

State Youth Policy: The Evolution of Concepts and A Cross-National Analysis of Models

Zarina Lukhmanova

PhD in Political Science, Uzbekistan

Received: 30 May 2026; **Accepted:** 26 June 2026; **Published:** 20 July 2026

Abstract: State youth policy has evolved from a fragmented set of social support measures into an independent field of public policy aimed at promoting the comprehensive development of young people and strengthening their role in society. This article examines the evolution of theoretical approaches to youth policy and presents a cross-national analysis of its principal models. The study explores the conceptual distinctions between social policy, youth policy, and state youth policy while highlighting their institutional and functional characteristics. Particular attention is paid to the historical development of youth policy, the emergence of new governance approaches, and the transformation of policy priorities in response to political, economic, and social changes. Based on a comparative analysis of international experience, the paper identifies the main models of youth policy and evaluates their strengths and limitations. The findings demonstrate that no universal model of youth policy exists. Instead, each country develops its own approach according to its political system, institutional framework, socio-economic conditions, and historical context.

Keywords: State youth policy, youth policy models, cross-national analysis, public policy, youth development, youth governance.

Introduction: Under contemporary conditions, assessing and addressing youth-related issues has become increasingly important. Governments and international organizations now recognize the significant role of young people in maintaining social stability and promoting peacebuilding while creating favorable conditions for the realization of their potential [1].

During the 1950s and 1960s, profound socio-political transformations stimulated renewed interest in youth participation in public and political life. This period was characterized by an unprecedented increase in youth protest movements, including student demonstrations and youth-led social revolutions [2].

The emerging global challenges gave rise to a new discourse focused on protecting younger generations from future conflicts and wars while fostering a culture of peace, mutual respect, and understanding through the promotion of universal ideals of peaceful coexistence. These developments marked the

beginning of the institutional history of modern youth policy [3].

In the 1970s, youth policy gradually emerged as an independent area of public policy in developed countries [4]. This decade represented a turning point in its institutional development. Youth policy became increasingly separated from general social policy, leading to the formation of its own conceptual framework, implementation mechanisms, and governance technologies.

Initially, however, youth policy developed in a fragmented and poorly coordinated manner. Government agencies implemented youth-related initiatives independently, responding primarily to the most pressing social problems affecting young people. Consequently, two major approaches to youth policy implementation emerged. The first advocated a relatively fragmented and decentralized approach (Coleman & Warren-Adamson, 1992 [5]), whereas the second emphasized the importance of a

comprehensive, coordinated, and integrated youth policy (Jones & Wallace, 1992 [6]).

A comparative analysis of youth policies worldwide demonstrates their highly diverse and issue-oriented nature. Governments typically formulated youth policy in response to specific societal concerns, including adolescence, child protection and welfare, social inequality, vocational education, juvenile delinquency, hooliganism, deviant behavior, and crime.

During the 1970s, considerable academic attention was devoted to youth subcultures and distinctive youth lifestyles. Since the early 1980s, researchers increasingly focused on youth unemployment, labor market integration, and employment opportunities.

The 1990s witnessed growing interest in specific youth-related challenges, including suicide, changing patterns of sexual behavior, alcohol and drug abuse, and the spread of HIV/AIDS. These emerging social issues significantly influenced the priorities and strategic directions of national youth policies across the world. At the same time, the fragmented nature of youth policy remained closely associated with broader social policy, partly because the very concept of "youth" lacks a universally accepted definition.

Thus, the evolution of youth policy has followed a gradual and adaptive trajectory closely linked to the socio-political challenges characteristic of each historical period. Whereas early government interventions primarily focused on responding to youth-related social problems, subsequent developments increasingly recognized young people as independent actors of social development. This transition reflects the progressive institutionalization of youth policy and the emergence of its own theoretical foundations, distinguishing it from the broader field of social policy.

