

---

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34768/r1.2022.v481.05>

**Ludmila G. Sokuryanska\***

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4097-952X>

e-mail: [sokuryanska@karazin.ua](mailto:sokuryanska@karazin.ua)

**Alexander S. Golikov\*\***

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>

e-mail: [golikov@karazin.ua](mailto:golikov@karazin.ua)

**SOCIOLOGY OF YOUTH IN UKRAINE YESTERDAY,  
TODAY, TOMORROW: PHOTO SKETCH**

SOCIOLOGY OF YOUTH IN UKRAINE YESTERDAY, TODAY,  
TOMORROW: A PHOTO SKETCH

**Keywords:** sociology of youth, youth, sociological reflection, Ukrainian journals, Ukrainian sociology.

The article reflects on the emergence and development of the sociology of youth in Ukraine over the past decade. Attention is drawn above all to the empirical nature of this branch of sociological knowledge and its reference to the analysis of specific youth problems. The connections of the sociology of youth with other middle-range sociological theories, primarily the sociology of education, are revealed. A detailed comprehension of the experience of the sociology of youth development over the past decade in Ukraine is provided. The authors refer to the main publications in the

---

\***Ludmila G. Sokuryanska** – Ph. D. in sociology, Full Professor, Vice-President of the Sociological Association of Ukraine; scientific interests: the sociology of youth, sociology of education, axiology.

\*\***Alexander S. Golikov** – Ph. D. in sociology, Associate Professor; scientific interests: history and theory of sociology, sociology of knowledge, sociocultural differentiations.

field of sociology of youth at that time, focusing primarily on themes, methodological approaches, paradigmatic aspects as well as categorical measurement of the evolution of sociology of youth in Ukraine. Special attention is paid to the transformation of the subject field of sociology of youth in the context of development processes and changes in the Ukrainian sociology. The authors draw conclusions on possible further directions of development of the sociology of youth in Ukraine in the new epistemological and social conditions.

#### SOCJOLOGIA MŁODZIEŻY NA UKRAINIE WCZORAJ, DZIŚ, JUTRO: FOTOSZKIC

**Słowa kluczowe:** socjologia młodzieży, młodzież, refleksja socjologiczna, czasopisma ukraińskie, socjologia ukraińska.

Artykuł stanowi refleksję na temat powstawania i rozwoju socjologii młodzieży na Ukrainie w ciągu ostatniej dekady. Uwagę zwraca przede wszystkim empiryczny charakter tej gałęzi wiedzy socjologicznej, jej odwoływanie się do analizy specyficznych problemów młodzieży. Ujawniają się związki socjologii młodzieży z innymi teoriami socjologicznymi średniego zasięgu, przede wszystkim z socjologią edukacji. Podano szczegółowe zrozumienie doświadczeń socjologii rozwoju młodzieży na Ukrainie w ciągu ostatniej dekady. Autorzy odwołują się do głównych publikacji z zakresu socjologii młodzieży w tym czasie, koncentrując się przede wszystkim na tematach, podejściach metodologicznych, aspektach paradygmatycznych, kategoriowym pomiarze ewolucji socjologii młodzieży na Ukrainie. Szczególną uwagę zwrócono na przekształcenia pola przedmiotowego socjologii młodzieży w kontekście procesów rozwojowych i przemian ukraińskiej nauki socjologicznej. Autorzy formułują wnioski dotyczące możliwych dalszych kierunków rozwoju socjologii młodzieży na Ukrainie w nowych warunkach epistemologiczno-społecznych.

The sociology of youth in Ukraine has gone in its development through a varied and difficult path. Youth has been and always will be an open question in any society. To answer this question in the conditions of the modern world, which is developing exponentially, is quite difficult, if not impossible. But it is necessary and inevitable.

---

In Ukrainian realities of the late 20th – early 21st century, the youth issue has become extremely relevant. Let us recall only some significant events in the recent history of Ukraine:

- the student “Revolution on Granite” (October 2-17, 1990, which led to the resignation of the head of the government of Ukraine Vitaliy Masol);
- “Orange Revolution” (November 20, 2004 – January 23, 2005), in which young people, including, and above all, students, took an active part; as a result, the former opposition came to power);
- “Revolution of Dignity” (Euromaidan November 21, 2013 – February 23, 2014) as a protest against the refusal of the political leadership of the country from the course towards European integration, in which Ukrainian students, in particular, organized a “human chain” Kyiv-Przemysl.

All these and many other events initiated by the Ukrainian youth and taking place with their direct participation, more than ever actualized the need for a sociological study of the life of the young generation of Ukrainians, and its role in the economic, political, and value transformation of our society. This issue, as we will show below, has always been at the centre of attention of Ukrainian sociologists. Today, another incredibly painful topic has been added to the traditional topic of youth research – the participation of youth in the war.

