

Ukrainian Sociology after 1991

Reznik, Volodymyr; Reznik, Oleksandr

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Sammelwerksbeitrag / collection article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Reznik, V., & Reznik, O. (2007). Ukrainian Sociology after 1991. In Y. Golovakha (Ed.), *Ukrainian Sociological Review 2004-2005* (pp. 28-58). Kiev: Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-105954>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

VOLODYMYR REZNIK,

Candidate of Sciences in Sociology, Research Fellow of the Department of Economic Sociology, Institute of Sociology, NAS of Ukraine

OLEKSANDR REZNIK,

Candidate of Sciences in Sociology, Research Fellow of the Department of Social Psychology, Institute of Sociology, NAS of Ukraine

Ukrainian Sociology after 1991¹

Abstract

The article is about specific features of the institutional development of Ukrainian sociology from 1990 to the beginning of 2004. Basing on empirical data related to the distribution of Candidate and Doctor's dissertations, the authors reveal the main tendencies in growth of the scientific and professional sociological community. There are discussed both current state and prospects of research by Ukrainian sociologists, as well as analyzed relations between sociology and the transforming society.

How efficient is sociology in production, accumulation, distribution, and application of new knowledge on society has been an actual social and scientific problem since the origin of this science. In Ukraine, it became especially significant due to the necessity of scientific basis for social control over the current transformational processes.

The state of Ukrainian sociology, its role and place in the modern society development were described in numerous publications by V. Volovych, V. Vorona, Ye. Golovakha, K. Hryshenko, N. Panina, V. Tancher, V. Tarasenko, M. Shulha and others. However, the results of all researches must be generalized at present and new aspects, which have

¹ Translated from the Ukrainian text "Ukrains'ka sotsiologhiia pislia 1991 roku", *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*, 2004, № 3, pp. 22–46.

not been studied enough, like a tendency for Ukrainian scientific and professional sociological community to grow, must be included.

The purposes of this paper are the following: a) to describe the development of the institutional basis related to Ukrainian sociology from 1990 to the beginning of 2004; b) to reveal the main tendencies in the scientific and professional sociological community; c) to discuss the state and prospects of research conducted by Ukrainian sociologists, and d) to analyze connections between sociology and the transforming society.

Institutional Basis Development and Growth of the Scientific and Professional Sociological Community

As to its organizational structure, modern Ukrainian sociology consists of governmental and non-governmental research institutions and specialized subdivisions included in educational institutions. Its basic elements, such as schools of thought and organizational structures supporting them, began to develop in 1960s, i.e. in the soviet time. A new stage of complete legalization, forming of an infrastructure, and legitimization of sociology in Ukraine coincided with the collapse of the USSR, renewal of the Ukrainian state system, as well as with the other social transformations. In this respect, the ***Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (IS NASU)*** is a striking example: in the soviet time, it developed from the Department of Methodology, Methods, and Techniques of Sociological Research (1968) to the Sociological Division of the Institute of Philosophy of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (in 1983), and in October 1990, it appeared in its current status¹. A similar course can be seen as to the system of sociological education in Ukraine: from sociological laboratories attached to chairs of philosophy or economics (in 1960s) to the chairs and divisions of applied sociology (in 1970–1980s), and since 1990s, to the chairs, divisions, and faculties of sociology.

In the soviet “perestroika” time, the forerunners of modern Ukrainian research institutions were: the Central and East Ukrainian Division of

¹ Yu. Pakhomov, Doctor of Sciences in Economics, Professor, and Academician of the NAS of Ukraine headed the Institute of Sociology from October 1990 to July 1992. Since 1992, V. Vorona, Doctor of Sciences in Economics, Professor, and Corresponding Member of the NAS of Ukraine is the IS NASU Director.

the All-Union Center for Public Opinion Studies, Center of Sociological Research of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Republican Scientific and Practical Sociological Center, Sociological Group attached to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, etc.

A similar path followed a professional self-governing public organization of sociologists, the **Sociological Association of Ukraine (SAU)**, established in 1990 on the basis of the former Soviet Sociological Association. The SAU unites individual and corporate members, as well as coordinates their interests. The President¹ and the Board head this organization. The SAU has its regional (oblast) divisions; summons periodical conferences (in 1990, 1993, 1998, 2000, and 2004). During the economic crisis of 1990s, its activity was seriously restrained because there was no material support by the government or other interested parties. Since April 1998, the Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine has been playing the key role for the SAU. Thanks to this fact, such activities of the SAU as organizational, socio-political, educational, and informational, as well as social control, have been resumed.

In Ukraine, sociological education has several degrees:

1. Programs of educational degrees — Bachelor's, Specialist's, Master's — at the higher educational establishments of the third and fourth levels of accreditation or at the universities having acquired the status of National.
2. Postgraduate training at the Institute of Continuing Education, Taras Shevchenko Kyiv State University (in the beginning of 1990s), at the Higher School of Sociology, IS NASU (since 2000), and at the Schools of Young Sociologists (since 1993) that were organized by the IS NASU and SAU.
3. Postgraduate study and working for Candidate or Doctor's degrees.

Specialized periodicals are the means helping to unite Ukrainian professional sociological community and providing sociological science and education with informational support. In 1990s, their existence was rather difficult: because of financial hardships, *Ukrainian Observer* (*Ukrains'kyi ohliadach*), an analytical newspaper founded by the SAU and Philosophical Association of Ukraine in 1992, was closed in July

¹ During 1990–1998 V. Volovych, Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy, Professor, the first Dean of the Faculty of Sociology and Psychology (Kyiv National Taras Shevchenko University) was the SAU President. Since April 1998, M. Shulha, Doctor of Sciences in Sociology, Professor, and Deputy Director of the Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine is the SAU President.

1995; *Philosophical and Sociological Thought (Filosofs'ka i sotsiologichna dumka)*, mutual journal for philosophers and sociologists, returned to its pure philosophical content in 1996. For this reason, in 1997, there was established *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing (Sotsiologiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh)*; it was the first all-Ukrainian academic journal. In 1998, it started as the Ukrainian language edition, and in 1999, its copies in Russian also appeared. Now the circulation of this quarterly comes to a thousand copies. Sociological materials are also appear in other journals and collected studies published by research and educational institutions. Direct professional communication between Ukrainian sociologists takes place at numerous scientific conferences. For example, the SAU holds a series of conferences named *Problems of the Sociological Theory Development (Problemy rozvytku sotsiologichnoi teorii)*. Each of them was dedicated to a certain theoretical aspect (2000 — Aspects of Sociological Theory Development, 2002 — Theoretical Aspects of Changes in the Social Structure of Ukrainian Society, 2003 — Transformation of Social Institutions and Institutional Structure of Society, 2004 — Social Processes in Ukraine). In Kharkiv, sociologists conduct every year *Kharkiv Sociological Readings*.

Because of financial difficulties, circulations of individual and collective publications, being a popular way to present the research results by Ukrainian sociologists, rarely could be over 300 copies. Besides, another serious problem is a lack of centralized bookselling and library distribution (as it was in the ex-USSR). Books come mostly in the National Library and scientific libraries of Kyiv and of the other big cities. So, if you do not live there, you have to buy them from the corresponding publishing houses or make copies in the above-mentioned libraries. Publication through electronic media has not enjoyed wide popularity yet, but there are some institutions having their own sociological Websites.

Deficiency of modern educational sociological books, in the beginning of 1990s, was somehow made up for the *Transformation of Humanitarian Education in Ukraine (Transformatsiia humanitarnoi osvity v Ukraini)*. This program was established by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine and financially supported by the *International Renaissance Foundation (Vidrodzhennia)*. Within the framework of this program, many Ukrainian sociologists have gained a right to publish a series of high-quality textbooks, manuals, and courses in sociology, written in Ukrainian. These books were mostly distributed among the

universities of Ukraine that took part in the program. We have to say that there was a drawback — limited circulation.

Among the last editions, the following may be regarded as the most successful as to the presentation material: *Sociology (Sotsiologhita)*, edited by S. Makeyev, and *Special and Branch Sociologies (Spetsial'ni ta haluzevi sotsiologhii)*, edited by V. Pylypenko.

