

Resilience of the Ukrainian society in wartime: components and influencing factors

 Olga Reznikova ^a,  Oleksandr Korniiievskiy ^a

^a National Institute for Strategic Studies, Ukraine


Abstract

This article offers a comprehensive, interdisciplinary approach to the issue of societal resilience in wartime. Given the fact that the potential of a society's resilience is fully revealed under conditions of shocks and crises, studying the experience of the Ukrainian society during the Russian-Ukrainian war provides valuable information for testing theoretical assumptions, developing knowledge and practices in the field of societal resilience. We have analysed the resilience of the Ukrainian society through the prism of the resilience of complex social system`s elements and connections between them in order to maintain the system`s functionality under destructive influences of war. We argue that there is a cumulative effect of the interaction of human, cultural, organizational, political, economic and other components of societal resilience, which enhances the adaptability and transformability of society. The article contributes to a better understanding of the civil society's role in crisis management and intersectoral linkages in ensuring society`s resilience.

Keywords: societal resilience, civil society institute, security, volunteers, war

Introduction

The resilience of the Ukrainian society in wartime came as a surprise to many foreign politicians and experts who had enough information to assess and to analyse it. Few people in the world believed that Ukraine would hold on for more than three days in a confrontation with the overwhelming forces of such an enemy, who also possesses nuclear weapons. However, since the first days of the war, the population of Ukraine has quickly adapted to life in the difficult conditions of wartime, and those citizens who were forced to leave their country were able to gradually adapt to life in other countries that provided temporary protection. Generally, in war conditions, the Ukrainian society demonstrates coherence and unity, readiness to respond to any crises and challenges caused by the Russian aggression, and to provide support to the state in terms of national security.

 Olga Reznikova, Strategic Planning Research Department, Center for Security Studies, National Institute for Strategic Studies, Ukraine; email: reznikova1010@gmail.com.

The President of Ukraine (2022, December 28) noted that unity is what allows Ukrainians to strengthen their society and state, and that everyone must be equal in unity. Zelensky clearly described the formula of national resilience in war conditions: continuity of the state functioning, resilient society, and reliable support of the world, mentioning that Ukrainians have them all simultaneously for the first time in several centuries.

Ukraine is now a symbol of courage, resilience, and indomitability for the whole world. Building the resilience of the Ukrainian society is an example of a successful practice of response to war and adaptation to sudden changes in the security environment that is worth studying. In this context, the purpose of this article is to identify the main components of the Ukrainian societal resilience, which have proved their importance in the full-scale war conditions launched by Russia on February 24, 2022, as well as the factors and practices that have strengthened societal resilience in Ukraine.

Although some components of societal resilience are sufficiently studied (values, institutions, sustainable livelihood, and political practices, etc.), the issue of their complex application in war conditions requires more attention from researchers. The experience of the Ukrainian society gives reason to assert that the cumulative effect of the application of all components of societal resilience enables society to withstand and survive in the conditions of a long-term armed conflict.

The main subject of this study is societal resilience, which was examined through the prism of a complex social system's ability to respond effectively to external and internal threats, to adapt to sudden changes in the security environment, to ensure uninterrupted functioning during a crisis, quickly recover after it to a level of development equal or higher than the pre-crisis one (Bertalanffy, 1968; Brown & Kulig, 1996/97; Holling, 1973; Wilson, 2012). The Ukrainian society's resilience is seen as a domestic process that is not the result of externally funded projects (Kudlenko, 2023). We argue that civil society institutions and citizens are key actors in strengthening societal resilience.

Considering the fact that a social system cannot be completely resilient, and that the process of its development is continuous (Wilson, 2015), it is more important to identify the presence or absence of resilience components in a certain society in a specific context and in a certain period rather than to assess the level of societal resilience as such. The components of the Ukrainian society's resilience in the context of war were analysed through the prism of the attributes of societal resilience described in the scientific literature (Canetti et al., 2013; Haavik, 2020; Keck & Sakdapolrak, 2013; Korostelina, 2020; Pollack & Wood, 2010, June; Wilson, 2012). Given the fact that the potential of a society's resilience (in particular its adaptive and transformative capacity) is fully revealed in the conditions of shocks and crises (Anholt et al., 2021), the Russian invasion of Ukraine as an existential threat to the Ukrainian state and society has revealed the entire range of societal resilience components. The main drivers of influence, which were taken into account when

studying the Ukrainian society's resilience during wartime are well-known cultural and historical factors, the general context of the political and social situation and living conditions in Ukraine.

The first part of the article summarizes the chosen scientific literature to substantiate the selection of the main subject, actors and components of societal resilience, in terms of which the study of the Ukrainian society's resilience in war conditions is conducted. The second part of the article examines the components and factors contributing to the readiness of the Ukrainian society, which manifested themselves during the full-scale war. We argue that the formed civic identity, patriotism, unity and motivation, flexibility of citizens, civil society institutions and authorities of Ukraine, citizens' awareness of the war-related sources and nature of threats are of great importance for enhancing societal resilience. Lessons learned from the experience of countering the Russian hybrid war and responding to other crises that Ukraine has faced in the past contribute to the readiness, adaptability and transformability of the Ukrainian society. The third part of the article examines such components of the Ukrainian society's resilience as: self-organization, self-help, and self-management. It has been concluded that social cohesion, proactive civic behaviour, a high level of readiness to cooperate in the triangle of "authorities - society - business" in order to ensure national security and sustainable development and solve existential problems, as well as a high level of public trust in the state authorities and civil society institutions are important components of societal resilience in Ukraine during wartime. The civil society's active role in responding to crises caused by war indicates its awareness of the existential threat to the state and understanding of the objectives and practical measures that strengthen public security and societal resilience.

The main research method was discourse and content analysis based on the information from open sources and on the results of sociological surveys conducted by various organizations in Ukraine. The collected facts focused on confirming such theoretical hypotheses: societal resilience is a domestic process and civil society institutions and citizens are key actors in its strengthening; the cumulative effect of the interaction between society's resilience components and influencing factors contributes to enhancing the adaptability and transformability of society.

The conducted study allows for supplementing the scientific debate on the conceptualization of societal resilience. In particular, the article contributes to a better understanding of the civil society's role in crisis management and intersectoral linkages in ensuring societal resilience. The analysis of the case of the Ukrainian society in wartime allows for a better understanding of goals and practical measures that contribute to enhancing public security and resilience during a crisis. The world-wide dissemination of relevant knowledge and lessons learned from Ukraine's experience is a contribution to building resilience at the regional and global levels.