In our publication, we would like to show (at least partially) the evolution of the sociology of youth in Ukraine, to present a sketch for its photographic portrait of the past, present and future. We have raised several important research questions, in particular: (1) What are the roots of Ukrainian youth sociology? What historical, sociocultural, political, etc. factors influenced its formation? (2) What were the main factors influencing the sociology of youth in Ukraine during the years of its independence? What changes and trends did they lead to? (3) What are the main structural, systemic, and functional characteristics of the sociology of youth in Ukraine over the past 10 years? How does this manifest itself in the activities of the leading academic publications in Ukraine? (4) How do the internal and external processes of transformation of the sociology of youth in Ukraine compare in recent years? Here we formulated, in particular, hypotheses about the predominantly empirical orientation of specialists in the field of sociology of youth in Ukrainian conditions and about the “focal” development and representation of the sociology of youth – characteristics of a specific stage of development of social science.

To achieve these goals, we used the method of document analysis in the technique of quantitative content analysis, as well as the historical method. The empirical basis for quantitative content analysis is indicated and described below.

### **The Roots of Ukrainian Sociology of Youth: Sketch for a Self-Analysis**

We believe that the countdown of its formation in Ukraine can be started from 1922-1923 when an unparalleled study of the student youth life was carried out in Kharkiv. Within the framework of two stages of the study (1922-1923), not only the problems of Kharkiv students' educational, social, and scientific work were analyzed, but also their participation in the restoration of the buildings of many Kharkiv universities destroyed during the war and the establishment of everyday life. It analyzed not only the social composition of students, which significantly changed after the proletarianization of higher education in 1922, but also the state of health of Kharkiv youth, the regularity and quality of their nutrition, and even the compliance of air volumes in classrooms with sanitary and hygienic standards. The materials of this study were presented in the monograph "The Life of Modern Ukrainian Students" (Popov et al. 1924).

Only 40 years after this publication, with the revival of sociology repressed in the Stalin era, its partial rehabilitation during the years of the "Khrushchev Thaw" in the USSR, in particular in Ukraine, sociological laboratories and centres appeared, which, among other factors, turned to research on youth issues. In this context, we note that the sociology of youth in Ukraine, as well as in the world as a whole, since it emerged as a response of society to "youth panics", has been (and still is) predominantly empirical. At the same time, research in this area was mainly devoted not so much to the study of youth problems proper, but the problems of society with youth. The problematization of youth was a general sociological phenomenon. Only in the last 20 years, with the development of a qualitative methodology that allows the sociologist to hear the voice and see the micro-phenomena of the life of his immediate respondents, this situation has changed somewhat. Today, by studying youth's everyday life, in this way we learn more about the younger generation and its problems as such.

But let us return to our historical excursion. Speaking about the partial rehabilitation of sociology in the Soviet Union in the late 1950s and early 1960s, we also have in mind the emerging opportunities for empirical research, since only historical materialism was recognized as the theoretical basis.

The sociological subdivisions that arose during this period were engaged, we emphasize this, primarily in empirical research. Established in 1963, one of the first sociological laboratories in the Ukrainian SSR, the Laboratory of Concrete Sociological Research of A. Gorky Kharkiv State University, now V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, which in the early years of her existence conducted large-scale research in the field of industrial sociology in the late 1960s and early 1970s, turned to an empirical analysis of the problems of the life of student youth and young professionals. The results of these studies were discussed at numerous all-Union and republican conferences, which were most often held at Kharkiv University, published in collections of conference materials, scientific articles, and monographs (Communist 1977, Social activity 1983, Ways of implementation 1988). It must be noted that Kharkiv University was in Soviet times and remains today one of the leading centres for the study of youth issues in Ukraine. Undoubtedly, sociologists from other universities and academic departments also addressed this issue (Chernovolenko et al. 1979).

An important impetus for the development of youth sociology in Ukraine was the participation of sociologists from Kharkiv University (Elena Yakuba and Irina Sheremet) in the Congress of the International Sociological Association, which was held in Varna in 1970. It was at this Congress that the Committee on the Sociology of Youth was created under the leadership of the famous Bulgarian sociologist Petr Mitev. It was the only Congress of the International Sociological Association that took place in a socialist country.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the sociology of youth was still dominated by studies of the problems of socialization and education of young people, primarily students and schoolchildren, the formation of social maturity and civic consciousness of young professionals (Barrows 1988). Only in the last three years of the 1980s, already in the context of "perestroika", studies (mostly all-Union) devoted to the role of youth in this process were conducted. Ukrainian scientists, primary sociologists from Kharkiv University, also took an active part in these studies.