To fully understand youth policy, it is therefore necessary to distinguish between the concepts of social policy and youth policy. Undoubtedly, youth policy represents one of the specialized domains of social policy that has undergone a process of institutionalization within this broader field [7]. Compared with youth policy, the concept of social policy is more clearly defined.

Social policy refers to the study of social systems, society, and the ways in which welfare systems satisfy human needs [8]. As an academic discipline, social policy is regarded as an applied social science drawing upon sociology, political science, economics, history, and demography to address issues related to public welfare. Its distinctive feature lies in its focus on analyzing systems of social governance and evaluating the functioning of institutions responsible for meeting

the needs of society. Consequently, social policy may be understood as the policy concerned with examining the structure and functioning of welfare systems designed to improve societal well-being.

Social Policy and Youth Policy: Conceptual Distinctions

Research in the field of social policy primarily focuses on public institutions (Young, 1985 [9]; Hills, 1991 [10]), including education, vocational training, the labor market, healthcare and social welfare systems, as well as crime prevention and the criminal justice system. Other areas of social policy address the needs of specific population groups, such as persons with disabilities, homeless individuals, older adults, and other socially vulnerable categories (Biggs, 1993 [11]; Swain et al., 1993 [12]; Thornton, 1990 [13]).

Social policy traditionally concentrates on supporting the most vulnerable members of society and those requiring state protection and assistance. Consequently, it may be defined as a set of governmental measures aimed at ensuring public welfare by addressing fundamental social needs such as security, education, employment, healthcare, poverty reduction, migration management, and social protection [14].

In contrast, youth policy represents a comprehensive system of activities implemented by public authorities, political parties, civil society organizations, and other non-governmental institutions engaged in social development. Its primary objective is to promote the development of young people, satisfy their essential social needs, address the most pressing challenges affecting youth, facilitate their social adaptation, and encourage active participation in social processes. In other words, youth policy specifically targets the younger segment of the population [15].

Youth policy has become an innovative branch of social policy that has undergone a complex and often contradictory process of institutionalization [16]. Many theoretical and practical issues remain open to debate, reflecting the relatively recent development of the academic disciplines—such as sociology, psychology, public administration, and political science—that provide the theoretical foundations for youth policy research.

Although youth policy may be regarded as a component of social policy, contemporary developments indicate that it has evolved into an autonomous field of public policy in many countries.

Throughout its development, two closely related concepts have emerged: "youth policy" and "state youth policy." The latter is particularly widespread in the post-Soviet academic and political discourse. The

key distinction between these concepts lies in the degree of state involvement and the participation of non-governmental actors in policy implementation. Consequently, the concept of youth policy is considerably broader than that of state youth policy.

According to one definition, state youth policy refers to the activities of public authorities aimed at creating legal, economic, and organizational conditions that enable the self-realization of young people and support the development of youth organizations, movements, and initiatives [17].

Another definition describes state youth policy as a specific form of legislative and executive activity intended to unlock the creative potential of young people and facilitate their successful transition into independent adulthood.

A broader interpretation defines state youth policy as the activity of public administrative institutions implementing a comprehensive set of measures based on legislative authority and legal regulations to influence the socialization of young people while preventing negative forms of social behavior. Within this framework, youth is formally recognized as a distinct socio-demographic group with legally defined status.

These interpretations share a common feature: they regard the state as the principal actor responsible for youth policy implementation.

Conversely, the broader concept of youth policy emphasizes the participation of a much wider range of actors. These include both formal institutions—such as government agencies, international organizations, and political parties—and informal institutions, including families, peer groups, and local communities [18].

Accordingly, youth policy may be defined as a systematic and integrated activity carried out jointly by the state, political parties, public institutions, non-governmental organizations, and other formal and informal social actors. Its purpose is to promote youth development, provide social support, satisfy the most important social needs of young people, solve their most significant problems, facilitate their social integration, and encourage active participation in society [19].

Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that the concept of state youth policy identifies the state as the sole or primary policy actor, whereas the broader concept of youth policy recognizes both governmental institutions and civil society organizations as active participants whose resources, capacities, and interactions shape the policy-making process [20].

