

digital intelligence and its components is a necessity for each individual, and the general formula of a modern successful personality is a harmonious combination of cognitive, emotional and digital intelligences.

Keywords: digital personality intelligence, digital memory, digital empathy, digital footprint, digital competencies, digitalization of education.

Материал был представлен и отправлен на рецензию: 15.03.2021

Принято к публикации: 30.03.2021

Рецензент: канд. пед. наук, доцент Самвел Асатрян

The material was submitted and sent to review: 15.03.2021

Was accepted for publication: 30.03.2021

Reviewer: Assoc. Prof., PhD. Samvel Asatryan

37.017.4(470+571)

CIVIC EDUCATION OF YOUTH IN THE CONDITIONS OF THE EURASIAN INTEGRATION OF RUSSIAN SOCIETY

Aleksanyan Ashot

Yerevan State University, Armenia

Nemanikhina Valentina

*National Research University "Belgorod State University",
Russian Federation*

The modern pedagogical process is designed to ensure the formation of diversified, morally and socially responsible citizens who can make decisions in a situation of choice, predicting possible consequences, ready for democratic cooperation and intercultural interaction, capable of participating in the development of the economic, political and cultural spheres of Russian society. At the present stage of the Eurasian integration processes and political transformation of Russia, the problem of the formation of civic culture and civic education play *a civiliarchic role*. The transition of Russian society from one political regime to another and the change in values are a factor in changing the attitude of society towards citizenship. Citizenship has always played an important role in the political consciousness of Russia, and in the context of the modern transformation of society, this fact cannot be underestimated. The civilizational character of Russian federalism and the civic dimension of nationality are specific, and one of the features of this character is citizenship.

Keywords: Citizenship, civic education, civiliarchic values, youth, political socialization, Russia, Eurasian integration.

The relevance of the topic of this article is associated with the growth of political activity of citizens seeking to influence the modern integration processes in Russia. Currently, there is a noticeable increase in the influence of young people on the political institutions of Russian society, on the formation of political parties and, ultimately, on the process of making and implementing political decisions. Revealing the reasons, forms and mechanisms for the inclusion of young people in the modern political process actualizes the topic of this article. Political practice demonstrates that in a globalized world, countries that can effectively develop the innovative potential of youth will have strategic and political advantages. The definition of the vectors of youth policy aimed at the development, improvement and implementation of the creative potential of modern youth in political life makes the topic of the article relevant. In modern Russia, there is an increase in opportunities for the realization of young people, both in political and other spheres of public life, which can act as a guarantee of the development of dialogue and partnership between youth and political power, a condition for the stability and sustainable development of CSOs and the state. In this regard, it becomes relevant to study issues related to understanding the

role of youth in the modern political process, studying the forms and content of its political activity, mechanisms for implementing state youth policy and optimizing the activities of institutions for the political participation of youth in the Russian political process.

Despite the wide range of problems being developed, in modern Russian political pedagogy and sociology, insufficient attention is paid to the study of the peculiarities of the civic consciousness of Russian youth and students at the present stage of Eurasian integration. In particular, the forms of legitimate and illegitimate protest civic activity of students, the peculiarities of civic consciousness of students studying in universities in Russian regions and megacities have not been sufficiently studied. The principles of modern youth policy aimed at developing the civic culture of Russian students and measuring citizenship have not been sufficiently developed. Within the framework of this article, a wide range of models for the formation and education of citizenship was analyzed, with an emphasis on the Russian model of the formation of youth citizenship. As for the scientific elaboration of this problem of comparative research, it is important to note that the younger generation, the social integration of youth, the reproduction of society, as well as the transformation of Russian societies occupy a sufficient place in the works of the classics of political sociology, as well as in the works of Western and Russian researchers of our time. Features of social reproduction of Russian society are reflected in political pedagogy, a systematic approach, in theories of social transformation of Russian society. Special attention should be paid to theories that study the issues of social development of the young generation, its social integration. In this regard, sociological theories are of interest: socialization, youth subcultures, destandardized transit of young people and their social integration in a society at risk, everyday practices of Russian youth, the peculiarities of the transit of urban, rural, regional and provincial youth and their NGOs. A significant place in the research of political pedagogy is occupied by theories focused on the study of the system of higher education of students. These are theories of social and professional mobility, educational strategies, changes in the life paths of students in the context of Russian modernization. In this article, an important place is occupied by theories of the development of youth citizenship, theories of citizenship and civic culture, as well as comparative studies of sociologists and political scientists based on the study of the characteristics of citizenship, civic culture of youth.

The prerequisites for the formation of federal and regional CSOs in Russia, at the stage of Eurasian integration and political transformation, the value orientations of Russians, including young people, were considered by O.V. Gaman-Golutvina, G.Ya. Grevtseva, N.V. Ippolitova, A.V. Lubsky and others [18;19;20;21;24]. In this context, the political and civic activity of social groups of the population and the specific forms of this democratic participation were considered in studies of the motives for involving youth NGOs in politics.

The subject of this article is Russian youth and students in the context of the Eurasian integration of Russian society. It is obvious that civic attitudes, the peculiarities of civic culture and the forms of implementation of the civic engagement of young people and students of Russian unions, the influence of public youth policy on the formation of Russian citizenship.

The purpose of the study of this article is to analyze the factors and conditions that influence the formation of citizenship of Russian youth and students in modern Russian society. Taking into account the fact that the identification of mechanisms for the development of legitimate and illegitimate protest civic activity vertically and horizontally affects youth NGOs and student unions. Despite the existence of a new Russia and the emergence of a new generation during the period of independent statehood, modern youth demonstrates a low level of citizenship, which is explained by the transit system of civic education, which does not yet meet the modern needs of competitiveness and does not contribute to the development of innovative thinking, as well as the disinterest of state institutions in the development of young people active civic identity.