After the collapse of the USSR, with Ukraine gaining independence, state bodies began to turn to the study of youth problems more often – one such example is the Ministry of Youth and Sports of Ukraine, and in particular, the State Institute of Family and Youth Policy created under this ministry in 1991. Commissioned by the Ministry and the Institute, various sociological centres of the country have conducted dozens of studies on various problems of the life of young people: from their integration into

new economic relations and positions in the labour market to participate in the reform of the Ukrainian state. As a result of these studies, more than 20 annual reports were drafted for the President of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada (Parliament) of Ukraine, and the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine on the situation of youth. Many of these reports, as well as relevant studies, were prepared by employees of the Oleksandr Yaremenko Ukrainian Institute for Social Research (Kyiv), which for many years, like Kharkiv University, has been one of the centres of sociological research and conferences on the sociology of youth.

The study of youth problems in the 1990s – early 2000s remained the focus of attention of sociologists of V.N. Karazin. Since 1995, more than 20 regional, national and international studies on youth topics have been conducted by the staff of the sociology department of this university. Within the framework of these studies, a special place was occupied by the study of the transformation of the value orientations of Ukrainian youth, their dynamics from Soviet to post-Soviet and European values as well as identification practices in the youth environment. The results of “youth” research were discussed at the traditional university conferences “Kharkiv sociological readings” and “Yakuba scientific session”, published in sociological periodicals of the university, among others, as well as abroad.

In the late 1990s – early 2000s, in addition to traditional conference venues on youth issues (Kharkiv University and Yaremenko Institute of Economics), two more annual thematic conferences addressed this issue: “Youth in a New Social Perspective” (since 1998 on the initiative of the youth association “Euroclub”, Zhytomyr, with the support of the EU Embassy in Ukraine) and “Youth Policy: Problems and Prospects” (since 2002 based on Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University on the initiative of the Department of Law, Sociology and Political Science). As a result of these conferences, collections of scientific articles under the same titles were published.

An important factor in raising the theoretical, methodological, and methodological level of youth sociology in Ukraine was the cooperation of Ukrainian sociologists who specialized in this field with foreign colleagues. Especially close cooperation has been established between Ukrainian and Polish sociologists. This cooperation is carried out thanks to the participation of Polish colleagues in conferences held in Kharkiv, Drohobych and other cities in Ukraine. Ukrainian sociologists took part in youth conferences in Przemysl, Warsaw, Lublin, Sanok, Zielona Gora and others. With the staff of the Institute of Youth of the University of Zielona Gora, sociologists from Kharkiv and Drohobych conducted several studies on the

problems of university students and school youth. Based on the results of these studies, a series of scientific articles have been published in both Polish and Ukrainian publications (Sokuryanska 2014; Sokuryanska, Schudlo 2015; Deineko, Sokuryanska 2015; Sokuryanska 2016; Zielińska, Sokuryanska 2016; Sokuryanska, Shchudlo 2018). For example, Prof. Maria Zelińska took part in the work of the Third Congress of the Sociological Association of Ukraine (SAU) “New inequalities – new conflicts: ways to overcome” (Kharkiv 2017). In turn, Ukrainian sociologists, for example, Acad. V. Bakirov (President of SAU), Prof. L. Sokuryanska (vice-president of SAU) and Prof. O. Khyzhniak took part in the meetings of the Seventeenth Congress of the Polish Sociological Association (September 2019). Scientific communication, thanks to which sociological knowledge is enriched, is carried out not only in the process of direct communication of sociologists within the framework of congresses, conferences, seminars, round tables, etc. but also through publications that allow us to learn more about what our Ukrainian and foreign colleagues, including those specializing in the field of sociology of youth, to become familiar with the results of their empirical and theoretical research, to identify possible options for cooperation in solving the issues facing the sociology of youth today.

That is why, in this work we have focused our attention on publications in the field of sociology of youth, presented in the leading sociological publications in Ukraine over the past decade.

### **Youth sociology in Ukraine: methodological aspects**

The above reminiscence of the history of the formation and development of the sociology of youth in Ukraine indicates that it has turned into a fairly widely represented branch in Ukrainian sociology, despite the fact that it has developed as an area defined not so much as a theoretical object of research, but an empirical one. However, to date the scale of this representation, its internal structure or the trends in the development of the sociology of youth in Ukraine have not become the object of a special study.

In addition, the sociology of youth itself has not become an object of specialized sociological reflection. And we are not even mentioning the sharpened and sophisticated tools of the elegant sociology of sociology, as formulated by P. Bourdieu (Bourdieu, Wacquant 1992) or “sociology of philosophies” in the variations of R. Collins (1998). The reflection has touched neither the themes, geography, nor the processes and phenomenality of the institutional design of the sociology of youth in Ukrainian conditions.

In the course of a preliminary analysis of the literature, we were unable to find a single specialized analysis of the development of the Ukrainian

sociology of youth, except for some simple generalizations for textbooks or anthologies for purely didactic purposes (see, for example, Golovaty 1999, Chernysh 2004). As for the rest, sociological reflection, which is usually so attentive, turns out to be inactive and incapacitated in sectoral sociologies. This may even be due to the very fact of low theoretical activity at the industry level, but this fact in itself also needs to be analyzed and verified.