One of the characteristic features showing that Ukrainian sociology develops is a growing number of scientists. Dissertation being a part and parcel of academic degree can be regarded as an evidence of belonging to the professional community. So, we used the quantitative distribution of Candidate and Doctor's dissertations for analysis of tendencies in Ukrainian sociological community. Our empirical base was composed of author's abstracts of dissertations for the degrees of Candidate or Doctor of Sciences in Sociology. The dissertations were defended from 1990 to March 2004 and registered in the IS NASU library, in the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, National Parliamentary Library of Ukraine, and M. Maksymovych Scientific Library of the Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University. The data was collected in March 2004. Total number is 236 author's abstracts. Analysis was conducted according to the following features: sex, specialty, place of execution, academic adviser (supervisor), leading institution, date of defense, place of defense, and academic degree.

As to specialties, distribution of Candidate and Doctor's dissertations reveals that most theses, as would be expected, were defended in the specialty 22.00.04, Special and Branch Sociologies: 95 dissertations (40.3% of the sample)¹. Less number was in the specialty 22.00.01, Theory and History of Sociology, as well as in the specialty 22.00.03, Social Structures and Social Relations — 69 (29.2%) and 64 (27.1%) correspondingly. As to the Methodology and Methods of Sociological Research, specialty 22.00.02, there were only 8 (3.4%) theses.

¹ Before 2000, dissertations for the degrees of Candidate and Doctor of Sciences in Sociology were defended in the following specialties: 22.00.01 — Theory and History of Sociology; 22.00.02 — Methodology and Methods of Sociological Research; 22.00.03 — Social Structure, Social Institutions, and Social Relations; 22.00.04 — Economic Sociology; 22.00.05 — Sociology of Politics; 22.00.06 — Sociology of Culture, Science, and Education; 22.00.07 — Sociology of Management. In 2002, specialized academic councils won a right to accept for examination and defense theses for the degrees of Candidate and Doctor of Sciences in Sociology in the four following specialties: 22.00.01 — Theory and History of Sociology; 22.00.02 — Methodology and Methods of Sociological Research; 22.00.03 — Social Structures and Social Relations; 22.00.04 — Special and Branch Sociologies.

Distribution presented in Table 1 shows a gradual rise in numbers of dissertations, especially in the specialties 22.00.03 and 22.00.04.

Table 1

**The Dynamics of Dissertation Distribution as to Specialties
(N)**

Specialties	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
22.00.01	0	6	8	5	5	2	10	2	3	9	2	6	6	4	1
22.00.02	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
22.00.03	1	3	5	4	4	4	6	1	2	7	9	5	6	6	1
22.00.04	0	3	3	6	8	8	5	7	5	9	8	6	9	17	1
Total	2	12	16	16	18	14	21	12	11	25	19	18	21	28	* ¹

Most dissertations were defended at the specialized academic council D 26.229.01 of the IS NASU — 102 (43.2% of the sample). They included 77 Candidate's and 25 Doctor's theses. The specialized academic council D 64.051.15, Sociological Faculty, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University (KhNU), accepted 90 (38.1%) dissertations, including 76 Candidate's and 14 Doctor's ones. The specialized academic council D 26.001.30, Sociology and Psychology Faculty, Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University (KNU), conferred 27 (11.4%) degrees. Among them were 24 Candidate's and 3 Doctor's ones. The specialized academic council D 64.700.01, Social and Psychological Faculty, National University of the Internal Affairs of Ukraine (NUIA), Kharkiv, accepted 17 (7.2%) dissertations, 13 Candidate's and 4 Doctor's theses.

Specialization of these four academic councils can be seen in the dissertation distribution (Table 2). The council D 26.229.01, IS NASU, accepted the largest number of dissertations in the specialty 22.00.03. Dissertations in the specialties 22.00.01 and 22.00.04 are leaders among those defended at the council D 64.051.15, Sociological Faculty, KhNU, and D 26.229.01, IS NASU. We have already mentioned a little number of dissertations on the methodology and methods of sociological research (only 8). There is only one academic council, which terms of reference cover this specialty.

¹ The data enclose only the beginning of 2004.

Table 2**Dissertation Distribution as to the Specialties and Specialized Academic Councils (N)**

Academic council	Specialty			
	22.00.01	22.00.02	22.00.03	22.00.04
Specialized academic council D 26.229.01, Institute of Sociology, NAS of Ukraine	27	–	45	30
Specialized academic council D 64.051.15, Sociological Faculty, KhNU	39	–	1	50
Specialized academic council D 26.001.30, Sociology and Psychology Faculty, KNU	3	8	1	15
Specialized academic council D 64.700.01, Social and Psychological Faculty, NUIA of Ukraine	–	–	17	–

For the period discussed in this article, an outstanding contribution to the sociological science was made by educational and research institutions of Kyiv, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Odessa, and Lviv (Table 3). It is no mere coincidence that the first two cities, with most dissertations defended and preliminary examined, are the most fruitful: they are the greatest centers having educational and research institutions. Among them, the undoubted leaders are IS NASU — 32.2% of all dissertations, KhNU — 19.1%, KNU — 12.3%.

Table 3**Dissertation Distribution as to the Place of Execution**

Place of execution	N	%
Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine	76	32.2
V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University	45	19.1
Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University	29	12.3
Dnipropetrovsk State University	12	5.1
Odessa National I.I. Mechnikov University	12	5.1

Table 3 (end)

National University of the Internal Affairs of Ukraine (Kharkiv)	10	4.2
Yaroslav the Wise National Law Academy of Ukraine	6	2.5
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv	5	2.1
Kharkiv Humanitarian Institute “People’s Ukrainian Academy”	4	1.7
National Economics University of Kyiv	3	1.3
Yurii Fedkovych Chernivtsi State University	3	1.3
H.S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy of the NAS of Ukraine	3	1.3
Institute of Continuing Education, KNU	3	1.3
H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University	3	1.3
National Technical University “Kharkiv Polytechnical Institute”	3	1.3
Others (under 3 dissertations)	19	8.1

We revealed an interesting fact: most dissertations executed outside Kyiv (Dnipropetrovsk, Odessa, and Lviv) are defended at the academic councils of Kharkiv, while Kyiv’s councils accept works executed in Kyiv, apart from three ones executed in Chernivtsi.

After a specialized academic council has accepted a dissertation for defense, there should be appointed a leading institution known by its achievements in the corresponding specialty. The leading institution presents its review based on collective examination and discussion. Now most reviews are from institutions of Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv, Odessa, and Dnipropetrovsk (Table 4), i.e. the situation is similar to the one we had as to a place of execution.

Moreover, leaders are chairs of the Sociology and Psychology Faculty, KNU — 27.5% of all reviews. As we can see, adherence to principles and a high degree of proficiency among their research fellows are of great value for the scientific community. That is why, most contenders for a degree wish to get a favorable review from this institution.

Table 4**Dissertation Distribution as to the Leading Institutions**

Leading institution	N	%
Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University	65	27.5
Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine	38	16.1
V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University	16	6.8
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv	13	5.5
Yaroslav the Wise National Law Academy of Ukraine	13	5.5
National Economics University of Kyiv	12	5.1
Odessa National I.I. Mechnikov University	12	5.1
National University of the Internal Affairs of Ukraine (Kharkiv)	8	3.4
National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy"	6	2.5
Dnipropetrovsk State University	6	2.5
H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University	6	2.5
H.S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy of the NAS of Ukraine	6	2.5
National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnical Institute"	4	1.7
National University of Pharmacy, Kharkiv	3	1.3
I.F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine	3	1.3
Ukrainian Scientific Research Institute for the Problems of Youth	3	1.3
Others (under 3 reviews)	22	9.3

Table 5 presents a rating of Ukrainian sociologists who were academic advisers (supervisors) of dissertations provided their authors with the corresponding degrees. We included in this list only those who supervised three and more theses, because three are a minimal number to achieve the academic status of Professor. The following rating shows that most supervisors have the Doctor's degree; for an objective reason (before 1990, there was no academic degree in sociology), most scientists have degrees in philosophy. We revealed also that, among leaders of this rating, there are research fellows of educational institutions from Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, and Kyiv, of course. This fact can be explained

by the idea that institutions lay the foundations of the schools of thought with their own authorities, disciples, and followers.

