



State authorities and public institutions interaction features in youth policy implementation: Current issues

Ekaterina L. Vodolazhskaya ^{1*}, Ekaterina V. Senatova ², Aleksandr A. Novikov ^{3,4}, Elena V. Novikova ^{3,4}, Sofia Sh. Ostanina ¹, Larisa F. Zhandarova ¹, Oleg A. Skutelnik ⁵

¹ Kazan National Research Technological University, Kazan, RUSSIA

² Academy of the Federal Penitentiary Service of Russia, Moscow, RUSSIA

³ Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Moscow, RUSSIA

⁴ Moscow International University, Moscow, RUSSIA

⁵ Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow, RUSSIA

*Corresponding author: vodolazhskaya86@bk.ru

Abstract

The relevance of this article lies in the study of such a social phenomenon as youth policy. Especially significant are the representations of the existing practices of youth policy designing and young people participation in social programming to implement various types of social innovations. Socio-psychological support of youth policy is considered as an independent topic with the questions of the youth identity crisis and the search for models of building solidarity in the new historical realities. The purpose of the research is to study youth policy from the perspective of social programming; to identify and analyze the features of youth policy in modern conditions. Research methods: as a research method, we used survey and interview methods that allow us to identify the specifics of young people social status as an indicator of society state as a whole. Research results: the article considers constructs of youth policy used in official administrative texts - state programs in the field of youth policy and unofficial texts of these programs developers. The novelty and originality of the research lies in the fact that for the first time the context of programming youth policy in modern conditions is studied. The main components are shown: normative, language, spatial, event-time, and problem contexts. It is shown that youth policy is constructed as a network of interconnected social practices of various kinds, including practices of youth participation in programming, based on the model of representation of youth interests by its affiliated representatives. For the first time, it is revealed that the construction of social practices of youth participation occurs with the designation of the role repertoire of young people and is reduced to roles: problem bearer (predominance of problem discourse); recipient of social benefits; passive participant of events (resource-oriented attitude to the younger generation); social practice of youth participation is characterized as problematic. This article shows that the problems of human development can be solved only through the active participation of young people in the interaction of the state and civil society and should be considered as criteria for the effectiveness of youth policy implementation. Practical significance: the data obtained in this work can be used in political science, legal psychology, social psychology, age psychology, as well as for further theoretical development of this issue.

Keywords: youth policy, youth, public institutions

Vodolazhskaya EL, Senatova EV, Novikov AA, Novikova EV, Ostanina SSh, Zhandarova LF, Skutelnik OA (2020) State authorities and public institutions interaction features in youth policy implementation: Current issues. Eurasia J Biosci 14: 2867-2872.

© 2020 Vodolazhskaya et al.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License.

INTRODUCTION

The topicality of the relevant research is determined by the strategic importance of the young generation in the context of modern dynamism - the real prospects for the development of any country in the coming decades are connected with youth (Smirnov, 2014; Omelchenko, 2016; Lukov, 2012). Youth issues traditionally attract the attention of Russian and foreign sociologists, as well as teachers, psychologists, and philosophers (Giddens, 2004; Andryushkov, 2007).

The issues of interaction between state authorities and public institutions in youth policy implementation are covered in various studies. The works of scientists reflect aspects of legislative and institutional support, issues of financing and state support programs' implementation for young people.

Received: March 2019

Accepted: March 2020

Printed: September 2020

Nevertheless, the issues of the dynamics of youth policy programming, evaluation of the quality and justification of the effectiveness of programs for young people, actualization of youth problems and construction of social practices of youth participation in social programming remain essentially outside the attention of researchers. The study of youth issues is still a topical issue that is broadcast in professional communities, on modern discussion platforms and in print publications, so programs aimed at young people and their integration into society are a serious analytical cross-section of youth policy study (Grigorieva, 1998; Antonov, 1995).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The issue of youth participation, dialogue and harmony, and building a new solidarity is currently becoming one of the most widely discussed issues (Tartsan, 2010; Shchenina, 2011). The need to understand the dynamics of socio-political processes in the sphere of youth support related to the reform of social policy in Russia and the change in the attitude of the state and society to the role of youth in social reproduction actualize the research of the official administrative discourse of social policy aimed at a youth audience, including the program dimension of youth policy. The most important agents of social change are young people, which transforms their role in the process of constructing youth policy towards becoming subjectivity (Gorshkov & Sheregi, 2010; Burtsev, 2007; Lukov, 2013). The topic of young people participation and their involvement in the processes of government becomes the subject of active discussion in the framework of public and business events.

