities of society and the government came to the fore slightly over one hundred years ago, while its scientific conceptualization gained attention in countries of Western Europe and in the United States only in the 1960s (when it became a concern of escalating importance due to youth-led protest movements).

The timeline of Russian YP is still debatable: While the fact that YP existed as an individual area of state governance during the Soviet period is recognized by most of the researchers, there is no consensus on its existence before the revolution. Nevertheless, some of YP elements (representing class-based YP) could be observed in Russia as early as in the 16th – 17th century [2].

There is no denying that full-fledged YP, its scientific conceptualization, legal and regulatory framework were established worldwide, including Russia, in the 20th century. In Russia, the impetus was given by the Soviet system and communism-ideology-related global transformations.

In the late Soviet period, two groups worked on scientific interpretation of YP as one of the priority areas of the state policy: The first group was headed by I.M. Ilinskiy the second group was headed by V.T. Lisovsky. The essence and the purpose (of high relevance ‘in all societies in all times’) of meaningful and dedicated YP were defined by I.M. Ilinskiy and his scientific school as “addressing the regulation of intergenerational relationships, the control of the process of continuity between generations and, hence, social development” [3, p. 436]. According to V.T. Lisovsky, YP can be seen as a ‘youth cross-section’ of public (national), municipal (regional, district) social and economic policy [4, p. 413].

We will hold to the first approach as more universal and containing the idea of youth subjectness, which is fundamental to contemporary reflections in this field and the roots of which (when it is seen as the ability to reach self-realization through conscious, rational, self-performed activity) are found in the works of Bulgarian scholar P.E. Mitev and Polish scholars M. Karwat and V. Milanowski. The youth is seen not only as the object of upbringing, but also as a subject of historical changes. I.M. Ilinskiy expands that idea, suggesting that subjectness should not only be recognized as a quality of the youth, but also be used as a linchpin [5].

It should be noted that in recent years, the theme of youth, in general, and YP, in particular, is taking on increasing importance and has become one of priorities in law-making as well as in social and humanities studies. This is proved by numerous youth-related international (UN and UNESCO) and European (EU, OECD) documents.

The principle of subjectness (in many respects similar to the concept of student agency in OECD documents and partway overlapping G. Biesta’s notion of subjectification [6]) has an important place in this theme: Subjectness is either addressed directly or implied. Therefore, we prefer to go with the sociologists who directly or indirectly dealt with this problem (first of all, in

the context of Russian realities). First and foremost, we are guided by works of the scholars representing the school of afore-mentioned I.M. Ilinskiy. Their contribution cannot be overstated, at it had a profound effect on scientific research in this field; it was also embodied in the respective legislative initiatives and draft legislation.

It was the group headed by I.M. Ilinskiy that spearheaded the development of the Law *On the General Principles of State Youth Policy in the USSR*. However, the law adopted in the waning days of the Soviet Union was doomed to a short life: The YP model promoted and controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union became irrelevant in the new social, economic, and political environment [5].

The subsequent decades of post-Soviet Russia were characterized by the nearly total absence of unified YP. A lack of shared vision of the YP essence, principles and models resulted in numerous projects that had been ineffective or had been turned down before 2020. In addition, there was no robust institutional framework for efficient implementation of YP.

So, a real breakthrough in this field was made only in 2020 that ushered in two milestone events. On July 1, 2020, when sweeping changes were made to the Constitution of the Russian Federation: The notion of youth policy was introduced and incorporated into the constitution (Article 71), thus providing the foundation for much-needed designated YP-related legislation: Russia, unlike CIS countries and most of the European countries, did not have any general law regarding YP. And on December 30, 2020, when Federal Law No 489-FZ *On Youth Policy in the Russian Federation* was adopted to become the basic law on YP [7].

Its main advantage is that it recognized legislatively the active role of young people (as well as civil society institutions) in development and implementation of YP: The initiators of the law definitely heeded the comments of YP ideologists and decided to incorporate the perception of the youth not so much as the targeted object as the subject of transformation activity in society.

As we can see, the understanding of the significance of the subjectness principle in YP has reached the highest level of law-making. It is quite explicable: The applicability of the subjectness principle in YP is associated with its generative nature in relation to other aspects of YP, as the dividing line between different conceptual contents of YP runs between the YP orientation towards the youth as an active subject or as an object in relation to which certain actions are carried out.