In this regard, the focus of our work was, as already emphasized above, a thorough review of the trends and features of the development of the Ukrainian sociology of youth over the past 10 years (from 2012 to 2021) with a further definition of further prospects and current problems of this development.

Such a framework of analysis is because from 2010-2012, thanks to the intensification of communications and, in particular, the emergence of Internet representations of the main Ukrainian sociological journals and scientific publications, we should expect, from our point of view, not only an increase in the representation of the sociology of youth in scientific discourse but also the intensification of cooperation between Ukrainian sociologists on youth issues.

The empirical basis of our research comprises publications in 8 authoritative Ukrainian sociological publications (“Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing” (STMM) (Kyiv), “Ukrainian society” (US) (Kyiv), “Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv” (KNU Bulletin) (Kyiv), “Ukrainian sociological journal” (USJ) (Kharkiv), “Bulletin of V.N. Karazon Kharkiv National University” (KhNU Bulletin) (Kharkiv), “SOCIOPROSTOR” (SP) (Kharkiv), “Ivan Franko Lviv National University Bulletin” (LNU Bulletin) (Lviv), “Ilya Mechnikov Odesa National University Bulletin” (ONU Bulletin) (Odesa)) published in the last 10 years (2012-2021).

If we take into account that the average annual number of issues for these 8 journals is approximately 18-20 (depending on the year), then approximately 180-200 issues and, accordingly, about 1600-1700 articles were devoted to the field of our research. We provide these figures only to acknowledge that although the 127 articles we identified (that is, approximately 7-9% of the sample we studied), do not constitute the majority, they represent a significant share of all publications of Ukrainian sociologists<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that not all journals and bulletins are included in this review. Some were excluded for various reasons (due to the specialization of the journals or, conversely, due to the involvement of non-sociological disciplines in the publication; due to the



Thus, the study was conducted using the technique of continuous sampling for key publications over the past 10 years. When the landscape of the entire Ukrainian sociology is considered, then it is a “nested sample”, where each of the publications we have chosen is a kind of a “nest”.

#### *Method and technique*

The study was carried out within the framework of the method of document analysis, where the articles of sociologists in Ukrainian academic publications are interpreted as sources of documentary information, the texts themselves are interpreted as objectification of information to be deciphered, and the attribution of these texts and their content is direct information.

#### *Indicators*

Both textual and metatextual (that is, about the academic texts themselves) information were analysed. In the first, more problematic case, we singled out key categories, which were then grouped and assigned to clusters we defined (such as sectoral sociology or key publication topics).

#### *Limitations of methodology*

Many sociologists who were actively working in the field of youth sociology in the 1990s or 2000s could “switch” to other topics in the 2010s. This happened to such well-known Ukrainian sociologists in the field of youth issues as O. Balakireva, A. Nikolaevskaya, A. Ruchka, N. Chernysh, L. Aza, V. Poddubny and others. However, even such a sample, constructed in fact in a nested manner, makes it possible to understand the trends in the sociology of youth in Ukraine.

### **Topology and geography of youth sociology in Ukraine**

We found that 130 authors participated in writing the 127 articles we found, 24 of them are mentioned more than once (Table 1). Thus, there are 175 names of authors in the 127 articles, which gives an average of fewer than 1.5 authors per article. More than a hundred both Ukrainian and foreign authors have only one article each.

All this may indicate both that developments in the sociology of youth require little collective effort (at least in generalizing data, designing articles, etc.), and that the world culture of writing articles (where collective authorship, according to our observations, is a much more frequent than an

---

short-term existence or due to regional “niche”). They include: “Social Technologies” (Zaporozhye), “Habitus” (Odessa), “Oles Gonchar Dnieper National University Bulletin” (Dnipro), “Sociological Studios” (Lutsk), as well as publications of Donetsk and Luhansk universities.

individual one) is poorly represented in the practices of Ukrainian specialists in the sociology of youth. It must be noted that even in 2021, for example, only 2 articles (both in STMM) turned out to be with individual authorship and 6 – with collective authorship. In contrast, in 2012 there were only 4 out of 23 collective articles. A more detailed and in-depth study of this issue is an important task for the further development of our topic.

It is indicative that even the four large “centres” of Ukrainian sociology of youth that we have chosen turned out to be highly differentiated. 61% of the articles (78 out of 127) were published in Kharkiv editions, 24% (31) – in Kyiv, 13% (16) – in Lviv, and only 2% – in Odessa. This confirms, as emphasized above, that the flagship of the Ukrainian sociology of youth is the Kharkiv (Yakuba’s) sociological school, which is represented not only by the sociologists of V.N. Karazin KhNU but also by the graduates of this university working in KhNUVD, KHU “NUA”, NTU “KhPI” (Protsenko, Sokuryanska 2013). Many publications on the sociology of youth are also authored by Kyiv sociologists.

