EDUCATIONAL WORK WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF YOUTH POLICY: POST-INDUSTRIAL IMPERATIVES

[a]TAMARA YANCHENKO, [b]LARYSA REN, [c]LIUDMYLA ZAVATSKA, [d]OKSANA PLATONOVA, [e]OKSANA MYKHAILENKO

[a-e]*T. H. Shevchenko National University «Chernihiv Colehium», 53, Hetman Polubotka Str., 14013, Chernihiv, Ukraine*
email: [a]tamyanchenko@gmail.com, [b]lora200416@gmail.com, [c]lzavatska2016@gmail.com, [d]ogplatonova@ukr.net, [e]omikhailienko87@gmail.com

Abstract: The article deals with the issues of youth policy in the context of the upbringing and socialization of young people in a post-industrial society and in the digital landscape. The influence of socio-political processes in society on the values and social practices of young people, including in the context of networking and participation in protest movements, is considered. The application of the ecosystem approach for the formation of youth policy and educational practices that unite a wide range of participants and stakeholders is proposed.

Keywords: youth policy; social changes; networks; postindustrial society; digital landscape; partnership; ecosystem.

1 Introduction

Youth is the most important social resource of civil society. Throughout the history of social thought, attempts have been made to give a universal definition of youth and to substantiate the characteristics of its individual and social development. The theoretical understanding of youth as a social community at all times depended on a specific historical situation. Taking into account the logic of the theoretical study of youth problems in sociological theories, it can be determined that the formation of the sociology of youth as a separate branch of sociological knowledge took place in several stages.

The study of youth issues is carried out within the framework of general sociological approaches that consider youth as a period of personality formation: psychological, social and spiritual. Representatives of the psychoanalytic approach (Z. Freud, A. Freud, E. Erikson, K. Jung, A. Adler, etc.) explored individual psychophysical properties of youth as one of the most difficult stages in a person's life, filled with crises and upheavals. In turn, youth within the framework of this approach is defined as a social group that is the bearer of these properties and is experiencing a period of psychological development of the individual.

The representatives of cultural approach (A. Schutz, P. Berger, T. Lukman, A.R. Brown, B.K. Malinovsky, R. Benedict, F. Tenbrook, D. Downes, P. Willis, S. Cohen, A McRobbie, S. Fries, etc.) examined the process of mastering the dominant culture in society by young people, as well as the values and norms of the youth subculture, as a result of which the spiritual formation of the individual takes place.

Structural functionalists (T. Parsons, R. Merton, S. Eisenstadt, etc.) defined a youth group as a system of positions filled by individuals, which means for them the acquisition of a certain social status and the fulfillment of a certain social role, as a result of which the social formation of the individual takes place.

The ideas of structural functionalism formed the basis of special sociological theories; in turn, within the framework of the culturological approach, subcultural studies of youth developed. The combination of these areas formed a deviant approach in the sociology of youth (W. Reich, G. Marcuse, E. Fromm, T. Rozzak, C. Reich, and others). Within the framework of this approach, deviations in the process of socialization are considered (the deviations which lead to an increase in tension in the youth environment and open up a great opportunity for young people to deviant and delinquent manifestations, as a result of which deviant behavior becomes the only form of youth adaptation to social structures). Accordingly, youth age, within the framework of this approach, is a period, the nature of which

is determined by the destructive processes taking place in the youth environment.

Interest in youth as a social community in social and humanitarian knowledge and specifically in sociology begins to take shape in the era of industrialization. This process was facilitated by the increasing role of education in an industrial society. The scientific and technological revolution freed man from the constant struggle for survival. The resulting temporary vacuum –"backlash" - began to be filled with new patterns of behavior, primarily on the part of young people. Industrialized countries of mass consumption give young people a variety of forms of free time [11]. Thus, a new culture was born, the culture of youth, whose orientations to a greater extent affected artistic and aesthetic experiences and determined the specific perception of this social community.