Even though the existence of this dividing line is not denied, in reality, it is neglected (which is clearly seen from the fact that Russian researchers, officials and legislators tend to narrow down the youth policy to its subtype – the state (rather, government) youth policy, implying their total identity). Consequently, although in theory and in legislation, the first orientation is generally declared, the second one prevails in practice. Therefore, the subjectness principle in Russian YP or rather the inconsistency between its theoretical recognition and its practical implementation needs further scientific conceptualization and clarification.

This characterizes the *aim* and *novelty* of our article, which attempts to gain insight into the specific character of the Russian youth policy in the context of the principle of youth subjectness and through the prism of action-activity-based approach. The founders of this approach, which forms the *methodological groundwork* of our theoretical study, are such renowned sociologists as P. Bourdieu, A. Giddens, P. Sztompka. Its underlying idea is that modern society can be seen not only as objects (groups, organizations, etc.), but also as a ‘field of opportunities’ for social subjects so that they could actualize their active actions. With this in mind, we will be able to problematize the relationship between youth subjectness and the state in YP implementation in the present-day environment of Russia.

The terminological framework. In scientific literature, the term ‘youth policy’ acquires an independent meaning in the 1960; however, as demonstrated by the analysis of scientific literature and public documents, there is no uniform definition, which can be explained by absent consensus regarding the understanding and perception of the youth, its place and role in contemporary society. It has nothing to do with the disagreement between scholars and practitioners; rather, it can be explained by a dual nature of the youth, which is a biological and social phenomenon as well as a subject and object of socialization. There is still heterogeneity of youth cohorts, which is caused by

social inequality. At one extreme, there are the so-called kidults (kid + adult) who have an extended period of infantilism and carelessness, while at the other extreme, there are deprived young people from low-income families; the enjoyment of their childhood is curtailed, and they do not fit into the picture with the routes to success, mainstream cultural and social identification.

Usually, the thoughts about the youth imply the focus on the future, overlooking the fact that the youth is the driver of the present.

The youth category can be seen from three perspectives: a) as a carrier of age-related psychophysiological characteristics; b) as a political and subcultural phenomenon; c) as a subject of juvenile-adaptive processes [8].

Note that in the Russian discourse, all the three perspectives are present, though the first one prevails. The distinctive characteristics of the youth as an objective social phenomenon constituting a special age group, according to I.M. Ilinskiy, are associated with the idea of its dependence; young people tend to live ‘on credit’; they do not have personal independence in making decisions involving their life; they have to choose education, profession, marriage; they have to solve problems of their moral and spiritual identity [5].

The ambiguity and complexity of the contemporary youth phenomenon, when in the context of the post-modern world, the set of ages (chronological, social and psychological) is not congruent, prompts researchers to speak about the so-called ‘post-youth’ phenomenon, or (in the context of the thesaurus concept of the youth [9]) to believe that young people’s own identification as the youth must be the requirement for affiliation to the youth community.

In the meantime, this approach is associated with excessive relativism; therefore, we will opt for the legislator’s basic definition of the youth as a social-demographic group of people aged 14 to 35 years. Then, we will define YP as a system of ideas, beliefs, concepts about the place and role of the youth in society as well as a practical activity of different subjects of social action (including the youth itself), which is aimed to implement the system.

Discussion and results. The dual nature of the youth and its unstable position between childhood and adulthood imply that the social potential of the youth is problem-prone and paradoxical. The resulting bidirectional vectors of YP are as follows: 1) prevention and neutralization of problems of immediate importance for the youth (or caused by the youth) and 2) provision of the youth with new opportunities (see Table 1). The first approach is known as a problem-based approach, while the second one is a resource-based approach [10].

Table 1 – Characteristics of the problem-based and resource-based approaches to the youth

	Problem-based approach		Resource-based approach	
	‘Problems of the youth’	‘The youth as a problem’	Utilitarian interpretation of the notion ‘resource’	Value-based interpretation of the notion ‘resource’
Description	Youth as a combination of difficulties specific for this particular life period of a person and arising during the person’s transit to adulthood	Youth as a problem-prone period for the other part of society	The youth as a resource of implementation of political decisions, projects, programs	The youth as a strategic asset
Type of youth policy	‘Social youth policy’	‘Youth policy of social control’	‘Youth mobilization policy’	‘Model of social education’

By and large, the YP ambiguity and complexity are associated with the balance between the perception of the youth as a “socially weak group, which needs unfailing social guardianship and protection” [11, p. 9], or – we would add – supervision and control, and as the main resource and driver of social development, an object and subject of investment policy.