Table 5

**Rating of Academic Advisers (Supervisors)
as to the Defended Dissertations**

Rating number	Academic adviser (supervisor)	Academic degree	Number of dissertations
1	O. Yakuba	Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy	12
2	V. Horodianenko	Doctor of Sciences in History	11
3	V. Soboliev	Doctor of Sciences in Sociology	11
4	V. Tancher	Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy	8
5	V. Bakirov	Doctor of Sciences in Sociology	7
6–8	V. Vorona	Doctor of Sciences in Economics	6
6–8	Yu. Yakovenko	Doctor of Sciences in Sociology	6
6–8	V. Astakhova	Doctor of Sciences in History	6
9–12	L. Sokhan	Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy	5
9–12	Yu. Saienko	Doctor of Sciences in Economics	5
9–12	M. Zakharchenko	Candidate of Sciences in Philosophy	5
9–12	A. Andruschenko	Candidate of Sciences in Philosophy	5
13–18	V. Volovych	Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy	4
13–18	V. Pylypenko	Doctor of Sciences in Sociology	4
13–18	Ye. Suimenko	Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy	4
13–18	A. Ruchka	Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy	4
13–18	I. Popova	Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy	4
13–18	S. Makeyev	Doctor of Sciences in Sociology	4
19–24	M. Shulha	Doctor of Sciences in Sociology	3
19–24	Ye. Podolska	Doctor of Sciences in Sociology	3
19–24	V. Nikolaievskyi	Candidate of Sciences in Philosophy	3
19–24	L. Sokurianska	Candidate of Sciences in Philosophy	3
19–24	V. Chornovolenko	Candidate of Sciences in Philosophy	3
19–24	O. Kutsenko	Doctor of Sciences in Sociology	3

The next stage of our research is to analyze the scientific community reproduction. If we take all authors of registered abstracts, their sex distribution shows that women prevail (56.8%) over men (43.2%) to a certain extent. However, distribution as to the academic degree is different: among Candidates, there are 120 women (63.2%) and 70 men (36.8%), while among Doctors, there are 14 women (30.4%) and 32 men (69.6%). At the beginning of 1990s, more men defended theses, and since the middle of 1990s, women have been dominating.

At present, there are significantly more Doctors and Candidates in the specialty 22.00.04 (Table 6). We also think that universal character of the specialties 22.00.01 and 22.00.03 is attractive to the sociological community, because it enables to cover aspects of branch sociologies. It is disturbing that there are only two Doctors in the specialty 22.00.02. Of course, this number of specialists in the methodology and methods of sociological research is extremely low for the whole Ukrainian sociology.

Table 6

**Distribution of the Defended Dissertations
as to Degrees and Specialties**

Academic degree	Specialty			
	22.00.01	22.00.02	22.00.03	22.00.04
Doctor of Sciences in Sociology	17	2	17	10
Candidate of Sciences in Sociology	52	6	47	85

**Research by Ukrainian Sociologists:
Current State and Prospects**

After legitimization as an independent science in the beginning of 1990s, Ukrainian sociology has been accomplishing a number of interdependent urgent tasks:

1. To introduce the world and national sociological classics excluded or unknown because of more than 70 years of soviet ideological pressure.
2. To develop a new theoretical and methodological basis after giving up the monopoly of orthodox Marxism (historical materialism).
3. To meet the world standards in application of methods and procedures for empirical sociological research.

4. To become involved in the world process of sociological theory development through theoretical and cognitive activity, as well as to conduct a fundamental investigation of the transforming society.
5. To put into practice the applied functions of sociology: its response to the current needs and urgent problems of society.

The ways to solve these problems, as well as to estimate the achieved results, seem to be very different. For example, despite the fact that most of Ukrainian sociologists conduct research on the basis of classical sociological inheritance and achievements of modern sociological thought of the West, V. Tancher considers them as insufficiently known because of lack of fairly translated classical texts and modern analytical works [1]. So far we have a quite low number of corresponding Ukrainian publications. As a rule, they were published at the expenses of the above-mentioned International Renaissance Foundation and other western charitable institutions. Ukrainian sociology got back the names of its national founders-classics, such as M. Drahomanov, M. Hrushevskiy, S. Podolynskiy, B. Kistiakivskiy, V. Lypynskiy, etc., but more attention must be paid to the republication of their papers. With few exceptions, such a work is either done or planned without participation of Ukrainian sociologists. Taking into account geographical situation of Ukraine and linguistic affinity with its northeastern neighbor, it is easy to understand why the corresponding Russian publications compensate for lack of national translated ones. Russians even publish works of the prominent classics of Ukrainian sociology. Western sociological publications, especially periodicals, do not come in Ukraine in sufficient quantities, because of financial difficulties or inadequate language competence of sociological community. Since there is no effective program for publication of foreign sociological works, they come to us mostly through the “window” of Russian translations. However, inaccessibility of the world sociological texts hardly could be considered as an obstacle in the way of national sociological school development. For example, Ye. Golovakha thinks of a cautious acceptance of western sociological experience, as far as he doubts that western theories on interpretation of the Ukrainian society phenomena and production of adequate knowledge could be effective. At the same time, he stresses that methods developed within the framework of these theories, as well as measuring scales seem to be very effective in Ukraine [2, pp. 173–174].

In the course of development of the theoretical and methodological basis of Ukrainian sociology, we can see a tolerance of other people's views, as well as a tendency to apply numerous research methods. How-

ever, as M. Shulha notes, there is a decline of the methodological culture of research, when not only science as a whole becomes of multi-paradigmatic character, but also a scientist's viewpoint [3, p. 174].

In modern Ukrainian sociology, the applied aspects dominate. This tendency is rooted in the soviet times as a way of protection from ideological pressure and control over sociological theories. At present, it is a result of insufficient means for fundamental investigations. Over the last ten years, scientific interests of our sociologists mostly confined within the middle-range theories; their attention was attracted to the social and political problems of society, electoral behavior, and consumer market. So, theoretical studies are left for a few scientists, and public interest in theories is insignificant. For instance, V. Tarasenko, while talking about empirical aspects, positivist ideals of scientific work, kinds of knowledge, and cognitive technologies dominant in sociology, rebukes Ukrainian sociological community for ignorance of general theoretical aspects and incapability to identify and set up a typology of even the social reality they are studying [4, pp. 23–24]. V. Tancher stresses that Ukrainian sociologists do not participate in discussions on “theoretical development” that are characteristic of the world sociology [1, p. 26].

Nevertheless, Ukrainian sociologists respond to the certain social and political problems (we will return to this question later). But, as V. Vorona notes, they, along with the other representatives of social sciences, could not perform the most important order, i.e. understand “society we live in”. As a result, they have not suggested to the government any effective model for transition to democracy. So, for ten years, the country has been changing by trial and error [5, p. 8].

At the same time, Ukrainian society transforming its economy, politics, and culture is a unique object of exclusive theoretical reflection; that is why, it can be an empirical precondition that will help Ukrainian sociologists to contribute theoretically to the world science. Why do not they fully use such a potential? M. Shulha speaking of the current state of national sociology established the following reasons: a) crisis in Ukrainian sociology that, along with the whole Ukrainian society, is in the search for self-identity — it tries to understand what it is, what it wants to be, and what it can be as the Ukrainian sociology; b) incomprehension of the present challenges and lack of adequate strategies for scientific research, as a result — uncoordinated research topics without proper generalization [3, pp. 170–171, 173]. However, from 1990 to the beginning of 2004, in studies by Ukrainian sociologists, there were some moments giving hope for change for the better.

At present, there is another difficulty for application of methods and procedures in an empirical research. It is a limited access to licensed software for data processing, because it is too expensive (as for the whole post-soviet space). However, Ukrainian sociological community has found a way to solve this problem due to successful applying a modular Russian-language software package for statistical analysis of the survey results named as *OCA* (*OCA* is a Ukrainian acronym for *Processing Sociological Questionnaires*). The author of the software is A. Gorbachyk, a Ukrainian sociologist and mathematician. *OCA* was developed in 1989 and, since then, has been improved regularly. In 2000, there appeared *OCA for MS Windows*, and in 2004, A. Gorbachyk and O. Gorbachyk introduced *OCA New Line*, perfected and financially accessible.

The most essential fact is that in 1990s, there was formed and determined the main scientific and coordinating center of sociological science in Ukraine — the Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine. Its leadership is beyond any doubt due to the objective quantitative indicators, high level of fundamental investigations and combination of theoretical, methodological, and conceptual principles with the empirical studies carried out on a national scale.

It is obvious that sociologists urged on by market conditions study the topics rarely related to the fundamental sociology. In this aspect, it would be interesting to become familiar with the research projects of IS NASU financed by the government and mostly determined by professionals (Table 7).