Industrialization gave rise to many new social processes, which, in turn, focused attention on the problems of growing up a person and contributed to the identification of youth as a special period in the formation of a person. The 20th century was marked by youth uprisings, revolutions, riots, a variety of youth subcultures and movements, an increase in the role of youth in politics, science and culture.

The end of the 1950s - the beginning of the 1960s was the period when the youth finally emerged as an independent force with its own specific cultural and political interests. Since that time, the era of youth riots begins, among which one can note the following: 1950s - the appearance of 'beatniks' (the Beats) in the USA, the forerunners of hippies and punks; 1960s - active development of the hippie youth movement; 1968 - student riots in France; 1970s - the emergence of "red brigades" in Germany, consisting of young Marxists; the beginning of the 1970s - the emergence of yuppie and punk subcultures in the USA and Britain [17]. Thus, we can conclude that the era of industrial society is the period of the emergence of young people as a social community that has its own axiological system and its own role in the process of social reproduction, which was emphasized by the importance of vocational education for young people, since young people were considered as the main production force.

At the turn of the 90s of the 20th century, young people were faced with a number of new processes taking place in society, and sociologists begin to consider them in line with social changes, where the problems of value orientations of young people, their self-identification and the process of youth socialization play a decisive role. It should be noted that the value orientations of young people in the early 1990s were built around two trends: radical hedonism (the desire for pleasure and enjoyment as the highest goal of life) and violence [15]. The era of post-industrial society defines young people according to three main features: age characteristics, social status, and social and psychological qualities due to both.

It should be noted that the post-industrial society is an era of global change, where the main product and resource of production is information, and the leading role is given to highly professional specialists who own large amounts of information. The founder of the concept of a post-industrial society, D. Bell, in his works, noted that the main value of a post-industrial society is theoretical knowledge, which is a source of innovation and shapes the policy of this society [5]. Accordingly, the main criterion for the new class structure is professionalism. A new class of intellectuals (the "technical class") appears, which influences decision-making in all spheres of public life. Moreover, the main area of activity, the support of which should be a priority for each state claiming the status of a post-industrial society, is R&D (research and development) - a combination of science, technology, and economics. D. Bell also noted that namely culture will be the determining factor in the birth of a new post-industrial society, since a person existing in a new

information reality must have radically different value orientations in comparison with a person of the industrial era. While an industrial society the status was determined by the place in the economic structure, i.e., class affiliation, in the post-industrial society the status is formed by such characteristics as the level of education, culture, professionalism, etc.

The basis of production in an industrial society was natural resources, while a post-industrial society forms the value of an intellectual resource. The status of a post-industrial society determines the amount of information and theoretical knowledge that a given society possesses. Youth as a social community of post-industrial information reality should have a number of abilities [19]:

- Make critical decisions;
- Successfully master a large amount of information;
- To navigate in any situation as quickly as possible;
- Analyze, design and predict.

Thus, the conditions of a post-industrial society form the value of science as the main factor in the development of society and its self-preservation. Accordingly, youth as a social community of informational reality should be the main intellectual and innovative resource of a post-industrial society, which will ensure a high level of integration of young people into the field of science and high technology, and, therefore, the status of modern societies as post-industrial will be maintained [21].

Considering the nature of the formation of youth as a social community of postindustrial information reality, its main characteristics can be distinguished:

- Demographic (age limits of youth as one of the phases of the life cycle);
- Socio-historical (the idea of youth as a social community at a given stage in the development of society, taking into account the nature of the socio-economic system, as well as the class structure);
- Socio-psychological (psychophysical properties of youth, features of the psychological formation of the personality);
- Spiritual and cultural (features of the formation of the value orientations of young people, the nature of the lifestyle and cultural norms of the youth subculture and, as a result, the spiritual formation of the individual);
- Sociological (gaining a social status in society and the success of mastering new roles of an "adult");
- Conflictological (relations between the individual and society associated with the propensity of young people to deviant and delinquent behavior);
- Innovative (definition of youth as a carrier of the intellectual resource of society).