We can state that the youth perception discourse prevailing in society (from the perspective of problem-based approach or resource-based approach) has an impact on the respective type of YP.

While the first perspective supports objectivity of the youth in YP, the other one opts for subjectness of the youth.

Thus, the conceptual content of YP depends on the answer to the questions: What role should be assigned to the youth in terms of YP implementation: an object or a subject, and what (or who) is the leading (or even sole) subject of this policy?

The subjectness principle is instrumental in differentiation between two main types of YP:

1) *government (state) youth policy (GYP)*, the subject of which is “the government represented by its special agencies whose activities are, to a greater or lesser degree, connected with human development (education, culture, physical fitness, labor, leisure, etc.)” [12, p. 584].

2) *non-government youth policy (NYP)*, the subjects of which are institutions of civil society, public and political (non-governmental) actors, sometimes transnational organizational-managerial structures and, the youth itself.

The diversity of NYP, which is not a priority for researchers who tend to focus their attention on GYP, suggests that its can be divided into several subtypes:

2a) *public youth policy (PYP)*, the subjects of which are different parties, trade unions, business communities, mass media, youth associations, young people.

A number of Russian researchers think that the focus should on PYP and its promotion through the social intersectoral partnership including the government, the third sector (non-profit organizations), political structures, business and the youth. Depending on the willingness of young people to be actively involved in the process of implementation of the youth policy, the above partnership can be implemented in the format of any of three models: subject-subjective; subjective-developing and subject-objective.

2b) *antisocial youth policy (AYP)*, which is of an antisocial nature, and its subjects are “extremist and terrorist groups and organizations, religious sects, and criminal structures as well as movements targeting the youth, for example, the AUE criminal movement popular among representatives of disadvantaged young people” [8, p. 447].

2c) *anti-systemic youth policy*, subjects of which are opponents of the ‘system,’ i.e. of the existence of a political system and the government as its main institution. The spirit of civic (digital, as of today) activism has been always inherent in young people due to their youthful maximalism, excitability, enthusiasm, immaturity, etc. Notably, German sociologist K. Mannheim saw the main function of the youth in being ‘a revitalizing agent’ of social life.

However, for the ideological purpose, GYP representatives tend to intentionally overlook the difference between the two last subtypes of NYP – the antisocial and anti-systemic youth policies.

P.A. Merkulov, A.L. Eliseev, D.V. Aronov [13] single out the so-called ‘negative youth policy’ as an individual type of GYP; however, we share S. Chirun and M. Chirun’ opinion that in this case “it refers to the government’s implementation of its punishing function to protect the youth from the types of social behavior condemnable by the government” [8, p. 447]; therefore, any argument for a special type of GYP would be inappropriate.

Thus, we, sharing other scholars’ opinion (Baal [14]; A.V. Lubskey, V.O. Vagina, D.A. Mamina [15]), think that the GYP notion should include not only the positive aspect of the policy encouraging young people’s conformist behavior towards the government and society, but also its negative aspect aimed to prevent deviant types (classified by R. Merton) of behavior of young people. This will allow for a comprehensive approach to GYP.

The above analysis of YP types and subtypes proves the wrongfulness of equation of ‘youth policy’ and ‘government youth policy,’ though sometimes legislators and officials unintentionally converge the above notions in favor of GYP. This demonstrates the political culture of the last decade in Russia, when traditions of statism and the tendency to closedness of the political regime have been restored, revealing old historical roots [16]. This has also an effect on the establishment of the respective model of YP.

There are four major models of YP, which are classified depending on the place and role of the government in securing rights and interests of young people [17]:

1) the conservative (adaptive) model is characterized by minimum government involvement, the leading role of public organizations, program-based nature, selective assistance to the youth (USA, 'new industrial countries': Taiwan, Singapore, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico).

