## National Research University Higher School of Economics

As a manuscript

### Nadezhda Nartova

### Citizenship and social engagement of urban youth in modern Russia

Thesis Summary for the purpose of obtaining academic degree Ph.D. in Sociology

Academic Supervisor:
Ph.D. in Sociology
Elena Omelchenko

#### **Problem statement**

Russian and western researchers recorded a general decrease in youth engagement in institutionalized politics in comparison to preceding generations: young people are less interested in politics, vote less frequently, and are less likely to be members of political parties and professional unions<sup>1</sup>. Denis Volkov notes that "compared to older generations, young people are twice less likely to monitor political news or discuss political issues with friends and other acquaintances; three times less likely to participate in elections". In the 2016 State Duma elections, only 30% of youth participated in the voting, merely 3.5% of youth are members of political parties, approximately 11% trust official political institutions, while almost 41%<sup>4</sup>, do not trust them, 57% are not interested in politics (compared to 19% of those who do)<sup>5</sup>.

This lack of youth participation in the legitimate sphere of politics and - more generally - its lack of civic consciousness, is interpreted in different ways. Some researchers talk about the political apathy of young people, their apolitical sentiment, the crisis of youth citizenship, and the formation of non-civic, egoistic, and infantile generation in general<sup>6</sup>. Others emphasize the general democratic crisis of contemporary countries as well as the trend of reduction in civic participation on the whole<sup>7</sup>. The third group of researchers is looking for answers connected directly to youth, its social background, limitations in access to participation, etc.<sup>8</sup>

N. Manning says that the dominant discourse on youth as non-participating, apathetic, and "non-civic" is brought by "orthodox (hegemonic) notions of politics" and "quantitative"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Pilkington H., Pollock G. 'Politics are bollocks': youth, politics and activism in contemporary Europe // The Sociological Review. 2015. Vol. 63, № S2. P. 1–35.; Putnam R. D. Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000. 554 p.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Волков Д. Отличия молодых россиян от представителей старших поколений: результаты социологического мониторинга// Вестник общественного мнения. 2020. № 1–2 (130) – с.127.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Гудков Л., Зоркая Н., Кочергина Е., Пипия К., Рысева А. "Поколение Z": молодежь времен путинского правления// Вестник общественного мнения. 2020. № 1-2 (130). – c.41.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Collection of short comparative country reports – RUSSIA (2018) // PROMISE: Promoting Youth Involvement and Social Engagement: Opportunities and challenges for 'conflicted' young people across Europe. URL: http://www.promise.manchester.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/National-Report-level-2-Russia-February-2019.pdf (last accessed: 14.04.2021).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Гудков Л., Зоркая Н., Кочергина Е., Пипия К., Рысева А. "Поколение Z": молодежь времен путинского правления// Вестник общественного мнения. 2020. № 1–2 (130). – c.33.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Hart S. The "problem" with youth: young people, citizenship and the community // Citizenship Studies. 2009. Vol. 13. No. 6. P. 641–657.; Fahmy E. Young Citizens: Young People's Involvement in Politics and Decision Making. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2006. 204 p.; Kimberlee R. H. 'Why don't British young people vote at general elections?'// Journal of Youth Studies. 2002. Vol. 5. No. 1. P. 86–98.; Milkman R. A New Political Generation: Millennials and the Post-2008 Wave of Protest// American Sociological Review. 2017. Vol. 82. No. 1. P. 1–31.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Clément K., Zhelnina A. Introduction to the Special Issue: Imagining a Link Between Local Activism and Political Transformation: Inventions from Russia and Eastern Europe// International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society. 2020. Vol. 33. No. 2. P. 117–124.; Norris P., Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited, Cambridge University Press, 2011. 350 p.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Kimberlee R. H. Why don't British young people vote at general elections?// Journal of Youth Studies. 2002. Vol. 5. No. 1. P. 86–98.

methodologies"<sup>9</sup>. Manning argues that the hegemonic model of politics - administrative, regulatory, demoralized - which is unconsciously used in research, effectively forces out any political forms that do not fit its boundaries<sup>10</sup>. Furthermore, according to H. Pilkington and G. Pollock, "arguments and counter-arguments about the apathy towards, or disconnect from, politics among young people are underpinned by an assumption of the normative "good" of political engagement"<sup>11</sup>. This in turn eliminates from the equation those young people who do not share this perspective, calling their participation apolitical, even if they are politically active. <sup>12</sup>

Therefore, the abandonment of a rigid understanding of political and civic participation, the separation of citizenship and participation in formal institutionalized politics, and a change in methodology and research focus promise to expand the perspective and understanding of young people's civic experience. Developing since the turn of the millennium, qualitative research on youth engagement as criticism and alternative to conventional approaches has shaped a "turn to everyday practices" in citizenship studies, which focuses on theorizing informal non-institutionalized politics, in which youth participate. Taking into consideration changing conditions of contemporary society, such as globalization, the emergence of neoliberal capitalism, high level of unpredictability, the development of the Internet, individualization, and precarization, in which the well-established models of political participation have proven to be irrelevant, researchers focus on everyday practices and interpretations of young people themselves, showing that youth are not apolitical or non-civic, but instead develops new ways of understanding citizenship, new forms of civic participation, significantly expanding the political repertoire. <sup>13</sup>

According to the Levada-Center, <sup>14</sup> 23% of Russian young people have volunteered or participated in activities of social organizations, 22% have signed political petitions and appeals, 11% have participated in political activities and initiatives on the Internet, 9% have stopped buying goods for political and ecological reasons. <sup>15</sup> This, however, does not allow the authors of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Manning N. 'I mainly look at things on an issue by issue basis': Reflexivity and phronêsis in young people's political engagements// Journal of Youth Studies. 2013. Vol. 16. No.1. - p.18. <sup>10</sup> Ibid. P. 21.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Pilkington H., Pollock G. 'Politics are bollocks': youth, politics and activism in contemporary Europe // The Sociological Review. 2015. Vol. 63. № S2. – p.6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Ibid. P. 6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Threadgold S. Youth, class and everyday struggles. London, New York: Routledge, 2018. 260 p.; Harris A., Wyn J., Younes S. Beyond apathetic or activist youth: 'Ordinary' young people and contemporary forms of participation// Young. 2010. Vol. 18. No. 1. P. 9–32.; Miller-Idriss C. Everyday Understandings of Citizenship in Germany // Citizenship Studies. 2006. Vol. 10. No. 5. P. 541–570.; Lister R., Smith N., Middleton S., Cox L. Young People Talk about Citizenship: Empirical Perspectives on Theoretical and Political Debates // Citizenship Studies. 2003. Vol. 7. No. 2. P. 235–253.; Stevenson N. Cultural Citizenship in the "Cultural" Society: a Cosmopolitan Approach // Citizenship Studies. 2003. Vol. 7. No. 3. P. 331–348.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> The ANO Levada Center has been included in the registry of non-commercial organizations acting as foreign agents.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Гудков Л., Зоркая Н., Кочергина Е., Пипия К., Рысева А. "Поколение Z": молодежь времен путинского правления// Вестник общественного мнения. 2020. № 1–2 (130). – c.33.

research to classify such actions as real politics; they define civic-political participation of the Russian youth as "spectator-like behaviour", i.e. participation without active participation <sup>16</sup>. The 2020 survey conducted by the Center for Studies of Civil Society and the Nonprofit Sector HSE has shown that young people aged 24 to 34 volunteer more often than the adult population of Russia (29% against 23%)<sup>17</sup> and assisting behavior, in general, is actively developing in large cities with the population of 1 mln and higher<sup>18</sup>. Hence, if the volunteering experience among young Russians is seven times higher than the participation in political parties, does that mean that somehow youth participate somewhere for some reason? Together with that, they participate within the specific conditions of contemporary Russia, which researchers define as "post-socialist 'managed' democracy", characterized by limitation of political expression and intolerance supported by the state<sup>19</sup>.

Since the beginning of the 2000s when Vladimir Putin came to power, a specific political regime has been forming in Russia. Using Vladimir Gelman's terminology, it is "personalized electoral authoritarianism"<sup>20</sup>, characterized among other things by the total intensification of state control together with the imitation of democratic processes. The prospects for civil society development and the relationship between the state and the society in general are described by researchers as "gloom and doom"<sup>21</sup>. Since the beginning of the 2000s, especially since the 2010s, in Russia, there has been a decreasing trend in access to public space for initiatives not controlled by the government. This process is tightening legislation that involves organization and carrying out of the public mass activities, including those of protest nature and direct action activism. The legislative base that regulates NGO activities has also changed, which lead not only to prosecution and closure of several civil and research NGOs in Russia but also to creating an atmosphere of fear with the likelihood that the organization might be shut down, if its activities, including sources of funding, stops satisfying the state. Amendments to several legislative acts known as "The

<sup>1</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Gudkov, L., Zorkaya, N., Kochergina, E., Pipiya, K., & Ryseva A. (2020b). Russia's 'Generation Z': attitudes and values 2019/2020. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in the Russian Federation, 2020. – p. 32. URL: http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/moskau/16134.pdf. (last accessed: 26.12.2020).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Котляр М., Гебернаторов Е. ВШЭ оценила уровень счастья российской молодежи. РБК. 27.06.2021 URL: https://www.rbc.ru/society/27/06/2021/60d751eb9a7947ff95714152?fbclid=IwAR0x5d3ufDf3zoa7Q9XkfgY7zNpC aLriszxWfW5j7hfSef8BkTe9N8qEcZU (last accessed: 14.09.2021).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Информационно-аналитический бюллетень о развитии гражданского общества и некоммерческого сектора в РФ. М.: Национальный исследовательский университет "Высшая школа экономики", Центр иссследовоаний гражданского общества и некоммерческого сектора. №2 (19) 2020. - c.17. URL: https://grans.hse.ru/data/2021/03/18/1399603728/Bulleten%2019 small.pdf (last accessed: 14.09.2021).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Grimm R., Pilkington H. 'Loud and proud': youth and the politics of silencing// The Sociological Review. 2015. Vol. 63. No. 2 suppl. – p.207.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Гельман В. "Недостойное правление": политика в современной России. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Европейского университета в Санкт-Петербург, 2019. – с.10.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Johnson J. E., Kulmala M., Jäppinen M. Street-level practice of Russia's social policymaking in Saint Petersburg: federalism, informal politics, and domestic violence// Journal of Social Policy. 2016. Vol. 45. No. 2. P. 287–304.