Thus, youth can be defined as a social community that includes a number of socio-psychological and spiritual and cultural characteristics. In the process of socialization, the psychological and spiritual formation of the personality takes place, as well as the development of the roles of the "adult", which results in the formation of social status in society. Youth is the bearer of intellectual potential, the implementation of which is determined by the characteristics of the stage of the historical development of society, the nature of the socio-economic system, the characteristics of the class structure, the mentality of the country, as well as various geopolitical changes, which is clearly seen in the example of the Arab Spring and the "color revolutions", where namely youth was the main driving force.

The post-industrial society is also called information, technotronic. In such a society, the economic component loses its decisive significance, and labor ceases to be the basis of social relations: post-materialistic values, in particular humanitarian ones, become dominant. These features have a huge impact on the forms of socialization of young people and the features of the inclusion of young people in adult life. The situation of the youth is even more complicated. First of all, the conditional socio-psychological boundaries of youth have expanded. On the one hand, the acceleration process significantly accelerated the physical and, in particular, puberty of adolescents, which is traditionally considered the lower limit of adolescence. On the other hand, the complication of labor and socio-political activities, in which a person must participate, caused a lengthening of the socially necessary period of preparation for life, in particular, the period of study, with which a certain incompleteness of social status is associated. Modern youth study longer at school and university and, accordingly, start an independent working life later.

The criteria for social maturity have also become more complex. The beginning of an independent working life, the completion of education and the acquisition of a stable profession, the acquisition of political and civil rights, material independence from parents, marriage and the birth of the first child - all these events, in their totality giving a person a sense of full adulthood and an appropriate social status, do not occur simultaneously. In addition, it is very significant that both the sequence itself and the symbolic meaning of each of them are not the same in different social strata. No less important than expanding the boundaries of youth as a social group is the complication of the very process of socialization. The formation of the personality of a young person today is carried out under the influence of several relatively autonomous social factors, the most important of which are: family, school, peer society, special youth organizations, mostly directed by adults, diverse youth informal, spontaneous groups and communities, mass media. Under these conditions, the importance of youth policy and educational work with young people especially increases. At the same time, a systematic rethinking of the basic principles and vectors of this work is necessary, in accordance with the changed (both globally and at the level of regions and countries) social conditions.

2 Materials and Method

The methodological basis of the study is philosophical, socio-pedagogical ideas about the social determination of the development of a person as a person; the role of active human activity in his personal self-development; socio-pedagogical approach to the study of social reality; the concept of a holistic world socio-pedagogical process and the originality of its manifestation in countries and regions; principles of a civilizational approach to the world historical and pedagogical process. Theoretical and methodological prerequisites for the study were the views and scientific provisions about a person as an object and subject of social development and self-development, research in the field of the theory of social education.

3 Results and Discussion

Throughout the 20th century, young people have been fighting the policy of militant paternalism, since this policy puts young people in the position of an object of influence, and not a subject of historical reality, and does not provide an opportunity for the development and self-realization of young people. The history of the countries of Europe and America in the 20th century clearly proved that social systems are obliged to create special mechanisms for overcoming barriers and barriers to the effective development of a young person, especially since it is young people who have the potential for the future, which they accumulate and develop in adolescence and youth. History shows that reforms can be successful only with the active participation of young people [1].

Starting from the 70s of the 20th century, developed Western countries begin a fairly rapid transition to a new state, which is called by experts "post-industrial society", "information society". As a result, Western society itself is undergoing dramatic changes that affect all spheres of life, including the interaction of society with young people. However, young people themselves are looking for their place in life and society. This is explained by the fact that young people in the modern world are experiencing a situation of a "double" identity crisis, which reflects both changes in society as a whole and the specifics of this age. Due to the special susceptibility and high social mobility of young people, the emergence of new value

orientations and the devaluation of the old ones affected this transitional social group to a greater extent than other strata of society. At the same time, the old traditional institutions of society, which helped young people to go through a period of socialization, are largely losing their significance. Old class divisions, differences between regions, religions, estates, ethnic minorities in the modern world have largely lost their significance. But the modern family, having undergone transformation, has largely lost its significance in the process of socialization. It should also be noted that the time of communication between parents and adolescents is very limited.