2) the social-governmental model is characterized by an active role of the government, existence of special coordinating and regulating institutions, comprehensiveness, decent financing, the right of all representatives of the youth to receive government support (most European countries: Germany, the Netherlands, France, Italy, Belgium, etc.)

3) the model of public-private partnership is characterized by limited government involvement and a limited list of youth policy avenues, the parity of the government and entities of civil society; the youth policy is primarily regulated at the municipal level (Sweden, Finland, Great Britain, etc.)

4) the communitarian model, where the government is a dominant factor in centralized implementation of youth policy (China, where the Communist Youth League recruits people aged from 14 to 28 years)

During the Soviet period, the fourth model was popular; today, Russia is trying to revive it, however, the lack of financial resources interferes with the consistency. The question of reasonableness or transformation of the model change remains open.

As for specific manifestations (including problematic ones) of the Russian model of YP, summing up the above experts' opinions and our own observations, we can point out the following:

The incomprehensive and controversial nature of the basic guidelines of YP, which can be explained by the fragmentariness and disequilibrium of the political culture and interests of YP subjects.

The fairly limited number of stakeholders in YP development.

Although in laws and regulations, YP is positioned as a priority of the Russian state policy, it has not reached the declared status so far.

A lack of clear and sound theoretical and practical mechanisms of YP interaction with other sectors of the state policy.

The inconsistency between the YP ideological priorities and its program-focused maintenance as well as financial support, which is provided by the 'left-over principle.' Consequently, quite a few resolutions and targeted programs tend to acquire declarative or advisory features.

The excessive influence of the president's agenda on the YP paradigm, thus shifting YP attention toward aspects of patriotic education, which boils down to militarism, at the expense of social and economic problems, which are more important for young people. In the conditions of escalating ideological contradictions, patriotic education is perceived as an ambiguous phenomenon [18].

Regional YPs tend to focus on college kids, thus leaving out young people not affiliated with institutional entities – higher education institutions and public organizations.

The 'bipolarity' of YP – the focus on assistance to sociably vulnerable young people (orphans, young offenders, children from troubled families, etc.) and support provided to the talented youth, thus leaving out most of the ordinary, 'average' young people.

In the meantime, targeted grant assistance to the talented youth and young families is insufficient, thus leading to the situation when grants are available to very few young people and families in some regions.

The focus on different youth structures (youth parliaments, youth governments, etc.) created under the umbrella of government authorities and represented primarily by young social climbers takes attention away from actual work with large audiences of young people. The above structures function not so much to serve their purpose – as social mobility elevators and as platforms to shorten the distance between young people and decision-makers – as political tools for persons concerned.

The emphasis on preservation of young generation's loyalty towards the established political order and the prevailing 'ceremonial-festive' style adopted for organization of youth events (youth

forums, gatherings, sports contests, etc.) involving a limited number of participants. Instead of broader opportunities for actualizing creative abilities, young people are offered the principles to life by, promoting servility and opportunism.

The absence of the vision of the desirable future, which would be incorporated into a coherent and appealing ideological concept or political program, and the subsequent absence of meaningful and understandable guidelines for young people [19].

The increasing and distinct tendency of government authorities to toughen negative sanctions for young people's social-political activity uncontrolled by the government, entailing discrediting the objectors and violent removal of the anti-systemic youth policy to the periphery of political life.

The attempt of the government to limit the social space for self-realization and self-expression of young people to boundaries of the regulation-based, formalism and routinization-prone activity that is approved by it.

Lack of publicity and information.

Situational-manipulative nature of YP.

Hyper-mannerism as an attempt to "put the cultural attributes of the past in the context of youth subcultures of postmodernism" [8, p. 446]. YP is built on rules and regulations derived from the retrospective experience and preventing understanding and knowing the actual needs and values of contemporary young people.

Simulation – the tendency of YP to generate simulacra (which is backed up by its functioning in marketing logic) rather than actual results and accomplishments.