This is also confirmed by the analysis of the cities of affiliation of authors in the field of youth sociology (Table 1). Here the map is, of course, more diverse, but in general, there are also two leading centres (Kharkiv – 43.3% of authors, and Kyiv – 17.3% of authors), while the remaining 26 cities gave less than 40% of publications, and in general, only 12 cities out of 28 on our list provided more than one article.

In addition, out of 28 affiliation cities, 10 (more than a third) are located abroad, thus, only 18 cities are located in Ukraine. International cooperation, as we wrote above, is certainly an important and indicative indicator of development, but it cannot be carried out to the detriment of the popularization and development of the sociology of youth in the regional centres of the country.

Table 1

Cities of affiliation of authors in the field of sociology of youth in Ukrainian publications for 2012-2021

	N	%		N	%		N	%
Kharkiv	55	43.3	Nikolaev	2	1.6	Melitopol	1	0.8
Kyiv	22	17.3	Odessa	2	1.6	Rzhechov	1	0.8
Lviv	9	7.1	Warsaw	1	0.8	Ružomberok	1	0.8
Lutsk	5	3.9	Vinnitsa	1	0.8	Samara	1	0.8
Drohobych	3	2.4	Glukhov	1	0.8	Simferopol	1	0.8
Yekaterinburg	3	2.4	Zaporozhye	1	0.8	Trnava	1	0.8
Minsk	3	2.4	Jerusalem	1	0.8	Uman	1	0.8
Kherson	3	2.4	Krivoy Rog	1	0.8	Yaroslav	1	0.8
Dnieper	2	1.6	Lugansk	1	0.8			
Ivano-Frankivsk	2	1.6	Lublin	1	0.8	Total	127	100

Source: own study.

So, a rather “focal” picture of the development of the sociology of youth in Ukrainian conditions emerges. Of course, if we took publications with a policy more loyal to the authors and with more voluminous issues (for example, some publications comprise fifty articles in one issue), we would most likely get a more “coherent” picture. However, there is reason to believe that the overall picture would be preserved, moreover, it is in the mirror of leading academic publications that this picture becomes as transparent and understandable as possible.

It should be noted that in general, only 15 out of 127 articles (i.e. 12%) can be unambiguously classified as foreign according to the affiliation of the author, while 88% (112 articles) over these 10 years are domestic. In this sense, it is significant that 12% of articles were received from almost 40% of cities. In other words, there is no possibility to talk about stable ties with specific academic centres abroad – we have a picture of sporadic, almost random academic cooperation, or, in other words, an undeveloped and only embryonic “market of symbolic production”, as P. Bourdieu would have called it (Bourdieu 1993). An exception is Ukrainian-Polish cooperation in the field of the sociology of youth, as mentioned above. However, we note that there is a certain disproportion in the issue of publication: Ukrainian sociologists are more often published in Polish publications than Polish ones in Ukrainian ones.

### Academical networks of youth sociology in Ukraine

The same hypothesis about the “focal” development and representation of the sociology of youth is also confirmed in the analysis of its representation in various publications (Table 2).

Table 2

The frequency of publication of articles in the field of sociology of youth in Ukrainian publications for 2012-2021

Name of journal (city of affiliation)	N	%
KhNU Bulletin (Kharkiv)	54	42.5
Ukrainian sociological journal (Kharkiv)	19	15.0
Ukrainian society (Kyiv)	17	13.4
LNU Bulletin (Lviv)	16	12.6
Sociology: theory, methods, marketing (Kyiv)	10	7.9
SOCIOPROSTOR (Kharkiv)	5	3.9
KNU Bulletin (Kyiv)	4	3.1
ONU Bulletin (Odessa)	2	1.6
Total	127	100.0

*Source:* own study.

Almost half of the articles are in the KhNU Bulletin, where an average of 5.5 articles on the sociology of youth are published per year (and this even though, unlike US or STMM, KhNU Bulletin is published only twice a year, not four). In the “second echelon” there are two Kyiv, one Lviv and one Kharkiv journals, which contain from 10 to 20 articles in the field of the sociology of youth over these 10 years. Finally, in three journals (Kharkiv, Kyiv, Odesa) very few articles in the field of the sociology of youth were found. This indicates that the “centres” of the sociology of youth exist not only geographically, but also institutionally, that is, in the form of involvement in certain networks for the dissemination of scientific publications and cooperation.

No less curious – but also disturbing – is the distribution of publications by year (Table 3).

Table 3

The frequency of publication of articles in the field of sociology of youth in Ukrainian publications in different years

Year	N	%	Year	N	%
2012	23	17.1	2018	10	7.9
2013	15	11.8	2019	5	3.9
2014	14	11.0	2020	2	1.6
2015	16	12.6	2021	6	6.3
2016	17	13.4			
2017	17	13.4	Total	127	100.0

*Source:* own study.