Russian undesirable foreign and international organizations' law" resulted in limitation or termination of activities on Russian territory for many international humanitarian organizations and funds. Nowadays, the state de facto has the monopoly for regulating the public sphere, strictly setting the framework of who, on what conditions, and with what kind of message is going to be authorized.

At the same time, since the mid-2000s, there has been an unprecedented politicization of the private<sup>22</sup>. The conservative turn with biopolitical agenda grants high significance to private life while constructing legitimate subjects/citizens<sup>23</sup>. Defining many aspects of private life, such as sexuality, as a social problem in the context of national identity and national security<sup>24</sup> leads to stricter regulation of both: sexuality itself and reproduction, family organization and child-rearing. Many aspects of life are now under control of the state itself and pro-state private and public initiatives: getting medical help, education, communication in social media, religion, participation in subcultures, etc. Svetlana Erpyleva argues that contemporary youth grow older in completely different conditions compared to those that existed even ten years ago - in the conditions of "politicization of everyday routine"<sup>25</sup>.

Therefore, in contemporary Russia, one can observe a relatively de-politicized public sphere from the state point of view due to the reduction in democratic processes and homogeneity of public rhetoric, and politicization of private life as a space where the moral and biopolitical foundation for the current political regime is being constructed. This, in turn, on the one hand, strengthens the "privatization of the political" among the population, which distances itself from politics and instead focuses its interests on home and work<sup>26</sup>, and on the other hand leads to the

<sup>-</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Temkina A., Zdravomyslova E. Gender's crooked path: Feminism confronts Russian patriarchy // Current Sociology. 2014. Vol. 62. No. 2. P. 253-270.; Rivkin-Fish, Michele R. 'From "Demographic Crisis" to "Dying Nation": the Politics of Language and Reproduction in Russia'// Goscilo, H. and Lanoux, A. (eds.), Gender and National Identity in Twentieth-century Russian Culture . DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006. P. 151-173.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Temkina A., Zdravomyslova E. Gender's crooked path: Feminism confronts Russian patriarchy // Current Sociology. 2014. Vol. 62. No. 2. P. 253-270.; Rivkin-Fish, Michele R. 'From "Demographic Crisis" to "Dying Nation": the Politics of Language and Reproduction in Russia'// Goscilo, H. and Lanoux, A. (eds.), Gender and National Identity in Twentieth-century Russian Culture. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006. P.151-173.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Stella F. Lesbian Lives in Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia. Post/Socialism and Gendered Sexualities. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 192 p.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Erpyleva S. Active citizens under Eighteen: minors in political protests// Journal of Youth Studies, 2020. DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2020.1820973. URL: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13676261.2020.1820973 (last accessed: 14.04.2021).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Clément K., Zhelnina A. Introduction to the Special Issue: Imagining a Link Between Local Activism and Political Transformation: Inventions from Russia and Eastern Europe// International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society. 2020. Vol. 33. No. 2. - p.121.

construction of so-called "civic' politics", when civic participation is potentially politically significant<sup>27</sup>.

In research on youth participation, the critique of the connection between citizenship, civic engagement, and political participation leads to the replacement of traditional, largely formalized, universalist categories and those belonging to the national state (such as citizenship and citizens' participation) with more flexible, dynamic and localized categories of understanding and participation in the life of the society (such as civil affiliation, civil engagement, and civil life) $^{28}$ . In contemporary sociological youth research, categories connected to citizenship and civil experience are barely separated and act as synonymous for the analysis of one or another aspect of young people's integration into society. The first one, however, acts as a description of idealtypical models, while the second one is for the analysis of routinely constructed meanings and implemented practices. In the dissertation research, citizenship<sup>29</sup> is defined as a phenomenon that includes both: constructed views on citizenship in everyday life and the means to exercise it, i.e. civic social engagement. Citizenship is seen as a socially constructed idea of the relationship between individual and communitarian within the nation state, including an understanding of rights, responsibilities, modes and limits of participation<sup>30</sup>. Civic social engagement is understood as "acts that can occur, either individually or collectively, that are intrinsically concerned with shaping the society we want to live in"<sup>31</sup> and that are being implemented in everyday life outside of the sphere of formalized politics.

The key *research question* of the dissertation research is how and what citizenship model is being formed among the contemporary urban Russian youth that have experience of civic social engagement? How do young men and women understand citizenship and exercise it? What are the limitations and prospects of such a model of civic participation?

The dissertation research attempts to answer these questions based on the experience of Saint Petersburg youth.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Zhuravlev O., Savelyeva N., Erpyleva S. The Cultural Pragmatics of an Event: the Politicization of Local Activism in Russia// International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society. 2020. Vol. 33. No. 2 P. 163–180.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup>Harris A., Wyn J., Younes S. Young people and citizenship: An everyday perspective// Youth Studies Australia. 2007. Vol. 26. No. 3. P. 19-27.; Ekman J., Amna E. Political participation and civic engagement: towards a new typology // Human affairs. 2012. Vol. 22. No. 3. P. 283–300.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Паслер О.В. Идентификационные модели гражданственности студенческой молодежи Северного Кавказа // Теория и практика общественного развития. 2015. №22. URL: http://www.teoria-practica.ru/vipusk-22-2015/ (last accessed: 14.04.2021).

Banaji, S. The trouble with civic: a snapshot of young people's civic and political engagements in twenty-first-century democracies// Journal of Youth Studies. 2008. Vol. 11. No. 5. – p. 544.; Bussemaker J., Voet R. Citizenship and gender: theoretical approaches and historical legacies// Critical social policy. 1998. Vol. 18. No. 3. P. 277-307.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Vromen, A. 'People Try to Put Us Down ...': Participatory Citizenship of 'Generation X'// Australian Journal of Political Science. 2003. Vol. 38. No 1. P. 82–83.

#### Literature review

The contemporary social and academic debate views citizenship as a complex, multidimensional, and controversial phenomenon. Researchers show that the theoretical and applied understandings of citizenship are historically prone to change, contextually conditioned, and socially differentiated. They depend on geopolitical and macroeconomic changes as much as on individual experiences and local situations.

The understanding of citizenship in the second half of the twentieth century was largely determined by the works of T.M. Marshall, who identified and discussed its three components: civil-law, political, and social<sup>32</sup>. An active discussion of citizenship started in the 80-90s of the 20th-century<sup>33</sup>, when, as noted by B. Kapustin, globalization and the increase in migration brought forward the "national citizenship", the crisis of welfare state forced to re-examine "social citizenship", while the "dysfunction of representative democracy" raised new questions about "political citizenship"<sup>34</sup>.

The aforementioned processes as well as the necessity to reconsider the conventional approaches and understandings are highly relevant to youth studies, especially when it comes to "political citizenship" as a way of youth integration into society and the ability of young people to influence it. The general decline in formal political participation among young people and emergent moral panics about youth being non-civic and apolitical lead to the search for answers to the question of what is happening with youth citizenship. R.H. Kimberlee<sup>35</sup> identified four dominant explanatory models for youth's lack of participation in the discussion at the turn of the century: "youth-focused" explanation links young people's lack of participation with their social background, skills, and competencies; "politics-focused" explanation problematizes structural limitations in terms of access to participation; "alternative value" interpretation argues that youth are being excluded from big politics due to having other interests and values, while the "generational" explanation connects low civic-political participation of young people with the changing conditions for transitioning into adulthood. None of these models, however, is self-sufficient, according to Kimberlee. The issue of looking for new perspectives in understanding youth citizenship remains relevant<sup>36</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup>Маршалл Т.Х. Гражданство и социальный класс// Капустин, Б. Г. Гражданство и гражданское общество — М.: Изд. дом Гос. ун-та — Высшей школы экономики, 2011. - c.154.

 $<sup>^{33}</sup>$  Капустин, Б. Г. Гражданство и гражданское общество — М.: Изд. дом Гос. ун-та — Высшей школы экономики, 2011. - с.141.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> Там же. С. 141.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> Kimberlee R. H. Why don't British young people vote at general elections?// Journal of Youth Studies. 2002. Vol 5. No. 1. P. 86–98.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> Ibid. P. 96.