1. Literature review and theoretical framework

Many scientists conclude that the debate over the conceptualization of societal resilience is still ongoing. In particular, Keck and Sakdapolrak (2013) claimed that only a small number of the scientific papers they had studied was devoted to the analysis of the concept of societal resilience, and that the majority contained the results of empirical research and a description of existing practices in this area. The authors noted that a significant part of societal resilience researchers focused primarily on individual social actors rather than on the system as a whole, on individual manifestations of resilience and practices rather than on the functionality of the system. Wilson (2015) drew attention to the interdisciplinary nature of the resilience concept, which explains the variety of dimensions of societal resilience examined through the prism of various scientific disciplines (social geography, sustainable development study, etc.), as well as from the point of view of various processes and phenomena (risk-oriented approach, formation of the social and economic capital of communities, etc.). Anholt et al. (2021) stated that the subject of resilience and ways to ensure it still remains a highly debated topic despite the active involvement of resilience thinking in scientific research and policy-making.

When analyzing the issue of societal resilience, it is important to answer crucial questions from the outset: the resilience of what and to what will be studied, as well as who and how can enhance it (Carpenter et al., 2001). In the context of this article, the object of resilience is society as a complex social system. Parsons and Smelser (1956) stated that a social system is created by the interaction of two or more actors interplaying meaningfully with each other. Copp (1992) assumed society as a peculiar collective entity. Wilson (2012) underlined that social communities should be considered open and unlimited systems rather than closed geographical entities.

The given findings testify in favour of the expediency of studying the issue of societal resilience through the prism of the complex systems theory. According to this theory, it is advisable to focus on the resilience of system elements and connections between them in order to maintain the system's functionality under destructive influences. From the society point of view, it is about the resilience of individuals, groups of people, including communities, and the effectiveness of their interaction on a systemic basis. As noted by Keck and Sakdapolrak (2013), the concept of societal resilience is focused on social entities (individuals, organizations, communities, and societies) and their persistability, adaptability and transformability. We also agreed with Korosteleva and Petrova (2021) and Kudlenko (2023) that resilience is applicable both at the individual and at the collective levels. Haavik (2020) stated that resilience is a systemic characteristic connected with the formation of society. He noted that, nowadays, societies are becoming increasingly complex and interdependent.

The openness of social systems indicates their potential vulnerability to a wide range of risks. Currently, a significant amount of research is devoted to society's

resilience to various types of natural disasters (earthquakes, droughts, floods, hurricanes, volcanic activity, etc.). This trend is most noticeable among studies carried out with the support of international organizations such as OECD, OSCE, World Economic Forum, UN and its bodies. However, society must also be prepared for other types of risks, particularly those arising from social relations. Adger (2000) believed that such risks might be the result of social, political, or environmental changes. Wilson (2012) singled out the consequences of human activity for the environment, socio-political and economic disruptions, and the effects of globalization among the main destructive anthropogenic impacts on society. Current threats are often complex, cascading, or hybrid in nature. For example, modern wars have direct and indirect destructive effects on all areas of social life. There is still little research on societal resilience to a full-scale war as a complex threat with cascading effects. Haavik (2020) argued that the perception of risk has gradually shifted from a local to a regional and global phenomenon. Bohle et al. (2009), Wilson (2015) noted that the concept of societal resilience is not only about protecting against hazards but also about using risks as new opportunities for development and innovation.

Hence, when answering the question of what modern society should be resilient to, it is advisable to apply a comprehensive approach, which focuses on ensuring societal resilience to all possible types of risks.

To determine the factors affecting the formation of the resilience of a certain society, it is necessary to characterize other attributes of the societal resilience concept. Researching various definitions of “societal resilience”, scientists have concluded that resilience is an integral and dynamic characteristic of the community; it subsists throughout the community’s existence (Community and Regional Resilience Institute [CARRI], 2013). Wilson (2015) argued that societies can never be fully resilient but can only try to maximize their resilience. Davidson (2010) noted that social systems are unique in that the tendencies toward complexity and individual reactions to these levels of complexity are determined not only by structural variability but also by their activity. Wilson (2015) suggested considering societal resilience through the lens of understanding how social systems respond to internal and external risks. This raises the question of identifying institutional, political, legal, and other mechanisms, processes, and factors affecting the formation of societal resilience.

According to Adger (2000), Anholt et al., (2021), Folke (2006), an important feature of a society’s resilience is its ability to withstand a wide range of threats, adapt to rapid changes in the security environment and recover from a crisis. The development of such ability requires the formation of necessary resources (social capital). Adger (2000), Keck and Sakdapolrak (2013) drew attention to the fact that the mere availability of resources is not enough to ensure societal resilience, it is necessary to organize access to them through appropriate institutions and social practices. Obrist et al. (2010) emphasized that ensuring access to public resources

puts the issues of fairness, justice, gender, kinship, ethnic role models, and accountability of power on the political agenda. Furedi (2007) stressed the context of a situation, cultural and historical factors, which can influence people's behaviour in crisis and determine how they respond to threats. Canetti et al. (2013) stressed that societal resilience is related to social-psychological dimensions such as patriotism, optimism and social integration, and to political dimensions such as strength of democracy and trust in leadership. Schwarz et al. (2011) pointed out that risk perception, preference, belief, knowledge, and experience are key factors that determine the possibility of adaptation to a crisis and its methods at the individual and societal levels.

Thus, building the ability to respond to a wide range of threats and recover from a crisis requires the dissemination of the necessary knowledge about risks in society, and the development of a safety and resilience culture. Eradication of discrimination on any basis and inequalities in society will contribute to the elimination of vulnerabilities and will, therefore, strengthen societal resilience.

Keck and Sakdapolrak (2013) defined the main determinants of societal resilience as follows: social relations and network structures, institutions and power relations, knowledge and discourse, as well as resources (economic, physical, natural, human, and social capital). These authors paid particular attention to the quality of social relations. Indeed, trust, reciprocity, and mutual support strengthen the resilience of society. Wilson (2015) noted that, in addition to social ties and networks, social identity and living conditions are essential for societal resilience. Pelling and High (2005) added that informal social ties are also an important resource for enhancing the resilience of society, which can be used to change the direction of its development. In this way, a society's ability to transform is strengthened, management flexibility is developed, and its participation in political decision-making processes is encouraged. All this also increases the efficiency of access to public resources, and subsequently societal resilience. Bohle et al. (2009), Lorenz (2010) emphasized the importance of strengthening ties between state institutions and civil society in order to improve societal resilience. Consequently, the activities of individuals motivated to enhance their adapting capacities and threat prevention tools are being organized and coordinated. Prokkola (2019) and Simionov et al. (2021) argued that formal and informal cross-border institutions and relations of trust are crucial from the perspective of border-regional resilience as a part of social and national resilience. These aspects are important when dealing with large-scale threats, including war, which have interregional and interstate level impacts.

