



GENERAL PROBLEMS OF THE MODERN RESEARCH AND INNOVATION POLICY

<https://doi.org/10.15407/scine21.01.003>

HEYETS, V. M. (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2895-6114>)

Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine,
26, P. Myrnogo St., Kyiv, 01011, Ukraine,
+380 44 280 1234, gvm@ief.org.ua

SOCIALIZATION OF NATIONALLY ROOTED DEVELOPMENT

Introduction. *This paper has explored the concept of social space in terms of social quality of life, which is determined by socialization in general and economic socialization in particular.*

Problem Statement. *Fundamental processes, with an emphasis on national rootedness, have allowed for the mitigation of disorder in social development through the social construction of reality. This process entails an institutional order within society that counteracts the growth of social entropy.*

Purpose. *The study has aimed to reveal and demonstrate how the socialization of nationally rooted development, fostering the energy of creativity, serves as a foundation for the resources and mechanisms necessary for the renewal of life.*

Materials and Methods. *Data from international and national sociological surveys, the State Statistical Service, the IMF, and national research institutions have been employed in this study. Methods used include abstract and logical analysis, monographic review, comparative analysis, as well as social and statistical observation.*

Results. *The article has examined components of social and economic policy with respect to achieving institutional order and its practical effectiveness through both state-driven social construction of reality and the development of an internalized approach to individual activities.*

Conclusions. *In the context of the full-scale invasion by the Russian Federation, Ukrainian social space has undergone significant restructuring, leading to the establishment of new structural foundations: large-scale humanitarian aid for impoverished population groups, shifts in the balance of trust and mistrust toward specific social institutions, a reassessment of values, and a drive to start a “new life” with new employment opportunities. Collectively, these elements represent emerging foundations of Ukrainian society, which should be prioritized in postwar reconstruction efforts with a focus on nationally rooted development.*

Keywords: social space, socialization, social construction, nationally rooted development, interiorization, exteriorization.

Citation: Heyets, V. M. (2025). Socialization of Nationally Rooted Development. *Sci. innov.*, 21(1), 3–16.
<https://doi.org/10.15407/scine21.01.003>

© Publisher PH “Akademiya” of the NAS of Ukraine, 2025. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

UNDERSTANDING THE ROOTS OF THE PROBLEM

Socialization is the process through which individuals internalize (*interiorize*) the social dimensions of life, shaping their personal identity. This identity not only enables *self-perception* but also fosters *self-awareness*, which serves as the foundation for *self-development* and *self-expression*. In turn, this process facilitates *externalization* and the *social construction of reality*, aligning with specific goals rooted in the national context. These goals reflect the challenges a country and its people need to address within a particular time frame. When discussing the socialization of individuals, the *social construction of a nation-rooted economic development* is regarded as twofold. On one side, the term “national” signifies identity aligned with the *social* and *biological* essence of human beings, emphasizing the interconnectedness of social and economic systems. On the other, it evokes deeper historical societal structures, emphasizing the population’s ability to *generate energy* – including *creative energy* – and act as a *source of resources and mechanisms for renewing life at every new stage of recovery and development*. The processes of *internalization and externalization*, as components of socialization, empower individuals to participate meaningfully in the socio-economic life specific to their country. Moreover, to prevent social disorder, individuals actively engage in shaping the social order by fostering trust and cooperation. This ensures sustainable progress and stability for the shared future of both present and future generations.

From a social perspective, according to humanistic personality theory – particularly within the framework of *humanistic psychology* – *individuals are inherently capable of self-improvement*. This innate drive allows them to *generate creative energy*, which, when combined with *acquired knowledge*, can be transformed into a *productive force for society*. The core nature of a person continuously propels them toward *personal growth, creativity, and self-sufficiency, unless external circumstances impose overwhelming obstacles* [1]. This inherent potential for self-actualization enables the

social construction of reality in ways that mitigate conflicts between government and society, as well as among different social groups. This view aligns with Abraham Maslow’s theory of self-actualization, which regards individuals as unified beings capable of ongoing creation. In the modern world, this creative capacity – rooted in both cognitive and *emotional processes* – makes individuals uniquely able to pursue continuous personal and social development. Creation, in this context, is an *unending process* that evolves alongside the person’s needs, from *physiological* to *personal* growth and fulfillment. This dynamic journey underpins not only individual self-improvement but also the broader social construction of reality.