Table 7

Research Works Financially Supported by the State Budget of Ukraine and/or Governmental Special Foundations that Were Performed by the IS NASU in 1991–2004

№	Performance period	Research topics	Supervisor
1	1991–1994	Labor behavior of youth under market economy	V. Pylypenko
2	1991–1994	Reasons of social conflicts and ways of resolving under the society's democratization	Ye. Golovakha
3	1991–1993	Forming and implementation of the state ethnic policy in present-day Ukraine	V. Yevtukh

Table 7 (cont.)

4	1991–1993	Regional problems of the national culture development: methodology and procedure of sociological analysis	Yu. Saienko
5	1991–1994	Communication mechanisms in the sociological survey	Yu. Yakovenko
6	1991–1994	Socio-economic conditions and motivation of a private entrepreneurship	V. Vorona
7	1991–1994	Planning and organization for a large-scale sample survey: methodology and procedure	M. Churylov
8	1991–1994	Social and socio-economic conditions and mechanisms for multi-structural character of Ukrainian economy as a basis for the rural economy revival	V. Tarasenko
9	1991–1994	Development of sociological thought in Ukraine during the 19–20 th centuries	V. Tancher
10	1991–1994	Factors determining a person's ethnic self-consciousness	M. Shulha
11	1992–1994	Reconsideration of value priorities in the mass consciousness	A. Ruchka
12	1992–1994	Tendencies and mechanisms of social differentiation and stratification	S. Makeyev
13	1992–1994	Influence of different patterns of ownership on a worker's labor motivation	K. Hryshenko
14	1992–1994	Formation and development of fine structures in social intellect and its functioning	Yu. Kanyhin
15	1992–1994	Social aspects of the collective productive activities under forming of the market economy	V. Matviienko
16	1992–1995	Social and status stratification under the market economy formation	V. Chornovolenko
17	1992–1995	Social and psychological factors of the personal identification and adaptation under social crisis	V. Tykhonovych

Table 7 (cont.)

18	1992–1995	Social aspects of the national security in Ukraine: theoretical and methodological basis	M. Mykhalchenko
19	1992–1995	Relationship between institutional and personal political cultures	V. Ossovskyi
20	1992–1995	Ukrainian ethnicity in the present-day world: historical, sociological, social, and demographic aspects	V. Troschynskiy
21	1993–1995	Deep psychological prerequisites for looking for ways out of the social crisis	O. Donchenko
22	1993–1995	Distinctive features of family life in the transforming society	N. Lavrynenko
23	1993–1995	Methodology and procedure for social expertise of the national and regional programs and projects	Yu. Saienko
24	1993–1995	Social well-being as a phenomenon of the mass consciousness: social and psychological analysis	N. Sobolieva
25	1993–1995	Development of the social well-being indicators system	N. Panina
26	1994–1996	Interethnic relations in Ukraine: structure, current state, and developmental prospects	V. Yevtukh
27	1994–1997	Theories of social changes in modern sociology	V. Tancher
28	1994–1997	Social mechanisms of privatization in Ukraine	Ye. Suimenko
29	1994–1997	Patterns of the general public psychology under social transformations	Ye. Golovakha
30	1994–1997	Quality control over the interviewer network: principles, criteria, and methods	M. Churylov
31	1995–1997	Tendencies of the spiritual culture transformation in the present-day Ukrainian society	M. Shulha

Table 7 (cont.)

32	1995–1997	Forming of cultural and communicative orientations of Ukrainian population under the systemic society's transformation	A. Ruchka
33	1995–1998	Sociological analysis of the social ideal choice by Ukrainians	V. Tarasenko
34	1995–1998	Theoretical and methodological principles of the public opinion identification on social, cultural, and political development of Ukraine	V. Ossovskyi
35	1995–1998	Current tendencies of the social mobility in Ukrainian society	S. Makeyev
36	1995–1998	Social and psychological factors for stabilization of Ukrainian society (personal aspect)	V. Tykhonovych
37	1995–1998	Status legitimization of elite groups in the present-day Ukrainian society	V. Chornovolenko
38	1995–1998	Elite of Ukraine: coming-to-be under social transformations (social and psychological research)	V. Ocheretianyi
39	1996–1998	Transformation of social myths in the mass consciousness of the transitional society in Ukraine: social and psychological analysis	N. Sobolieva
40	1996–1998	Methodological aspects of expert evaluation as to the adoption and implementation of social policy in Ukraine	Yu. Saienko
41	1996–1998	Ukrainian Diaspora from the East and West: ethnic and national self-expression, prospects of cooperation in Ukraine	V. Troschynskyi
42	1996–1999	The dynamics and factors of the social well-being of Ukrainian population under transformations of society	N. Panina
43	1996–1999	The population's attitude towards market reforms: trends and forecasts	V. Pylypenko

Table 7 (cont.)

44	1997–2000	Socio-economic behavior of the productive activity subjects	Ye. Suimenko
45	1997–2000	Modernization and renovation projects for a society at the threshold of the 21 st century	V. Tancher
46	1997–2000	Political transformation of the present-day Ukrainian society: social and historical analysis	M. Mykhalchenko
47	1998–2000	Legitimization of identities in the multicultural space of modern society	A. Ruchka
48	1998–2001	Millennium as a social and psychological phenomenon (new life prospects in the mass consciousness)	V. Tykhonovych
49	1998–2001	Development of methods for studying the public opinion subjects in transforming societies	V. Ossovskiy
50	1998–2001	Status and professional identities: destruction and construction	S. Makeyev
51	1998–2001	Marginalization in the transitional society: social, psychological, and cultural aspects	M. Shulha
52	1999–2001	Processes of ethnic integration in the present-day Ukrainian society: tendencies, factors, and prospects	V. Troschynskiy
53	1999–2001	Social identification of the Ukrainian society	V. Tarasenko
54	1999–2002	Political success in the transforming society: subjects, criteria, and factors	N. Panina
55	1999–2000	National system of the social indicators in Ukraine	Yu. Saienko
56	1999–2003	Study of the socio-economic behavior patterns of the able-bodied Ukrainian population	Ye. Suimenko

Table 7 (end)

57	1999–2001	Social and psychological monitoring of living conditions and activity of those who suffered from the Chornobyl catastrophe: comparative analysis and recommendations	Yu. Saienko
58	2000–2001	Socio-environmental risks and safety under natural disasters or man-caused accidents (by experience of overcoming the Chornobyl catastrophe consequences)	Yu. Saienko
59	2000–2003	Modern political and ideological stereotypes as a subject matter of sociological analysis	M. Mykhalchenko
60	2000–2003	Sociological theory of social transformations	V. Tancher
61	2001–2003	Socio-cultural differentiation of the present-day Ukrainian society	A. Ruchka
62	2001–2004	Formational and transformational tendencies of social institutions	S. Makeyev
63	2001–2004	Forming of a new image-and-symbolic social space in the personal and mass consciousness of Ukrainian population	V. Tykhonovych
64	2001–2004	Forming of a new living area of a person under global transformations	M. Shulha

We can see that most of these projects aimed at gaining new knowledge about Ukrainian society on a national scale, as well as at developing theoretical, methodological, and technical basis for comprehension of this phenomenon. Of course, it would be much more difficult to conduct all these researches and publish results in articles, books, and informational materials if the researches had been financed exclusively by non-governmental sources. NGOs could have confined scientific interests of researchers within their own applied problems. In our case, fundamental investigations (imaging the sociological science) were realized due to the government financial support and work of the IS NASU as a specialized institution.

The most valuable achievement is a large-scale project on the annual monitoring of public opinion. It was launched in 1994 on the initiative of V. Vorona, the IS NASU director, who also has been supervising the project since then. N. Panina and Ye. Golovakha developed the program and tools of the first project stage (*Ukrainian Society at the Threshold of the 21st Century, 1994–2002*); on the basis of these tools, they also constructed a sociological test called *Integral Index of Social Well-Being* that made it possible to assess efficiency of social policy by taking into account its influence on social and psychological climate and the state of public opinion [6]. N. Panina and M. Churylov designed the all-national sample consisted of 1800 respondents. The second project stage (*Ukrainian Society: Monitoring of Social Changes*) started in 2003 and has been conducted with the help of new tools and indicators system altered by a group of scientists at the head of Yu. Saienko. This system was tested at the first project stage (1994–2002). At the second stage, researchers plan to add some indicators to the monitoring components in order to profoundly analyze the certain spheres of social life, such as economic, political and social situations, social well-being, health, social relations, informational space, leisure activity, living conditions, financial position of a family, employment, education, transport and communication, environment, etc. For each sphere there is a set of indicators.