On the whole, we believe that the main distinctive feature of Russian YP is its governmental/ state (government-controlled) nature; even its non-governmental sub-types (NYP) are put under control of government authorities (i.e. acquire characteristics of GYP) or are marginalized, or are persecuted. Therefore, the above description refers mostly to one type of YP – GYP. The other distinctive feature is the paternalistic nature of YP (perception of the youth as being in need of continuous patronage and supervision by the government) as well as the moralizing-ideological nature (the emphasis on patriotic education at the expense of civic consciousness). The integrating effect of these features is the following: The government becomes the dominant subject of YP and not only formulates its basic principles, goals and objectives, but also supervises all its areas. The expectable result is fusion of YP and GYP.

By and large, we can state that despite the theoretical thoroughness of the concept of youth subjectness in Russian studies and its incorporation into the YP legal and regulatory framework, the practical implementation of YP in the contemporary Russian environment demonstrates objective rather than subjective approach to the youth.

On the other hand, the listed problem-prone aspects of YP contain answers regarding the measures that should be taken to improve the situation.

For example, instead of sanctions, which are applied to participants of rallies and protest groups organized through social media by young people, there should be YP sensitive to needs and requirements of young people and capable of creating multi-format space for positive youth activism. Especially considering that, as noted by V.V. Shcheblanova, L.V. Loginova, D.V. Zaitsev and I.Yu. Surkova [20], the very opportunity to reach the social consensus regarding the prospects of social development defines, to a great extent, the border between constructiveness/destructiveness of civic activism.

In addition, the YP modernization requires the abolishment of traditions of paternalism (putting the youth in the position of endlessly immature and irrational), moving away from the perception of the youth solely as an object of the government's action, and, by all means, categorical refusal from the administrative model, regulative and punitive discourses. The conceptual principle of subjectness needs promotion; while it has been declared in the scientific and legislative environment, it has been neglected in the real-world context. In other words, there should be a model void of priorities of hierarchical forms of institutional regulation, which generate over-organization, formalism and out-of-touch symbolism of ceremonial events.

Stating that, we offer web-based forms of communication between the government and the youth; we also urge to strengthen different forms of self-governance and self-organization of the youth, which will be instrumental in cultivation of true youth leaders and will help expand the youth audience involved in actual social transformations.

Conclusion. In conclusion, we can say that the position of youth is a critical indicator of the wellbeing of society, and it largely depends on a country's youth policy. The analysis of the Russian YP showed that its specific character is strongly associated with its primary function as GYP, which, in its turn, contributes to and exacerbates the dissonance between two formats of the subjectness principle in YP – theoretical (for the youth) and practical (for the government). However, considering the historically insufficient development of institutions of civil society in Russia and the increasing tendency to the strengthening of the government's regulation and control of different policies (including YP), the hope that the youth subjectness principle related to YP will get rid of its declarative nature and will become effective is naïve and premature.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Bynner J. Youth Prospects in the Digital Society / J. Bynner & W.R. Heinz. UK: Bristol, Policy Press, 2021. 178 p. <https://doi.org/10.51952/9781447351474>
2. Меркулов П. А. Государственная молодежная политика в дореволюционной России – от сословности к полноценному социальному регулированию / П. А. Меркулов, А. Л. Елисеев, Д. В. Аронов // *Bylye Gody*. 2018. Т. 49(3). С. 1061-1073.
3. Ильинский И. М. Собрание сочинений: В 5т. Т. 2: Молодежь. Молодежная политика. Молодежная организация / И. М. Ильинский. М.: Терра, 2016. 672 с.
4. Социология молодежи / под ред. В. Т. Лисовского. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во СПбГУ, 1996. 413 с.
5. Луков В. А. Молодежная политика: концепция И. М. Ильинского // *Знание. Понимание. Умение*. 2016. № 2. С. 13-24.
6. Biesta G. Risking Ourselves in Education: Qualification, Socialization, and Subjectification Revisited / G. Biesta // *Educational Theory*. 2020. No. 70(1). P. 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12411>
7. Отроков О. Ю. Молодежная политика России после принятия профильного федерального закона / О. Ю. Отроков // *Вестник Пятигорского государственного университета*. 2021. № 2. С. 170-173. https://doi.org/10.53531/25420747_2021_2_170
8. Чирун С. Н. Молодежная политика России в пространстве постправды / С. Н. Чирун, М. С. Чирун // *Вестник Кемеровского государственного университета*. Серия: Политические, социологические и экономические науки. 2020. Т. 5. № 4. С. 444-453. <https://doi.org/10.21603/2500-3372-2020-5-4-444-453>
9. Пинчук А. Н. Государственная молодежная политика в современной России: переосмысление перспектив в тезаурусном подходе / А.Н. Пинчук, С.Г. Карепова // *Знание. Понимание. Умение*. 2022. № 2. С. 282-287. <https://doi.org/10.17805/zpu.2022.2.22>
10. Смирнов В. А. Молодежная политика: опыт системного описания // *Социологические исследования*. 2014. № 3(359). С. 72-74. URL: https://www.elibrary.ru/title_about_new.asp?id=8227&langid=2
11. Луков В. Инновационный потенциал новых поколений и молодежная политика на современном этапе развития общества / В. Луков, С. Луков, Э. Погорский // *PolitBook*. – 2014. № 2. С. 6-18. URL: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=23233323>
12. Ильинский И.М. Молодёжь и молодёжная политика. Философия. История. Теория. М.: Голос, 2001. 584 с.
13. Меркулов П.А. Негативная молодежная политика как составляющая государственной политики в отношении молодежи / П. А. Меркулов, А.Л. Елисеев, Д.В. Аронов // *Власть*. 2015. № 2. С. 141-145. URL: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=23203557>
14. Бааль Н. Б. Государственная молодежная политика как инструмент профилактики политического экстремизма в молодежной среде // *Вестник тверского государственного*