Modernity is characterized by a high density of technological and social innovations that make the experience of the older generation useless for young people, and determines the priority for modern people issues of searching for new information, thinking and choosing, as well as constant self-education. Nowadays, people have to make decisions on their own, make choices from a huge variety of alternatives, live in a large flow of information, and learn to be resistant to influence: to distinguish the right from the wrong. A simple, average person becomes free, perhaps, as never before, but this does not make him/her happier. Each individual has to find ways to solve the problems independently, which arise, and be responsible for the results and mistakes, among other things (Berger & Lukman, 1995; Mikulski, 1978; Harrison & Huntington, 2002). One of the essential attributes of modern dynamism is the temporary nature of connections, groups, and communities. People enter into diverse, fragmentary, temporary relationships, and so is their group affiliation. A person prefers not to have strong and long-term attachments, and non-stop interactive contacts become predominant. The era forces us to talk about influence

and culture, teams and coalitions, not about structure, but about networks (Andreeva, 1998; Baranov et al., 2019; Vishnevsky & Shapko, 1995; Dubin, 1998; Feinburg, 1969). The only unifying motive for people in modern conditions is the desire for elusive subjectively interpreted happiness and the willingness to continue the path to the complete exhaustion of individual life forces, which exacerbates the problem of building a dialogue and communication (Narutto, 2019; Putilina et al., 2019; Cherdymova, 2017). It is generally accepted that the social policy of a social state should ensure movement towards achieving social justice in society, reducing social inequality, providing everyone with a job or other source of livelihood, preserving peace and harmony in society, and creating a favorable living environment for people. Given the characteristics of modern times, absolute security, that is, the guarantee of protection of social rights in any circumstances in real conditions is impossible (Kurbatova, 2004; Marcuse, 2002; Kosova, 1994; Kraeva & Voronin, 1995).

In this regard, an integrative understanding of social policy with an emphasis on two principles becomes relevant: prevention of social risks and activation of human resources. This emphasis is important to update when analyzing youth programs implemented in modern Russia.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND STRUCTURE

The study of youth policy construction practices in official administrative discourse with an emphasis on reflexive self-construction of agents of this process involves solving a number of research tasks: studying the context of youth policy programming; describing ways to actualize social problems of youth in the texts of informants as subject to the program format of their solution; identifying and describing constructs of youth participation practices in youth policy programming, including constructs of interaction between officials and recipients of the studied programs; study of ways to justify the social effectiveness of youth policy implementation presented in the texts of informants.

The solution of the above-mentioned tasks is accompanied by a number of difficulties: a rather narrow circle of direct participants in the process of developing social programs for young people; in fact, the lack of specialists in evaluation activities in Russia and, as a result, difficulties in determining effective mechanisms for youth participation in the development and implementation of social programs, contradictions and a number of inconsistencies in the content of these official texts; the inability to obtain information about the specifics of youth participation in mass surveys of respondents due to the specifics of the programming process as complex, requiring certain knowledge about the principles and methods of programming, as well as the difficulty in building a sample of direct participants in

the social process under study; the involvement of developers of youth policy programs in the processes of its implementation, which limits the possibility of using the expert survey method.

The survey was conducted on the developed units of questions. The course included sample questions that should have been discussed during the interview, but given the soft format of the semi-formal interview, priority was given to the natural course of the conversation. Respondents received guarantees of confidentiality: the materials were used in a generalized form. In addition, interviews were conducted. Each interview was recorded on a tape recorder, and then was transcribed. A set of such transcripts of personal semi-formalized interviews with developers of social programs for young people was then used for analysis and formulation of conclusions.