Two periods are clearly distinguished here, differing in the number of publications. These periods are not initially intuitively obvious to a sociologist from within Ukrainian sociology. For some reason, between 2017 and 2018, a specific turning point occurred, and the number of publications from a fairly stable indicator decreased by about a half. Whether this is due to some internal trends in the Ukrainian sociology of youth itself (for example, a change of generations), or with the specifics of the formation of the market (for example, when the requirements for postgraduate and doctoral students' publications changed, a considerable part of their efforts concentrated on publications in foreign publications) – this question requires a separate study, however, the empirical fact recorded by us is very revealing.

Finally, another illustrative example and proof of the “focal” development of the sociology of youth in Ukrainian conditions is the distribution of authors depending on affiliation among different journals. After all, it is precisely such distribution, if it is sufficiently pronounced, that will demonstrate the connection between geographical dispersion and institutional dispersion, and, consequently, will prove the rigidity and social homology of structuring the centres of the sociology of youth in Ukrainian conditions.

It is significant that only five of the eight journals we analyzed somehow formed more or less unique “clusters” (of course, we did not conduct specialized analysis, but the visualization in Table 5 shows this) by geography. These are the “Ukrainian Sociological Journal”, “KhNU Bulletin”, “Ukrainian Society”, “Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing” and “LNU Bulletin”. And it was found that:

- the latter has formed its own “unique” (but the low occupancy of the cells does not allow us to classify it as stable, where only two cells – Lviv and Kherson – show more than one publication) cluster due primarily to cooperation with Poland and Slovakia;
- Kyiv publications formed the stability of the cluster due to Kyiv and Lviv authors, and uniqueness - due to authors from Lutsk, Vinnytsia, Samara and Jerusalem;
- Kharkiv publications formed the sustainability of the cluster due to Kharkiv authors, as well as partly – Drohobych and Lutsk (with whom, among other things, institutional cooperation was carried out), and uniqueness – due to a whole set of affiliations (Lugansk, Ivano-Frankivsk, Dnipro, Minsk, Melitopol, etc.).

Thus, all three groups of publications demonstrate approximately similar strategies for the formation of their own “clusters” (ultimately – the centres of the sociology of youth in Ukrainian sociology), including sustainability, ensured by their authors and their reproduction (where the Kharkiv centre is characterized by the most powerful volume, which is enough to support one more peripheral journal), and the “prominences” and “external branches” of this focus are not least due to institutional cooperation (graduate students, doctoral students) and informal connections. The three journals that have not formed their own “centres” demonstrate the narrowness of their academic base and the sporadic selection of it.

### **Heteronomy of Ukrainian sociology of youth**

Another important aspect of the analysis of the state of the sociology of youth in Ukraine is the analysis of its substantive aspects. One of the hypotheses with which we approached the analysis was the predominantly empirical orientation of specialists in the field of sociology of youth in Ukrainian conditions<sup>2</sup>. We were not mistaken: 98 articles (76%) are a representation of the empirical data of sociological research, and another 10 (8%) are a presentation of a secondary analysis of sociological data. Only 19 articles (15%) are theoretical. These data are quite sad for the Ukrainian sociology of youth: it once again testify that this branch of sociology exists primarily as a set of empirical studies, but not as a structured holistic sectoral sociology with a strong theoretical background and a stable academic doxa.

---

<sup>2</sup>The same trend, as already emphasized, is characteristic for the sociology of youth in the world as a whole.

This is also confirmed by the analysis of the methodological aspects of the articles we analyzed. We managed to establish this for 51 out of 127 articles. We found 20 articles within the framework of the sociocultural approach (dominating precisely in the Kharkiv “centre” of the sociology of youth), a qualitative methodology of field research (17 articles), risk theory (5 articles, all wholly or partly owned by the same author), comparative approach (4 articles), phenomenology and Bourdieuism (2 articles each), and content-analysis (1 article). As it turned out, only in 29 of these 51 articles one can see a connection with the level of general sociological theory (sociocultural approach, Bourdieuism, phenomenology), the remaining 22 articles deal more with methodological aspects of research implementation.

In this light, it is not surprising that the sociology of youth turns out to be a low-autonomous branch of sociology. Only 17 articles (13%) are articles exclusively within the framework of the sociology of youth. 110 articles (87%) show strong and easily visible links to other middle-range theories. Note that for one article, we could fix a connection with more than one branch of sociology, and in total – with no more than three. In total, we identified 140 links for, and recall, 110 articles. These 140 links were formed with 18 branch sociologies, of which 11 were connected more than once.