Several researchers considered societal resilience as a result of a specifically targeted activity (CARRI, 2013; Pelling, 2003; Wilson, 2015). Appropriate measures allow for building a society's capabilities to effectively prevent threats, respond to hazards and recover from crises. Other important attributes of societal resilience are its abilities to survive, adapt, evolve, transform, reorganize, and develop in the face of rapid changes, which are enhanced by the ability to learn from previous crises

(Keck & Sakdapolrak, 2013). Folke et al. (2003) and Wilson (2012) argued that social systems never return to their original state after disturbances and do not develop linearly due to their learning ability and social memory. Based on past experience, social memory is an important determinant of societal resilience since it lays the foundations for self-organization and preparedness to respond to unexpected crises (Ashby, 1947; Kaufmann, 2013; Wilson, 2007). Simultaneously, past experience may have a restrictive impact on societal resilience or may contain societal vulnerabilities (Folke et al., 2003). The previous experience does not imply the existence of new risks (especially “black swans”) and, therefore, hinders the development of tools for preventing threats and responding to crises. The society’s transformations needed to develop resilience may sometimes be constrained by certain cultural, socio-economic, political, and institutional boundaries. Davidson (2010) and Wilson (2015) generalized on the fact that social memory is formed based on public experience (its interpretation, reflections, and expectations), traditions, and the network of stakeholders. In the context of building societal resilience, the ability to learn positive lessons from past experiences and mistakes is important. As practice proves, both formal and informal training aimed at increasing the level of public preparedness for crises are equally effective. Keck and Sakdapolrak (2013) pointed out that it is particularly important that information about the experience and relevant knowledge be disseminated not only among civil society but also studied by those involved in political decision-making. These authors claimed that the societal resilience concept has shifted the emphasis from the ability of social actors to respond to threats and learn lessons from past experience to their ability to participate in public administration and transform social functions and structures.

According to Pursiainen and Rød (May 31, 2016), there is no universally recognized method of assessing societal resilience. Currently, the main methods for assessing societal resilience are qualitative and based on the societal resilience patterns and the nature of its determinants. They have a high level of subjectivity. Considering that the experts who assessed societal resilience in Ukraine by the time of the Russian invasion in 2022 had access to a wide range of information, it is obvious that it was the subjectivity of the assessments and the influence of uncertainty that led to a significant deviation of their results from reality (Reznikova & Smolianiuk, 2023). Given the fact that the social system cannot be completely resilient, and that the process of its development is continuous (Wilson, 2015), the main goal of assessing a society’s resilience should not be to determine its level as such but to identify the presence or absence of resilience attributes and components in a specific context and in a certain period.

The above analysis of the scientific literature made it possible to select the main components of societal resilience, in terms of which a study of the Ukrainian society’s resilience under war conditions was conducted. Such components are: established civic and local identity; social cohesion and coherence (synergy) between authorities and civil society institutions; legality, equality, and justice in

public administration; developed connections between different social groups; involvement of civil society institutions in ensuring security and sustainable development, solving vital social problems; trust in the authorities and civil society institutions; motivation and willingness of citizens to participate in the defense of their state from external aggression, providing the necessary assistance to the military and various vulnerable social groups; citizens' awareness of the sources and nature of threats associated with war, as well as of the procedures to be followed in case of their occurrence; the existence of previous experience in overcoming crises; flexibility and creativity of the population in war conditions; reliable communication channels between the population and the authorities; developed organizational, security, economic, social and other capabilities (social capital).

We suggest dividing the aforementioned components of societal resilience into two groups: the components and factors contributing to the readiness (Lyon, 2014; Pfefferbaum et al., 2007) of society to respond effectively to crises caused by war; the components and factors enhancing the self-organization potential of society (Ashby, 1947; Kaufmann, 2013) in wartime. We argue that both groups of components contribute to the increase of a society's adaptability and transformability as key features of societal resilience.

2. Components and factors contributing to the readiness of the Ukrainian society for crisis response

According to Iakymenko (2022), the Russian invasion of Ukraine has radically changed the situation in the country and in the world. As the author noted, the Ukrainian people suffered thousands of casualties; many citizens became victims of torture and inhumane treatment. Ukraine has suffered unprecedented destruction and lost much of its economic potential and infrastructure. A significant number of Ukrainian citizens lost their property, documents, housing and jobs, and were left without necessary care, support and funds, and moved to safer regions of Ukraine or abroad. However, all the horrors and disasters of the war failed to break the will of the Ukrainian people for freedom and independence. The citizens of Ukraine, of all ethnicities, have demonstrated to the whole world their courage, indomitability, and will to victory (Iakymenko, 2022). This is one of the vivid manifestations of the civic identity of Ukrainians, which has acquired an established character. The predominance of the national civic identity over the local and regional ones indicates the completion of the process of formation of the Ukrainian political nation as a whole.

The Ukrainian culture, symbols and attributes of statehood, state independence of Ukraine and Ukrainian citizenship as spiritual and socio-political values have become important factors for the consolidation of society. According to the Ilko Kucheriv Democratic Initiatives Foundation (2023, August 22), the absolute majority of Ukrainians (almost 89%) are proud to be citizens of Ukraine. The

Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (2023) stated that civic identity is dominant among all socio-demographic, political and religious groups in the country (79.5%). A public opinion poll conducted by the Razumkov Centre (2023, August 24) showed that the share of those who are proud of the state symbols of Ukraine has increased: the Flag of Ukraine (from 26% in 2011 to 75% in 2023), the Coat of Arms of Ukraine (from 25% to 74%), the National Anthem (from 22.5% to 69%). Also, the share of those who are proud of the official language of Ukraine increased from 32% to 74%, and the share of those who are proud of its currency (the hryvnia) increased from 19% to 57%.

The history of the Ukrainian people is complex and dramatic, but they have always sought freedom and independence. Ukrainians have already experienced the consequences of a large-scale man-made disaster (the accident at the Chornobyl nuclear power plant in 1986), the 1932-1933 famine (Holodomor), wars (the First and Second World Wars, other liberation wars in historical retrospect, the Russian hybrid war 2014-2022), the disintegration of the USSR, the Covid-19 pandemic, etc. As Kudlenko (2023) rightfully pointed out, the resilience of the Ukrainian society did not arise from scratch in 2022, but developed throughout the long history of Ukraine. She underlined that the value of freedom is an important source of Ukrainian resilience. Korostelina (2020) added that the critical approach to history is a valuable component of the Ukrainian society's resilience.