FEATURES OF PROGRAMS PERCEPTION IN YOUTH POLICY CONTEXT

Based on the analysis of social programs and surveys of young people, one can draw a number of conclusions about the specifics of constructing youth policy in the official, administrative discourse of the studied state programs. The role and discursive position of young people at the stages of ordering and developing social programs, according to the statements of young people (77%), is not defined. According to young people (89%), program developers do not assess the situation of young people in society from the position of actors (they do not perceive them as acting actors); moreover, they define this aspect as one of the main problems of state youth policy in General. The current social programs for young people support the socio-state model of youth policy, the priorities of which are significant influence on young people by state structures and the actual responsibility of the authorities for the processes of integration of new generations of young people or their individual groups into society.

From the point of view of young people, the construction of social practices of youth participation occurs with the designation of the role repertoire of young people and is reduced to the following roles: problem bearer (predominance of problem discourse) (89%); recipient of social benefits (89%); passive participant in events (resource-oriented attitude to the younger generation) (56%); social practice of youth participation is characterized as problematic (68%). By the young people opinion the mainstreaming of social problems of youth in the official administrative discourse can be realized in the following way: the legitimation of one of the problem factors as the main reason for the development and implementation of the program (86% of answers); approval of the need to solve software format, using common characteristics (complexity and duration of the funding), but without specifying the

specifics of this problem (56%); assessment of the effectiveness of the previous program, which solves the problem using absolute measures (89%). There are a number of ways for construction to justify the effectiveness of the programs: the formulation of targets and indicators are in strict accordance with the logic of a software format that allows us to select the indicators, reflecting the positive dynamics of the program implementation; the use in the formulations of the results of socially-approved processes (e.g., ensuring effective cooperation with youth associations), without defining the nature and indicators of the process development; the use of different in nature spaces as the program's audience in such topics as the purpose and results; use of quantitative indicators to justify qualitative changes; approval of the dependence of improving the effectiveness of youth policy implementation on increasing the values of quantitative indicators. According to young people, only individual youth communities are perceived as an actor of interaction (56%).

Some informants (29%) expressed doubts about the appropriateness of social programs study for young people due to the purpose of this document solely to justify the allocation of funds from the budget, that is, regulatory and financial approval of expenditures for the implementation of activities. At the same time, the differences between the targets set in the programs and the specifics of real activities in the field of youth policy implementation were emphasized. In this regard, we can say that this position of informants allows us to problematize the priority of the program approach in solving youth problems, as well as their effectiveness. Let us look directly at the results obtained during the survey. With regard to the context of youth policy programming, the texts of virtually all informants (89%) prioritize the normative context, which is reflected in their frequent reference to the goals and programs used, with references to their normative bases; in focusing on how things should be, rather than on the actual state of Affairs. Such attention to the normative context of the studied programs is expected, due to the specifics of the status of informants - representatives of authorities and management at different levels, the significance of the normative context for which is undeniable. We will also pay attention to the use of informants and a number of such constructions if in official language to say, which allow us to talk not only about the specifics of the language used, but also to consider it as the context of the programs under study. According to the interview, this language is formal when developing and evaluating programs, does not update the topic of partnership, and is aimed at a narrow group of recipients of these programs, who are, in fact, far from young people.

Features of the spatial and temporal context of the studied programs are shown through attention to events at the Federal and regional levels, as well as postulating

the need to build social policy in the region in accordance with the Federal distribution of priorities.

In other words, informants emphasize the importance of taking into account the context of the Federal level, along with the event-time context.

Another feature of the programming context of youth policy is that this policy is included as a component in broader programs whose titles are not approved for the youth audience. At the same time, the specificity of the youth group is still confirmed due to the allocation of special areas of activity in state programs, as well as through the participation of specialized bodies for youth Affairs in the development and implementation of these sections of programs.

Summarizing what has been said about ways to update youth problems as requiring a program format for their solution, we can highlight that three such methods have been identified, of which only one - the first in the list can be described as offering equal participation of young people with other actors in the process under study. Continuing to consider the practices of youth participation in the development of social programs, we can note a certain elitism that accompanies the selection of youth representatives for their access to the platform for the presentation of youth opinions. In youth Advisory structures, these are competitive procedures for selecting participants, and for public hearings, the complexity of analyzing the submitted information may become a barrier.