Young people in the modern world find themselves in a social vacuum. They desperately need support, communication, a circle of people where they can feel "their own". Young people face many problems that they are not able to solve, relying on their individual experience, or on the life experience of adults. They need a peer group that faces the same problems. This can explain the group nature of behavior, values, and interests inherent in young people, noted by all researchers. The peer group serves as a bridge to the adult world. For a while, it gives young people a sense of security and freedom in their circle. Independence and freedom are features of the adult subculture, and the social protection and emotional attachment that a young person still needs as an incomplete adult come from childhood and the parental family.

They choose for themselves not only an example to follow, but also a new element of social control. In the role of judges of those actions and actions that young people perform, their peers act. This is a completely new situation, which has a fundamentally important moment for the socialization of young people. A teenager learns to look at himself through the eyes of other people who, firstly, are not relatives, and secondly, are not older. All this led to the emergence of the phenomenon of youth subcultures.

Researchers note that the most important complex reason for the fundamentally new position of young people in society was the acceleration of the historical process [22]. Today's youth cannot take advantage of the life experience of a generation of adults, accumulated by them in their youth. The youth of children and fathers takes place in different societies, requires different talents, skills and qualifications, approaches to achieving social status and fulfilling social roles. Therefore, parents cannot pass on much of their life experience to their growing children. Although by inertia they continue to fulfill their function of a socializer: they teach, forbid, control. The traditional roles that today's youth have learned in the family are of little use for achieving success in the changed realities of life. Therefore, a well-thought-out system of educational work, within the framework of a competent youth policy, taking into account the realities of our time, is critically important.

It should be noted that socialization is the process of integrating an individual into society, into various types of social communities (group, social institution, social organization) through the assimilation of elements of culture, social norms and values, on the basis of which socially significant personality traits are formed. In socialization, two phases are distinguished - social adaptation and internalization. Social adaptation means the adaptation of an individual to socio-economic conditions, to role functions, social norms, to the environment of his life [14]. Internalization is the process of incorporating social norms and values into the inner world of a person. From this point of view, socialization can be represented as a process of assimilation by an individual of social norms and values, due to which this individual becomes an active social subject [10]. In other words, this process is quite complex: it includes both the assimilation of social experience and the actual use of this experience, carried out through various forms of relationships between the individual and his environment, as a result of which a person is formed as an individual. Thus, at any historical stage and under any political regime, socialization acts primarily as a process of interiorization (personal assimilation) of the system of social values that prevails in society. Values are objectively related to

social needs. However, unlike needs, values are incentives for human activity itself, giving it such features as freedom and subjectively given meaning. The value system is the semantic core of any culture (subculture). Without taking into account these semantic aspects, it is impossible to form an effective youth policy, to determine its value parameters and ideological guidelines.

Socialization is carried out both in the course of a targeted impact on a person in the education system, and under the influence of a wide range of other influencing factors (family and extra-family communication, art, media, etc.) Absolutization of any one of these components creates a distorted idea of the formation personality. This mistake is made by many researchers who are trying to trace the formation of the human personality through the prism of any one component. This is how one-sided ideas about personality arise and illusions are created, which can often be found in modern literature. Therefore, when talking about personal development, we should talk about a holistic consideration of all these aspects.

It follows from this that educational work should not be reduced only to the mechanical "imposition on young people" of ready-made social "forms", to simple interaction or only to the sum of external influences of the macro- and microenvironment. This is a process of holistic formation, education and development of youth as a special social group based on the range of specific social relations in which it is included with the help of all types of its socially significant life activity. Young people are not only and not so much an object of influence on the part of society and its social institutions, they are an active subject of social life. The final "result" of socialization largely depends on her consciousness and self-consciousness, her own social activity - a young person as a phenomenon must "take place" [7].