The scientific novelty of this article is as follows: 1) the differences in the cultural and value dimensions of civic education of regional and federal youth are argued; 2) developed a civiliarchic dimension of the civic engagement of young people in modern Russia; 3) developed non-

civiliarchic disobedience of youth NGOs in modern Russia, analyzed the factors contributing to the circulation of conflict civil discourse among youth and students; 4) analyzed civiliarchic directions of transformation of civic education of Russian youth: from the ways proposed by public authorities to innovative social networks focused on protecting social rights and freedoms; 5) explained the low efficiency of public youth policy in the field of civic education and the development of civic patriotism of Russian youth; 6) the key democratic competencies of citizenship were studied, since so far the Russian system of civic education and youth non-governmental organizations cannot provide an agenda for the formation of citizenship among young people.

This article allows you to analyze the social processes of changing the citizenship of Russian youth to new forms of its implementation. In addition, the result of this study is a comparative analysis of youth policy in the development of youth citizenship and conceptualization of it as a factor determining the formation of both legitimate and illegitimate protest civic activity of young people and their NGOs. Also, as a result of the study, the development of citizenship and civic engagement of youth in political parties and CSOs, and students in universities was developed. The article shows how the transformations of Russian statehood and civil society lead to the formation of a civil state, which, as a consequence, should lead to a decrease in the level of resistance of youth NGOs. The research problem lies in the existence of a contradiction: on the one hand, public youth policy shows the need to increase the citizenship of young people, but at the same time the means and content of this policy indicate the restraint of public institutions to have young people and students with high civic engagement. On the other hand, in modern scientific discourse, citizenship, following the changes of modern society, becomes more and more multifaceted and complex. Not getting the opportunity to actively participate and influence either the life of political parties, civil society and their university, or what is happening in the country, Russian youth and students do not know enough forms of expression of another type of citizenship, actively used by them in EU member states and the USA.

Strengthening European and Eurasian integration processes in the modern world activates the tasks of civic education of Russian youth in a new civilization based on the priorities of the values of human morality and culture. The critical situation in which the younger generation finds itself requires turning to a certain system of values associated with the best national traditions, the common human tradition of humanism as a global worldview that determines a person's attitude to the world around him and other people. The solution to many pressing problems of modern Russian society depends on the level of citizenship of the younger generation, therefore, the civic development of the individual is the most important component of the educational process. At the same time, a number of topical issues related to the formation of youth citizenship, as well as the conceptual foundations of the system for the formation of citizenship, the content and readiness of youth for professional and personal interaction with civil society organizations (CSOs), remain unexplored in political pedagogy [1,17-20; 3].

In modern Russia, students are the part of young people who are the most institutionally united, characterized by certain social behavior and psychology, and a system of value orientations. However, in recent decades, higher education is increasingly viewed in Russia not as an elite social 'lift', but as a mass form of life for school graduates, upon completion of which a diploma will provide them with a job. Students still retain the features of a separate social and demographic group, but, as they become a mass social group, they lose the characteristics of civilism and elitism. Russia, according to the political discourse of public authorities, is on the path of innovative development, digitalization and modernization, which requires consolidation from CSOs, and from each individual person to fulfill his duty as a citizen and patriot. The definition of a "good citizen", and with it the content of the concept of citizenship, depends on the political system and on the role that the government offers to its citizens. Young people and students, due to their special importance in the reproduction of society, are expected to behave actively and responsibly. However, youth policy at the country and university level is still limited

both in form and in content by military and patriotic education. Speaking about citizenship, the government regularly replaces it with the concept of "patriotism", thereby preventing the development of either civic consciousness or civic activity [7,106-109;9;13,45-49].

In political pedagogy, the issue of citizenship is experiencing a new wave of interest: post-modern civil society is characterized by globalization, multiethnicity and multiculturalism, the rapidly growing role of technology and information, consumerism, such a more complex society also presupposes a more complex, comprehensive understanding of citizenship. In Russia, on the one hand, by recognizing the transit of modern CSOs, the public authorities are transmitting the values of innovation, openness and civic responsibility. On the other hand, youth policy, including in the issue of civic education, not only does not contribute to the development of civil, political and social rights, but also does not develop new types of citizenship (*media citizenship, social citizenship, environmental citizenship, ecological citizenship, digital citizenship*). With the constant declaration of the need to increase the level of civic education, in fact, at the level of public youth policy and at the level of universities, we are talking only about military and patriotic education [14]. It is worth recognizing that federal public institutions and local government bodies are conducting parallel efforts to increase civic engagement and civic consciousness. A comparative analysis of civic educational practice in the formal and informal environment shows that the process of shaping youth citizenship is not purposefully carried out. As a result, a number of contradictions have developed between:

- the need of CSOs for political active youth, ready for civic self-determination on the basis of civic position and civic competence, and the unwillingness of the educational process at universities to provide this social demand;
- the demand for this integral quality among young people and the shortcomings of theoretical and practical tools for its formation in the *civiliarchic* educational process of universities and CSOs.

The indicated contradictions determined the essence of the research problem for this article: what are the political pedagogical conditions for the formation of citizenship among young people in universities according to its structural, substantive and integral characteristics? The main task of civic education is to contribute to the effective political socialization of youth through communication to such *civiliarchic values*, which are a priority at this stage of modernization of public administration and local government in Russia. The purpose of this article is to analyze the processes of Eurasian integration associated with the participation of young people in determining the strategy and tactics of building the Russian state, using comparative analysis and the method of content analysis of official documents.

The civilized priority of civic education is defined in regulatory and legal documents in the field of political socialization (*Federal Law "on Education in the Russian Federation", The RF Government Programme "Development of Education for 2013-2020", National Doctrine of Education in the Russian Federation until 2025, State program "Patriotic education of citizens of the Russian Federation for 2016-2020"* etc.). A comparative analysis of these documents allows us to conclude that one of the main goals of political socialization is the education of literate citizens of a legal, democratic state, capable of acting in a civil society, respecting human dignity, rights and freedoms, that is, a person with humanity, morality, Russian civil identity, which is based on the values of the civil state.