According to H. Kotenko, the war has demonstrated once again how important civil society is, as able to recover from weaknesses and strengthen state institutions in times of crisis (EUProstir, 2022, May 10). Despite the loss of resources and technical capabilities (premises, office equipment, etc.), the relocation of a part of the Ukrainian public associations from the occupied and frontline territories to safer regions, the activists of civil society institutions (hereinafter - CSI) continued to work effectively in two main directions: 1) counteraction to Russia's aggression, which has led to a certain militarization of the Ukrainian civil society; 2) interaction with authorities and business structures in overcoming the consequences of Russian aggression (in particular, providing assistance to internally displaced persons (hereinafter - IDPs) and other vulnerable population groups, reconstruction of social and cultural infrastructure in the de-occupied territories). This has led to increased involvement of the Ukrainian civil society in the performance of certain state functions in the social and humanitarian areas in wartime.

Thus, CSI demonstrate their willingness to cooperate with the state and take on important functions. There is also the reverse process of delegating the respective functions to the CSI on the initiative of the state. This attitude of the state toward the CSI is a recognition of their important role both in the implementation of their traditional functions and in the identification and formation of innovative needs of society.

According to the analytical report Ukrainian Civil Society (2023), in a situation where the civil society of Ukraine had to endure two dramatic events one

after another (the COVID-19 pandemic and a full-scale war), two-thirds of the interviewed representatives of public and charitable organizations (hereinafter - POs/COs) fully or better adapted to the crisis. 81.8% of the interviewed representatives of POs/COs noted that they completely or significantly maintained communication with their target audiences during the war; 73.5% of them managed to maintain and develop new partnerships; 71.5% successfully implemented projects and activities (Ukrainian Civil Society, 2023). According to Lelyuk et al. (2022), 69.5% of the Kyiv city CSI were not afraid to continue working during the Russian invasion of Ukraine; most of the metropolitan CSI have expanded the geography of their activities; a third of them focused on helping Ukrainian military and war-affected citizens. The absolute majority of the respondents (92.1%) advocate the consolidation of activities on a single platform, which demonstrates the need for CSI to establish long-term systemic intersectoral cooperation (Lelyuk et al., 2022). In particular, the Internet portal *vcentri.com* and the public spaces VCENTRI HUB network became such a platform in Kyiv.

Among the most important factors contributing to the adaptation of the Ukrainian civil society to war conditions, we note the high level of public trust in the authorities and CSI. First of all, this is about CSI, which are oriented to meet the urgent needs of the military and various groups of the civilian population. According to Razumkov Centre (2023, March 15), Ukrainian citizens most often expressed confidence in the Armed Forces of Ukraine (96% of respondents trust them), volunteer organizations (88%), the President of Ukraine (83%), the Church (70%), public organizations (66%), the Ukrainian mass media (65%). The growing level of optimism of Ukrainian citizens regarding the state's development prospects (according to the results of this sociological survey) also deserves attention: 49% of respondents believe that Ukraine is able to overcome existing problems and difficulties within the next few years; 36% believe that Ukraine will be able to overcome problems in the longer term; only 3% believe that Ukraine is not able to solve existing problems (the rest - undecided). In September-October 2022, these indicators were 41%, 43%, and 5%, respectively, and at the end of 2021, they were 18%, 54%, and 18%, respectively (Razumkov Centre, 2023, March 15). The high level of trust of the Ukrainian population in the state and local authorities is, *inter alia*, the result of their observance of the legality, justice, equality, and protection of human rights principles, as well as the predictability and transparency of their activities even in wartime.

According to the aforementioned public opinion polls, a significant number of Ukrainian citizens positively evaluates the activities of socially oriented public organizations (associations). This proves the need of Ukrainian society to spread the relevant public initiatives, unite citizens in organized interest groups, particularly in the form of structured public organizations, fulfil both a number of classic functions and the function of facilitating the adaptation of different social groups to the war. We can indicate the annual increase in the number of different types of public associations

registered in Ukraine, starting from 2014 (since the beginning of the Russian hybrid aggression against Ukraine), and an even greater increase after February 24, 2022 (since the beginning of the Russian invasion of Ukraine). We can emphasize a noticeable increase in the number of such public associations as charitable organizations (14,999 as of 01.01.2014; 20,498 as of 01.01.2022; 29,910 as of 01.01.2024), associations of co-owners of apartment buildings (condominium) (respectively 16,213; 37,695 and 39,709), public unions (526 as of 01.02.2015; 2,071 as of 01.01.2022; 2,347 as of 01.01.2024) during all the years of the Russian aggression against Ukraine. The number of non-profit public organizations in Ukraine has increased from 77,286 (as of January 1, 2014) to 96,543 (as of January 1, 2022) and to 102,860 (as of January 1, 2024) (State Statistics Service of Ukraine, n.d.).

It is necessary to substantiate in more detail the thesis that the activity of CSI is one of the most important components of strengthening social cohesion and resilience. To this end, we will use the example of the economic activity of public associations in wartime. Generally, the variety of forms of entrepreneurship and the development of small business contribute to the formation of institutionally capable and socially responsible private business. According to the Internet platform Opendatabot (“Biznes u viinu”, 2023, March 28), since the beginning of the war in 2022, almost 202,000 new private entrepreneurs (hereinafter - PE) and more than 30,000 new companies in different branches have been registered in Ukraine. More than 15,900 new PE and 2,800 new companies were registered in March 2023. According to VKURSI big data platform, 296,389 new PE and 58,042 companies were registered in Ukraine in 2021, and in 2022 - 201,295 PE and 33,837 companies (VKURSI, January 16, 2023). As the Opendatabot (“Biznes u viinu”, 2023, March 28) showed, the highest number of registered new entities was recorded in the first week of the war (5,306 new entrepreneurs), which was more than in the week before the war (5,231, respectively).

The given statistics show that, despite the high level of uncertainty and loss, Ukrainian entrepreneurs demonstrated readiness, flexibility, and the ability to resume and develop their businesses during the war. This was facilitated not only by the formed motivation of Ukrainian citizens and their will to win but also by the support of the state in the form of targeted lending programs, etc. Generally, the high level of readiness of the Ukrainian society to crises of any origin made it possible to adapt quickly to rapidly changing security conditions.