The most powerfully represented, which is not surprising, are the sociology of education (more than half of all these links, namely 71 links) and the sociology of childhood (more than 10% of all links, namely 16). Also quite often met such sectoral sociology as the sociology of culture, the sociology of career, the sociology of social inequalities, the sociology of the family, and social work. Less often – the sociology of religion, the sociology of deviant behaviour, the sociology of the Internet and the sociology of sports.

An extremely alarming fact is that in the 2010s sociologists in the leading Ukrainian journals we analyzed focused on the problems of youth in the light of economic sociology, political sociology, the problems of studying the emerging market society and capitalism (the sociology of advertising, the sociology of marketing). And even the emergent situation of the pandemic did not cause a deep response in the sociology of youth (although a surge in publications on the issue of the emergency was recorded).

### **Youth topics in the youth sociology in Ukraine**

In general, this is confirmed by the analysis of thematic tags that we entered for each article. The rules for fixing tags were similar<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup>From 1 to 3 tags for each article, but, unlike additional middle-range theories, tagging

In total, we identified 82 thematic tags, with a total of 364 mentions of these tags. However, this diversity should not deceive: only half of them (43 tags) was mentioned more than once, and 39 tags were mentioned once. Among them are such topical issues as autobiography, adaptation, addiction, bullying, civil, discourse, friendship, life plans, game, inclusion, content analysis, corruption, motherhood, media, dreams, migration, modelling, moral and psychological atmosphere, music, informal connections, giftedness, loneliness, alienation, pandemic, behavior, consumption, problems, projects, advertising, reforms, parents, market, self-realization, youth sociology, old age, stereotypes, theory, tolerance, and human capital.

As one can see, there are extremely topical issues here that are on the periphery of the attention of sociologists dealing with the problems of the sociology of youth. It was surprising for us to find here the problems of the pandemic, discourse, consumption, parents, the market, self-realization, stereotypes, the theory of the sociology of youth, and tolerance.

We see that different groups of young people (students (15.1%), adolescents (4.9%), schoolchildren (3%), children (2.7%)), categories of sociocultural approach (perception (4.9%), values (4.7%), practices (3.8%), identities (1.4%), subculture (1.6%)), areas of youth life (education (5.2%), leisure (2.5%), family (2.2%), university (2.2%), the Internet (1.4%), sports, work (0.8% each), studies (0.8%)), social processes (career (3.3%), European integration (2.7%), modernization (2.5%), socialization (2.2%), problems (deviations (1, 9%), risks (1.9%), social protection (0.8%), etc. dominate.

As one can see, the thematic tags form a much more diverse picture of youth practices in the mirror of Ukrainian youth sociology, however, the unconditional dominance of educational issues remains in the tags “students”, “university”, “education”, “schoolchildren” in a total form more than a quarter of the total volume of tags.

### **Resume and conclusion**

Our analysis of the publications of Ukrainian sociologists on youth issues allowed us to draw some conclusions. We note that in the sociological discourse on youth in the last 10 years, there has been practically no perception of it as a problem of society, an assessment of the younger generation as lost, which was typical for both society and media, and for

---

for each article was mandatory. We did not fix more than three tags for each article, so as not to exaggerate the significance of each of the individual articles in our analysis: so that one of the articles did not “give” more tags than two or three others totally, for example.



the academic view earlier. The problematization of youth is replaced by its normalization. At the same time, scientific, in particular, sociological understanding of youth problems themselves does not meet the needs of understanding modern youth practices. Despite the rather large number of empirical studies in the field of the sociology of youth, there is a catastrophic lack of theoretical reflection by sociologists specializing in this field of scientific knowledge. The shortage of theorizing in this area, of course, continues to be felt, however, in fairness, we note that the studies of some Kharkiv sociologists, as some academic studies, nevertheless, ended with the development of the theoretical foundations of the study of youth. So, the theory of social activity of the individual, developed in the late 1970s – early 1980s belongs to Prof. E. Yakuba, head of the sociological laboratory of Kharkiv University. This theory later, in the early 2000s, was developed into a subject-value approach to youth, and then – in the theory of the value field by a student of E. Yakuba, Prof. L. Sokuryanska (Sokuryanska 2006). Another branch of this theory development was the concept of meta-subjectness, developed sequentially in the 2010s in the works of L. Sokuryanska, A. Golikov and B. Dikan (Sokuryanskaya, Golikov 2016), as well as the problematics of the knowledge foundations of the social activity of person (Golikov 2020).

We found that different groups of young people, categories of sociocultural approach, areas of youth life, social processes, and problems are the main clusters of issues in Ukrainian sociology of youth. Such structuring of an academic discipline may indicate both its empirical orientation and certain methodological features of the Ukrainian sociology of youth, as well as the problem orientation of this branch of sociological knowledge in the conditions of Ukraine.

We also found a dramatic situation, described above. It may be due, among other things, to the next phenomenon: if the Ukrainian sociology of youth had its own stable and generally accepted approaches to the main problems, then its reaction to the urgent and problematic demands of society would certainly be faster, and attention would be focused not only on empirically accessible and obvious problems (in the field of education, career, inequalities, family formation) but also on more societally, macro-sociologically important and represented ones.