Analysis of the monitoring data became a significant knowledge-base on the social structure of Ukrainian society, its social and psychological atmosphere, social well-being, public opinion, mass media functioning, social aspects of economic reforms, socio-cultural and socio-ethnic processes, social and psychological consequences of the Chornobyl catastrophe, etc. But the most important contribution to the sociological science was made due to a new methodological approach to the analysis of transforming societies. It is based on a quasi-experimental method including: a) regular large-scale monitoring survey with the samples on a national and regional scale, and b) cross-cultural analysis of various components of Ukrainian and other societies. This approach must be a methodological precondition for a new sociological theory that would explain the phenomenon of transforming Ukrainian society and assume a great importance for the world sociology. It is quite possible that the conceptions developed by Ukrainian sociologists, such as a phenomenon of subjective poverty [7], social anomie [8], amoral majority [9], double de-institutionalization [10], everyday ideologies [11], etc., will be developed into an integral theoretical interpretation. An interest displayed by western and Russian sociological communities in the Ukrainian sociol-

ogists' works on the basis of empirical data of sociological research supports this assumption. Moreover, articles showing this interest formed two special editions of the *International Journal of Sociology* [12] and one special edition of the Russian journal named as *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia* [13].

As we mentioned above, the Institute of Sociology publishes books and specialized periodicals, serves as a base for the Higher School of Sociology and SAU. Moreover, here is a bank of sociological data for Ukraine after gaining its independence. Since 1997, the National Archives of Sociological Data have been developed. Software for saving and looking for information is based on the *OCA for MS Windows* (developed by A. Gorbachyk). Requested files are presented both in the OCA and SPSS formats. We hope that the archives will form the national center for exchange of sociological information between Ukrainian and foreign researchers, as well as create the necessary prerequisites for more profound analysis of system transformations in Ukrainian society.

Ukrainian sociology does not avoid scientific discussions, competing methods, different theoretical approaches and interpretations. Some disputes are published in journals, such as:

1. Between Yu. Yakovenko and Ye. Zelinskyi, on the one side, and V. Bebyk, on the other, about adherence to scientific standards while organizing, conducting a survey and publishing results [14].
2. Between V. Khmelko and Ye. Golovakha about the amoral majority phenomenon as a manifestation of demoralization of human relations in Ukraine over the last two decades [15].
3. Between I. Martyniuk and I. Dobronravova about evaluation of the book by L. Bevzenko on the possible social interpretations of the synergetic paradigm [16], etc.

Such productive conflicts in a scientific community are the evidence of reasonable criticism, joint responsibility, and intentions to maintain a good quality of research. As a result, they ensure verification and growth in scientific knowledge.

Contacts between sociologists of Ukraine and other countries play an important role in the scientific development. On the one hand, these contacts bring new experience and knowledge related to the survey and research work; on the other hand, they consolidate the position of Ukrainian sociology in the world and help to win a wide recognition. The following contacts seem to be the most fruitful:

1. Trips of Ukrainian sociologists abroad in order to get familiar with the organization of research and education, as well as to establish and maintain professional contacts.
2. Participation of Ukrainian sociologists at international sociological congresses, conferences, meetings in Ukraine, as well as abroad.
3. A large number of publications: a) by Ukrainian sociologists in foreign editions; b) by foreign sociologists in Ukrainian editions; c) by Ukrainian and foreign sociologists (together) in Ukrainian and foreign editions.
4. Participation of Ukrainian sociologists in various international research projects.
5. Membership of Ukrainian sociologists and sociological groups in international research organizations (the SAU and IS NASU have been collective members of the International Sociological Association since 1993 and 1995 correspondingly).
6. Direct help of foreign sociologists aimed to make Ukrainian research activity meet the world standards.
7. Preparation of information materials and digests (English versions) on works by Ukrainian sociologists (including research results) to be distributed among foreign readership.

The main achievements of Ukrainian sociology are in the following research branches:

- Development of sociological theory and research methodology [17].
- Laws and tendencies of the post-communist society development [18].
- Social stratification processes [19].
- Political processes [20].
- Interethnic relations, demographic and migration processes [21].
- The means of public communication and public opinion [22].
- Sociology of economics [23].
- Sociology of management [24].
- Social psychology [25].
- Sociology of crime [26].

Sociology and the Transforming Society: Aspects of Relations

Developing from 1990 up to the present, Ukrainian sociology has to overcome numerous difficulties. On the one hand, Ukraine gained its independence, tried to develop a democratic legal state of the open civil so-

ciety and market economy. On the other hand, as in the soviet times, sociological science has to perform its functions (theoretical and cognitive, consuming, informational, social and managing, social and critical, forming of the public opinion and outlook) in the society of no sociological culture. This concerns Ukrainian elite too, because its attitude to sociology depends on political conjuncture; sometimes it is even biased, intolerant, devoid of constructive character.

Despite the fact that government authorities, parties and non-governmental organizations are regularly provided with informational, analytical and other materials, moreover, these institutions often invite sociologists to be experts, consultants and analysts, their professional achievements are hardly taken into account while decisions relate to the strategy or tactics of social development. A sharp rise in the public attention to sociological surveys can be seen mostly before and during elections, referendums, and various reforms. Since there are no sociological divisions in the government bodies, we regard this fact as an evidence of poor dealing with sociological information at the governmental level.

In the beginning of 2000, M. Shulha declared that, in Ukrainian society, sociology was a half-recognized and hardly needful social institution, because the government was interested in it only as in an academic discipline and theoretical studies; it is not recognized as an official institution collecting information about the current state and well-being of society; the society is “rather indifferent to the distortions in sociological science” and to pseudo-sociological centers cynically speculating in the sociology’s authority recognized by the public opinion [3, pp. 175–176]. Since then the government has been taking some steps to further a role of sociology in the social life. For instance, Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 275/2001 of the 25th of April 2001 *On Development of the Sociological Science in Ukraine* obliged the Cabinet of Ministers, Ministry of Education and Science, and the Higher Attestation Commission to take necessary measures, as well as the regional bodies to promote the SAU activity in regions [27]. However, in I. Kononov’s opinion, the sociological community could not take advantage of the Decree because of weak self-organization and inability to assert the rights in the scientific community as a whole, lack of influence on the government policy, in particular, related to its own interests [28, pp. 217–218].

There was an evidence of the fact that Ukraine’s government had become ready to take into account the professional sociological opinion: in 2002, Administration of the President of Ukraine applied to four leading sociological institutions for conducting the public opinion poll about a

constitutional reform draft. Along with the other specialists, sociologists took this opportunity to get involved in the solution of social and political problems. It is worth mentioning that in 1990–1991, sociologists provided the Verkhovna Rada with information about the public opinion during political or economic crisis. Their prognoses of the referendum on Ukrainian independence (December 1991), exit polls during parliamentary elections of 1998 and 2002, presidential elections of 1999 and local elections, as well as studies of pre-election ratings were of great importance. The exit poll conducted during the referendum of 2000 on the President's powers revealed a partial falsification [29]; this fact influenced indirectly the parliament and the referendum results were not implemented.

As to the subsequent constitutional reform, results of the public opinion polls were a convincing argument, among others, that helped to reject the idea of electing the President of Ukraine in parliament (instead of national elections). Thus, sociology has been performing its functions of the public control over the activity of governmental and non-governmental organs during elections and referendums, ensuring citizens' rights to elect their representatives to all governmental bodies, public arbitration between political opponents, as well as avoiding the conflict escalation.

Such a constructive activity was performed in spite of serious obstacles thrown by the so-called sociological “impostors”, “laymen”, and “swindlers”:

- (a) (Members of pseudo-sociological institutions who announced inaccurate, incomplete, biased or even deliberately falsified results of the public opinion polls during elections;
- (b) (Representatives of the mass media who interpret (purposely or not) polling results in a lay or scientifically incorrect manner.

Manifestations of informational and psychological aggression against electorate and contenders for elective office discredit sociology, lead to the general public's despair and sometimes cause adverse reactions of politicians. For example, before the parliamentary elections of 2002, V. Lytvyn, leader of the bloc *For United Ukraine*, Head of the Presidential Administration, Corresponding Member of the NAS of Ukraine (at that time), Doctor of Historical Sciences, called sociology a “prostituted science”.