3. Components and factors strengthening the self-organizational potential of the Ukrainian society

The spread of volunteer and charitable organizations' activities in wartime is a powerful component of societal resilience, which has contributed to the better adaptation of the population to crisis conditions and revealed its self-organizational potential. The extraordinary activity of such organizations in various areas of

assistance to the Ukrainian military and civilian population should be noted. According to Tyshchenko et al. (2022, April 02), this became one of the determining factors of societal resilience and countering the enemy. This thesis is confirmed by the results of the sociological study *Ukrainian Civil Society* (2023): during the first ten months of the war in Ukraine, the mass media mentioned charity and volunteer initiatives more than 98 thousand times, which is ten times more than in 2021. According to Zagoriy Foundation (n.d.), 86% of Ukrainian residents became philanthropists in 2022, and one in three Ukrainians engaged in volunteer activities (for comparison, in 2021, this figure was 5%).

We should underline the important coordinating role of the Ukrainian Volunteer Service in monitoring the needs for volunteer assistance to various social groups of people, mobilizing volunteers to help those who were deprived of their means of subsistence as a result of hostilities, training personnel for volunteer activities, providing for the needs of socially significant public initiatives and socially oriented CSI.

The above-mentioned high trust level of the Ukrainian population in volunteer organizations is due to their high mobility, efficiency, and variety of volunteering ways. As Mandebura-Noha (2016) stated, the basis of the Ukrainian volunteer movement consists of concerned and caring citizens belonging to various professions and social groups. According to the researcher, the term “concerned and caring” becomes a marker of change in the matrix of political culture and the model of the political behaviour of Ukrainians, namely: an indicative manifestation of a proactive, responsible behaviour. So, war-driven changes in the moral- and socio-psychological conditions of the Ukrainian society, and the general well-being of ordinary citizens, should be added to the factors influencing societal resilience in wartime. At the same time, the results of sociological studies show the presence of certain social fatigue and anxiety among the population, despite consistently high patriotic sentiments and expectations. This testifies to the traumatic experience of the war for the population of Ukraine. Yet, more than half of the surveyed Ukrainian citizens are optimistic about their future (55%) and the future of the country (61%), and most of them believe in Ukraine’s victory in this war (85%) (Ilko Kucheriv Democratic Initiatives Foundation, 2023, December 27).

The war led to an increase in the number of Ukrainian citizens affected by hostilities and occupation and, at the same time, significantly intensified the activities of volunteer, charity, veteran, and other CSI to assist IDPs, residents of the frontline territories, and citizens of Ukraine who survived the occupation. According to the experts (GURT, 2022, April 26), it also led to some psychological difficulties and the breakdown of social ties. They noted that Ukrainians feel psychological pressure because of uncertainty, worry about the lives of their loved ones and the country, experience changes in most areas of life, and often simply do not know how to act or where to find reliable information. Consequently, in the context of the war, the authorities, together with CSI, resorted to strengthening joint efforts to provide

medical and psychological support to Ukrainian citizens, primarily IDPs, and social and psychological rehabilitation to combatants. At the same time, during the war, the network of self-help groups expanded as a form of public association providing services for the social and psychological rehabilitation of the above-mentioned categories of citizens. This contributed to strengthening or restoring ties between different social groups in Ukraine.

Ocheretiana (2023, March 30) provided evidence of the readiness of ordinary citizens of Ukraine to support their fellow citizens in war conditions. Among other things, she focuses on the fact that immediately after February 24, 2022, many people began to unite into humanitarian headquarters, create volunteer projects and public initiatives in every community, regardless of its size and location. Public initiatives were launched by entrepreneurs, local deputies, educators, clergy, and representatives of other groups. The given facts demonstrate the tendency to establish cooperation between representatives of different groups of the population to overcome the consequences of the war and to provide assistance to all categories of citizens affected by it. The development of ties between different social groups is definitely an essential component of societal resilience, which proved its importance for the resistance of the Ukrainian society against Russian aggression. Thanks to local public self-organization and solidarity of various social groups of the population, together with an almost unprecedented amount of assistance from the democratic world, most IDPs were able to adapt to the conditions of war in the new safer regions of Ukraine.

Generally, the implementation of the self-organization potential of the Ukrainian society and its proactive behaviour helped the population withstand the difficult conditions. According to the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (2023), even during the war, the majority of the population considers living conditions to be generally satisfactory (about 60%).

Most social initiatives, which generally characterized the public activities at the beginning of the war, turned out to be long-term, and the vast majority of them are still working. Some public initiatives were transformed in the process of volunteering. Ocheretiana (2023, March 30) noted that some public initiatives at the beginning of the war tried to meet as many requests as possible, and, over time, it has become necessary to improve the organization of such chaotic activities. We should emphasize that the defining feature of reforming public activities after February 24, 2022, in contrast to the previous stage of public self-organization under the Russian hybrid aggression (April 2014 - February 2022), was the shift of Ukrainian CSI from multi-vector activities and their narrowing to certain areas: humanitarian aid and support for IDPs, socially vulnerable segments of the population; legal support for IDPs (advocacy); provision of medical and psychological assistance to IDPs and other vulnerable groups. Kaplan (2022) suggested that, with the increase of international aid to Ukraine and the strengthening of its institutional capacity, the functions of meeting the needs of the military and of

the population affected by hostilities and occupation would be performed mainly by the rear services of the Armed Forces and other competent governmental bodies. At the same time, in the future, the involvement of volunteer organizations in the performance of these functions will still be relevant due to the fact that the number of combat veterans in need of physical, psychological, and social rehabilitation will increase, and the problems related to the integration of IDPs will require further attention. This makes it possible to better adapt to the new reality.

As established above, interaction and mutual support are important components of strengthening the resilience of the society. Given the current Ukrainian realities of countering the Russian armed aggression and of overcoming the destructive consequences of war, we consider it necessary to focus on such attributes of societal resilience as readiness to cooperate in the triangle of “authorities - society - business”, in particular on social partnership, and coherence and coordination of practical actions of state authorities, business structures and CSI of Ukraine. According to Kaplan (2022), public activities in Ukraine acquired new forms of systemic organization, cooperation of authorities, business, the Army, society, and self-government after February 24, 2022. This conclusion is confirmed by successful practices and examples of effective, well-organized cooperation between activists, charitable foundations, and volunteers, on the one hand, and authorities and businesses, on the other. A network of humanitarian headquarters and volunteer centres has started to operate thanks to the synergy of authorities, society, and business in Ukraine. The centres may, under certain conditions, develop into social enterprises, helping, *inter alia*, IDPs to integrate into new territorial communities. The Coordinating Staff for Humanitarian and Social Affairs, which involves various authorities of Ukraine, together with Ukrainian volunteers has created a national platform SpivDiia. The platform unites the efforts of volunteers, businesses and state authorities for humanitarian aid and support services to the citizens of Ukraine during the war. Local authorities, CSI, and businesses, with financial support from foreign donors (primarily EU institutions) have created a regional network of social, educational, journalistic, and innovation hubs. Assistance for IDPs was organized in humanitarian support and volunteer centers, primarily in the hub-cities of Vinnytsia, Dnipro, Zaporizhzhia, Kryvyi Rih, Kyiv, Lviv, Poltava, Uzhhorod, and Chernivtsi.

