

## SOCIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

### **POLITICAL IDENTITIES OF UKRAINIAN CITIZENS: A LONG WAY FROM AMBIVALENCE TO NATIONAL UNITY**

**Yevhenii Sosniuk<sup>1</sup>**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-126-8-26>

During the last thirty years deep social transformation takes place in Ukraine, which began from the moment of Ukrainian independence. In comparison to many countries of Central, Southern, and Eastern Europe democratic transition in Ukraine passes slower. Due to this there is a need for more detailed study of specifics of process of social change and its dynamics.

One of the significant obstacles on the way to successful democratic change in the country is inexpressiveness and ambivalence of political identities of the population, which has been observed since the time of Ukrainian independence.

Quite a lively illustration of this peculiarities is the phenomena of double institutionalization, which has been described in a work of E.Golovakha and N. Panina [1, p. 5–22]. Authors consider, that the state of social anomy and distrust led to ambivalence of social consciousness of ukrainians, which was expressed in acceptance of both «old» institutions, which remained legitimate, but often lost legal status, and the «new» – legal, but illegitimate. Ambivalence of social consciousness secured the consent of most citizens to exist in such institutional space, in which two institutional systems act simultaneously. The scientists point out, that dominance of such type of perception of reality contributed to prolongation of «transitional period crisis», because the very essence of this perception unknowingly resisted the way out of it. This way, according to the authors, ambivalence of social consciousness fully encouraged the establishment of phenomena of double institutionalization, and directly fuelled its existence.

A. Ruchka points out at the fact of absence of ideological identification among the large part of Ukrainian population [6, p. 29–40]. While analyzing the data of sociological monitoring, conducted by Institute of sociology NAS of Ukraine, author recognizes sustainable conservation of percentage of respondents, which are unable to identify themselves with any of existent political-ideological streams. For instance, in 1994 share of such respondents

---

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine

accounted for 59%, and in 2012 – 53%. The researcher explains this trend by such circumstance, that some political parties became that distant from real advocacy of their electorate interests, that they have lost the support not only among the general population, but even among their devoted voters. While we agree in principle with authors conclusion, we additionally consider that phenomenon of ideological ambiguity of the population must appear from dominant ambivalent state of public consciousness, and from institutional unestablishness of Ukrainian society.

Benefitting from dataset of monitoring research of Institute of sociology NAS of Ukraine, O. Reznik made an attempt to reveal whether the demand for authoritarian governance really exists among mass consciousness of Ukrainians [3, p. 26–31]. The results of the research revealed, that mosaic-ambivalent type of personality, which was described at the beginning of 1990s still exists and is still quite widespread. This type combines elements of democratic consciousness, which is only beginning to form, and totalitarian structures, which are gradually disintegrating. The main conflict of mosaic consciousness comprises of contradiction between democratic ideals and real content, temp and extent of democratization, which generates an attempt to speed up this process by any means available, particularly by methods borrowed from well familiar totalitarian armory – intolerance and intensive struggle against «the enemies of democracy». But it is also remarkable that among the people, who tend to accept authoritarian governance, there are more respondents who are set up to paternalism, and less of those, who share liberal position. In contrary, among those, who are set up to liberal principle of relationship between state and individual, rather than on paternalism. Therefore, declarative authoritativeness of mass consciousness is not the terrible harbinger of devolution of Ukraine to authoritarianism, but is rather an expression on illegitimacy of common political order, when the population does not accept imitational model of democracy, and is discontent by temps of rotation of political class [3, p. 26–31].

Of course, those features are not exhausting the specifics of expression of political transformation during social transit in Ukraine. For example, in work of V. Reznik it was statistically proven, that language preference has a direct effect on their geopolitical orientations. According to author's data, Russian speaking and pro-Russian oriented respondents outnumbered Ukrainian-speaking and pro-European oriented citizens for more than 10 years – from 2000 to 2013. After 2013 this proportion dramatically changed – pro-European citizens began to outnumber pro-Russian oriented by 20%. According to author's analysis, this may be connected to dramatic events on Maidan, annexation of Crimea by Russian federation, and the beginning of

war in the East of Ukraine, which significantly influenced geopolitical orientation of the populace [5, p. 91–104].