On the other hand, we must not forget that the socialization of young people is carried out under the general influence of social (primarily youth) economic, cultural, educational and demographic processes taking place in society. Reality, being a very contradictory and multidimensional process, causes various forms of socialization, explicit or hidden, positive or negative, intense or sluggish, controlled or spontaneous. In society, there always remains an area of social elements, the scale of which is expanding in conditions of instability and reforms. The elements affect the processes of socialization, making its results unpredictable.

The internal differentiation of young people is determined not only by social parameters. Researchers, in addition to stratification, distinguish such types of differentiation as age and subcultural: adolescents - up to 18 years old, young people - 18-24 years old, "young adults" - 25-29 years old. Each of these time periods sets certain tasks for the young man. There is a close relationship between age and social capabilities of a person [19]. Differentiating factors are increasing in youth culture. Researchers, by interviewing various representatives of young people, found that many young people aged 24 and over sharply oppose themselves to adolescents, identifying them with youth, and themselves with adults [8]. This means, first of all, that there is an increasing need to study the specifics of group relations, the characteristics of the formation of needs and goals, the role and place of various strata of youth in the new society.

Changes in economic and political relations, which shook the entire system of social expectations on a global scale, gave rise to a state of uncertainty in society, sometimes confusion and frustration with all its consequences - depression, passivity, aggressiveness, etc. During the period of transition to a different model of society, it is especially difficult for adolescents and young people. This is due to the fact that the ideas of minors about morality, law, for a number of reasons, including young age, are in an immature, unstable state and have not yet become conscious, especially automatic, regulators of their behavior.

Education is based on active assistance for young people in choosing healthy life orientations through the formation of the foundations of worldview security in the context of globalization

and a behavioral approach, the essence of which is the recognition that actual needs encourage a person to take certain actions. In particular, in colleges and universities, this implies assisting the student in understanding his capabilities, developing creative abilities through the use of managerial methods. One of the principles of work is the principle of "peer to peer", which allows forming a system of student self-government and socializing youth [4]. The development of various forms of student self-government is one of the priority tasks of building a system of educational work at the university.

The practical goal of education comes down to the formation of a personality capable of responding adequately, quickly adapting to changing conditions, making managerial decisions, possessing civic activity, purposefulness and enterprise. Education is a purposeful process of shaping the personality of the pupil through the acquisition of the following qualities and properties: leadership qualities, morality, charisma, the ability to set high goals for oneself and achieve maximum life results.

The technology of education involves both a direct impact on the personality of a student in order to achieve the goals, and an indirect impact on the educational environment, in order to create optimal conditions for the development of personality traits and qualities. By organizing the external environment, holding actions, events, we stimulate the interest and need of a young person for involvement and participation in events, a need for knowledge, introspection arises.

At the same time, in the conditions of intensive development of digitalization, when new areas for self-realization of young people are being created, including the digital educational environment, there is a need to build an effective system of conditions for the harmonious balance of the process of self-realization not only in the real, but also in the virtual (digital) environment [22]. Diffusion of the line between real and digital space is becoming more and more obvious. Whether this is good or bad is hard to say. However, it can be noted with confidence that in such a situation it is important that the system of social values formed in the real environment be identical to the system of social values taken into account when self-realization in a virtual (digital) environment. To do this, digital educational activities should be built as a kind of meta-activity based on five main tasks [12].

The first task is to form in a young person a respectful attitude to the rule of law, as well as to social and constitutional values, which, as a rule, are the basis for the sustainable development of society and the state.

The second task is to develop knowledge about the hierarchy of constitutional values, social solidarity and social responsibility.

The third task is the development of skills and abilities in the formation of self-realization strategies focused on such universal social values as humanism, conscientiousness and diligence.

The fourth task is to support the value-semantic aspiration of the individual, identified with a certain culture and history of the state.

The fifth task is to increase the competitiveness of young specialists in the professional environment.