Therefore, the concepts of social policy, youth policy,

and state youth policy represent successive levels of specialization. Social policy encompasses all categories of the population, whereas youth policy focuses on a specific socio-demographic group by considering the distinctive characteristics of youth socialization and development. State youth policy, in turn, represents only one institutional mechanism for implementing youth policy, with government serving as the leading actor. Consequently, treating these concepts as synonymous is methodologically inaccurate and limits the comprehensive analysis of contemporary youth governance.

REFERENCES

1. Резолюцию СБ ООН 2250 Молодежь, мир и безопасность
Источник: <https://www.youth4peace.info/UNSCR2250/Introduction>
2. Чальцева И. С. Молодежная политика за рубежом: попытка анализа// Сравнительная педагогика, 2016, С. 296, Стр 87
3. 954-е пленарное заседание ООН Меры, направленные на содействие распространению среди молодежи идеалов мира, взаимного уважения и взаимопонимания между народами// 198 декабря 1960 г.
4. Coles B. Youth and social policy. Youth citizenship and young careers// University of York, UCLPress. 2020. P. 250. Pp.30-31.
5. Coleman J.C., Warren-Adamson C. Youth policy in the 1990s: the way forward//London: Routledge.1992.
6. Jones G, .Wallace C. Youth family and citizenship//Milton Keynes: Open University Press. 1992.
7. Пель В.С. Государственная молодежная политика//Новосибирск: Изд-во СибАГС, 2015. С.143. Стр.5.
8. Coles B. Youth and social policy. Youth citizenship and young careers// University of York, UCLPress. 2020. P. 250. Pp.23.
9. Young P. Mastering social welfare //London: Macmillan. 1985.
10. Hills J. The state of welfare: the welfare state in Britain since 1974 //Oxford: Clarendon.1991.
11. Biggs S. Understanding ageing //Buckingham: Open University Press. 1993.
12. Swain J., Finkelstein V., French S, Oliver M. Disabling barriers-enabling environments //London: Sage. 1993.
13. Thornton R. The new homeless: the crisis of youth