The search for new ways of analysis revolves around three key axes: (1) methodological turn to qualitative research and studies of everyday experiences; (2) conceptual movement away from a narrow understanding of politics as a formal-administrative sphere towards a broader scope of issues connected to social changes; and (3) broadening the range of practices and experience that are understood as civic participation.

A significant contribution in the discussion was given by qualitative methodology works of R. Lister<sup>37</sup> et. al. and C. Miller-Idriss<sup>38</sup>, who studied British and German youth respectively and showed that, for contemporary youth in their everyday lives, citizenship has many different, often ambiguous meanings. Together with "traditional" formal parameters, however, it also includes an active component of social interaction in the broad sense of this word. The research conducted by A. Harris<sup>39</sup> and his colleagues has demonstrated that Australian young people exercise their citizenship not through formal political participation but social interactions and engagement at the familiar level of the inner circle: family, group of peers, neighbors. H.P. Bang<sup>40</sup> point out that youth are reflexive, critical, and competent when it comes to politics, social problems, and processes, while simultaneously acting in the frameworks of everyday life, relying on its experience and opportunities and coming up with their own ways, which defines it as "everyday makers".

N. Manning<sup>41</sup> shows that youth form civic participation through the micro-politicization of everyday life, blurring the boundaries between the public and the private. Young generation personifies politics, advancing their own vision and the diversity of lifestyles, tastes or consumption preferences<sup>42</sup>. Youth are active and involve themselves in spaces important for young people - leisure, culture, consumption, ecology. Following M. Sveningsson<sup>43</sup>, B. Berger<sup>44</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Lister R., Smith N., Middleton S., Cox L. Young People Talk about Citizenship: Empirical Perspectives on Theoretical and Political Debates// Citizenship Studies. 2003. Vol.7. No. 2. P. 235–253.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> Miller-Idriss C. Everyday Understandings of Citizenship in Germany// Citizenship Studies. 2006. Vol. 10. No. 5. P. 541–570.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Harris A., Wyn J. Young People's Politics and the Micro-Territories of the Local// Australian Journal of Political Science. 2009. Vol. 44. No. 2. P. 327–344.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> Bang H. P. Among everyday makers and expert citizens//Newman, J. (ed.) Remaking Governance. Bristol: Policy Press, 2005. P. 159-179.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> Manning N. 'I mainly look at things on an issue by issue basis': Reflexivity and phronêsis in young people's political engagements// Journal of Youth Studies. 2013. Vol. 16. No. 1. - P. 18.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> See: Threadgold S.Youth, class and everyday struggles. London, New Yourk: Routledge, 2018. 260 p.; Harris A., Roose J. DIY citizenship amongst young Muslims: experiences of the 'ordinary'// Journal of Youth Studies. 2014. Vol. 17. No. 6. P. 794-813.; Harris A. Young Women, Late Modern Politics, and the Participatory Possibilities of Online Cultures// Journal of Youth Studies. 2008. Vol. 11. No. 5. P. 481–95.; Stevenson N. Cultural Citizenship in the "Cultural" Society: a Cosmopolitan Approach // Citizenship Studies. 2003. Vol. 7, No. 3. P. 331–348.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> Sveningsson M. 'I Wouldn't Have What It Takes': Young Swedes Understandings of Political Participation // Young. 2015. Vol. 24. No. 2. P. 139–156.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup> Berger B. Political Theory, Political Science, and the End of Civic Engagement// Perspectives on Politics. 2009. Vol.7. No. 2. P. 335–350.

especially highlights that young people form their own agenda that does not lie within the interests of formal politics, but instead includes the issues that unite political, social, and moral aspects, such as identity, moral order, justice, and environment.

The new forms of citizenship bring about the research of new forms of civic and social participation of youth. Young people dramatically broaden their repertoire of ways to act and be included: from charitable donations to community development, from signing the petitions to performances, from seminars to volunteering<sup>45</sup>. Thinking critically over the contemporary debate around citizenship, J. Ekman and E. Amna<sup>46</sup> concluded that together with a conventional manifest of "political participation", which implies formal political behavior or participation in protest activities, contemporary citizenship includes other forms, such as civic social engagement and participation. In form, civic social participation is not traditional or formal, although it could potentially influence both the sphere of formal politics and the process of social transformations, which enables researchers to define it as latent political<sup>47</sup> or pre-political participation, stimulating and mitigating the latter<sup>48</sup>. Various aspects of civic social participation - from reflexive attention towards social problems, participation in the life of society/country/scene to individual and collective actions, directed towards social change - become closely intertwined with the everyday life of youth<sup>49</sup>.

A. Harris and his colleagues state the importance of a transition in youth citizenship studies: from 'civics deficit' to 'new engagements' thesis<sup>50</sup>. Expanding the sociological optics and considering everyday experience in the framework of qualitative methodology enable the researchers to see new meanings that are linked to participation, such as pleasure and emotional experiences<sup>51</sup>, the refusal to participate as a reflexive position, and, naturally, the formation of models of more inclusive citizenship<sup>52</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> Adler R. P., Goggin J. What Do We Mean By "Civic Engagement"? // Journal of Transformative Education. 2005. Vol. 3. No. 3. P. 236–253.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> Ekman J., Amna E. Political participation and civic engagement: towards a new typology // Human affairs. 2012. Vol. 22. No.3. P. 283–300.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> Ibid. P. 292.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> Berger B. Political Theory, Political Science, and the End of Civic Engagement// Perspectives on Politics. 2009. Vol. 7. No. 2. P. 342.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> Ekman J., Amnå E. Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology // Human affairs. 2012. Vol. 22 No. 3. P. 283-300.; Adler R. P., Goggin J. What Do We Mean By "Civic Engagement"? // Journal of Transformative Education. 2005. Vol. 3 No. 3. P. 236-253.; Banaji S. The trouble with civic: a snapshot of young people's civic and political engagements in twenty-first-century democracies // Journal of Youth Studies. 2008. Vol. 11 No. 5. P. 543-560.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> Harris A., Wyn J., Younes S. Young people and citizenship: An everyday perspective// Youth Studies Australia. 2007. Vol. 26. No. 3. P. 19–27.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> Riley S., More Y., Griffin C. The "pleasure citizen": Analyzing partying as a form of social and political participation// Young. 2010. Vol. 18. No. 1. P. 33–54.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> Lister R. Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential// Citizenship Studies. 2007. Vol. 11. No.1. P. 49–61.

In Russian academic discussion, youth citizenship is mainly viewed from a general theoretical standpoint and is connected to spiritual and moral characteristics of a person together with patriotism, which in turn, according to many authors, are subjects of fostering<sup>53</sup>. However, in sociological empirical research of recent years, one can see a more complex and heterogeneous picture. Quantitative research works show the decline in participation in formal politics but an increase in different forms of young people's 54 social participation as well as their interest in sociopolitical problems<sup>55</sup>. Based on the results of a quantitative examination among the participants of the All-Caucasus youth forum "Mashuk-2015", O. Pasler<sup>56</sup> identifies three models for demonstrating youth citizenship: active, biased, and absentheeist. V. Malenkov and N. Maltseva<sup>57</sup> point out that among Tyumen youth what dominates is a traditionalist model of patriotism, not civic, which the researchers connect to the dominant militarized state discourse of patriotism. Together with their colleagues, E. Omelchenko and H. Pilkinton<sup>58</sup> demonstrate that youth look at patriotism from different points of view, which not only reproduces the dominant rhetorics but also actively combats those, creating their own interpretations and ways of being a patriot and a citizen. Researchers who studied young people participating in protest activities talk about a high level of civic reflection among youth and their protest sentiments<sup>59</sup>. At the same time, E. Velikotnaya and her colleagues<sup>60</sup> surveyed high school students of Sverdlovsk Region and noted that even when teenagers have a desire to be socially and politically active, they do not have the

\_

<sup>53</sup> See: Гражданственность личности в условиях изменяющегося мира: от протестной к созидательной активности: сб. научных статей Междунар. науч.-практ. конф., 22-23 октября 2015 г. / редкол.: С. И. Беленцов (отв. ред.) [и др.]; Юго-Зап. гос. ун-т. Курск, 2015. 430 с.; Лубский А., Мамина Д. Гражданственность в молодежной среде как предмет теоретико-методологического дискурса // Социально-гуманитарные знания. 2019. №7. С. 69–78; Семенова Ю. Кризис гражданской идентичности в условиях трансформации современного общества// // Вестник Оренбургского государственного университета. 2010. Т. 113. №. 07. С. 87–92.; Гаврилюк В., Маленков В. Гражданственность, патриотизм и воспитание молодежи // Социологические исследования. 2007. № 4. С. 44–50.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup> Гудков Л., Зоркая Н., Кочергина Е., Пипия К., Рысева А. "Поколение Z": молодежь времен путинского правления// Вестник общественного мнения. 2020. № 1–2 (130). С.21-121.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>55</sup> Маршак А., Рожкова Л. Политический и гражданский потенциал молодежи Поволжья и Крыма в современных условиях // Власть. 2020. №3. С. 98–109.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> Паслер О.В. Идентификационные модели гражданственности студенческой молодежи Северного Кавказа // Теория и практика общественного развития. 2015. №22. URL: http://www.teoria-practica.ru/vipusk-22-2015/ (last accessed: 14.04.2021).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> Маленков В., Мальцева Н. Гражданственность и патриотизм в представлениях постсоветского поколения// Социология. 2020. №5. С.152-162.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</sup> С чего начинается Родина: молодежь в лабиринтах патриотизма / Науч. ред.: Е. Л. Омельченко, Х. Пилкингтон. Ульяновск : Ульяновский государственный университет, 2012. 320 с.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup> Борусяк Л. "Я же не овощ, который сидит за компом и жалуется на власть, я − гражданин". Анализ мотивации и гендерных особенностей участия молодежи в протестных акциях 2017 года// Неприкосновенный запас. Дебаты о политике и культуре. 2018. № 3 (119). С. 153-168.; Erpyleva S. Active citizens under Eighteen: minors in political protests// Journal of Youth Studies, 2020. DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2020.1820973. URL: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13676261.2020.1820973 (last accessed: 14.04.2021).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> Великодняя Е., Задворняк А., Черепанова Е. Социально ориентированные некоммерческие организации и молодежные объединения как фактор формирования гражданственности молодежи // Манускрипт. 2020. №5. С. 119–125.