As scientists rightly point out, an effective youth policy cannot be implemented exclusively by the state. There are risks of its bureaucratization and formalization. The role of public structures and institutions is extremely great, and it is not by chance that back in 1999, the outstanding researcher of youth problems, I. M. Ilyinsky, formulated the idea of a public youth policy. It is based on possible ways of developing civil society and is "a system of ideas, views on youth and its role in social development, as well as practical actions of various civil society structures aimed at putting these ideas and views into practice in order to achieve social perspectives, approved by the majority of the people" (Ilyinsky as cited in Brake, 2013 [7]).

In the system of values of the youth environment, information values occupy one of the highest priority places. In an implicit form, information values and needs have in fact always been paramount for all strata of society, since, generally speaking, the degree of awareness of a person is directly related not only to his spiritual, but also to material and economic capabilities. In modern society, and especially in the developed countries of the world, the role of information values is increasing sharply every year, and the reason for this is both the avalanche-like development of technical means of communication and the equally powerful penetration of the capabilities of these means into the minds of young people. At the same time, in view of the fact that young people are the most socially active segment of the population, it is in the youth society that information needs of various types acquire the greatest strength. The impact of information resources, especially social networks, on young people is very high, which is especially evident in the example of the Arab Spring and the color revolutions. The youth is the main driving force of events and at the same time the victim [3]. As a rule, the group that has seized power does not satisfy its expectations, solving specific personal problems. First of all, young people are at the forefront of the "color revolutions" because of the peculiarities of group dynamics. Firstly, young people tend to support social transformations due to their age and dissatisfaction with the status quo. Any change in society requires, as D. Porritt notes, a huge army of "youth, non-governmental organizations, leaders of the business community, entrepreneurs and scientists who want to change things" [18]. Secondly, young people are closely connected with the Internet and social networks, and therefore are better organized than the older generation. Thirdly, due to age pecifics, youth is not always included in the system of stable social ties, and therefore is prone to rebellion, a clear manifestation of her protest position against established social orders on the "street". Young people not only "wait for changes", but also have opportunities (including physical and social ones) to bring them closer by their own actions. Fourthly, youth protest is sometimes inclined to take the most radical, forceful forms, including confrontation with law enforcement agencies, blocking important city highways, etc. This circumstance makes young people united in groups an important destructive force in state building. Summing up the results of the Arab Spring, it can be noted that many participants in those events became disillusioned with the "Arab revolution" and left politics [13, 16]. Despite the growing number of civil society organizations, the number of young people who are actually active in these organizations remains limited. The younger generation does not feel understood by the new or former political elites. The revolution did not resolve, but stirred up new tensions and divisions within youth movements, between secular and religious strata, between radicals and conservatives, between the various interests of urban and rural young people.

Protest participants are attracted to groups using the Internet, social networks, and networks also serve as a means of maintaining communication between participants. This is how activists are kept in constant readiness for actions, their actions are coordinated online. The terrorist organization ISIS uses the same methods of online youth recruitment.

Thus, it is obvious that educational work with young people in isolation from the digital environment will not bring any positive results. A break from youth trends, modern and convenient ways of interaction for young people, the loss of relevant channels of communication and interaction can quickly lead to dysfunction of the institutions of educational work. It is especially important for the subjects of youth education to develop methods and forms of work in parallel with the dynamics of the digitalization process.

For the effective functioning of the institutions of education of modern youth, coordination and interaction of the subjects of this process, the creation of a single educational and pedagogical space, an ecosystem, is necessary. A successful place to create this space, even on a global scale, can be the Internet and its digital tools and interaction technologies. Provided that social

interaction is actively included in the process of digital transformation, the rapid development of innovative methods and tools of work, the majority of youth education subjects will be able to retain the youth audience and develop this important social work in the present and in the future.