университета. Серия: философия. 2021. № 2(56). С. 106-115.
<https://doi.org/10.26456/vtphilos/2021.2.121>

15. Лубский А. В. Молодежная политика и гражданские практики в молодежной среде в современной России / А. В. Лубский, В. О. Вагина, Д. А. Мамина // Гуманитарий Юга России. 2019. № 8(6). С. 171-187. <https://doi.org/10.23683/2227-8656.2019.6.11>

16. Андрушина Е. В. Государственная молодежная политика в российском обществе: этапы, основные направления, показатели результативности // Государственное управление. Электронный вестник. 2018. № 67. С. 269-281. <https://doi.org/10.24411/2070-1381-2018-00027>

17. Степанищенко О. В. Молодежь как объект государственной политики: монография. Краснодар: Кубанский гос. технологический ун-т, 2011. 100 с.

18. Кочетков М. В. Патриотическое воспитание: объединяющие и разъединяющие основания в условиях обостряющихся идеологических противоречий // Медиация в образовании: поликультурный контекст. материалы III Международной конференции. Красноярск: Сибирский федеральный университет, 2022. С. 132-138. URL: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=48056840>.

19. Itckovich M. National core values in the perception of modern Russian youth / M. Itckovich, T. Itskovich, A. Shutaleva // 11th International Technology, Education and Development Conference (INTED). 2017. P. 6460-6470. <https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2017.1489>

20. Щебланова В. В. Гражданский активизм студентов: риск деструктивных проявлений в Поволжском регионе / В. В. Щебланова, Л. В. Логинова, Д. В. Зайцев, И. Ю. Суркова // Вестник РУДН. Серия: Социология. 2020. Т. 20. № 3. С. 595-610. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2272-2020-20-3-595-610>

REFERENCES

1. Bynner J. Youth Prospects in the Digital Society / J. Bynner & W.R. Heinz. – UK: Bristol, Policy Press, 2021. – 178 p. <https://doi.org/10.51952/9781447351474>

2. Merkulov P. A. State Youth Policy in Pre-Revolutionary Russia: from Social Stratification of Society to Full Social Regulation / P.A. Merkulov, A.L. Eliseev & D.V. Aronov // Bylye Gody. 2018. No. 49(3). P. 1061-1073. <https://doi.org/10.13187/bg.2018.3.1061>

3. Ilinskiy I.M. Collected works: In 5 vols. Vol. 2: Youth. Youth policy. Youth organization / I. M. Ilinskiy. Moscow: Terra, 2016. 672 p.

4. Sociology of Youth / V. T. Lisovsky (ed.). St. Petersburg: Publishing House of St. Petersburg State University, 1996. 413 p.