understanding of how they can make that happen apart from being active in social media. E. Arif<sup>61</sup> and L. Litvina<sup>62</sup> illustrate how consumption becomes the space of civic and, more broadly, political expression. Researching the participants of the movement "Nashi", A. D. Krivonos<sup>63</sup> demonstrates that even propagated pro-state agenda is redefined and reinterpreted by the activists in the context of their biographies.

Therefore, the search for sociological answers to the questions of youth citizenship remains one of the most relevant issues in youth studies, especially in Russia, where the norms, forms, and vocabularies of civic/political/social/collective/individual being have continuously been defined and redefined over the last three decades, while the cultural differences between generations could be called "gaps".

#### Aims and objectives of the research

The aim of the dissertation research is identifying, analyzing, and conceptualizing the Russian urban youth model that is being formed in the everyday lives of youth, who have experience of social engagement (the case of Saint-Petersburg).

Objectives of the research:

- 1. To adapt and broaden the conception of citizenship regarding the analysis of youth's everyday experience;
- 2. To identify the dominant views towards citizenship among the urban youth;
- 3. To reconstruct the main ways to exercise citizenship as social engagement of youth in everyday life;
- 4. To analyze the constraints for the exercised model of citizenship for social engagement of youth and potential social changes in the society.

#### Methodology

The *theoretical object* of the dissertation study is the category of citizenship. In contemporary youth research, citizenship is developed as an analytical category that helps grasp both: static (e.g, views on norms and values) and dynamic (e.g, practices) nature of social

 $<sup>^{61}</sup>$  Ариф Э. Потребление в среде молодых активистов // Мониторинг общественного мнения: Экономические и социальные перемены. 2019. № 1. С. 66–83.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup> Литвина Д. (Без)денежное потребление в среде антикапиталистически настроенной молодежи: опыт полевого исследования анархистов // Этнографическое обозрение. 2014. № 1. С. 47–60.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>63</sup> Krivonos, D. State-managed Youth Participation in Russia: The National, Collective and Personal in Nashi Activists' Narratives// Anthropology of East Europe Review, 2015. Vol. 33. No.1. P. 44–58.

engagement<sup>64</sup>. Citizenship includes the views on the status of being a citizen and the ways to exercise it within the existing structural conditions.

As an *empirical object* of the research, it was chosen to use young people aged 18 to 35 that reside in Saint Petersburg and have experience of civic social engagement.

The *subject* of the dissertation research is the forms of citizenship emerging among socially included urban youth.

# The author's contribution to the development of the research problem and data collection

The dissertation research was conducted based on the materials of three collaborative projects 65, carried out by the Saint-Petersburg HSE Center for Youth studies under the academic advisory of Omelchenko Elena, doctor of sociology. The project "Russian Youth Citizenship: Contemporary Meanings and Practices" was carried out in 2013. Projects "Promoting Youth Involvement and Social Inclusion: Opportunities and Challenges in the Context of Intergenerational Relations" and "Promoting Youth Involvement and Social Inclusion: Analysis of Youth Activist Initiatives and Communities in St. Petersburg" were conducted in the framework of the consortium on the international project "PROMoting Youth Involvement and Social Engagement: opportunities and challenges for 'conflicted' young people across Europe" 66 in 2016 and 2017 respectively.

In the aforementioned collaborative project, the author participated in all stages of project development and implementation both as a researcher (2013, 2016-2017) and as a coordinator (2017); the development of the following: research program of theoretical and methodological foundations of the research, research tools, as well as empirical data collection and analysis, and report writing and presentation of the findings at academic conferences and in scholarly articles.

Although all of the projects were collaborative, as part of the project the author also studied a more narrow subject connected to constructing and exercising citizenship, and social engagement of youth. In the 2013 project, the author researched subjective meanings and understandings of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup> Lister R., Smith N., Middleton S., Cox L. Young People Talk about Citizenship: Empirical Perspectives on Theoretical and Political Debates// Citizenship Studies. 2003. Vol. 7. No. 2. P. 235–253.; Miller-Idriss C. Everyday Understandings of Citizenship in Germany// Citizenship Studies. 2006. Vol. 10. No. 5. P. 541–570.; Harris A., Wyn J., Younes S. Young people and citizenship: An everyday perspective// Youth Studies Australia. 2007. Vol. 26. No. 3. P.19-27; Pilkington H., Pollock G. 'Politics are bollocks': youth, politics and activism in contemporary Europe // The Sociological Review. 2015. Vol. 63, № S2. P. 1–35.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>65</sup> All projects were supported by the HSE Research Foundation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>66</sup> 'PROMoting Youth Involvement and Social Engagement: Opportunities and Challenges for "Conflicted" Young People across Europe' (European Commission's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme, Grant Agreement no. 693221, 2016 – 2019 years, leader Jo Deakin)

citizenship by young professionals; in the 2016 project she performed an intergenerational comparative analysis of the views on citizenship; in 2016, she was involved in the research of HIV activism in Saint-Petersburg.

In 2018, under the advisory of E. Omelchenko, the author participated in the research that was a part of the Center for Youth Studies project "Promoting Youth Involvement and Social Engagement: Analysis of Innovative Youth Activism in Europe and Russia" (in a consortium for the project "PROMoting Youth Involvement and Social Engagement: opportunities and challenges for 'conflicted' young people across Europe". The participation included a cross-country analysis of cases in Russia, Germany, Croatia, and Portugal and employed a method of meta-ethnographic synthesis, which enabled the author both: to work on the 2017 empirical data and see the common in the experiences, practices, and interpretations of the Russian and European youth <sup>67</sup>.

#### Theoretical framework

The dissertation research was conducted in the framework of the conceptual field of citizenship research as well as the research on political and social engagement of youth in everyday life.

Recent youth research has shown that youth is not apolitical or anti-political, but frustrated with the traditional ways of political participation and the activities of political institutions<sup>68</sup>. Contemporary youth, even with political, civic, and social needs, prefers to avoid traditional channels of participation since they believe that formal politics remains deaf to their problems. B. Cammaerts et. al. argue that "most young people are not bored with politics, but they often believe that those who "do" politics are neither representing them nor caring about them"<sup>69</sup>. State institutions and youth policy form a youth agenda based on their interests, without solving issues that are urgent for the younger generation. Youth are seen either as a resource that needs to be mobilized and built into the existing social order based on the perception of "adults" without taking into account global social shifts and changes in life courses. Or, due to generational differences, young people are viewed as unknown, and therefore unpredictable, and as a consequence, a dangerous part of the population that needs to be taken under control. Because of these views, the

<sup>-</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>67</sup> Nartova N., Shilova N. Cluster Analysis: Cluster 4: Gender/Sexuality// PROMISE: Promoting Youth Involvement and Social Engagement: Opportunities and challenges for conflicted young people across Europe. WP6: From Conflict to Innovation: Ethnographic Case Studies. 2019. URL: http://www.promise.manchester.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Cluster-4-analysis-Final-individual-report.pdf (last accessed: 14.04.2021).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> Pilkington H., Pollock G. 'Politics are bollocks': youth, politics and activism in contemporary Europe // The Sociological Review. 2015. Vol. 63, № S2. P. 1–35.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>69</sup> Cammaerts B., Bruter M., Banaji S., Harrison S., Anstead N. The Myth of Youth Apathy: Young Europeans' Critical Attitudes Toward Democratic Life// American Behavioral Scientist. 2014. Vol. 58. No. 5. – p. 650.

initiatives and choices of young people themselves are often marginalized and stigmatized as deviant.

It is important to bear in mind, however, that the contemporary youth are growing up in a society that is undergoing serious economic, social, and political transformations, and is significantly different from the society in which previous generations grew up. Problems of economic security in the global world, deindustrialization, and the narrowing of opportunities for social mobility are becoming a significant barrier to the usual civic participation since the priority of young people is earning a livelihood, through the concentration of efforts on studies and work <sup>70</sup>. At the same time, a change in the course of life associated with the prolongation of growing up gives a greater resource of "biographical availability" of various ways of social engagement for young people than for other age groups <sup>71</sup>. Living in an individualized, rapidly changing world with limited horizons for planning, youth are forced to reflexively create not only their life projects <sup>72</sup> but also a "new biography of citizenship" <sup>73</sup>.