Practices of youth participation in youth policy programming are designed by informants with an emphasis on representatives of specific youth associations (89% of cases), primarily created by government and administrative bodies. In other words, practices of youth participation in programming for youth policy is essentially reduced to participation of its representatives, which are clearly identified in the operating activities of the programs where the main actor - the activities of a number of Advisory structures. Such features of youth participation practices in social programming correspond to the modern principles of the political system in Russian society, while updating the problems of mechanisms for selecting youth representatives to present, promote and defend their interests in the process we are studying, as well as informing them about the operation of such mechanisms. In addition to the above-mentioned, based on the results of the analysis of interviews' transcripts, we can say that the real actors in programming youth policy are representatives of youth associations that receive the floor at various forums and events, who have mastered the function of event developers. At the same time, the contexts of using the term developments suggest that we are talking primarily about training young people, their official representatives, in the field of social programming, rather than about their actual

participation in the development and implementation of program activities.

Informants while outlining a few aspects causing difficulties in the evaluation of efficiency programs under consideration; use of certain terms when describing the effectiveness of these programs: efficiency and effectiveness as economic and so social, etc.; how to evaluate the effectiveness of long-term financial cost of a possible social effect after the completion of the program; how to identify that changes have arisen as a result of social programs; how to combine the achievement of planned indicators and getting a positive assessment given by the youth themselves to the studied programs and their effectiveness.

Summing up the study conclusions, as the informants construct the effectiveness of the youth policy programs, we can allocate these programs' developers understanding of the imperfect nature of their efficiency indicators in the current practices, often the definition of this efficiency as reducible to a comparison of the planned and implemented financing programs.

CONCLUSIONS

The topic of changing the status of youth social programs and youth themselves in the process of social programming could be the subject of a special scientific study. We can talk about an integrated youth policy implemented and coordinated from a single center (for example, a separate Ministry), or a differentiated policy implemented by different actors who have their own target, program and technological attitudes for the younger generation.

Thus, modern young people find ways of self-realization in an environment with many unknowns, and they become the main agent of social changes taking place in society. This argument allows us to focus on the special relevance of the study of youth issues in the context of modern theories of social change.

In General, the analysis of the results revealed several ways to update the social problems of young people in the texts of the studied programs. We can mention the development and implementation of the initiative: the idea can be presented by an organization, but this does not mean that it will be the implementer after the program is approved. The construction of key social problems of young people in the official discourse at the regional level is quite a controversial process. The position of direct participants in the process as actors is problematic due to the existence of problems that are perceived by developers as significant, but are not actualized as a motive for implementing specific programs. The topics of studying the hidden meanings of youth policy programming become significant: for whom, for what purposes and tasks these texts are developed, which are claimed to be aimed at solving

youth problems; execution of orders of different levels of government. We are talking about a way to update the problem, when the impetus for the development of the program is not the most significant and relevant problem of youth at the moment, but the order of the Department, etc.; duplication of a social problem from the current program that ends its operation in order to continue funding (termination of the current program as a basis for developing a new one). According to the informants, the focus of programming practitioners' attention is on completing the program's validity period, rather than solving a particular youth problem. It is important to raise the question of youth repertoire role in the programming of youth policy, in its interaction with officials and recipients of the studied programs. Thus, the implementation of youth participation in this process is carried out through its active, affiliated representatives,

meaning by the latter, who have high positions, other high formal statuses in specific youth structures and not in youth organizations as a whole. Regarding the constructs of interaction between officials and recipients of programs, we note the focus of informants' attention on the weakness of the position of youth associations. State modernization, the search for new effective forms of organizing public life, and the testing of models for managing the economic and political sphere of the country give young people a special status and a special role in the process of reproduction of society. In this regard, an inadequate assessment of the place and role of modern youth in social processes, the use of ineffective approaches to the implementation of youth policy can lead to strategic mistakes that have long-term consequences.