The results of research conducted by O. Reznik and V. Reznik considering determinants, which engender geopolitical orientations of Ukrainian citizens are also quite interesting. Authors identified several determinants of support of membership of Ukraine in the EU: identification of self primarily as a Ukrainian citizen, negative attitude to providing Russian language with official status to, granting preference to the system of multi-party democracy, positive attitude to market transformation. On the contrary, determinants of respondent's support of joining the union with Russia and Belarus are the following: identification of self as ethnic Russian, support for providing Russian language with status of second official language, and moreover, preference of planned economy [4, p. 117–145]. Authors consider that these changes demonstrate the appearance of national unity among the citizens of Ukraine regarding European integration, because for the first time in state's history, the number of supporters of pro-Western orientation began to surpass the number of supporters of pro-Russian orientation significantly which is a clear evidence of departure of mass consciousness from the state of ambivalence.

The researchers fixate other positive developments, especially in views of the youth. For instance, the resent work of O. Sosniuk and I. Ostapenko, which was devoted to study of aspects of national and civil identity, revealed that there is a great measure of differentiability, structuredness and consistency in the youth's picture of «real ukrainian» and «real citizen», and that is also represented in contrary concepts of «pseudoukrainian» and «pseudocitizen». This discoveries can be considered an indicators of unity of views of Ukrainian citizens about concepts which are important from point of view of formation of political identity, at least among the youth [2, p. 49–77; 7, p. 164–176].

In conclusion, certain changes of political identities of Ukrainian citizens take place, and these changes are the evidence of gradual, but still qualitatively different changes in political consciousness of the populace. Listed changes may be considered as precondition for successful transit from ambivalence of political identities to formation of national unity.

Perspectives of further studies lie in the more detailed analysis of dynamics of change of political identities of citizens of Ukraine in circumstances of social transit.

### References:

1. Golovaha E., Panina, N. (2001) Postsovetskaja deinstitucionalizacija i stanovlenie novyh social'nyh institutov v ukrainskom obshhestve [Post-Soviet deinstitutionalization and the development of new social institutions in Ukrainian society]. *Sociology: Theory, Methods and Marketing*, no. 4, pp. 5–22.

2. Ostapenko I. V. (2019) Stratehiyi ta tekhnolohiyi aktyvizatsiyi samoidentyfikuvannya molodi : metodychnyy posibnyk [Strategies and technologies for activating youth self-identification]. Kropyvnytskyi: Imeks-LTD, 114 p. (in Ukrainian)
3. Reznik O. (2017) Declarative authoritariassness of Ukrainians mass public culture: real and fictional threats to democracy. *Ahora*, no. 19/20, pp. 26–31.
4. Reznik O., Reznik V. (2017) Ukraine's European Choice as a Social Condition of Democratic Transition. *Ideology and Politics Journal*, no. 2(8), pp. 117–145.
5. Reznik V. (2018) Ukraine's citizens: changes in the ratio of pro-Russian to pro-European ones. *Ukrainian society; monitoring of social changes*, no. 5(19), pp. 91–104.
6. Ruchka A. (2012) Polityko-ideolohichna samoidentyfikatsiia naselennia suchasnoi Ukrainy [Political and ideological self-identification of the population of modern Ukraine]. *Ukrainian society 1992–2012. Current state and dynamics of changes. Sociological monitoring*. Kyiv: Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine, pp. 29–40. (in Ukrainian)
7. Sosniuk O. P., Ostapenko I. V. (2017) Psykhosemantychni osoblyvosti natsionalnoi ta hromadianskoi identychnosti studentskoi molodi [Psychosemantic features of student youth's national and civic identity]. *Ukrainian Psychological Journal*, no. 2(4), pp. 164–176. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.17721/upj.2017.2\(4\).12](https://doi.org/10.17721/upj.2017.2(4).12)