At the same time, it is youth who in many ways embody the value shift from materialistic to post-materialistic values<sup>74</sup>. Young people form their agenda, on the one hand, lying outside the interests of formal politics, and, on the other hand, including issues that combine political, social, and moral aspects<sup>75</sup>, such as human rights, environmental problems, moral order, and identity<sup>76</sup>. Young generation personifies politics, defending their vision and diversity of lifestyles, taste preferences, consumption, etc<sup>77</sup>. Thus, young people form civic participation, blurring the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup> Harris A., Wyn J., Younes S. Beyond apathetic or activist youth 'Ordinary' young people and contemporary forms of participation// Young. 2010. Vol. 18. No.1. - p.12.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup> Milkman R. (2017) A New Political Generation: Millennials and the Post-2008 Wave of Protest// American Sociological Review. 2017. Vol. 82. No. 1. – p.3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>72</sup> Woodman D., Leccardi C. Generation, transitions, and culture as practice: a temporal approach to youth studies// Youth cultures, transitions, and generations. Bridging the gap in youth research/ Ed. by Woodman D., Bennet A. - Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. P. 56-68.; Leccardi C. Changing time experience, changing biographies and new youth values// Youth Policy in a Changing World. From Theory to Practice/ Ed. by Hahn-Bleibtreu M., Molgat M. - Opladen, Berlin, Toronto: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 2012. P. 225-237.; Beck U., Beck-Gernsheim E. Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and its Social and Political Consequences. - London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage, 2002. 221 p.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</sup> Harris A., Wyn J., Younes S. Beyond apathetic or activist youth 'Ordinary' young people and contemporary forms of participation// Young. 2010. Vol. 18. No.1. - p.13

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</sup> Inglehart R. Values, ideology and cognitive mobilization// R. Dalton, M. Kuechler(Eds) Changing the Political Order: New Social Movements in Western Democracy. Oxford: Polity Press, 2009. P.43-66.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>75</sup> Berger B. Political Theory, Political Science, and the End of Civic Engagement// Perspectives on Politics. 2009. Vol.7. No. 2. P. 335–350.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup> Sveningsson M. 'I Wouldn't Have What It Takes': Young Swedes Understandings of Political Participation // Young. 2015. Vol. 24, No. 2. P. 139–156.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>77</sup> Harris A., Wyn J., Younes S. Beyond apathetic or activist youth 'Ordinary' young people and contemporary forms of participation// Young. 2010. Vol. 18. No. 1. P. 9–32.

boundaries between private and public, through the politicization of morality and micropoliticization of everyday life<sup>78</sup>.

This leads to the fact that young people are significantly expanding the repertoire of forms of engagement and action: from charitable donations to community development, from signing petitions to performances, from seminars to volunteering <sup>79</sup>. Young people create new types of solidarities, building them as autonomous communication spaces based on horizontal connections and sensitive to individual experiences <sup>80</sup>. At the same time, young people often abandon the search for consensus, which they understand as a homogenizing and universalist discourse of dominant political regimes, and see their social spaces as an opportunity to express different points of view, disputes, disagreements, and conflicts <sup>81</sup>, forming spaces that are no longer homogeneous or centered, rather fragmented, heterogeneous, including inequalities and competition <sup>82</sup>. Together with that, new youth civic solidarities imply the inclusion not only of "new", previously excluded groups, e.g., girls and young women, but also the engagement of varying degrees of intensity <sup>83</sup>.

Challenging the thesis about the apathy and infantilism of young generation, researchers emphasize that young people are critical and reflective of what is happening around them. At the same time, engagement is based not only on a rational assessment of the situation but also on moral and emotional involvement<sup>84</sup>. In this context, sociologists of youth express the need to recognize the right to "not participate", since refusal to participate is often not the characteristic of being apathetic or apolitical, but a reflexive choice<sup>85</sup>.

As a result, young people build their own models of citizenship that are implemented in everyday life, based on their personal experience and capabilities: changeable, open, reflexive. Researchers conceptualize such forms of citizenship as "cultural"<sup>86</sup>, "DYI-citizenship"<sup>87</sup>, "self-

<sup>82</sup> Kenny S. Community development today: engaging challenges through cosmopolitanism? // Community Development Journal.2016. Vol. 51, № 1. P. 23–41.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>78</sup> Manning N. 'I mainly look at things on an issue by issue basis': Reflexivity and phronêsis in young people's political engagements// Journal of Youth Studies. 2013. Vol.16. No.1. - p.18.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>79</sup> Adler R. P., Goggin J. What Do We Mean By "Civic Engagement"? // Journal of Transformative Education. 2005. Vol. 3. No.3. P. 236–253.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>80</sup> Pilkington H., Pollock G. 'Politics are bollocks': youth, politics and activism in contemporary Europe // The Sociological Review. 2015. Vol. 63, № S2. -p.8

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>81</sup> Ibid. P. 9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>83</sup> Pilkington H., Acik N. Not Entitled to Talk: (Mis)recognition, Inequality and Social Activism of Young Muslims// Sociology. 2020. Vol. 54. No.1. P. 181–198.; Harris A. Young Women, Late Modern Politics, and the Participatory Possibilities of Online Cultures// Journal of Youth Studies. 2008. Vol. 11. No. 5. P. 481–95.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>84</sup> Manning N. 'I mainly look at things on an issue by issue basis': Reflexivity and phronêsis in young people's political engagements// Journal of Youth Studies. 2013. Vol. 16. No.1. P.17-33.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>85</sup> Cammaerts B., Bruter M., Banaji S., Harrison S., Anstead N. 'The Myth of Youth Apathy: Young Europeans' Critical Attitudes Toward Democratic Life'// American Behavioral Scientist. 2014. Vol. 58. No. 5. P. 645–664.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>86</sup> Stevenson N. Cultural Citizenship in the "Cultural" Society: a Cosmopolitan Approach // Citizenship Studies. 2003. Vol. 7. No. 3. P. 331–348.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>87</sup> Harris A., Roose J. DIY citizenship amongst young Muslims: experiences of the 'ordinary'// Journal of Youth Studies. 2014. Vol. 17. No .6. P. 794–813.

actualizing citizenship"<sup>88</sup>, and young people themselves as "everyday makers"<sup>89</sup>. These forms of citizenship are becoming more sensitive and inclusive<sup>90</sup>, giving youth the opportunity for both individual and collective ways of solving common problems<sup>91</sup>. It is important to emphasize here that day-to-day civic participation and engagement constitute latent political participation<sup>92</sup>. While not traditionally political in form, they nevertheless can potentially influence both the sphere of formal politics and the process of social transformation. At the same time, Pilkinton and Pollock note that privatized and individualized participation is less costly in terms of participation cost and public visibility, which in turn can reduce the importance of unconventional youth participation as civic participation, including for young people themselves<sup>93</sup>.

Overall, the contemporary sociological debate provides the framework for the dissertation research - studying youth citizenship from young people's perspective while taking into consideration the contradictory context of their lives. The turn to everyday life helps to go beyond structural analysis of institutionalized politics and participation/lack of participation<sup>94</sup> in it, which would be dictated by the theory of political opportunities. It allows seeing new views on citizenship, the diversity of forms of participation, emerging and collapsing solidarities, conflicts, and conventions.

#### Methods of data collection and analysis

The dissertation research finds its foundation on several research projects, conducted by the Saint-Petersburg HSE Center for Youth studies between 2013 and 2017. This gives the opportunity to gather more data for analysis and obtain not just single-point results but get a broader picture of views on citizenship and ways of it to be exercised by the urban youth in the past decade.

The dissertation research uses the empirical data gathered for the "Russian Youth Citizenship: Contemporary Meanings and Practices", which was supported by HSE Research Foundation in 2013, and two other projects conducted within the framework of a larger

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>88</sup> Bennett W. L., Wells C., Rank A. Young citizens and civic learning: two paradigms of citizenship in the digital age// Citizenship Studies. 2009. Vol. 13. No. 2. P. 105–120

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>89</sup> Bang H. P. 'Among everyday makers and expert citizens'//Newman, J. (ed.) Remaking Governance. Bristol: Policy Press., 2005. P. 159-179

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>90</sup> Lister R. Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential // Citizenship Studies. 2007. Vol. 11. No.1. P. 49–61.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>91</sup> Rheingans R., Hollands R. 'There is no alternative?': challenging dominant understandings of youth politics in late modernity through a case study of the 2010 UK student occupation movement// Journal of Youth Studies. 2013. Vol. 16. No.4. P. 546–564.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>92</sup> Ekman J., Amna E. Political participation and civic engagement: towards a new typology // Human affairs. 2012. Vol. 22. No. 3. P. 283–300.

<sup>93</sup> Pilkington H., Pollock G. 'Politics are bollocks': youth, politics and activism in contemporary Europe // The Sociological Review. 2015. Vol. 63. № S2. – p.4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>94</sup> Milkman R. A New Political Generation: Millennials and the Post-2008 Wave of Protest// American Sociological Review. 2017. Vol. 82. No. 1. P. 1–31.

international project. One is called "PROMoting Youth Involvement and Social Engagement: opportunities and challenges for 'conflicted' young people across Europe" and was realized as part of the Horizon 2020 program in 2016-2019; the others are "Promoting Youth Involvement and Social Inclusion: Opportunities and Challenges in the Context of Intergenerational Relations" (HSE Research Foundation, 2016) and "Promoting Youth Involvement and Social Inclusion: Analysis of Youth Activist Initiatives and Communities in St. Petersburg" (HSE Research Foundation, 2017)<sup>95</sup>.