REFERENCES

- Andreeva GM (1998) Social psychology. Textbook for higher education institutions. Moscow: ASPECT - PRESS.
- Andryushkov L (2007) Social youth policy program: contribution of the territorial community. Public education, 8: 47-52.
- Antonov MG (1995) Youth policy of the state, party and public organizations: PhD Thesis. Saint Petersburg.
- Baranov VV, Cherdymova EI, Novikov SB, Lukina EV, Kazurov OA, Korzhanova AA, Gurbanov RA (2019) Student attitude to ethical consumption as new ecological practice. Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews, 7(4): 1173-1179.
- Berger P, Lukman T (1995) Social construction of reality. The foundations of knowledge in everyday life. A treatise on the sociology of knowledge. Moscow: Medium.
- Burtsev VM (2007) State youth policy as a factor in the formation of civil society: PhD Thesis. Saint Petersburg.
- Cherdymova EI (2017) Possibilities of art therapy for the development of emotional intelligence of elderly people for the purpose of health saving. Bulletin of the Shadrinsk state pedagogical University, 2(34): 68-72.
- Dubin BV (1998) Groups, institutions and masses: cultural reproduction and cultural dynamics in Russia today. Economic and social changes: Monitoring of public opinion. Information Bulletin of All-Russian center for public opinion research, 4, 22-32.
- Feinburg ZI (1969) Value orientations of the individual in some social groups of the socialist society. Personality and its value orientations. Information Bulletin of the Institute of concrete social research of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 25(40): 59-99.
- Giddens E (2004) an elusive world. How globalization changes our lives. Moscow: the entire world.
- Gorshkov MK, Sheregi FE (2010) Youth of Russia: sociological portrait. Moscow: Center for social forecasting and marketing.
- Grigorieva IA (1998) Social policy and social reform in Russia in the 90's. St. Petersburg: Education and culture.
- Harrison L, Huntington S (2002) Culture matters. How values contribute to social progress. Moscow: Moscow school of political research.
- Kosova LB (1994) Approaches to the study of values and attitudes. Sociological research, 2: 114-118.
- Kraeva OL, Voronin GL (1995) Typology of value-normative orientations. Sociological journal, 3: 151-158.
- Kurbatova LN (2004) Education as a social quality of society. Perm: Volga state technological University.
- Lukov VA (2012) Theories of youth: Interdisciplinary study. Moscow: Kanon.
- Lukov VA (2013) State youth policy: Russian and world practice of implementing the innovative potential of new generations in society: scientific monograph. Moscow: Publishing house of Mosc. humanit. university.
- Marcuse G (2002) Eros and civilization. One-dimensional man: Study of ideology of developed industrial society. Moscow: AST.
- Mikulski KI (1978) Socio-economic policy in a socialist society. Moscow: Mysl.

- Narutto SV, Cherdymova EI, Sokolova ED, Savostyanova SA, Stolyarova AN, Vilskaya NV, Konovalova IA, Smirnova EA. 2019. First-Year Student Attitude to Social Networks. *International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology*, 8(2): 273-276.
- Omelchenko DA (2016) Youth and society: in search for new solidarity. *Sociological research*, 2: 161-163
- Putilina ES, Meleshko GS, Cherdymova EI, Kurbanov RA, Belyalova AM, Shatskaya II, Kobzeva EI, Zhuravleva MV (2019) Ecological relationships in real and virtual environments: contact points. *EurAsian Journal of BioSciences*, 13(2): 1475-1480
- Shchenina OG (2011) Political interaction between government and youth. Consent in society as a condition for the development of modern Russia (political and social aspects). Moscow: Institute of sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Smirnov VA (2014) Youth policy: experience in system description. *Sociological research*, 3: 72-80.
- Tartsan VN (2010) State youth policy in modern Russia. *Political research*, 3: 156-160.
- Vishnevsky YuR, Shapko VT (1995) *Sociology of youth: Studentbook*. Yekaterinburg: Publishing house of Nizhni-Tagil state pedagogical institute.

www.ejobios.org