However, this is not enough. The development of the sociology of youth as a special sociological *theory* undoubtedly requires the combined efforts of Ukrainian sociologists in the theoretical solution of the youth issue and closer cooperation with foreign colleagues. At the same time, the initiative to develop solid theoretical foundations of the Ukrainian sociology

of youth should come from those “foci” in this field of knowledge, which we wrote about above. Today it is important to activate various forms of epistemological search within the framework of conferences, round tables, and seminars on the development of the sociology of youth, which can take place both online and offline regimes. It is necessary to involve in such regimes not only well-known, venerable sociologists, but also young scientists who can bring (and are already bringing, as the youth should be!) new approaches to solving the old problems of our science.

### **Literatura | References**

- BARROWS H. S. (1988), *The Tutorial Process*, Springfield, Southern Illinois University School of Medicine.
- BOURDIEU P. (1993), *The Field of Cultural Production*, Columbia University Press, Cambridge.
- BOURDIEU P., WACQUANT L. J. D. (1992), *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- CHERNOVOLENKO V., OSSOWSKI V., PANIOTTO V. (1979), *Prestige occupations and problems of social and professional orientation of young people*, Naukova Dumka, Kiev, Ukraine.
- CHERNYSH N. (2004), *Sociologia mlodi, Sociologia: Kurs lekci*, Lviv.
- COLLINS R. (1998), *The Sociology of Philosophies. A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA and London.
- DEINEKO O., SOKURYANSKA L. (2015), *Studentship in the Society of Risks: the Factors of Social Subjectivity Actualization*, “Youth Policy: Problems and Prospects”, 6.
- GOLIKOV A. S. (2020), *Max Weber’s Heuristics About University and Education and The Challenges of the XXI Century*, “Philosophy of education”, 26(2).
- GOLOVATY N. F. (1999), *Sociology of Youth: Series of Lectures*, MAUP, Kyiv.
- POPOV I. I., ZUZIK D. T., KOGAN V. M. (1924), *Zhizn’ sovremennogo ukrainskogo studenchestva: po dannym studencheskih perepisej i drugih ob sledovani* (The Life of Modern Ukrainian Students: According to Student Censuses and other Surveys), Chervonyy Shlyakh, Khar’kov, <http://escriptorium.univer.kharkov.ua/handle/1237075002/4122>

- PROTSENKO L., SOKURYANSKA L. (2013), Kharkiv (Yakubinska) sociological school: origins, research vectors, generations of researchers, "Ukrainian Sociological Journal", 1-2.
- SOKURYANSKA L. (2006), *Studenchestvo na puty k druhomu obshchestvu: tsenostnyy diskurs perekhoda*, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Kharkiv.
- SOKURYANSKA L. (2014), Educational reform in Ukraine: the risks of irresponsibility actualization, [in:] *Studia nad wiedzą. Wiedza a instytucjonalizacja nieodpowiedzialności*, eds. M. Zemło, A. Jabłoński, J. Szymczyk, Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II, Lublin, vol. VI, pp. 379-388.
- SOKURYANSKA L. (2016), Perspectives of Development of Ukraine's Situation in Perception of Ukrainian and Polish Students: the factor determinance, "Ukrainian Sociological Journal", 1-2, pp. 31-36.
- SOKURYANSKA L., SCHUDLO S. (2015) Tożsamość obywatelska oraz plany emigracyjne studenckiej młodzieży wschodniego i zachodniego przygranicza Ukrainy, [in:] *Transgraniczność w perspektywie socjologicznej. Pogranicza i centra współczesnej Europy. Różnorodność praktyk i teorii*, eds. D. Szaban, J. Nyckowiak, T. Kołodziej, Lubuskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, Zielona Góra, 9(2), pp. 293-309.
- SOKURYANSKA L., SHCHUDLO S. (2018), Youth of the Ukrainian borderland in the transition to the knowledge society: values, educational plans, visions of life success, "Rocznik Lubuski", ed. M. Zielińska, Zielona Góra, 44(1), pp. 91-107.
- SOKURYANSKAYA L. G., GOLIKOV A. S. (2016), Discourse of social subject and subject of social discourse: possibility of knowledge theorems, <http://scaspee.com/all-materials/discourse-of-social-subject-and-subject-of-social-discourse-possibility-of-knowledge-theorems-sokuryanskaya-l-g-golikov-a-s>
- ZIELINSKA M., SOKURYANSKA L. (2016), Opinions on the events in eastern Ukraine in 2014 as an indicator of the generalised socio-political beliefs, Polish-Ukrainian comparisons, "Rocznik Lubuski", eds. D. Bazuń, M. Kwiatkowski, Zielona Góra, 42(2a), pp. 317-344.