The dissertation research was conducted in Saint-Petersburg, which is the second-largest city in Russia. Saint-Petersburg is a metropolis with a population of approximately 5.5 million people; it serves as a point of attraction to educational and labor migration. Like any large city, Saint-Petersburg is culturally, socially, and economically heterogeneous; it allows for many different lifestyles, provides resources for new experiences and initiatives. At the same time, being "the cultural capital" it is a part of all dominant social and political processes and is under a watchful gaze of the federal authorities.

The dissertation research is carried out in the framework of qualitative methodology. The main research method is biographical interview because it enables a researcher to understand young people's individual experiences and their perspectives. Additional methods used in the research are participatory observation of youth scenes and biographical interviews with young people's parents. Thematic analysis was used to work with the transcripts in order to identify common elements in the narratives: reconstruct common topics, events, and dominant ways of their interpretation <sup>96</sup>.

The dissertation research was carried out in several stages. The objective of the first stage in 2013 was to identify the spectrum of ideas about citizenship and the ways to exercise it among urban youth. For this, 35 interviews with "young professionals" were collected in St. Petersburg - young people aged 22 to 30 with higher education, employed in various sectors of the economy. Although the experience of social civic participation was not a criterion for selecting informants, during the interview, 14 people spoke about it. The empirical data analysis has shown that along with essentialized or formalized ideas about citizenship (for example, by place of birth or by passport) and frustration with traditional forms of political participation (e.g. voting or rallies),

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>95</sup> It is important to note that all projects mentioned above were conducted by research teams, which is why the nuances of researcher-informant communication differed from interview to interview due to individual characteristics of the researchers. All researchers, however, complied with the accepting, non-discrimination, subject-subject policy of interaction with the informants. During the project implementation all interviews were recorded on recording devices, transcribed, and anonymized. All names were changed to alias names.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>96</sup> Riessman, Catherine Kohler Narrative Analysis// Kelly N., Horrocks C., Milnes K., Roberts B., Robinson D. (eds) Narrative, Memory and Everyday Life. Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield, 2005. P. 1–7.; Nartova N., Krupets Y., Shilova A. HIV Activism in Modern Russia: From NGOs to Community Development// Community development journal. 2020. Vol. 55. No. 3. – p. 8.

young people, including those who do not have the practice of civic social engagement in their background, articulate the idea of citizenship as an active and effective social participation. The results of this stage of the study are presented in the following publications:

Krupets Y., Morris J., Nartova N., Omelchenko E., Sabirova G. Imagining young adults' citizenship in Russia: from fatalism to affective ideas of belonging // Journal of Youth Studies. 2017. Vol. 20. No. 2. P. 252-267

Krupetz Y., Nartova N., Omelchenko E., Sabirova G. Youth of St. Petersburg and Ulyanovsk: Beyond the Common Civic Identity // XV April International Academic Conference on Economic and Social Development. E.Yasin (ed.). Moscow, HSE publishing house, 2015. Vol. 4. P. 479-487 (in Russ.).

At the second stage of the study in 2016, the dominant idea of citizenship and its implementation in everyday life among young people with experience of civic social participation was clarified, and the specifics of youth citizenship in relation to the parental generation were identified. During this period, interviews were collected with St. Petersburg youth who had at least some experience of social engagement, while their main activity was study or work. In total, the sample included 28 young men and women aged 18 to 26 years, approximately equally distributed in different spheres of activism (political, creative, urban, socially-oriented). To analyze the ideas of citizenship that are new or commonly reproduced and the ways of its realization, the studied young people's parents were interviewed. In the parental generation, 25 women and 7 men were interviewed, most of whom had higher education (25 people), 6 people received secondary vocational education, and one only had a school education. The qualitative data analysis showed that young St. Petersburgers are building a model of citizenship that is different from that of their parents; it includes active involvement in social changes in everyday space. At the same time, for parents, citizenship is mainly defined in moral and ethical categories and manifests itself through responsible work activity. The results of the second stage of the study are presented in following publications:

Nartova N. Citizenship as understood by St.Petersburg young people and their parents // Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya [Sociological Studies]. 2019. Vol. 45. No 12. P. 38-47 (in Russ.).

Nartova N. Citizenship and social engagement of youth in the Putin era// Youth in Putin's Russia/ Ed. by E. Omelchenko. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021 (forthcoming).

As part of the third stage of the research in 2017, the main ways of exercising citizenship as the social engagement of young people in everyday life were analyzed using the case study method. A scene of civic activists for moral order in the city, a scene of civic opposition activism, an LGBTIQ scene, a feminist scene, and a scene of HIV activism were selected for study in St. Petersburg. In total, 67 in-depth biographical interviews were collected with men and women,

scene participants aged 18 to 35 years. Additionally, interviews with 9 people involved in the scenes aged 36-40 and two over 40. The informants of this research were involved in one or another activist field, but in different positions: from volunteers to NGO leaders. The field data analysis showed that for socially active youth in St. Petersburg, work within the community and for the community is a key strategy for their own social participation and the way to exercise citizenship, which nevertheless carries a number of restrictions for broader social changes.

The results of this stage are presented in the following publications:

Nartova N., Krupets Y., Shilova A. HIV Activism in Modern Russia: From NGOs to Community Development // Community development journal. 2020. Vol. 55. No. 3. P. 419-436.

Nartova N. Citizenship and social engagement of youth in the Putin era// Youth in Putin's Russia/ Ed. by E. Omelchenko. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021 (forthcoming).

Thus, the empirical foundation of the dissertation research consists of 109 biographical interviews with young people in St. Petersburg aged 18-35 who have experience of civic social engagement. Among the informants, there are people with university education, students, and people with only school education. There are people from high-income and low-income families. There are individuals with addiction and criminal history. At the time of the study, some of the informants were married and had children, some were in childless partnerships, some were single/unmarried or raised children on their own. However, these young people differ not only in their socio-economic background and values but also in different experiences of social engagement - from isolated cases of volunteer work to active activist participation. What is common to all informants is that their social inclusion takes place outside traditional political institutions (such as parties, for example). This allows, on the one side, to overcome the passive/active dichotomy in the study of young people and to consider it as a component of a continuum of different experiences and intensity of participation. On the other side, to include in the analysis of civic participation not only political activists but also young people distancing themselves from direct politically oriented activities. On the third side, to highlight the emerging convention on the understanding and interpretation of citizenship, as well as the main ways to exercise it by socially active urban youth in Russia.

#### Statements to be defended

1. In the dissertation research, for the first time in Russian sociology of youth, citizenship is studied as an emerging convention regarding the interpretation and implementation of citizenship that is formed in everyday life outside the institutions of formal politics and traditional channels of civic political participation. This approach allowed us to deproblematise young people as non-citizens, broaden the basis for analysing citizenship,

- and highlight the emerging model of citizenship among young people who have experience of social engagement.
- 2. The research has shown that young people are a group that not only assimilates dominant norms of citizenship in the process of transition to adulthood, but is also actively involved in the creation of ideas about citizenship and the ways of its implementation, building their own model of citizenship that differs from both state and parental models. This in turn leads to significant generational shifts in the interpretation of citizenship.
- 3. Citizenship of Russian youth is formed in the specific conditions of growing up the socio-political context of Russia in the 2000s-2020s, characterized by a significant reduction in available modes of public civic participation. At the same time, young people are not becoming apolitical or non-citizen, but are articulating the idea of active citizenship and seeking new channels of participation, influence and solidarity, including in the space of everyday life.
- 4. The analysis of the vast empirical material shows that among young citizens who have experience of social engagement, a personified model of citizenship develops, which implies active personal involvement (care, responsibility, reflexivity, critical thinking to what is happening around) and activity in everyday life (manifestation of activity in relation to others in space accessible to young people for change and influence) "everyday caring citizenship". The implementation of such a model of citizenship is accompanied for youth by the activity of creating and developing communities, which gives young people a sense of solidarity and belonging in a socially heterogeneous world.
- 5. The dissertation research has shown that joining together with those close to them in spirit and biographical experience allows young people to create relatively safe spaces, maintain their own identities, and recognize existing experiences. The creation of small groups, however, leads not only to conflicts between them but also to the impossibility of broader solidarity. This, in turn, narrows the possibility of developing general consensus strategies aimed at the long-term perspective of social change.