Generally, the given information confirms the conclusion by Kudlenko (2023) that the Ukrainian society’s resilience is a domestic process which is not the result of externally funded initiatives but which develops organically, bottom-up and horizontally in times of crises and existential threat through a mesh of relations. It also confirms the conclusion by Korostelina (2020) that volunteerism and dialogues are central components of resilience practices. We argue that civil society institutions and citizens, as individuals, are key actors that play an important role in strengthening societal resilience. Although formal and informal cross-border institutions and relationships of trust played an important role in the case of

Ukrainian refugees to the EU, at the same time, the assumption by Simionov et al. (2021) that the lack of knowledge about the EU in Ukraine can limit the conditions for building a stronger and more resilient society is not confirmed by the experience of Ukraine in wartime. We argue that external actors can support societal resilience, but they are not the main actors in the development of national resilience.

The implementation of the security and mobilization potential of the Ukrainian civil society, its ability for self-organization, self-help and self-government, as well as the acquired experience of interaction of CSI, state authorities, and business in strengthening societal resilience in wartime have revealed the important attributes of resilience: adaptability, strong linkages between components and actors, transformability, etc. The gained experience will determine further priorities of the interaction between the state and civil society and public-private partnership in post-war Ukraine. These include the reconstruction of destroyed industrial enterprises and social infrastructure; housing restoration; the social, medical, and psychological rehabilitation of military and civilian victims of hostilities, facilitation of their reintegration into the post-war society; building communication with residents of the de-occupied territories, ensuring their irreversible return to the Ukrainian informational and mental space; mitigating economic risks for small and medium-sized businesses; development and implementation of the latest ethical and legal principles of state-public interaction in accordance with the European principles of good governance, etc.

Conclusions

Given the fact that the potential of the society's resilience is revealed in conditions of shocks and crises, Russia's full-scale war as an existential threat against the Ukrainian state and society, with cascading effects which revealed the entire range of the components of societal resilience. The collected facts confirmed that building the Ukrainian society's resilience is a domestic process, and CSI and citizens are key actors in its strengthening. The experience of Ukraine in countering the Russian hybrid aggression acquired after 2014, and the Ukrainian CSI's activities aimed to assist the military and various vulnerable social groups allowed the Ukrainian society to quickly adapt to wartime conditions. From the very first days of the war, the security, mobilization, and socially-oriented potential of societal self-organization was fully revealed. This formed the basis of the resilience of the Ukrainian rear, including the resilience of regions and communities. Thus, so to speak, a "public front" for counteracting the Russian aggression has been opened in Ukraine. The civic identity of the Ukrainian people, formed in the course of historical and cultural development and strengthened by its cohesion and motivation, caused a rapid and decisive response to the enemy.

The citizens' awareness of the sources and nature of war-related threats plays an important role in providing readiness to respond them. This is achieved by

disseminating reliable information about the security situation, knowledge and skills necessary for an effective response to threats, as well as lessons learned from previous experience.

The capacity for self-organization, self-help, and self-management is traditionally inherent in the Ukrainian society, it is characterized by social cohesion and demonstrates the potential for strengthening societal resilience. This caused a powerful surge of public activities, primarily volunteering and charity, both during Russia's hybrid aggression in 2014 and during Russia's full-scale war against Ukraine. Such a situation indicates the high level of readiness of the Ukrainian civil society to cooperate with the state in order to restore and ensure sustainable and safe social development and to solve vital problems. In turn, this has created a synergy of actions between authorities and CSI in countering the aggressor. The results of the conducted sociological studies indicate the existence of another important component of the Ukrainian society's resilience during the war: a high level of trust in the authorities of Ukraine and CSI.

During 2022-2023, the institutional space of the Ukrainian civil society was supplemented by networks of newly created public associations: humanitarian headquarters, volunteer centers, public hubs of various kinds, etc. They provided the required assistance to war-affected citizens, the IDPs, and military personnel. This has significantly strengthened ties between different social groups in Ukraine, which is another important component of societal resilience. Generally, the Ukrainian civil society has assumed some of the state functions in such areas as social, humanitarian, and legal protection, meeting the economic, cultural, and social needs of vulnerable social groups, the social and psychological rehabilitation of the Ukrainian military and civilian population, etc. This allows us to reveal the transformability of the Ukrainian society.

In the context of the war in Ukraine, a number of positive changes of a strategic nature are observed: the development of small and medium-sized businesses, which constitute the economic basis of civil society and one of the important features of a progressive economy; the intensification of the collaboration of CSI, local self-government bodies with foreign donors. Together with other factors, this contributed to the formation of a powerful "economic front" in Ukraine, because a fully functioning state is impossible without effective economic activity, even under martial law.

The relocation of a significant number of people from the occupied and front-line territories to the safer western and central regions of Ukraine caused some socio-economic tensions in the local communities of these regions. At the same time, the adapting capacity of the Ukrainian society gave impetus to the strengthening of economic competition in these regions. This led to the restoration of the entrepreneurial potential of public associations, the development of private businesses, and the growth of self-employment. Generally, these positive changes

demonstrate the ability of the Ukrainian society to transform negative events into positive results conducive to development.

The significant increase in the effectiveness of the interaction of state authorities, local self-government bodies, territorial communities, businesses, and CSI is an important positive change, of a strategic nature, which influenced the strengthening of societal resilience in Ukraine. The main areas of this collaboration are: countering the Russian aggression and overcoming the consequences of war, strengthening the economic potential of Ukraine, promoting the relocation of enterprises from the war zone, developing social entrepreneurship, ensuring food security, providing assistance to vulnerable social groups, etc.

It is not one or several components of societal resilience, but the cumulative effect of their application that enables the Ukrainian society to withstand and survive during wartime. It enhances the adaptability and transformability of the Ukrainian society as key features of societal resilience. This effect is confirmed by the ability of Ukrainian citizens, CSI and the authorities of Ukraine to transform social relations and to quickly adapt to wartime conditions, without losing functionality and democratic values.

The lessons learned from the experience of the Ukrainian society in wartime allow for a better understanding of goals and practical measures that contribute to enhancing public security and societal resilience during a crisis, developing cooperation in the triangle of “authorities - society - business”, and building resilience at the regional and global levels. In the context of strengthening societal resilience, promising areas for further research include improvement of the societal resilience assessment methodology; the comprehensive analysis of the changes that occur in the structure of civil society under the influence of war, and the processes that affect the strengthening of societal resilience; the comprehensive analysis of the prerequisites of institutionalization of public initiatives, the impact of civil legal awareness and civil culture on this process.