Political pedagogy examines the pedagogical aspects of the social and political formation and development of the individual, acquiring social and political status, functioning, as well as maintaining the achieved and restoring the lost social and political characteristics. The complexity and inclusiveness of civic education shows its interdisciplinarity. Currently, political educators in Russia are taking practical steps to restore certain structures of the civic education system, in particular youth organizations, associations, clubs, military and sports camps, spiritual and educational centers, a museum, linking their work with the education of civic patriotism, youth development, focused on a wide range of initiatives, etc. Thus, political pedagogy comparatively

studies the issues of a person's sequential passage through the stages of civil and political socialization, his inclusion in the system of social relations at different periods of life. This is largely facilitated by an interdisciplinary approach, interdisciplinary connections of political pedagogy of education with other social and humanitarian sciences. The interdisciplinary connections of the political science of education shows that it is within the competence of political pedagogy and pedagogical sociology to identify the interaction of the influence of the microenvironment and education on personality development. The significance of political pedagogy in interaction with pedagogical sociology is determined by the fact that the impact of macrofactors and mesofactors of political socialization is projected onto one young person, a group of young people through the action of microfactors [14,21-37;17,138-141].

In modern Russian conditions, it seems necessary to monitor the process of socializing influence on the individual of the social environment due to the fact that as a result of the ongoing social, economic and institutional transformation of Russian society, new social and political conditions for its functioning arise. To understand the essence of the changes taking place in the process of civil socialization at the present stage of society's development, it is necessary to analyze in more detail both the conditions of the social and cultural mechanisms of the individual's assimilation of the national experience of previous generations, and the shifts in political life characteristic of modern Russian society. In order to analyze the features of the process of political socialization in modern Russian society, it is necessary to study the mechanisms of institutionalization, as well as the factors of spontaneous political socialization of Russians, the role of political education as a means of directed political socialization. A directed form of political socialization is an educational and purposeful teaching effect on an individual. The spontaneous process of political socialization, on the contrary, due to its uncontrollable nature, needs to be carefully studied in order to obtain the ability to manage it and reduce the risks of the occurrence of destructive processes due to deviations from lawful behavior. Cognition of the mechanism, factors and patterns of political socialization is possible on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of indicators: political culture, agents, institutions of socialization and political education.

The Union State of Russia and Belarus, the Eurasian integration processes and the ongoing institutional changes in the political system in Russia are reflected in the political socialization of Russian youth as in the process of their inclusion in political relations at the level of political activity and at the level of forming young people's awareness of political reality. In the context of the transformation of the political system at the present stage, the political socialization of Russian youth has its own characteristics, consisting in a variable choice of models of political behavior. The younger generation has the ability to more quickly assimilate the experience of political reality gained in previous decades under the conditions of a weakened mechanism of state control over the socialization of young people, which led to the instability of ideological attitudes and ideas in relation to the established forms of statehood, social spiritual values, goals and prospects of social development. A weak connection with the political experience of previous generations creates the prospect of an innovative alignment of political forces and ensuring the continuation of the process of development of social life, but at the same time it has the risks of interrupting the continuity of generations and the loss of the value civilizational foundations of *civilarchic culture*.

The participation of youth in the protest movements of 2011-2014 and the anti-corruption protests of 2017-2018 in large cities of Russia, the emergence and spread of radical nationalist groups, political youth extremism, the decisive role of youth in the device of the so-called 'color revolutions' in many countries have raised the issue of the need for careful, a balanced, scientifically and methodologically developed approach to the processes of political socialization of Russian youth. One of the important results of public and scientific discussion on this issue was the conclusion about the need for a targeted impact on the processes of political socialization of young people, the desired result of which should be the formation of civic identity, attitudes of civic responsibility, patriotism, spiritual and moral values among young people. The period of the collapse of the USSR, democratic transition and value vacuum came to an end, together with the

awareness of the state authorities of the need to educate the younger generation from the standpoint of ensuring Russia's national interests. Over the years, state programs have been adopted to implement state youth policy and ensure effective patriotic education of citizens.

One cannot but take into account the fact that the democratic transition in Russia and other republics of the former USSR proceeded in parallel with the processes of inciting nationalist sentiments, gaining independence, and the beginning of state building. The political elite of most of the states that emerged in the post-Soviet space needed at least the creation of a formal democracy of a civil society organization (CSOs). At the same time, political competition was not allowed, which was partly due to the rather apathetic attitude of citizens to the protection of their rights and freedoms, conditioned by the political culture. The establishment of a full-fledged functioning democracy was not in the interests of the ruling groups, since it was necessary for them to consolidate their newly acquired power positions. Accordingly, democratization was carried out largely by the active participation of the ruling political parties, that is, under the control of state institutions. The new governments, at least initially, were pushing for democratic change. At the same time, in countries where, after the consolidation of power, it became possible to reduce democratic elements to a minimum, this was done. This state of affairs was a consequence of the fact that, on the one hand, the predominantly transformed Soviet bureaucratic political culture became the elite in the states, on the other, there was no clear division of citizens into social strata aware of their civic interests. Both the political power and the majority of the population perceived democracy in the abstract, expecting automatic economic growth, quality of life and legal protection from it. At the same time, stable democratic movements were also absent due to the lack of a reliable and stable social base. In a number of countries, authoritarian traditions were superimposed on these factors. Political parties that in fact adhered to a democratic orientation, or did not have real levers of influence on power, or, while in power, in fact used authoritarian methods of government, while often resorting to populist methods due to poor experience in government. Thus, various difficulties were formed for the development of sovereign democracy [19].

The gradually strengthened Russian elite revised a number of provisions of the legislation and the theory of democracy, in particular, the idea of sovereign democracy, and also rebuilt the political system for itself. Thus, it is obvious that sovereign democracy requires the transformation of an authoritarian political culture, and hence its carriers in the institutions of state power, into a new one with *civilarchic democratic* attitudes. Otherwise, democratic regimes, even if they are formally strengthened, will be predominantly declarative in nature. The education of the younger generation, the innovative processes of its development are becoming important links in the system of Russian statehood. When developing new standards for Russian civic education, it is emphasized that it should be aimed at fostering civic, democratic, patriotic convictions, at forming tolerance in the conditions of our multicultural society. The solution of these tasks requires the formation of a political culture among the growing citizens as a necessary condition for their democratic life and social growth. An analysis of the pedagogical aspects of the formation of political culture in the modern conditions of Eurasian integration is especially important due to the role that cultural originality played in the historical development of Russia. Young people are carriers of the political culture of Russian society, which is formed through civic education, political socialization, social and political activity. The formation of political culture is a socially conditioned process of personal development in the field of civic education, political relations and activities. Being a kind of culture in general, the political culture of young people acts as a unity and common, and also has its own characteristics in the field of civic education, the field of relations both at the micro level and at the macro level.