- homelessness and the response of local housing authorities //London: SHAC. 1990.
14. Coles B. Youth and social policy. Youth citizenship and young careers//University of York, UCLPress. 2020, P. 250. Pp.97.
15. Доклад специалистов Российской академии народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте Российской Федерации Молодежь России 2000-2025 гг: развитие человеческого капитала /Министерство образования и науки Российской Федерации, Росмолодёжь, Москва. 2013 С.187. Стр.20. //Источник: <http://vmo.rgub.ru/files/report-937-2.pdf>
16. Пель В.С. Государственная молодежная политика//Новосибирск: Изд-во СибАГС, 2015. С 143.Стр 5.
17. Басов Н.Ф. Содержания и основные направления социальной работы с молодежью//Технологии социальной работы с молодежью/сборник//2013 г. Стр. 10.
18. Меркулов П.А. Исторический опыт разработки и реализации государственной молодежной политики в России С. 245, Стр. 111.
19. Доклад специалистов Российской академии народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте Российской Федерации Молодежь России 2000-2025 гг: развитие человеческого капитала /Министерство образования и науки Российской Федерации, Росмолодёжь, Москва. 2013 С.187. Стр.40. Источник: <http://vmo.rgub.ru/files/report-937-2.pdf>
20. Государственная молодежная политика: российская и мировая практика реализации в обществе инновационного потенциала новых поколений: науч. монография / под общ.ред. Вал. А. Лукова. — М.: Изд-во Моск. гуманит. ун-та, 2013. С. 25.
21. Анисимов А.В. Новая молодежная политика в Томской области – Инструменты интеграции// Социально-гуманитарные молодежные проекты университетов – местному сообществу. Материалы Всероссийской научно-практической конференции с международным участием, 25–26 октября 2012 года Редактор Е.В. Лукина/Томск: Изд-во Том. ун-та, 2013. С.214. Стр. 16.
22. Кострова А.А. Публичная молодежная политика: процесс становления и реализации в современной России//Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата политических наук. Москва, 2008, Стр. 10.
23. Меркулов П.А. Исторический опыт разработки и реализации государственной молодежной политики в России // Москва, 2015, С 245. Стр 110.
24. Ginwright Sh., Cammarota J. and Noguera P. Youth, Social Justice, and Communities: Toward a Theory of Urban Youth Policy Published by: Social Justice/Global Options, Vol. 32, No. 3 (101), Waging War over Public Education and Youth Services (2005), P. 24-40 Pp.27.URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/29768319>
25. Луков В.А. Концептуализация молодёжи в XXI веке: новые идеи и подходы// СОЦИС. 2012.№2
26. Левада-центр (Аналитический центр изучения общественного мнения им. Юрия Левады) утверждает, что в России усилились эмиграционные настроения. Уехать из страны хочет каждый пятый опрошенный - 21% против 17% в 2014 году. Значительно увеличилась доля желающих уехать среди молодежи в возрасте от 18 до 24 лет - с 22% в 2015 году до 53% в 2019 году. Основными причинами респонденты называют желание обеспечить достойное будущее детям, а также экономическую и политическую ситуацию в стране. Источник: <https://www.levada.ru/2019/11/26/emigratsionnye-nastroeniya-4/>
27. Ginwright Sh., Cammarota J. and Noguera P. Youth, Social Justice, and Communities: Toward a Theory of Urban Youth Policy // Published by: Social Justice/Global Options, Vol. 32, No. 3 (101), Waging War over Public Education and Youth Services (2005), Pp. 24-40 P.27 URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/29768319>
28. Левитская А. А. Молодежная политика- национальный приоритет России Источник: www.coe.int/t/dg4/youth/Source/Resources/Forum21/Issue_No9/N9_YP_Russia_ru.pdf
29. Скробов А.П. Молодежь России: тенденции социального развития в условиях кризиса // СПб. 2010. С. 131. Стр. 25.
30. Елишев С.О. Общественная молодежная политика крупных хозяйственных объединений (корпораций) // Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н.И. Лобачевского. Серия: Социальные науки. 2013. № 4 (32). Стр. 27.
31. Кочетков А.В. Доктрины, стратегии и концепции в сфере государственной молодежной политики Источник: http://www.mgimo.ru/files2/2015_04/up32/file

[bc3d68f876e8efa82768c11c4c2d0b3b.pdf](#)

32. Митин А.А. Молодежная политика и левые молодежные организации современной России
Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата политических наук. Чита. 2009. Стр. 29
33. Walther A., Hejl G. M., Jensen T. B. Youth Transitions, Youth Policy and Participation – State of the Art Report. 2002. P.65, Pp 33.
34. Кибанов А.Я., Ловчева М.В., Лукьянова Т.В. Молодежная политика в России и зарубежных странах// М.: Издательский дом ФГБОУВПО ГУУ, 2012, Стр.4
35. Леонова О.А. Роль государственной молодежной политики в решении проблем молодого поколения//Вестн. Ом. ун-та. 2011. № 1. С.242.
36. Ховрин А.Ю. Социальное партнерство в сфере реализации молодежной политики//Диссертация на соискание ученой степени доктора социологических наук. М. 2010
37. Петрова И.Э., Пусяк Г.С. Государственно-частное партнерство в социальной деятельности молодежных организаций//г. Нижний Новгород // Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н.И. Лобачевского. Серия: Социальные науки. 2013. № 3. Стр 56.
38. Сафонова А.С. Молодежная политика и молодежь в политике: зарубежный ОПЫТ // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики Тамбов: Грамота, 2013. № 2 (28): в 2-х ч. Ч. II. Стр. 171.
39. Леонова О.А. Роль государственной молодежной политики в решении проблем молодого поколения//Вестн. Ом. ун-та. 2011. № 1. С.242.