References

- Adger, W. N. (2000). Social and ecological resilience: are they related? *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(3), 347-364. <https://doi.org/10.1191/030913200701540465>
- Anholt, R., Van Dullemen, C., Carvalho, J. S. de, Rijbroek, J., Sieckelinck, S., & Sloodman, M. W. (2021). Understanding Societal Resilience: The Case for Engaged Scholarship. In M. Ungar (Ed.), *Multisystemic Resilience: Adaptation and Transformation in Contexts of Change* (pp. 551-564). New York. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190095888.003.0029>
- Ashby, W. R. (1947). Principles of the Self-Organizing Dynamic System. *Journal of General Psychology*, 37, 125-128.
- Bohle, H.-G., Etzold, B., & Keck, M. (2009). Resilience as agency. *IHDP-Update*, 2, 8-13.

- Brown, D., & Kulig, J. (1996/97). The concept of resiliency: Theoretical lessons from community research. *Health and Canadian Society*, 4, 29-52.
- Canetti, D., Waismel-Manor, I., Cohen, N., & Rapaport, C. (2013). What does national resilience mean in a democracy? Evidence from the United States and Israel. *Armed Forces & Society*, 40(3), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X12466828>
- Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Anderies, J. M., & Abel, N. (2001). From metaphor to measurement: resilience of what to what? *Ecosystems*, 4(8), 765-781.
- Community and Regional Resilience Institute [CARRI]. (2013). *Definitions of Community Resilience: An Analysis: A CARRI Report*. <https://studylib.net/doc/8284951/definitions-of-community-resilience>
- Copp, D. (1992). The Concept of a Society. *Dialogue*, 31, 183-212.
- Davidson, D.J. (2010). The applicability of the concept of resilience to social systems: some sources of optimism and nagging doubts. *Society and Natural Resources*, 23, 1135-1149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941921003652940>
- EDNANNIA. (2023). *Ukrainian civil society under the war: A report based on the findings of the study*. <https://ednannia.ua/attachments/article/12447/Ukrainian%20civil%20society%20under%20the%20war.pdf>
- EUProstir. (2022, May 10). *Evakuatsiia, prytulky, zakupivli - novi sfery aktyvnosti proiektu EU4CSOs pid chas viiny* [Evacuation, shelters, procurement - new areas of activity of the EU4CSOs project during the war]. <https://euprostir.org.ua/stories/185363>
- Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: the emergence of a perspective for social-ecological system analyses. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), 253-267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.04.002>
- Folke, C., Colding, J., & Berkes, F. (2003). Synthesis: building resilience and adaptive capacity in social-ecological systems. In F. Berkes, J. Colding & C. Folke (Eds.), *Navigating Social-ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change* (pp. 329-352). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Furedi, F. (2007). The changing meaning of disaster. *Area*, 39(4), 482-489. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2007.00764.x>
- GURT. (2022, April 26). *V Ukraini zapustyly unikalnu prohramu dlia psykholohichnoi pidtrymky u mini-hrupakh "Chas pohovoryty"* [A unique program for psychological support in mini-groups "Time to talk" was launched In Ukraine]. <https://gurt.org.ua/news/trainings/77738>
- Haavik, T. K. (2020). Societal resilience - Clarifying the concept and upscaling the scope. *Safety Science*, 132, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104964>
- Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 4, 1-23.
- Iakymenko, Y. (Ed.). (2022). *Polityko-ideolohichni orientatsii hromadian Ukrainy v umovakh rosiiskoi ahresii* [Political and Ideological Orientations of Ukrainian

- Citizens in the Conditions of the Russian Aggression]. *National Security and Defense*, 3-4, 2-79.
- Ilko Kucheriv Democratic Initiatives Foundation. (2023, December 27). *Pidsumky 2023 roku: hromadska dumka ukraintsv* [Results of 2023: public opinion of Ukrainians]. <https://dif.org.ua/en/article/pidsumki-2023-roku-gromadska-dumka-ukraintsv>
- Ilko Kucheriv Democratic Initiatives Foundation. (2023, August 22). *Den Nezalezhnosti Ukrainy: shliakh do peremohy, identychnist ta tsinnist derzhavy na tli viiny* [Independence Day of Ukraine: the path to victory, the identity and value of the state against the background of war]. <https://dif.org.ua/en/article/den-nezalezhnosti-ukraini-shlyakh-do-peremogi-identychnist-ta-tsinnist-derzhavi-na-tli-viiny>
- Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. (2023). *Sotsiologichniy monitorynh "Ukrainske suspilstvo"* [Sociological monitoring "Ukrainian society"]. <https://www.kiis.com.ua/materials/>
- Kaplan, Yu. (Ed.). (2022). *Pro stan rozvytku hromadianskoho suspilstva Ukrainy v 2021 rotsi ta yoho zminy na pochatku 2022 roku* [On the state of development of Ukrainian civil society in 2021 and its changes at the beginning of 2022]. Kyiv: NISS.
- Kaufmann, M. (2013). Emergent self-organisation in emergencies: resilience rationales in interconnected societies. *Resilience*, 1(1), 53-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2013.765742>
- Keck, M. & Sakdapolrak, P. (2013). What is social resilience? Lessons learned and ways forward. *Erdkunde*, 67(1), 5-19. <http://doi.org/10.3112/erdkunde.2013.01.02>
- Korosteleva, E., & Petrova, I. (2021). Community resilience in Belarus and the EU response. *Journal of Common Market Studies Annual Review*, 59(4), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13248>
- Korostelina, K. V. (2020). National Resilience to Protracted Violence in Ukraine. *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 27(2), art. 4. <https://doi.org/10.46743/1082-7307/2020.1689>
- Kudlenko, A. (2023). Roots of Ukrainian resilience and the agency of Ukrainian society before and after Russia's full-scale invasion. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 44(4), 513-529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2023.2258620>
- Lelyuk, R., Ruban, D., & Cherpak, T. (2022). *The state of development of civil society institutions in Kyiv*. Kyiv: Summit-book. <https://www.flipbookpdf.net/web/site/f09e1375ce1abc72837f35f5575cb6792743d576202211.pdf.html#page/2>
- Lorenz, D. (2010). The diversity of resilience: contributions from a social science perspective. *Natural Hazards*, 67(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-010-9654-y>
- Lyon, C. (2014). Place systems and social resilience: a framework for understanding place in social adaptation, resilience, and transformation. *Society & Natural Resources*, 27, 1009-1023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2014.918228>
- Mandebura-Noha, O. S. (2016). Volonterstvo yak nova forma hromadianskoi aktyvnosti v Ukraini [Volunteering as a new form of civil activity in Ukraine]. In M. I. Mykhalchenko (Ed.). *Transformatsiia politychnykh instytutiv Ukrainy: problemy*