Political educators are responsible to society for the result of their activities. This emphasizes the importance of their social, political and cultural role in Russian society, the importance of a purposeful orientation of the future teacher towards the tolerant and humanistic values of their profession. One of the essential confirmation of this is the establishment of the main directions of the state policy of modern Russia in the field of modernization of Russian education. The key goal

of the new state program was the implementation of state policy in the field of civic education, the creation of conditions for increasing civic responsibility for the fate of the country, increasing the level of democratic consolidation of society in order to solve the problems of ensuring national security and sustainable development of Russia, strengthening the sense of patriotism of citizens towards the history and culture of a multinational country, ensuring the continuity of generations of Russians, educating a citizen who loves his homeland and family, who has an active civic position. The functioning of state institutions in accordance with the goals has actualized interest in the problem of forming a modern model of political socialization of Russian youth, its factors, principles and approaches [25].

Eurasian integration processes and political transformations in Russia have created conditions for not so much integrating factors among young people as differentiating ones. During the transitional period for it, the radical breakdown of the entire social system, the state significantly weakened its control over the processes of political socialization. Transformational processes have significantly reduced the role of such social institutions from the standpoint of moral and patriotic education, and at the same time the primary factors and conditions for the socialization of young people, such as the family, the education system, and the army. Social networks, information and communication technologies, television and the Internet, as well as informal associations, which previously did not occupy leading positions in the socialization process, took a leading place in the socialization of young people. It was these means of political communication that began to influence the emerging worldview of the younger generation, its political ideology and social orientation. Unlike the older generation, the modern generation of young people has developed radically different values and political life priorities. Information and communication technologies and social media are developing the framework of political knowledge, which occupies a leading place among the means of influencing the civic consciousness of young people and youth NGOs. Modern social networks carry out purposeful and latent civic socialization of young people, influencing political activity, civic position, forming attitudes towards certain models of political behavior and ideology. An important place in the political socialization of modern youth began to be occupied by youth associations, movements, NGOs and various youth unions. Until now, no equal in scope of political tools for the socialization of young people has appeared in Russia. The need of young people for political communication with peers on various civic interests, communication was realized in the processes of civic education of various informal youth organizations: left and right radical, nationalist, football fans and others.

A comparative analysis of the processes of political socialization of youth at the stage of Eurasian integration processes follows the geopolitical and regional conflict model, caused not only by economic problems, but also by the adherence of the Jewish society to ethnic and confessional values. Therefore, the adoption of state programs aimed at establishing civic identity and patriotism in Russian society speaks of the remaining urgent issue of the political socialization of Russian youth in order to ensure the stable development of the state. To achieve these goals, the young generation must undergo political socialization based on political and social priorities, common norms and values of the development of the state and society. What model of political socialization is being formed in the Russian state and how does it affect the worldview of young people? Currently, there are two vectors of political socialization of youth, purposefully formed by society and the state. One of them can be attributed to the conservative, traditional, or, using the terminology prevailing in Russian philosophy at the end of the 19th century, the national approach. This approach is based on social and cultural traditions, which are the basis for the formation of civic and patriotic attitudes among young people. It is proposed to transfer some methods of Russian political pedagogical schools to the system of civic education. Instilling spiritual and moral values among young people, the formation of civic identity through strengthening the state's attention to the history and culture of Russia. The theme of patriotism is being developed in raising the prestige of the army, popularizing sporting events, such as the Olympic Games in Sochi in 2014, etc. The political elite, with the support of state institutions, initiated the creation of civic networks and political youth organizations, such as "Molodaya Gvardiya", "Nashi", "All-Russian

“People’s Front” and others with the aim of direct participation in the process of political socialization of youth on the basis of patriotic, civic positions [22;23;25].

The second way is attributed to the liberal democratic or individualistic type of civic education, the concept of which is borrowed from the civic educational systems of Western countries. Success in life and career development are declared the leading goals of human life. Civic education of young people is based on instilling competencies in them, that is, on those skills and abilities that they will need in practical application. The borrowing of Western models led to the restructuring of the entire system of civic education. The goals implemented in these two directions are in some contradiction: it is difficult to expect civic responsibility and solidarity from a young person if he is motivated for personal success. Thus, we can conclude that in Russian society there is no single model of political socialization of young people. But the measures of political influence on young people should be flexible, free from political pressure, taking into account the youth characteristics of this social group of maximalism of positions and assessments, political naivety, inexperience, and a tendency to imitate prominent representatives of the political arena. It is important for the state to create opportunities for youth to be active, gain political experience, assimilate the values of patriotism, civic solidarity with its people, and make independent and creative choice of political behavior. The state youth policy is of particular importance in the processes of political socialization of youth. Moreover, in political pedagogy, citizenship is defined as the ability and willingness to act in the role of a citizen, as a virtue of a free and full member of a political community, which contributes to his commitment to the interests of this community; as an active and conscious involvement in the political life of the community [16]. Political pedagogy considers “citizenship”, “civil”, “civil society” and “civility” categories as components of civiliarchy, manifested in political active or passive participation, as well as the problems of *civiliarchic culture*, freedom and the need for political relations of the individual, state institutions and society.