#### The main research findings

The idea of citizenship: 'non-indifference', criticism, and care for others<sup>97</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>97</sup> The findings demonstrated in this subparagraph are presented in the publications submitted to the defense - Krupets Y., Morris J., Nartova N., Omelchenko E., Sabirova G. Imagining young adults' citizenship in Russia: from fatalism to affective ideas of belonging // Journal of Youth Studies. 2017. Vol. 20. No. 2. P. 252-267; Nartova N. Citizenship as understood by St.Petersburg young people and their parents // Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya [Sociological Studies]. 2019. Vol. 45. No 12. P. 38-47 (in Russ.). And in additional publications: Nartova N. Citizenship and social engagement of youth in the Putin era// Youth in Putin's Russia/ Ed. by E. Omelchenko. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021 (в печати); Krupetz Y., Nartova N., Omelchenko E., Sabirova G. Youth of St. Petersburg and

The devaluation of the political and the imposition of state patriotism<sup>98</sup>, as the main logic of expression of belonging to the state, expressed in unconditional loyalty to the existing system, give rise to a critical perception of state rhetoric among young people. At the same time, youth want to retain the right to active, effective citizenship. That is why, along with the essentialized ideas about citizenship as a status upon birth, or the logic of privatized citizenship as responsibility for their lives, urban young people articulate the idea of citizenship as active, including political participation.

However, this active position is not absolute; it is associated with individual choices and the available forces and opportunities. Young people associate the idea of active citizenship in conditions of individual opportunities with a number of special characteristics of a citizen and citizenship in general, which in turn endows this idealized idea with concrete practical meaning and gives an idea of the possibilities of its implementation.

Citizenship is associated with sympathy for what is happening around. At the same time, "non-indifference" is constructed not just as empathy, but as an effective personal responsibility. At the same time, non-indifference and empathy, in the opinion of young people, should be accompanied by the development of critical perception of the surrounding reality. Young people defend their autonomous judgment and label this as an important part of citizenship.

The next important characteristic constituting citizenship is activity orientation. Non-indifference and criticism should not lead to passivity, but should stimulate activity, should lead to some action steps.

When it comes to activities, youth values orientation towards others. Young men and women emphasize that citizenship is going beyond the limits of their individual life, it is an activity that is directed outside - at other people and problematic situations around them.

At the same time, however, for young people, involvement in helping others is a very specific activity in that space, in the context where they can do something and influence the situation, even if these are small steps or small actions. For youth, citizenship is in many ways citizenship "at arm's length" - targeted, concrete actions that may not lead to "world peace", but will make a difference.

Such "caring labor" in David Gerber's broadened understanding <sup>99</sup> is fundamentally important for young people, it gives meaning not only to the very manifestation of citizenship but

Ulyanovsk: Beyond the Common Civic Identity // XV April International Academic Conference on Economic and Social Development. E.Yasin (ed.). Moscow, HSE publishing house, 2015. Vol. 4. P. 479-487 (in Russ.).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>98</sup> С чего начинается Родина: молодежь в лабиринтах патриотизма / Науч. ред.: Е. Л. Омельченко, Х. Пилкингтон. Ульяновск: Ульяновский государственный университет, 2012. 320 с.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>99</sup> Гербер Д. Бредовая работа. Трактат о распространении бессмысленного труда. М.: Ад Маргинем Пресс, 2020. 331 с.

also to their life in general. Moreover, it is included in the general value concepts of how the world should work. Tatiana, a twenty-two-year-old, with experience of volunteering, discusses who real citizens are:

"I think they don't allow injustice to triumph. I mean, if they see that it's unfair when they leave a child in kindergarten when he/she has neither a close adult nor normal clothes there, then they try to mitigate this injustice. I mean, you can't say that you can help everyone, but you can make a difference with your participation. Or it may concern ecology, that is, you can simply separate your garbage at home or not litter on the street. And well, among my people, I respect those who think about that" (2016).

Hence, young people form, on the one hand, a very personalized model of citizenship, based on personal care and responsibility, on the other hand, critical and reflective, focused on independent judgments, and third, an active one, focused on the manifestation of activity in relation to others in the space where they can change and influence something. And this greatly distinguishes the younger generation from their parents, for whom citizenship is privatized and is primarily associated with moral and ethical attitudes of "being a good person" and privatized responsibilities - working, paying taxes, etc. The emerging convention among young people on citizenship as "everyday caring citizenship" largely determines the direction of the implementation of this idea, or, in other words, the ways of exercising citizenship.

Exercising citizenship: working for a community 100

There is a disappointment among young people in the available channels for political democratic participation. For many young men and women, this is not so much an internalized general mood but a personal experience. Traditional ways of expressing citizenship in Russia look both ineffective and dangerous for young people. In general, youth talk about the repressive nature of the modern Russian state - "no freedom, no right to speak out" (Irina, 26 years old, IT specialist, 2013), "people are imprisoned for reposts, likes, jokes. People are being eavesdropped, inspected, and their correspondence is being read" (Aleksandr, 18 years old, student, political activist, 2017), although the potential for youth solidarity in public protest remains.

At the same time, the experience of civic participation for many young men and women begins precisely with an internal need to get involved, with an internal need for action, as a reaction

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>100</sup> The findings demonstrated in this subparagraph are presented in the publications submitted to the defense - Nartova N. Citizenship as understood by St.Petersburg young people and their parents // Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya [Sociological Studies]. 2019. Vol. 45. No 12. P. 38-47 (in Russ.).; Nartova N., Krupets Y., Shilova A. HIV Activism in Modern Russia: From NGOs to Community Development // Community development journal. 2020. Vol. 55. No.

<sup>3.</sup> P. 419–436. And additional publications: Nartova N. Citizenship and social engagement of youth in the Putin era// Youth in Putin's Russia/ Ed. by E. Omelchenko. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021 (forthcoming).

to what is happening in the country - with the feeling that "it is impossible not to do". However, the first action or engagement does not make a person a citizen. Young people emphasize the process of becoming a citizen, the need to invest time, personal and other resources in mastering the skills of civic and social participation.

Cross-country meta-ethnographic analysis of youth activism shows that social engagement not only enables young people to develop many skills and competencies but also significantly expands the range of their social and civic participation<sup>101</sup>.

For young people, grassroots social and civic activity is important. Young people share the idea of the formation of civil society as a community of initiative, involved people. And they see self-organization and work for the community as the main direction of their activity: "I was born in this country, and I see its problems, and I want to help people organize themselves and solve these problems" (Svetlana, 21 years old, student, 2016).

For youth, it is working within the community and for the community that is the key, often the only effective strategy for their own social participation and the way to exercise citizenship. Involvement activism of different kinds allows young people not only to create friendly networks but in general, gives a sense of belonging to the community, participation in important events for the community. Grassroots social participation, community development, and "caring work", give young people a sense of satisfaction, support, and meaning in their own activities.

Thus, the emerging idea of "everyday citizenship of care" is accompanied for St. Petersburg's youth by the activity of creating and developing communities. Activities within different groups, on the one hand, require young people to develop various skills, and, on the other hand, expand the spheres of their social engagement. But more importantly, everyday communication, friendship, direct care, and participation in communities give young people a sense of solidarity, belonging, and involvement in these small steps to improve the world around them, including for themselves.

Constraints in ways to exercise citizenship: biographical control, conflicts and the impossibility of a long-term perspective<sup>102</sup>.

<sup>102</sup> The findings demonstrated in this subparagraph are presented in the publications submitted to the defense - Nartova N., Krupets Y., Shilova A. HIV Activism in Modern Russia: From NGOs to Community Development // Community development journal. 2020. Vol. 55. No. 3. P. 419-436. And the additional publication: Nartova N. Citizenship and social engagement of youth in the Putin era// Youth in Putin's Russia/ Ed. by E. Omelchenko. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021 (forthcoming).

Nartova N., Shilova N. Cluster Analysis: Cluster 4: Gender/Sexuality// PROMISE: Promoting Youth Involvement and Social Engagement: Opportunities and challenges for conflicted young people across Europe. WP6: From Conflict to Innovation: Ethnographic Case Studies, 2019. URL: http://www.promise.manchester.ac.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2019/04/Cluster-4-analysis-Final-individual-report.pdf (last accessed: 14.04.2021).

The model of citizenship, built on the ideas of "everyday caring citizenship", which is also actively implemented through building activist groups and working for communities, faces a number of significant problems and constraints for young people themselves and society as a whole.

Involvement in communities is associated with "biographical control" of entry and membership in it. Karin Clement and Anna Zhelnina, in their work on pragmatic politics, argue that, among other things, it is built on an imaginary community with all those who share the same life experience, and therefore is not necessarily tolerant <sup>103</sup>.

Young activists talk about the existing practices of control over the entry into a community when the background of a person is checked for its compliance with the experience and goals shared by this group. The discrepancy between the biography of a potential participant and the biographies of other members of the group may lead to the need for a newcomer to prove his/her own "trustworthiness" or to question the general legitimacy of a person in some area of civic participation.

Biography is often seen as a key resource for belonging and the right to participate in communities that bring together people whose experiences are marginalized and stigmatized. There are many of them in Russia, including non-heterosexual youth, transgender youth, or, for example, HIV-positive youth. The desire to create a safe, understanding, and accepting space leads to a mode of participation where, only with a specific biographical experience, a person can act on behalf of the community and for it. In this way, 19-year-old HIV-negative Fedor reflects on his status in the context of his own volunteer work to protect the rights of HIV-positive people:

"I don't have the characteristic there that I am very often accused of - very often I face criticism towards me, I have no status, HIV-positive status /... / I hear so often that "you have no future in HIV activism, you have no status, what can you tell them, you have no status, how can you communicate with positive people, you have no right to talk with positive people", well, that kind of garbage" (2017).