- teorii i praktyky* [Transformation of political institutions of Ukraine: issues of theory and practice] (pp. 243-277). Kyiv: Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Obrist, B., Mayumana, I., & Kessy, F. (2010). Livelihood, malaria and resilience: a case study in the Kilombero Valley, Tanzania. *Progress in Development Studies*, 10(4), 325-343. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146499340901000405>
- Ocheretiana, M. (2023, March 30). *Spilnoty viiny. Yak hromadianske suspilstvo vidstoialo Ukrainu* [Communities of War. How civil society defended Ukraine]. LB.ua. https://lb.ua/news/2023/03/30/550475_spilnoti_viyeni_yak_gromadyanske.html
- Opendatabot.ua. (2023, March). *Biznes u viinu: 202 tysiachi fopiv za rik* [Business during the war: 202 thousand private entrepreneurs per year]. <https://opendatabot.ua/analytics/fops-per-waryear>
- Parsons, T. & Smelser, N. J. (1956). *Economy and Society: A Study in the Integration of Economic and Social Theory*. The Free Press, Glencoe, IL.
- Pelling, M. (2003). *The vulnerability of cities: natural disasters and social resilience*. London: Earthscan.
- Pelling, M., & High, C. (2005). Understanding adaptation: what can social capital offer assessments of adaptive capacity? *Global Environmental Change*, 15(4), 308-319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2005.02.001>
- Pfefferbaum, B., Reissman, D., Pfefferbaum, R., Klomp, R., & Gurwitch, R. (2007). Building resilience to mass trauma events. In L. Doll, S. Bonzo, J. Mercy, & D. Sleet (Eds.), *Handbook on injury and violence prevention interventions* (pp. 347-358). Springer US.
- Pollack, J. H., & Wood, J. D. (2010, June). *Enhancing Public Resilience to Mass-Casualty WMD Terrorism in the United States: Definitions, Challenges, and Recommendations*. Federation of American Scientists. <https://fas.org/irp/agency/dod/dtra/resilience.pdf>
- President of Ukraine. (2022, December 28). *Speech by the President with the annual message to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine on the internal and external situation of Ukraine*. <https://www.president.gov.ua/news/vistup-prezidenta-zi-shorichnim-poslannyam-do-verhovnoyi-rad-80113>
- Prokkola, E.K. (2019), Border-regional resilience in EU internal and external border areas in Finland. *European Planning Studies*, 27(8), 1587-1606. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2019.1595531>
- Pursiainen, C., & Rød, B. (Eds.). (2016, May 31). *Report of criteria for evaluating resilience*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320286600_Report_of_criteria_for_evaluating_resilience
- Razumkov Centre. (2023, August 24). *Identity of Ukrainian citizens: trends of change (May, 2023)*. <https://razumkov.org.ua/en/research-areas/surveys/identity-of-ukrainian-citizens-trends-of-change-may-2023>
- Razumkov Centre. (2023, March 15). *Otsinka hromadianamy sytuatsii v kraini ta dii vlady, dovira do sotsialnykh instytutiv (liutyi-berezen 2023r.)* [Citizens' assessment of the

- situation in the country and the actions of the authorities, trust in social institutions (February-March 2023)]. <https://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/otsinka-gromadianamy-sytuatsii-v-kraini-ta-dii-vlady-dovira-do-sotsialnykh-institutiv-liutyi-berezen-2023r>
- Reznikova O., & Smolianiuk V. (2023). Conceptual Issues of National Security Policy-Making Under Uncertainty. *Politologija*, 111(3), 41-73. <https://doi.org/10.15388/Polit.2023.111.2>
- Schwarz, A.-M., Béné, C., Bennett, G., Boso, D., Hilly, Z., Paul, C., Posala, R., Sibiti, S., & Andrew, N. (2011). Vulnerability and resilience of remote rural communities to shocks and global changes: empirical analysis from Solomon Islands. *Global Environmental Change*, 21(3), 1128-1140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.04.011>
- Simionov, L. M., Pascariu, G. C., & Bureiko, N. (2021). Building resilience beyond the EU's eastern borders. EU actorness and societal perceptions in Ukraine and Republic of Moldova. *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, 12(SI), 250-272, <https://doi.org/10.47743/ejes-2021-SI12>
- State Statistics Service of Ukraine. (n.d.). *Kilkist zareiestrovanykh yurydychnykh osib za orhanizatsiino-pravovymy formamy hospodariuvannia z rozpodilom za oznakoiu stati kerivnyka* [The number of registered enterprises by organizational and legal forms with a distribution based on the gender of the manager]. https://ukrstat.gov.ua/edrpy/ukr/EDRPU_2023/ks_opfg/arh_ks_opfg_23.htm
- Tyshchenko, Yu., Kaplan, Yu., Korniiievskiy, O., & Pelivanova, N. (2022, April 02). *Bezpretsedentna konsolidatsiia ukrainskoho hromadianskoho suspilstva u protydyi rosiiskomu vtorhnenniu* [Unprecedented consolidation of Ukrainian civil society in resistance to the Russian invasion]. National Institute for Strategic Studies. <https://niss.gov.ua/news/novyny-nisd/bezpretsedentna-konsolidatsiya-ukrayinskoho-hromadyanskoho-suspilstva-u-protydyi>
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications*. N.Y.: George Braziller.
- VKURSI. (2023, January 16). *69% FOPiv zareiestruvaly u «Dii», a novykh biznesiv zivaylos na tretynu menshe* [Study: 69% of private entrepreneurs registered in “Diya”, and new businesses appeared by a third less]. <https://vkursi.pro/news/content/69-fopiv-ukraintsi-zareiestruvaly-u-dii-a-novykh-biznesiv-zivaylos-na-tretynu-menshe-doslizhennia-v-483047>
- Wilson, G. A. (2007). *Multifunctional Agriculture: a Transition Theory Perspective*. Wallingford: CABI. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.08.003>
- Wilson, G. A. (2012). *Community Resilience and Environmental Transitions*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203144916>
- Wilson, G. A. (2015). Community Resilience and Social Memory. *Environmental Values*, 24(2), 227-257. <http://doi.org/10.3197/096327114X13947900182157>
- Zagoriy Foundation. (n.d.). *Blahodiinist u chasy viiny* [Charity in wartimes]. <https://zagoriy.foundation/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/zvit-doslidzhennya-3.pdf>