To tell the truth, these problems are rooted in the specific features of the development of Ukrainian sociology. It was revived as a part of the soviet sociology by the generation of the sixties. At that time, the association of sociologists was similar to a community (*Gemeinschaft*, according to F. Tönnies), a primary group, or a medieval guild. It was a small so-

cial group; its members were familiar with the scientific activity of each other and even knew each other personally. Qualification and social mobility were mostly of the guild character: “apprentice — journeyman — master”. During the post-soviet period, the sociological community was transforming to a mass community, a secondary group or even a quasi-group. Old informal mechanisms of the social control based on moral values, decency, unselfishness, proficiency, progress are ineffective in new conditions. Now people consider sociology not as a vocation but as a profession or a way to earn money. Development of educational sociological network and increase in a number of specialists with degrees in sociology confirm this fact. As to I. Sosunova, the “elite” sociology transformed to the “mass” sociology [2, p. 119]. In the USSR, people became active sociologists at a mature age, following their vocation, often despite their background, and it was a deliberate choice of a hardly privileged science in the soviet period. But now the motives to come in sociology are more pragmatic. Taking this fact into account, adherents of professional principles and civic responsibility try to improve institutional mechanisms for social control inside the sociological professional community. For this purpose, the Sociological Association of Ukraine has developed a normative document aimed at regulating ethical aspects of professional activity of Ukrainian sociologists, the *Code of Professional Ethics*, adopted at the 5th Congress of the SAU (May 2004).

In order to have a protection from informational and psychological aggression presented by sociological information that is far from reliable or deliberately distorted, the sociological community has launched a campaign of voluntary public accreditation to the SAU of all organizations professionally conducting sociological researches¹.

If laws do not work, sociologists hope for changes in the mass consumption of their professional products through developing sociological

¹ Organizations accredited by the SAU are the following: Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine (www.i-soc.kiev.ua; e-mail: i-soc@i-soc.org.ua); Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (www.kiis.com.ua; e-mail: office@kiis.com.ua); O. Yaremchenko Ukrainian Institute for Social Research (www.uisr.org.ua; e-mail: uisr@ukrnet.net); Social Monitoring Center (www.smc.org.ua; e-mail: mail@smc.org.ua); Taylor Nelson Sofres (TNS) Ukraine (www.tnssofres.com.ua; e-mail: churylov@tnsofres.com.ua); Center for Social Expertise and Prognoses of the Institute of Sociology, NAS of Ukraine (e-mail: csep@csep.kiev.ua); Sociological Faculty, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University (www-ukr.univer.kharkov.ua/departments/sociology.php; e-mail: postmaster@univer.kharkov.ua); the East Ukrainian Foundation for Social Research (Kharkiv) (www.sociology.kharkiv.org; e-mail: sociology@univer.kharkov.ua, kharkov@sociologist.com); Sociological and Marketing Studies Service in the Southern and Eastern Ukraine "Socio-Market" (Dnipropetrovsk) (e-mail: socio-m@a-teleport.com).

culture and imparting sociological knowledge to public, first and foremost, through sociological education. It concerns teaching sociology as a basic social and humanitarian discipline at all educational establishments from the first to the fourth level of accreditation. So, in May 1993, the Ministry of Education of Ukraine adopted an official act providing for course in sociology 54 academic hours. However, in reality, administration of an educational institution often reduces teaching hours for courses in general sociology. If the sociological community of Ukraine does not comprehend and adequately respond to this situation, sociology may become a free elective as it has already happened in Russia. Russian educational programs of the second generation do not include sociology as a compulsory humanitarian discipline. As a result, sociology teachers are subject to the decisions of rectors or deans, besides, there is a great disparity in numbers of certified sociologists and those who required for the society.

In Ukraine, sociological education is provided at many institutes and universities among all Ukrainian regions.¹ As to the general public, there are such ways of getting more acquainted with the achievements in sociological science: a) publicist activity of the famous sociologists, such as Ye. Golovakha, M. Shulha, Yu. Saienko, O. Zlobina and others, their contributions to periodicals, speeches on TV, radio, etc.; b) governmental activities of some Ukrainian sociologists (V. Vrublevskiy, M. Shulha, O. Nelha, M. Lukashevych and others)

Thus, sociology in Ukraine has become an integral part of the world sociology. Moreover, it is inseparably linked with the complex transformational processes in Ukrainian society; that is why, not only scientific factors, but also social, political, and economic ones influence its development. At present, Ukrainian sociology is an independent science; its contribution to the solution of social problems is generally acknowledged. There is a good chance to catch up with the world achievements. Productive research strategies will ensure the successful development of sociology in Ukraine, as well as promote the formation of national sociological school capable of making theoretical and categorical contribution to the world sociology. Such possibilities and processes can be analyzed in the further studies.

¹ According to the site "Sociology Hall" (www.sociology.kharkov.ua), approximately 26 Ukrainian universities train specialists in the "Sociology and Social Work" speciality.

References

1. *Tancher V.* Sotsiolohichna dumka Ukrainy na tli svitovoi sotsiolohii // Sotsiolohiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh. — 1998. — № 1–2. — S. 18–26.
2. Sotsiologiia i politika. Materialy Piznaval'ni tekhnolohii v ukrains'kii sotsiolohii // Problemy rozvytku sotsiolohichnoi teorii: Naukovi dopovidi i povidomlennia Vseukrains'koi sotsiolohichnoi konferentsii. — K., 2003.
3. *Shulha M.* Ukrainska sotsiolohiia u poshukakh samoidentychnosti // Sotsiolohiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh. — 2000. — № 2. — S. 170–177.
4. *Tarasenko V.I.* Piznaval'ni tekhnolohii v ukrains'kii sotsiolohii // Problemy rozvytku sotsiolohichnoi teorii: Naukovi dopovidi i povidomlennia Vseukrains'koi sotsiolohichnoi konferentsii. — K., 2001. — S. 19–25.
5. *Vorona V.M.* Instituttsionalizm kak kontseptsiiia ekonomicheskikh transformatsii v Ukraine // Problemy rozvytku sotsiolohichnoi teorii. Transformatsiia sotsial'nykh instytutiv ta instyuttsional'noi struktury suspil'stva. Naukovi dopovidi i povidomlennia III Vseukrains'koi sotsiolohichnoi konferentsii. — K., 2003. — S. 7–15.
6. *Golovakha Ye.I., Panina N.V.* Integralnyi indeks sotsial'nogo samochuvstviia (IISS): konstruiuvannia i primenennia sotsiologicheskogo testa v massovykh oprosakh. — K., 1997.
7. *Golovakha E.* Living Standards and Economic Attitudes of the Population. From Illusory Prosperity to Illusory Impoverishment // International Journal of Sociology. — 1999 (Fall). — Vol. 29. — № 3. — P. 31–48.
8. *Golovakha E., Panina N.* Democratization in Ukraine under Conditions of Post-Totalitarian Anomie: The Need for a New Rights Developmental Strategy / Farnen R. (ed.). Democracy, Socialization and Loyalty in East and West. — London, 1996.
9. *Golovakha Ye.* Fenomen “amoral'noi bil'shosti” v ukrains'komu suspil'stvi // Ukraina–2002. Monitorynh sotsial'nykh zmin. — K., 2002. — S. 460–468.
10. *Golovakha Ye.I., Panina N.V.* Postradians'ka deinstyuttsionalizatsiia i stanovlennia novykh sotsialnykh instytutiv v ukrains'komu suspil'stvi // Sotsiolohiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh. — 2001. — № 4. — S. 5–22.
11. *Popova I.* Sotsiolohichniy pidkhid do vyvchennia lehitymnosti ta lehitymatsii. Do postanovky problemy // Sotsiolohiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh. — 2000. — № 3. — S. 21–41.
12. Social Problems in Post-Communist Ukraine (I, II) // International Journal of Sociology. — 1999 (Fall). — Vol. 29. — № 3; 1999–2000 (Winter). — Vol. 29. — № 4.
13. Sotsiologicheskiie issledovaniia. — 1999. — № 10.
14. *Yakovenko Yu.I., Zelinskyy Ye.A.* U chomu poliahaie kohnityvna osoblyvist' sotsiolohichnoho reportazhu?; *Bebyk V.M.* “Anty-Ya” i kryza ofitsiinoi sotsiolohii v Ukraini (Z vidpovidi pryskiplyvym oponentam) // Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohicha dumka. — 1994. — № 7–8. — S. 210–233.
15. *Khumelko V.* Lyst do redaktsii; *Golovakha Ye.* “I vse zh taky VONA ober-taiet'sia” (sche raz pro “amoral'nu bil'shist” u svitli krytychnykh zauvazhen'

V. Khmelka) // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh.* — 2003. — № 2. — S. 212–217.

16. *Martyniuk I.* Pro synerhetyku bez liubovi; *Dobronravova I.* Chy potrebuie synerhetyka liubovi? // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh.* — № 3. — S. 195–206.