The 21st century was characterized by the emergence of a large number of political pedagogical studies in which citizenship was viewed as a complex social and psychological phenomenon, as an integrative personality trait and a basic value orientation. An analysis of modern research suggests that it makes sense to consider the process of the formation of an individual's civic consciousness only in the context of the interaction of constructive and destructive factors, since this phenomenon manifests itself in the form of individual behavior, but is mediated by the social and cultural environment. Recognition of the impossibility of forming citizenship outside social conditions, on the one hand, and the inseparability of the individual and social, and on the other hand, necessitates the search for opportunities to harmonize personal and public interests, finding a balance between the actor-institute of relations between the citizen and the state in order to achieve the effectiveness of civic education [5;8]. This position is confirmed in the following provisions: the consistency of individual virtue and social justice is important; a harmonious unity of social and personal is necessary, a reasonable combination of internal freedom and respect for state power, personal and public, general and private interests. Recognizing the integrative nature of citizenship, some researchers consider its essence through the prism of some particular quality, understood as the main, basic, typical, which refracts the meaning of citizenship. The analysis of scientific research makes it possible to single out the following leading foundations of citizenship: 1) *activity and responsibility*; 2) *consciousness and self-awareness of the individual*; 3) *national and moral qualities*; 4) *emotions, feelings, faith*; 5) *civic duty and civic obligations*; 6) *moral, legal and value civic position and civil religion*.

Attempts to reduce citizenship to any one quality, that is, patriotism, activity, knowledge of rights, are untenable, since, for example, knowledge of one's rights and obligations, laws is not an example of a civil attitude to business, the world, people, and even to themselves yourself. In various definitions of citizenship, as a rule, the development factor and, moreover, its focus on reaching the top are not recorded. In this context, a rather large list of civic qualities and characteristics is being recruited, which are not always equivalent, they cannot be put on the same

level. Analyzing these definitions, it is important to differentiate them, to build a hierarchy of qualities that form a meaningful and logical structure of citizenship. At the same time, based on the criterion of formation, citizenship can be represented as a multi-level structure: 1) low level, that is, civic position is not formed, the presence of civic qualities is not clearly traced, low readiness to exercise the rights and duties of a citizen; 2) the middle level, that is, civic position and qualities at the stage of formation, partial readiness to exercise the rights and obligations of a citizen; 3) a high level, that is, civic qualities are formed, an active civic position, a high readiness to exercise the rights and obligations of a citizen [15].

The effectiveness of civic education in Russia largely depends on the modern methodology of the educational process, conditioned by the new philosophy and psychology of a person, understood as a self-overcoming being, transforming himself. *First*, the content of civic education should include knowledge, methods of activity, value orientations, without which it is impossible to fulfill social roles in modern Russian society. *Secondly*, when studying the issues of anthropocentrism and civic studies, it should be remembered that in conditions of an ecological crisis, the tasks of political pedagogy related to human survival come to the fore, which require that a person be aware of himself as a part of society and nature, understand the responsibility for their sustainable development. *Thirdly*, the personal experience of young people is an effective means of civic education, which presupposes an appeal to real political, economic, social reality, its tendencies and contradictions. The individual experience of young people, including common sense, delusions, myths, requires scientific understanding, since only scientific knowledge makes it possible to understand the deep mechanisms of development, the true meaning of the events taking place in the world. Proceeding from this, it is necessary to carry out a synthesis of personal experience and scientific information, which will contribute to the formation of not only knowledge demanded by a citizen, but also relations, value orientations, samples of civic consciousness adopted by a person. *Fourth*, the active component of the educational process, focused on systematic modeling and analysis of life situations requiring students to apply knowledge and skills, plays a leading role in designing the content of formal and informal civic courses. Gaming technologies are involved in such activities. *Fifthly*, education of a citizen presupposes the development of skills and attitudes necessary for direct participation in political affairs, but the system of civic values (attitude to rights and freedoms as values, civil peace and harmony, state unity, love and respect to Russia) that lie behind political institutions and procedures. As the practice of studying civics courses has shown, the desire of university teachers and CSO trainers to activate the cognitive activity of young people in some cases leads to the 'falsification' of educational forms, which contradicts the need to form civic values. In this regard, it should be noted that the content of the problematic problem analyzed by young people is important not because of what example is specifically analyzed, but because of what moral and legal attitude will be fixed in the minds of young people as a result of its reasonable solution. The listed principles of constructing the content of formal and informal civic courses will become effective only if there is productive communication between the teacher and youth, based on *a civiliarchic dialogue and partnership*. An educational dialogue and partnership, as practice shows, can be successful if the value and semantic equality of teachers and youth is realized, of course, not in terms of the amount of knowledge or life experience, but in its innate right to unlimited knowledge of the world in those forms that are organic and comfortable. on a personal level [10].

In the process of realizing the goals of civic education, formal and non-formal educational activities should be supplemented by the transformation of the social and pedagogical environment of the educational institution and CSOs. It is about acquiring the democratic experience of tolerance, partnership, solidarity and consensus among young people. The life of universities and CSOs should be a source for the formation of democratic views and behavior among the young generation through the organization of student unions and youth associations, student government bodies, and the development of cooperative ties. It is the corporate work to change the university environment and social networks that is aimed at realizing the goal of civic education, shaping the

readiness of young people to participate in improving the social mechanism and personally influencing the social and political life of Russia. For this, young people must understand the relationship between citizens, citizens and society, citizens and the state; should be able to live in the modern world with its diversity of cultures, possessing the methods of activity, practical skills, models of civic behavior. Young people should also be able to overcome political conflict situations and be aware of the consequences of their activities. Thus, the implementation of the goal of civic education requires a systematic approach in terms of integrating formal and non-formal activities [11]. The entire educational process is intended to serve the civil socialization of youth.

The difficult process of building a civil society in Russia is closely related to qualitative changes in the consciousness of Russian citizens. An important role in this process belongs to the civic education of the population of Russia. It should contribute to the formation of the political and legal culture of the individual, humanistic moral guidelines and democratic citizenship. In this context, one of the most difficult problems of the democratic reform of civic education being carried out in Russia is raising the legal culture of young people. Without a qualified and effective solution to this problem, it is difficult to talk about the stabilization of the social and legal situation in Russian society. Without a legal culture in state institutions and CSOs, the goal of democratic reform and the creation of a welfare state will hardly be achieved. This does not mean the formal or informal sphere of civic activity and the fulfillment of a particular social role, but the hierarchy of values in the structure of each actor. At the same time, the internal value and external social content of their activity do not coincide.