Unification with those who have similar experiences leads, on the one hand, to the creation of groups that are small, self-contained, and isolated from the "big world", where like-minded people find everything understandable and shared. On the other hand, it generates many emotionally charged conflicts both within groups and between them.

Researchers consider conflict and rejection of consensus as one of the important characteristics of contemporary youth civic and social participation, as their resistance to dominant

24

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>103</sup> Clément K., Zhelnina A. Beyond Loyalty and Dissent: Pragmatic Everyday Politics in Contemporary Russia// International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society. 2020. Vol. 33. No.2. – p.146.

political norms<sup>104</sup>. Individual biographies cannot be reduced to one another; they do not represent static sets of statuses/positions/interests/interpretations; they are dynamic and changeable, contextually redefinable, so they will generate a difference for which young people are not always ready. It is the recruiting of biography, in my opinion, and broader than private experience, as a basis for legitimation, the endless evaluation of each other for similarities and differences, privileges, and vulnerabilities that do not provide opportunities for consolidation and consensus. Because of this, young people involved in various initiatives can hardly unite and work towards common goals.

Small groups and communities give both a sense of belonging to the participants and become spaces of escape from a large and non-accepting society, participating in conflicts and confrontations with others. Together with individual and group action at arm's length and direct care, they form a new experience of civic participation, in which time condenses into the here and now, without giving the opportunity to see the long-term prospects of social change.

Overall, modern youth citizenship, actualizes the present, solving problems through care and work for communities that can be solved here and now. At the same time, young people also get stuck in the present, refusing to build long-term consolidated strategies.

#### Conclusion

The dissertation research has shown that Russian youth, like their Western peers, are forming a new model of citizenship focused on exercising it in everyday life. The "everyday caring citizenship" created by young residents of St. Petersburg is associated with non-indifference, personal responsibility, and actions where they can change something. However, in Russian context, private everyday life and informal communities are the only spaces where young people can do something since the public sphere is under the monopoly control of the state. By labeling traditional civic participation, such as demonstrations or elections, as dangerous and ineffective channels, young people are relegated to day-to-day care, volunteering, and community development.

The development of local groups, associations, and communities is becoming a key resource for St. Petersburg youth, both in exercising citizenship and in gaining a sense of belonging. Social engagement enables young people to develop skills and abilities, expand areas of participation, and generally form agency, even for those groups of young people who are persistently stigmatized and marginalized. The creation through social participation of networks of support and

\_

Pilkington H., Pollock G. 'Politics are bollocks': youth, politics and activism in contemporary Europe // The Sociological Review. 2015. Vol. 63. № S2. P. 1–35.

recognition, as well as a broader sense of belonging, are generally regarded by researchers as some of the important aspects of citizenship<sup>105</sup>. At the same time, pressure on NGOs and public associations in Russia does not allow young people to take their groups into public space. Young people form a kind of "Zomia"<sup>106</sup>, in many ways a reality parallel to the state, in which they try to run away from the state and resist it.

Connecting with those who are close in spirit and biographical experience allows young people to create relatively safe spaces, maintain their own identities, and recognize existing experiences. The creation of small groups, however, leads not only to conflicts between them but also to the impossibility of broader solidarity. This, in turn, narrows the possibility of developing common consensus strategies aimed at the long term. Youth civic social engagement actualizes the present but faces the future with difficulty. This calls into question the effectiveness of such models of citizenship. After all, state institutions remain the key players in long-term planning that determine the country's development, while the young people involved in this study not only do not trust them but also distance themselves from them.

Of course, it is not possible to extrapolate these results directly to all Russian youth, as the findings are limited by the methodology, empirical basis and geography of the study. As quantitative surveys show, a large proportion of young people have no experience of civic social engagement, and among those who do - a high number of young men and women involved in progovernment initiatives - official university volunteer organisations, which for Lev Gudkov and colleagues rather devalues the civic potential of young people <sup>107</sup>. However, qualitative research suggests that the state model of military-patriotic citizenship <sup>108</sup> is being actively redefined by the Russian people, including young people in their daily lives <sup>109</sup>. Participants in even state-sanctioned volunteer and public initiatives do not show total loyalty and reproduce the dominant ideology; their motives are varied: from career benefits and new competencies, to a desire for a sense of

Parker A., Morgan H. Citizenship, Marginalisation and Youth Offending: Acceptance, Responsibility and Resettlement// Sociological Research Online. 2020. Vol. 25. No. 3. P. 507-523.; Mansouri F., Kirpitchenko L. Practices of active citizenship among migrant youth: beyond conventionalities// Social Identities. 2016. Vol. 22. No.3. P. 307-323.; Cicognani E., Mazzoni D., Albanesi C., Zani B. Sense of Community and Empowerment Among Young People: Understanding Pathwaysfrom Civic Participation to Social Well-Being// Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations. 2015. Vol. 26. No. 1. P. 24-44.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>106</sup> Скотт Дж. С. Искусство быть неподвластным: Анархическая история высокогорий Юго-Восточной Азии. М.: Новое издательство, 2017. 568 с.

 $<sup>^{107}</sup>$  Гудков Л., Зоркая Н., Кочергина Е., Пипия К., Рысева А. «Поколение Z»: молодежь времен путинского правления// Вестник общественного мнения. 2020. № 1-2 (130). - c. 43-44.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>108</sup> Ясавеев И. Г. Лейтмотивы властной риторики в отношении российской молодёжи // Социологическое обозрение. 2016. Т. 15. № 3. С. 49-67.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>109</sup> Клеман К. Патриотизм снизу. «Как такое возможно, чтобы люди жили так бедно в богатой стране?». М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2021. – 232 с.; С чего начинается Родина: молодежь в лабиринтах патриотизма / Науч. ред.: Е. Л. Омельченко, Х. Пилкингтон. Ульяновск: Ульяновский государственный университет, 2012. 320 с.

belonging and the need to be useful in the here and now<sup>110</sup>. Thus, I would suggest that in contemporary Russia there is an emerging demand from young people for active citizenship outside the sphere of official legitimate politics, allowing them to engage, solidarise, influence and care in the spaces available to them for control.

# List of publications by the author of the dissertation that reflect the main research findings of the dissertation

Articles presented to the defense:

- 1. Krupets Y., Morris J., Nartova N., Omelchenko E., Sabirova G. Imagining young adults' citizenship in Russia: from fatalism to affective ideas of belonging // Journal of Youth Studies, 2017. Vol. 20, No. 2. P. 252-267.
- Nartova N. Citizenship as understood by St.Petersburg young people and their parents //
  Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya [Sociological Studies]. 2019. Vol. 45. No 12. P. 38-47 (in
  Russ.).
- 3. Nartova N., Krupets Y., Shilova A. HIV Activism in Modern Russia: From NGOs to Community Development // Community development journal. 2020. Vol. 55. No. 3. P. 419-436.

#### Additional publications

- Nartova N. Citizenship and social engagement of youth in the Putin era// Youth in Putin's Russia/ Ed. by E. Omelchenko. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021 (Forthcoming).
- Krupetz Y., Nartova N., Omelchenko E., Sabirova G. Youth of St. Petersburg and Ulyanovsk: Beyond the Common Civic Identity // XV April International Academic Conference on Economic and Social Development. E.Yasin (ed.). Moscow, HSE publishing house, 2015. Vol. 4. P. 479-487 (in Russ.).

#### **Approbation of research findings**

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>110</sup> См. например: Лукьянова Е., Елкина О. Волонтерство как пространство молодежного взаимодействия: в поисках и противоречиях развития// Молодежь в городе: культуры, сцены и солидарности. Под ред. Е.Омельченко., М.: Издательский дом Высшей школы экономики. С. 229-281.; Гончарова Н. В., Ясавеев И. Г. Конструирование смыслов поисковой работы в России: лейтмотивы властей и участников экспедиций // Мир России: Социология, этнология. 2020. Т. 29. № 1. С. 153-173.

International conference "Youth in society: in search of new solidarities" (St. Petersburg, 16-17.10.2015). Paper: Citizenship of Russian youth: meanings, practices, emotions. With Y. Krupet.

International conference "Urban youth cultures: solidarity, creativity, activism" (St. Petersburg, 30.11-01.12.2017). Paper: HIV activism in St. Petersburg: from NGOs to community development. With A. Shilova.

Winter discussion school Gaidpark (Repino, 01.02.2018). Paper: Ideological, civil, family, career, sexual orientations of Generation Z. With E. Omelchenko, Y. Krupets.

International conference: "Nationalism, Empire and State" (St. Petersburg, 07-08.04.2018). Paper: A palette of patriotic sentiments of urban youth: from fighters for moral order to everyday citizenship. With E. Omelchenko.

International seminar "Postsocialist Revolutions of Intimacy: Sexuality, Rights and Backlash" (Stockholm, 01-02.10.2018). Paper: Between Scylla and Charybdis: the youth LGBTQ+ activism in modern Russia.

International conference «Young people and social change: action, reaction and inaction» (Manchester, 08-09.04.2019). Paper: Youth-quakes? Desires, needs and actions! Presentations and panel discussion of cluster analysis findings. Cluster 4: Gender and sexuality. With A.Shilova.

Public Seminar of the Institute for Russian and East European Studies, Indiana University (Bloomington, 23.09.2019). Paper: Between Public and Private: Youth in Search of Citizenship in Modern Russia.