Speaking about the education of young people within the framework of youth policy, one should pay attention to the concept of "learning ecosystems". These ecosystems involve "many people and pieces of content with different roles and different learning contexts, as well as complex relationships between them" [20]. They are seen as personalized online learning programs that make learning fun, effective and efficient, adapt to the needs, strengths and weaknesses of the individual, offering the right material at the right time and focusing on the areas that need to be worked on the most; they are justified as "a synthesis of organizations (having their own learning ecosystems) and individual learning ecosystems" [2]. As part of their study "Educational Ecosystems: Emerging Practice for the Future of Education", P. Luksha, D. Spencer-Kase and D. Kubista identify three basic characteristics of educational ecosystems: versatility, co-creation, purposefulness; they believe that "...the difference between partnerships built on the ecosystem model and traditional industrial ones is that the center of the entire system should be not an educational organization, but a student, and each participant in the ecosystem has own interest in ensuring that the student comes to the maximum relevant and demanded learning outcomes" (Luksha et al. as cited in Akiva & Robinson, 2022 [2]). Based on the analysis of more than 40 educational ecosystems representing the experience of different countries, the authors demonstrate how the classical education system is being transformed and what to expect from the education of the future. They define the learning ecosystem as "a network of participants who consciously establish interdependent, dynamic and evolving relationships that create conditions for the emergence of new and diverse learning opportunities throughout life". According to the authors, the goal of this ecosystem is to provide all participants with a learning experience applicable throughout life. This approach is quite applicable to the education of young people, especially in the digital environment. Given the diversity of meanings, the key to research is not the term "ecosystem" itself, but a set of properties that this or that association must have in order to promote innovation and correspond to the characteristics of an ecosystem.

"Movement towards ecosystem" allows moving from hierarchical systems based on coercion and violence to networked models of collaborative voluntary learning and development. Such models are built on the principles of openness, trusting relationships within the framework of cooperation, the development of horizontal non-hierarchical structures, "soft ties" that are formed in the absence of institutionalized relationships, as well as strategies for coordination, promotion, assistance, and the probabilistic-statistical nature of the result. A distinctive feature of the projected educational ecosystem is the educational environment, the digital capabilities of which provide the network nature of the interactions of the subjects of education with the "object world" [20].

This approach is also consistent with the principles of the UN regarding youth policy. It should be noted that, according to the UN, the most general principles of global youth policy are as follows: participation of young people in the formation and implementation of activities that affect their direct interests and rights; the transition from centralized programs for all youth to local projects, the rejection of long-term programs in favor of short-term ones, with the dominance of local (municipal) authorities and other structures that better feel the problems of young people in a particular territory; a differentiated approach to various groups of young people while maintaining uniform social guarantees for young people of all social categories; support for non-state youth groups.

If we talk about the national level, then, obviously, the directions of youth policy on it are formed on the basis of the goals and objectives that a particular state sets for itself in its implementation. So, for example, in Germany, the priority areas of youth policy within the framework of national action programs are the following: caring for children and adolescents, involving young people in decision-making processes, developing skills in using the media, integrating socially disadvantaged youth into society, developing the principles of democracy and tolerance among the youth, cultural and moral education of youth and so on.

The multidirectional nature of youth policy leads to the involvement of various state and public institutions in the process of its implementation. At the same time, much depends on what model of youth policy is implemented by a particular state. In some cases (as in the USA, Great Britain and a number of other states), the state assumes only the functions of developing the main directions of youth policy, transferring its implementation to the local level, or to public organizations. In other cases, the state assumes most of the functions not only for the development, but also for the implementation of youth policy, with the involvement of a private resource (European states). Of course, in the modern world there are also states that pursue an exclusively state youth policy. An example here is China. Thus, "China's youth policy is entirely in the hands of the ruling party. Its main attention is paid to such issues as raising political, social, as well as economic consciousness, in accordance with the party ideology" [9].

Summarizing, we can talk about three main participants in the implementation of youth policy in the post-industrial society: state authorities, local authorities, and NGOs. From the point of view of European experts, the participation of NGOs in youth policy can be not only practical, but corrective in nature. As L. Siulara notes, the role of NGOs is to provide an "independent and critical voice" in youth policy (Siulara as cited in Anestal, 2017 [4]). In addition to non-governmental organizations that participate in the implementation of youth policy activities, one should also note such a European phenomenon of recent years as the emergence of youth non-governmental organizations (YOUNGO)). In particular, such organizations are actively involved in the activities of the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Undoubtedly, the creation of such organizations is an effective way to involve young people in solving, among other things, the global problems of our time. At the same time, youth NGOs are, as a rule, non-political in nature.