Historically, different types of value orientations of youth and youth NGOs have developed in Russia. In particular, *civil conformist path* on which the youth, trying to become an actor, adapts to the system of norms, rules and prohibitions of Russian society, represented primarily by state institutions and CSOs. The youth identifies becoming as an actor with the development and obedient performance of one or another political and social role, the pursuit of an ideal with a social and political career. Moving up the ladder of political and social growth is taken by him as self-affirmation, although in fact, as this progress, young people more and more cease to be themselves, lose their civic characteristics and, of course, human independence. On this path, citizens of Russia and CSOs are formed, whose political and social expectations, as a rule, have not been achieved, and whose natural talents have not been realized. As young people lose their civic principles, there is an imperceptible substitution of the idea of serving their people and state institutions by serving a superior, and the substitution of the ideal by social norms inevitably leads to the replacement of these norms themselves by the execution of the will of the ruling elite at the federal and regional levels [2;4]. Hence, the following pattern follows: the more civil independence and human dignity are preserved as an individual, citizen and specialist, the more difficult the political life of young people in Russian society and, moreover, an official career is. And here there should be no illusions: the formation of young people as self-worth individuals and their social status, success in Russian society not only do not coincide, but for the majority of youth NGOs there are things that are incompatible. Since on this path work for the benefit of Russian society becomes an end in itself, the highest achievement in the personal plane can only be professional growth, which, however, makes a person himself only a means of labor, and his personal qualities are an optional addition to the profession. Therefore, it turns out that there are no irreplaceable people here, and the most highly qualified specialist remains only a 'partial' person. There is also a *civil non-conformist path*, in which young people do not adapt to political and social norms and rules, but seeks to bypass them, to get out of the comprehensive control and constant pressure of Russian society. In this sense, *civil anti-conformism*, an antisocial way of alienating young people from Russian society, in an effort not to adapt or bypass the norms of life of Russian society, but to break, pass them by force and deception. The main danger is not even that youth NGOs violate the laws of the country, but that, along with state institutions, they constitute an additional source of discomfort and fear in life, deprivation of human dignity and personal principles. From the point of view of civil society and the rule of law, violation of public

norms and laws is inadmissible, and in its content it is as resistance to evil by force (violence) of state powers, an attempt to respond to force by force of state institutions. And as long as there are state institutions with their legitimate and legal instruments, as long as there will be hard and soft power. From the above properties of values, it clearly follows that evil can only be neutralized by civil education, democratic dialogue and partnership. Therefore, in the field of civic education and morality, and even more so in law and politics, their opposition is insurmountable. As for the *civil superconformist path*, this is the conscious creativity of those actors who transmit and educate young people and youth NGOs with *civilianarchic values* of patriotism, faith, love and beauty and realize the spiritual potential of the young generation, regardless of their profession and social role. In this sense, the system of civic education at all levels is the only social institution that can really direct the value and orientation activities of young people towards the formation of an independent and socially active personality of a citizen of Russia, fully aware of his personal responsibility for everything that happens in his country. For young people in CSOs and universities are busy not only mentally, but above all cultural education and self-education [2; 6;12]. It is during the years of formal and informal civic education that the formation of aesthetic and artistic taste and moral sense begins and basically ends, but how successfully this already depends on the quality of the work of CSOs and the university institution. Political pedagogy, in fact, to this day, divides teachers and students, respectively, into the actor of their influence, thereby destroying the spiritual and value level of their communication. The task, therefore, is to do this purposefully and professionally, that is, not imposing ready-made attitudes, but maximally contributing to the disclosure of value principles.

Thus, value and civic activity combines internal value self-regulation and external and evaluative goal-setting, personal self-realization and social activity. Their combination, the manifestation of the internal in the external, the correspondence of means to goals is most feasible today only in the system of civic education in the unity of educational processes. But for this it is necessary to move away from the stereotypes of our thinking at all levels and understand that humanitarian, spiritual and value training is today the real basis for the modern development of the social institution of civic education and the first effective step in the realities of the 21st century. It should be noted that at present, modernization on a national scale is lacking an integral system of civic education of young people, an organic and significant part of which would be the system of educating a citizen of Russia, focused on the formation and development of an individual who is ready to live in a civil, democratic society and a social state, free, possessing human dignity, humanistically oriented, tolerant, socially active, characterized by citizenship and patriotism.

References:

1. Alapuro, R. (2001) "Reflections on Social Networks and Collective Action in Russia." In: Webber, S., Liikanen, I. (Eds.) *Education and Civic Culture in Post-Communist Countries*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 13-27.
2. Bouher, L. D. (2017) "Revisiting parental influence in individual political development: Democratic parenting in adolescence." *Applied Developmental Science* 111(1), pp. 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2017.1288125>.
3. EACEA (2017) Overview of the Higher Education System: Russian Federation. Brussels: European Union. Accessed January 20, 2021. https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/countryfiche_russian_federation_2017.pdf.
4. Gurova, G., Piattoeva, N. and Takala, T. (2015) "Quality of education and its evaluation: an analysis of the Russian academic discussion." *European Education* 47 (4), pp. 346-364.
5. Hammett, D., Marshall D. (2017) "Building peaceful citizens? Nation-building in divided societies." *Space and Polity* 21(2), pp. 129-143.
6. Jeffrey A., Staeheli L.A. (2015) "Learning Citizenship: Civility, Civil Society, and the Possibilities of Citizenship." In: Kallio K., Mills S., and Skelton T. (eds) *Politics, Citizenship and Rights. Geographies of Children and Young People*, vol 7. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-4585-94-1_29-1.
7. McDermott, P. (2004) "Civic Education in Central Russia: Possibilities and Challenges." *Journal of Thought*, 39(1), pp. 103-117. Accessed March 23, 2021. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42589776>.