17. *Yakovenko Yu.I.* Problema artefaktu v sotsiologhii (istoryko-teoretychnyi analiz): Avtoreferat dysertatsii... doktora sotsiologichnykh nauk. — K., 1996; *Naumova M.* Sotsial'noie znaniie: opyt kontseptualizatsii. — K., 1999; *Tancher V.* Neo-Elitist Theory in Light of Democratic Transformation and Ukrainian Realities // *Sociological Research. November–December 2000 / Vol. 39.* — № 6. — N.Y., 2001. — P. 5–20; *Stepanenko V.* State to Build. Nation to Borm: Ethnopolity in Ukraine // *Diversity in Nation. Managing Multiethnic Communities.* — Budapest, 2001. — P. 307–347; *Horodianenko V.* Teorii serednioho rivnia: mistse u strukturi sotsiologichnoho znannia i tendentsii rozvytku (istoriohrafichnyi analiz na materiali krain SND) // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh.* — 2001. — № 4. — S. 187–202; *Burlachuk V.F.* Simvol i vlast'. Rol' simvolicheskikh struktur v postroienii kartyny sotsial'nogo mira. — K., 2002; *Stegniy O.H.* Instytutsionalizatsiia ekolohichnykh interesiv u suspilstvi sotsioghennykh ryzykiv. — K., 2002; *Bevzenko L.D.* Sotsial'naia samoorganizatsiia. Sinergeticheskaia paradigma: vozmozhnosti sotsial'nykh interpretatsii. — K., 2002; *Sobolieva N.I.* Sotsiologhiia sub'yektyvnoi real'nosti. — K., 2002; *Lobanova A.S.* Fenomen sotsial'noi mimikrii. — K., 2004; *Tarasenko V., Ivanenko O.* Problema sotsial'noi identyfikatsii ukrains'koho suspil'stva (sotsiotekhnologichna paradyhma). — K., 2004.

18. *Golovakha Ye.I., Panina N.V.* Sotsial'noie bezumie: istoriia, teoriia i soremennaia praktika. — K., 1994; *Meier-Dallach H.P., Churilov N., Golovakha E., Panina N., Stegniy A.* Tchernobyl. Einsichten und Erfahrungen einer Schweizer Hilfsaktion. — Z rich, 1994; *Bakirov V.S., Kushnariov Ye.P., Kizilov A.I. i dr.* Gorod i gosudarstvo: problemy, trevogi, nadezhdy gorozhan Vostoka Ukrainy / Pod red. V.S. Bakirova, Ye.P. Kushnariova. — Kharkov, 1996; *Golovakha Ye.I.* Suspil'stvo, scho transformuiet'sia. Dosvid sotsiologichnoho monitorynhu v Ukraini. — K., 1997; *Stepanenko V.* The Construction of Identity and School Policy in Ukraine. — N.Y., 1998; *Stegniy O.* Environmentalism as a Vector of Social Development of Regions in Ukraine // *International Cooperation — The Approach to Sustainable Communities. International Forum Proceedings.* — Bratislava, 1999; *Popova I.M.* Povsednevnyie ideologii. Kak oni zhivut, meniautsia i ischezaiut. — K., 2000; Postchornobyl's'kyi sotsium: 15 rokiv po avarii. — K., 2000; *Golovakha E., Panina N.* The Potential for Protest in Ukrainian Society // *Sociological Research. November–December 2000 / Vol. 39.* — № 6. — N.Y., 2001. — P. 50–63; *Panina N., Golovakha E.* Tendencies in the Development of Ukrainian Society (1994–2001). *Sociological Indicators.* — K., 2001.

19. *Makeyev S.A., Oksamitnaia S.N., Shvachko Ye.V.* Sotsial'nyie identyfikatsii i identichnosti. — K., 1996; *Yakuba Ye.A., Kutsenko O.D., Khizhniak L.M. i dr.* Zmneniie sotsial'no-klassovoi struktury obschestva v usloviakh yego transformatsii. — Kharkov, 1997; *Makeyev S., Kharchenko N.* The Differentiation of

Income and Consumption in Ukraine. On the Path to Poverty // *International Journal of Sociology*. — 1999 (Fall). — Vol. 29. — № 3. — P. 14–30; Podvizhnost' struktury. Sovremennyye protsessy sotsial'noi mobil'nosti / Pod red. S. Makeyeva. — K., 1999; *Kutsenko O.D.* Obschestvo neravnykh. Klassovyi analiz neravenstva v perekhodnom obschestve. Podkhody zapadnykh sotsiologov. — Khar'kov, 2000; *Makeyev S.* Strukturna perspektyva v suchasni sotsiologii // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 1998. — № 1–2. — S. 27–36; *Kutsenko O.* Pro deaki sotsiostrukturni naslidky instytutsiinykh zmin v ukrains'komu suspil'stvi // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 2000. — № 1–2. — S. 26–32; *Klassovoie obschestvo. Teoriia i empiricheskiie realii* / Pod red. S.A. Makeyeva. — K., 2003; *Simonchuk Ye.V.* Sredniy klass: liudi i statusy. — K., 2003.

20. *Golovakha Ye.I., Panina N.V., Pakhomov Yu.N., Churilov N.N., Burov I.V.* Politicheskaia kul'tura naseleniia Ukrainy. Rezul'taty sotsiologicheskikh issledovaniy. — K., 1993; *Bekeshkina I.* Population Readiness to Social Protest and Authoritarian Syndrome in the Post-totalitarian Society // *Democratization: Abstracts of Papers to the XVI World Congress*. — Berlin, 1994; *Shulha M., Potekhin O. et al.* Ruling Elite in Contemporary Ukraine. Analytical Report № 10. — K., 1998; *Vyshniak O.I.* Elektoral'na sotsiologhiia: istoriia, teorii, metody. — K., 2000; *Shulga M., Boyko N.* A Sociological Portrait of the Government of Ukraine // *International Journal of Sociology*. — 1999 (Fall). — Vol. 29. — № 3. — P. 76–96; *Gorbachyuk A.* Political Orientations and the Social Well-Being of the Ukrainian Population // *International Journal of Sociology*. — 1999–2000 (Winter). — Vol. 29. — № 4. — P. 77–87; *Poltorak V., Petrov O.* Problemy stratehichnoho planuvannia prezidents'koi vyborchoi kampanii // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 1999. — № 3. — S. 41–61; *Churylov M., Pototska S.* 10000 vybortsiv bulo opytano firmoiu “Socis-Gallup” u den' vyboriv: sprobha provedennia pershoho Exit poll v Ukraini // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 1998. — № 3. — S. 75–88; *Oksamitnaia S.* Trends of Intergenerational Society in Ukrainian Society // *Sociological Research*. November–December 2000 / Vol. 39. — № 6. — N.Y., 2001. — P. 64–79; *Mimandusova G., Privalov Iu., Saenko Iu.* Social Monitoring of the Post-Chernobyl Situation // *Sociological Research*. November–December 2000 / Vol. 39. — № 6. — N.Y., 2001. — P. 80–89; *Khmelko V.* Makrosotsial'ni zminy v ukrains'komu suspil'stvi za roky nezalezhnosti // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 2003. — № 1. — S. 5–23; *Churilov N., Stegniy O., Meier-Dallach H.P.* The Regions in Ukraine: Perceptions, Fears and Hopes of Population // *Meier-Dallach H.P., Juchler J. (eds.) Post-socialist Transformations and Civil Society in a Globalizing World*. — N.Y., 2002. — P. 159–187; *Churilov N.N.* Attitude of the Population of Ukraine towards National Security // *The Public Image of Defence and the Military in Central and Eastern Europe*. — Geneva; Belgrade, 2003. — P. 141–158.