5. Lukov V. A. I. M. Ilinskiy's conception of youth policy // Knowledge. Understanding. Skill. 2016. No. 2. P. 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.17805/zpu.2016.2.2>

6. Biesta G. Risking Ourselves in Education: Qualification, Socialization, and Subjectification Revisited / G. Biesta // Educational Theory. 2020. No. 70(1). P. 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12411>

7. Otrokov O. Yu. Youth Policy of Russia After the Adoption of the Relevant Federal Law / O.Yu. Otrokov // Pyatigorsk State University Bulletin. 2021. No. 2. P. 170-173. https://doi.org/10.53531/25420747_2021_2_170

8. Chirun S. Russian Youth Policy in the Post-Truth Space / S. Chirun & M. Chirun // Bulletin of Kemerovo State University Series Political Sociological and Economic sciences. 2020. No. 5(4). P. 444-453. <https://doi.org/10.21603/2500-3372-2020-5-4-444-453>

9. Pinchuk A. N. State youth policy in modern Russia: rethinking prospects in the thesaurus approach / A. N. Pinchuk, S. G. Karepova // Knowledge. Understanding. Skill. 2022. No. 2. P. 282-287. <https://doi.org/10.17805/zpu.2022.2.22>

10. Smirnov V. A. Youth policy: experience of system description // Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. 2014. No. 3(359). P. 72-80. URL: https://www.elibrary.ru/title_about_new.asp?id=8227&langid=2

11. Lukov V. Innovative potential of new generations and youth policy at the present stage of development of society / V. Lukov, S. Lukov & E. Pogorsky // PolitBook. 2014. No. 2. P. 6-18. URL: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=23233323>.
12. Ilinskiy I. M. Youth and youth policy. Philosophy. History. Theory. Moscow: Golos, 2001. 584 p.
13. Merkulov P. A. Negative youth policy as a part of public policy towards young people / P. A. Merkulov, A. L. Eliseev & D. V. Aronov // The Authority. 2015. No. 2. P. 141-145. URL: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=23203557>
14. Baal N. B. State youth policy as a tool for preventing political extremism in youth environment // Vestnik Tver State University. Series: Philosophy. 2021. No. 2(56). P. 106-115. <https://doi.org/10.26456/vtphilos/2021.4.106>
15. Lubsky A. V. Youth policy and civic practices in youth environment in modern Russia / A.V. Lubsky V.O. Vagina & D.A. Mamina // Humanities of the South of Russia. 2019. No. 8(6). P. 171-187. <https://doi.org/10.23683/2227-8656.2019.6.11>
16. Andryushina E. V. State Youth Policy in Russia: Evolution, Main Directions, Performance Indicators // E-journal public administration. 2018. No. 67. P. 269-281. <https://doi.org/10.24411/2070-1381-2018-00027>
17. Stepanischenko O. V. Youth as an object of state policy: a monograph. Krasnodar: Publishing House of the Kuban State Technological University, 2011. 100 p.
18. Kochetkov M. V. Patriotic education: unifying and separating grounds in the conditions of escalating ideological contradictions // Mediatsiya v obrazovanii: polikul'turnyy kontekst. materialy III Mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii. Krasnoyarsk: Sibirskiy federal'nyy universitet, 2022. P. 132-138. URL: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=48056840>
19. Itckovich M. National core values in the perception of modern Russian youth / M. Itckovich, T. Itskovich, A. Shutaleva // 11th International Technology, Education and Development Conference (INTED). 2017. P. 6460-6470. <https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2017.1489>
20. Shcheblanova V. V. Student civil activism: Risk of destructive manifestations in the Volga Region / V. V. Shcheblanova, L. V. Loginova, D. V. Zaitsev & I. Yu. Surkova // RUDN Journal of Sociology. 2020. No. 20(3). P. 595-610. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2272-2020-20-3-595-610>

ОБ АВТОРЕ / ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Гилязова Ольга Сергеевна, кандидат философских наук доцент Центра развития универсальных компетенций Уральский федеральный университет, 620002, ул. Мира, 19, г. Екатеринбург, Россия, тел.: 89533830105, olga_gilyazova@mail.ru

Gilyazova Olga S., PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor at the Center for the development of universal competencies, Ural Federal University, 620002, 19 Mira str., Yekaterinburg, Russia, tel.: 89533830105, olga_gilyazova@mail.ru

Дата поступления в редакцию: 12.04.2023

После рецензирования: 23.05.2023

Дата принятия к публикации: 13.06.2023