8. Misselwitz, H.-J. (2016) “Civic education in an era of social transformation.” In: Segert, D. (Ed.) *Civic Education and Democratisation in the Eastern Partnership Countries*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, pp.27-44.
9. Morgan, W.J., Trofimova, I.N., and Kliucharev, G.A. (2019). Civil Society, Social Change, and a New Popular Education in Russia. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315885711>.
10. Piattoeva, N. (2010) “Perceptions of the past and education of future citizens in contemporary Russia.” In: Reid, A., Gill, J., and Sears, A. (Eds.) *Globalization, the Nation-State and the Citizen: Dilemmas and Directions for Civics and Citizenship Education*. New York: Routledge, pp. 128-142. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203855119>.
11. Segert, D. (2016) “Actors, opportunities and obstacles in civic education and democratisation in the Eastern Partnership countries.” In: Segert, D. (Ed.) *Civic Education and Democratisation in the Eastern Partnership Countries*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, pp.11-24.
12. Staeheli, L., Hammett, D. (2010) “Educating the new national citizen: Education, political subjectivity, and divided societies.” *Citizenship Studies* 14(6), pp. 667-680. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2010.522353>.
13. Stranius, P. (2001) “The Intelligentsia and the ‘Breakdown of Culture’ in Post-Soviet Russia.” In: Webber, S., Liikanen, I. (Eds.) *Education and Civic Culture in Post-Communist Countries*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 42-52.
14. Tolstenko, A., Baltovskij, L., and Radikov, I. (2019). *Chance of Civic Education in Russia*. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019859684>.
15. Vaillant J.G. (2001) “Civic Education for Russia: an Outsider’s View.” In: Webber S., Liikanen I. (eds) *Education and Civic Culture in Post-Communist Countries. Studies in Russia and East Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-28702-0_18.
16. Wray-Lake, L., DeHaan, C. R., Shubert, J., and Ryan, R. M. (2019) “Examining links from civic engagement to daily well-being from a self-determination theory perspective.” *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 14(2), pp. 166-177, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2017.1388432>.
17. Wuttke, A. (2020) “Political engagement’s non-political roots: examining the role of basic psychological needs in the political domain.” *Motiv Emot* 44, pp. 135-150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-019-09801-w>.
18. Гаман-Голутвина, О. В. (2012) “Метафизика элитных трансформаций в России”. *Полис. Политические исследования* 4, стр. 23-40.
19. Грачев, Н. Д. (2011) “Суверенная демократия: социально-философский взгляд”. *Власть* 2, стр. 106-109.
20. Гревцева, Г.Я., Ипполитова, Н.В. (2015) “Воспитание гражданственности и патриотизма молодежи: исторический аспект”. *Вестник Челябинского государственного педагогического университета* 6, стр. 27-32.
21. Лубский, А.В. (2017) “Гражданский патриотизм: совместимости патриотизма и гражданственности в российском обществе”. *Гуманитарий Юга России* 23(1), стр. 42-59.
22. Молодая Гвардия Единой России (2021) “История МГЕР”. Дата доступа: 20.02.2021. <https://mger.ru/gvardiya/>.
23. Общероссийский народный фронт (2021) “История ОНФ”. Дата доступа: 20.02.2021. <https://onf.ru/structure/istoriya-onf/>.
24. Пляис, Я. А. (2008) “«Суверенная демократия» - новый концепт партии”. *Власть* 4, стр. 24-32.
25. Правительство РФ (2016) “Государственная программа «Патриотическое воспитание граждан Российской Федерации на 2016-2020 годы»”. Дата доступа: 20.02.2021. <http://government.ru/docs/21341/>.

ГРАЖДАНСКОЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ МОЛОДЕЖИ В УСЛОВИЯХ ЕВРАЗИЙСКОЙ ИНТЕГРАЦИИ РОССИЙСКОГО ОБЩЕСТВА

Алексанян Ашот

Ереванский государственный университет, Армения

Неманихина Валентина

Белгородский государственный национальный
исследовательский университет, Российская Федерация

Аннотация

На современном этапе евразийской интеграции российского общества гражданское образование молодежи играет решающую роль в обучении будущей политической элиты не только формальной и

неформальной учебным программам, но и политической жизни. Одна из важнейших ролей университетов и организаций гражданского общества (ОГО) в российском обществе – обучать, и обучать молодых людей тому, как быть политически активными членами многонационального народа Российской Федерации. Многонациональное государство не должно терять роль гражданского образования и ОГО в подготовке молодежи и студентов к информированию и вовлечению граждан, уделяя при этом особое внимание традиционным академическим наукам и развитию трудовых ресурсов.

Гражданское образование выдвигает институциональную функцию образования по формированию информированного избирателя на междисциплинарной и коммуникативной основе. Оно направлено на охват всех предметных областей, сочетаю в себе различные навыки и компетенции, которые будут полезны молодым людям и студентам на протяжении всей их социальной жизни в качестве граждан, избирателей и лидеров, а также членов ОГО, политических партий или участников гражданских инициатив и движения. Гражданское образование может модернизировать российское общество цивилиархическим образом, поскольку более внимательные и мотивированные граждане ведут к более демократическому и справедливому обществу. Всегда было важно быть толерантным и целеустремленным гражданином. Но в российском обществе, которое сталкивается со сложными глобальными проблемами и межинтеграционными конфликтами, партийная политика и эффективное гражданское образование являются императивом российского патриотизма. Следующие молодые поколения должны быть информированы и наделены полномочиями для решения стоящих перед ними задач на институциональном уровне, на уровне ОГО, а также в евразийском и глобальном масштабе. Молодежные неправительственные организации (НПО) должны адекватно оценивать политическую среду и быть новаторскими, а также принимать гуманистические, информированные и своевременные решения.

Систематический подход к гражданскому образованию учит молодых людей, как быть хорошими гражданами, как работает демократия и что требуется для того, чтобы она служила благу всех граждан России. В этом контексте молодых людей необходимо целенаправленно обучать тому, как быть эффективным членом цивилиархического общества и в то же время, какие инструменты использовать для достижения хорошего управления и социальной справедливости, борьбы с коррупцией и экстремизмом, тем самым сохраняя цивилиархический диалог и партнерство в многонациональной, многокультурной и многоязычной стране. Современные молодежные НПО могут создавать и развивать социальные сети для индивидуальных и комплексных программ неформального обучения на основе исследований политической педагогики.