21. *Shulga N.A.* Etnicheskaiia samoidentifikatsiia lichnosti. — K., 1996; *Rudnytska T.M.* Etnichni spil'noty Ukrainy: tendentsii sotsial'nykh zmin. — K., 1998; *Pribytkova I.* Profile and Migration Intentions of Crimean Tatars Living in Uzbekistan. — Geneva, 1998; *Paniotto V.* The Level of Anti-Semitism in Ukraine

// *International Journal of Sociology*. — 1999 (Fall). — Vol. 29. — № 3. — P. 66–75; *Shulga M.* Formation of Ukrainian State Policy towards the Diaspora // *New Diasporas in Hungary, Russia and Ukraine: Legal Regulations and Current Politics*. — Budapest, 2000. — P. 308–320; *Kononov I.F.* Etnos. Tsinnosti. Komunika-tsiiia (Donbas v etnokul'turnykh koordynatakh Ukrainy). — Luhansk, 2000; *Shulga M.* The Rights of Ethnic Minorities in Ukraine: Dynamics Transformation // *New Diasporas in Hungary, Russia and Ukraine: Legal Regulations and Current Politics*. — Budapest, 2000. — P. 331–349; *Pribytkova I.* The Demographic Situation in Ukraine. — Strasbourg, 2000; *Shulga N.A.* Velikoie pereg-seleniie narodov: repatrianty, bezhentsy, trudovyye migranty. — K., 2002; *Shulga N., Panina N., Golovakha E., Zisels I.* Jewish Emigration from Ukraine: Structure, Tendencies and Prospects // *The Jews of the Soviet Union in Israel and in the Diaspora*. — Jerusalem, 2001. — Vol. 20–21. — P. 325–347; *Prybytkova I.* Demografichniy rozvytok Ukrainy u 1990-kh rokakh // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 2000. — № 3. — S. 69–85.

22. *Kostenko N.V.* Tsennosti i simvoly massovoi komunikatsii. — K., 1993; *Ossovskyyi V.L.* Hromads'ka dumka: sprobha sotsiologichnoi interpretatsii. — K., 1999; *Molodiozhnaia subkultura / Pod red. N.A. Pobedy*. — Odessa, 1999; *Lisitsa N.M.* Reklama v sovremennom obschestve. — Kharkov, 1999; *Lavrinenko N.V.* Zhenschina: samorealizatsiia v sem'ye i obschestve (sotsiologicheskii aspekt). — K., 1999; *Vorona V., Golovakha Ye., Panina N.* Hromads'ka dumka i masovi nastroi v Rosii ta Ukraini: do i pislia serpnevoi finansovoi kryzy 1998 roku // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 1999. — № 1. — S. 122–131; *Ossovskyyi V.* Problema identyfikatsii hromads'koi dumky // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 1998. — № 1–2. — S. 36–53; *Sotsiokul'turni identychnosti i praktyky / Za red. A. Ruchky*. — K., 2002; *Kostenko N.* Kul'turni identychnosti: peretvorennia i vyznannia // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 2001. — № 4. — S. 69–88; *Korolko V.* Do pytannia pro sotsial'nu rol' ta etyku Public Relations // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 2000. — № 1. — S. 62–75.

23. *Grischenko K.K., Ruchka A.A. i dr.* Sotsial'nyie aspekty ekonomicheskoi reformy. — K., 1991; *Pilipenko V.Ye.* Sotsial'naia reguliatsiia trudovogo povedeniia: sotsiologicheskii analiz. — K., 1993; *Tarasenko V.I.* Sotsiologhiia potreb-leniia: Metodologicheskiiie problemy. — K., 1993; *Arseienko A.* Sotsial'no-eko-nomicheskii mekhanizm regulirovaniia trudovykh otnoshenii (na primere US, Kanady, Velikobritanii). — K., 1995; *Korzhov G.* Entrepreneurs and Perspectives for the Emergence of the Middle Classes in Post-Communist Ukraine // *International Journal of Sociology*. — 1999–2000 (Winter). — Vol. 29. — № 4. — P. 33–53; *Kutuiev P.* Ratsional'nyi kapitalizm v Ukraini: mizh mifom i real'nistiu // *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*. — 1999. — № 2. — S. 5–21; *Pachkovskyyi Yu.F.* Sotsiopsykholohiia pidpriemnyts'koi diial'nosti i povedinky. — Lviv, 2000; *Pylypenko V.Ye.* Reformy. Pidpriemstvo. Kul'tura. — K., 2001; *Suimerko E.I.* Social Tension in the Privatization Processes // *Sociological Research*. November–December 2000 / Vol. 39. — № 6. — N.Y., 2001. — P. 36–49; *Ivashchenko O.* Sotsiologhiia samozainiatosti: do problemy vyznachennia pred-

meta // Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh. — 2002. — № 4. — S. 189–197; *Suimerko Ye.I., Yefremenko T.A.* Homo economicus sovremennoi Ukrainy. Povedencheskiy aspect. — K., 2004.

24. *Pilipenko V.Ye.* Organizatsiia. Trud. Effektivnost'. — K., 1991; *Nahornyi B.H.* Upravlinnia innovatsiynymy protsesamy u promyslovosti (sotsiologichnyi analiz): Avtoreferat dysertatsii... doktora sotsiologichnykh nauk. — Kharkiv, 1994; *Khyzhniak L.M.* Peretvorennia orhanizatsii v umovakh sotsial'no-ekonomichnykh zmin. — Kharkiv, 1999; *Bureha V.V.* Sotsial'no-adekvatnyi menedzhment. — K., 2001; *Yatsenko A.M.* Orhanizatsiino-kul'turni resursy i mekhanizmy sotsial'noho upravlinnia (sotsiologichnyi analiz). — Odessa, 2003.

25. *Martyniuk I.O.* Problemy zhiznennogo samoopredeleniia molodiozhi: Opyt prikladnogo issledovaniia. — K., 1993; *Martyniuk I.O., Sobolieva N.I.* Liudy i roli. — K., 1993; *Donchenko Ye.* Sotsiial'naia psikhika. — K., 1994; *Sokhan L.V., Golovakha Ye.I., Anufrieva R.A. i dr.* Psikhologhiia zhiznennogo uspekha: opyt sotsial'no-psikhologicheskogo analiza preodoleniia kriticheskikh situatsii. — K., 1995; *Zlobina O.H., Tykhorovych V.O.* Osobystist' siohodni: adaptatsiia do sotsialnoi nestabil'nosti. — K., 1996; *Sokhan L.V., Zlobina O.H., Shulha M.O. ta in.* Mystetstvo zhyttietvorchosti osobystosti. — K., 1997; *Zlobina E.* The “Image of the Population” among Representatives of Power Structures as a Source of Social Distortions // Sociological Research. November–December 2000 / Vol. 39. — № 6. — N.Y., 2001. — P. 21–35; *Zlobina O.H.* Osobystist' yak sub'yekt sotsial'nykh zmin. — K., 2004.

26. *Kostenko N.* Hazardous Everyday Life (International Survey of Crime Victims in Kiev) // International Journal of Sociology. — 1999–2000 (Winter). — Vol. 29. — № 4. — P. 16–32; *Molodiozh' i narkotiki (sotsiologhiia narkotizma)* / Pod red. V.A. Soboleva, I.P. Ruschenko. — Kharkov, 2000; *Ruschenko I.P.* Sotsiologhiia zlochynnosti. — Kharkiv, 2001; *Organizovannyye prestupnyie grupy v Ukraine: traditsionnoie i tipichnoie (sotsiologicheskii ocherk).* — Kharkov, 2002; *Bova A.* The Population's Attitudes toward Bribery in Some Cities of Ukraine) // International Journal of Sociology. — 1999–2000 (Winter). — Vol. 29. — № 4. — P. 6–15; *Ruschenko I.* Dialoh sotsiolooha ta yurysta pro latentnu zlochynnist' i ne til'ky pro tse... // Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh. — 2001. — № 2. — S. 8–12.

27. Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy № 275/2001, 25.04.2001 “Pro rozvytok sotsiologichnoi nauky v Ukraini” // Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh. — 2001. — № 2. — S. 5–7.

28. *Kononov I.* Dialoh i refleksiiia v ukrains'komu sotsiologichnomu spivtovaryvstvi // Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh. — 2003. — № 4. — S. 217–227.

29. *Paniotto V., Kharchenko N.* Sotsiologichni doslidzhennia yak sposib kontroliu za rezul'tatamy vyboriv i referendumiv // Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh. — 2001. — № 1. — S. 155–170.