Thus, we can say that youth policy in the modern world is a multidimensional and multifaceted phenomenon. The multiplicity of approaches to it only further emphasizes its complexity. However, youth policy has become an integral part of public policy in all developed (and developing) countries. Since youth work has its own specificities in different countries, very few trends can be observed today on an international scale. It can be argued with increasing confidence that the methods and types of work with youth should be adjusted taking into account the changes that are taking place today in the field of other services and in the lifestyle of modern people, including the emergence of new types of education and leisure. The former methods and formats of such work no longer fully meet the new requirements of our time and must be adapted to the changed reality, including through the introduction of informal approaches to working with youth and the digitalization of this area.

Literature:

1. Abramuszkinova, E., & Smidova, M. (2017). The Values and Attitudes of Young People. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis, 65*(6), 1823-1832.
2. Akiva, T., & Robinson, K. (2022). *It Takes an Ecosystem: Understanding the People, Places, and Possibilities of Learning and Development Across Settings*. Information Age Publishing.

3.   Anderson, C. (2013). Youth, the "Arab Spring," and Social Movements. *Review of Middle East Studies, 47*(2), 150-156.

4.   Anestal, G. (2017). *Youth policy development*. Lulu.

5.   Bell, D. (1976). *The coming of post-industrial society: A venture of social forecasting*. Basic Books.

6.   Blakely, G. (2017). *Youth policy*. Routledge.

7.   Brake, M. (2013). *The Sociology of Youth Culture and Youth Subcultures (Routledge Revivals): Sex and Drugs and Rock 'n' Roll?* Routledge.

8.   Bynner, J., & Heinz, W. (2021). *Youth Prospects in the Digital Society: Identities and Inequalities in an Unravelling Europe*. Policy Press.

9.   Earl, J., Maher, T., & Elliott, T. (2017). Youth, activism, and social movements. *Sociology Complex, 11,* e12465.

10. George, I., & Uyanga, U. (2014). Youth and Moral Values in a Changing Society. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 19*(6), 40-44.

11. Hahn-Bleibtreu, M., & Molgat, M. (2012). *Youth Policy in a Changing World: From Theory to Practice.* Barbara Budrich Publishers.

12. Halpem, R. (2013). *Youth, Education, and the Role of Society: Rethinking Learning in the High School Years*. Harvard Education Press.

13. Harris, M. (2015). *Jordan's youth after the Arab Spring*. Lowy Institute for International Policy.

14. Norasakkunkit, V., Uchida, Y., & Toivonen, T. (2012). Caught Between Culture, Society, and Globalization: Youth Marginalization in Post-industrial Japan. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 6*(5), 361-378.

15. Novikova, T., & Fomchenkova, G. (2020). Life Values of Modern Youth: To the Issue of Institutionalization of Education. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 527. Proceedings of the VIII International Scientific and Practical Conference 'Current problems of social and labour relations' (ISPC-CPSLR 2020), pp. 496-500.

16. Ozgul, B. (2020). *Leading Protests in the Digital Age: Youth Activism in Egypt and Syria*. Palgrave Macmillan.

17. Pickard, S. (2019). P*olitics, Protest and Young People*. Springer.

18. Porritt, J. (2013). *The World We Mad*e. London: Phaidon.

19. Santos, V., Yonejura, T., Soares, C., Campos, C. (2012). Social values: in the words of the youth. *Acta Paul Enferm., 25*(2), 263-269.

20. Schipperheijn, K. (2022). Learning Ecosystems: Creating Innovative, Lean and Tech-driven Learning Strategies. Kogan Page.

21. Third, A., Collin, P., Walsh, L., Black, R. (2019). *Young People in Digital Society: Control Shift*. Palgrave Macmillan.

22. Tilleczek, K., & Campbell, V. (2019). *Youth in the Digital Age: Paradox, Promise, Predicament.* Routledge.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AM, AO