Улучшение гражданского образования может устранить многие недемократические недостатки политической системы транзитного российского общества. Активная гражданская идентичность и участие ОГО повышают цивилиархическую подотчетность избранных должностных лиц, поскольку только информированные и мотивированные граждане будут задавать сложные вопросы лидерам своих политических партий. Это улучшает цивилиархический дискурс, поскольку информированные и заинтересованные граждане через НПО и социальные сети будут требовать большего от органов государственной власти и политических партий. Они реализуют российский идеал гражданского патриотизма и равенства, предоставляя каждому гражданину, независимо от происхождения, инструменты, которые позволяют ему стать полноправным участником политического процесса.

Ключевые слова: гражданство, гражданское образование, цивилиархические ценности, молодежь, политическая социализация, Россия, евразийская интеграция.

Список использованной литературы

1. Alapuro, R. (2001) “Reflections on Social Networks and Collective Action in Russia.” In: Webber, S., Liikanen, I. (Eds.) *Education and Civic Culture in Post-Communist Countries*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 13-27.
2. Bougher, L. D. (2017) “Revisiting parental influence in individual political development: Democratic parenting in adolescence.” *Applied Developmental Science* 111(1), pp. 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2017.1288125>.
3. EACEA (2017) Overview of the Higher Education System: Russian Federation. Brussels: European Union. Accessed January 20, 2021. https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/countryfiche_russian_federation_2017.pdf.
4. Gurova, G., Piattoeva, N. and Takala, T. (2015) “Quality of education and its evaluation: an analysis of the Russian academic discussion.” *European Education* 47 (4), pp. 346-364.

5. Hammett, D., Marshall D. (2017) “Building peaceful citizens? Nation-building in divided societies.” *Space and Polity* 21(2), pp. 129-143.
6. Jeffrey A., Staeheli L.A. (2015) “Learning Citizenship: Civility, Civil Society, and the Possibilities of Citizenship.” In: Kallio K., Mills S., and Skelton T. (eds) *Politics, Citizenship and Rights. Geographies of Children and Young People*, vol 7. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-4585-94-1_29-1.
7. McDermott, P. (2004) “Civic Education in Central Russia: Possibilities and Challenges.” *Journal of Thought*, 39(1), pp. 103-117. Accessed March 23, 2021. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42589776>.
8. Misselwitz, H.-J. (2016) “Civic education in an era of social transformation.” In: Segert, D. (Ed.) *Civic Education and Democratisation in the Eastern Partnership Countries*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, pp.27-44.
9. Morgan, W.J., Trofimova, I.N., and Kliucharev, G.A. (2019). *Civil Society, Social Change, and a New Popular Education in Russia*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315885711>.
10. Piattoeva, N. (2010) “Perceptions of the past and education of future citizens in contemporary Russia.” In: Reid, A., Gill, J., and Sears, A. (Eds.) *Globalization, the Nation-State and the Citizen: Dilemmas and Directions for Civics and Citizenship Education*. New York: Routledge, pp. 128-142. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203855119>.
11. Segert, D. (2016) “Actors, opportunities and obstacles in civic education and democratisation in the Eastern Partnership countries.” In: Segert, D. (Ed.) *Civic Education and Democratisation in the Eastern Partnership Countries*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, pp.11-24.
12. Staeheli, L., Hammett, D. (2010) “Educating the new national citizen: Education, political subjectivity, and divided societies.” *Citizenship Studies* 14(6), pp. 667-680. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2010.522353>.
13. Stranius, P. (2001) “The Intelligentsia and the ‘Breakdown of Culture’ in Post-Soviet Russia.” In: Webber, S., Liikanen, I. (Eds.) *Education and Civic Culture in Post-Communist Countries*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 42-52.
14. Tolstenko, A., Baltovskij, L., and Radikov, I. (2019). *Chance of Civic Education in Russia*. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019859684>.
15. Vaillant J.G. (2001) “Civic Education for Russia: an Outsider’s View.” In: Webber S., Liikanen I. (eds) *Education and Civic Culture in Post-Communist Countries. Studies in Russia and East Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-28702-0_18.
16. Wray-Lake, L., DeHaan, C. R., Shubert, J., and Ryan, R. M. (2019) “Examining links from civic engagement to daily well-being from a self-determination theory perspective.” *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 14(2), pp. 166-177, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2017.1388432>.
17. Wuttke, A. (2020) “Political engagement’s non-political roots: examining the role of basic psychological needs in the political domain.” *Motiv Emot* 44, pp. 135-150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-019-09801-w>.
18. Гаман-Голутвина, О. В. (2012) “Метафизика элитных трансформаций в России”. *Полис. Политические исследования* 4, стр. 23-40.
19. Грачев, Н. Д. (2011) “Суверенная демократия: социально-философский взгляд”. *Власть* 2, стр. 106-109.
20. Гревцева, Г.Я., Ипполитова, Н.В. (2015) “Воспитание гражданственности и патриотизма молодежи: исторический аспект”. *Вестник Челябинского государственного педагогического университета* 6, стр. 27-32.
21. Лубский, А.В. (2017) “Гражданский патриотизм: совместимости патриотизма и гражданственности в российском обществе”. *Гуманитарий Юга России* 23(1), стр. 42-59.
22. Молодая Гвардия Единой России (2021) “История МГЕР”. Дата доступа: 20.02.2021. <https://mger.ru/gvardiya/>.
23. Общероссийский народный фронт (2021) “История ОНФ”. Дата доступа: 20.02.2021. <https://onf.ru/structure/istoriya-onf/>.
24. Пляйс, Я. А. (2008) “«Суверенная демократия» - новый концепт партии”. *Власть* 4, стр. 24-32.
25. Правительство РФ (2016) “Государственная программа «Патриотическое воспитание граждан Российской Федерации на 2016-2020 годы»”. Дата доступа: 20.02.2021. <http://government.ru/docs/21341/>.

*Материал был представлен и отправлен на рецензию: 26.03.2021
Принято к публикации: 05.04.2021*

Рецензент: канд.фил. наук, доцент Роберт Хачатрян

*The material was submitted and sent to review: 26.03.2021
Was accepted for publication: 05.04.2021
Reviewer: Assoc. Prof., PhD. Robert Khachtryan*