The term “socialization” that describes the development of an individual’s social nature in preparation for life within society, was first introduced into academic discourse by American sociologist Franklin Giddings in the late 19th century through his work *The Theory of Socialization* [2]. However, the social essence of humanity has been a topic of philosophical inquiry throughout history, underscoring its phenomenological significance across cultures and eras.

In the phenomenological approach, socialization is understood by the individual not only as the ability to distinguish the social aspects of life but also as a process of organically experiencing them. As a member of society, the individual’s consciousness generates sensations, perceptions, ideas, and thoughts, all of which emerge through sensory observation. These experiences possess both an implicit continuity and explicit clarity. Due to its complex nature, socialization is studied across multiple disciplines – sociology, psychology, pedagogy, cultural studies, history, philosophy, and economics – each contributing to a comprehensive understanding of its development. Within the field of economics, economic socialization reflects how individuals internalize economic norms, which facilitates their social adaptation [3, p. 339–399]. The interdisciplinary study of socialization has given rise to disciplinary branches, primarily rooted in cultural and philosophical perspectives.

From ancient times, philosophers have viewed humans as social beings, actively engaged in the collective activities of society. Even before the term “socialization” entered scientific discourse in the second half of the 14th century, the concept existed in practice as part of natural human life. Socialization has historically played a key role in sublimating conflict between society and the individual, channeling tension into socially constructive directions. *As Freud’s psychological theories suggest, the life instinct that manifests itself as libido drives individuals to seek socially safe forms of interaction, toward cooperation and social interaction, which not only mitigate chaos and hostility but also become a productive force that enhances the well-being of the entire society.*

At the heart of population interaction lie social cohesion, inclusivity, and interpersonal and intergroup connections. Through these channels, individuals and groups exercise their capacity for externalization, influencing societal development both at a general level and within specific aspects of individual and collective life. This influence directly contributes to what is known as the social quality of life [4]. *Social interaction generates an effect of action, meaning it is both a social construct and a key component of life quality. Instead of leading to social entropy – which is typically marked by the breakdown or weakening of values and institutions – socialization encourages negentropic actions that maintain social order and cohesion.* According to Anthony Giddens, socialization serves as a preparation of individuals for a life imbued with social meaning, fostering organized social life and the institutionalization of social reality through practices, norms, and customs that bring structure and order. *The loss of coherence and organization within society, however, can lead to increasing uncertainty, a process identified as social entropy.* Radziwill states that the dynamics of a society that *does not engage in the necessary cultural work* to maintain clarity about the ultimate purpose of human life exhibit a tendency toward the dissipation of its spiritual, intellectual, and material resources. This dissipation arises from the

spontaneous, non-linear growth of fragmented processes that concentrate resources around means mistakenly perceived as ends in themselves [5].

The increasing tendency toward loss of social coherence, order, and rising uncertainty – manifesting itself as growing social entropy, as discussed earlier – is, according to Oleksandr Radziwill, a result of insufficient cultural work. However, we argue that while cultural work is essential, it is an insufficient condition on its own to trigger the process governed by the law of entropy. In Talcott Parsons’ general system of action, cultural work primarily serves the function of pattern maintenance, and it constitutes only one of four subsystems within the overall system of action. To foster the dynamism necessary for development – both at the level of individual growth and within social groups or society as a whole – mere pattern reproduction through cultural work is inadequate. While the loss of societal development benchmarks, due to deficiencies in cultural activity, may hinder the ability to reproduce patterns or even exemplary models, cultural work alone cannot fully prevent systemic breakdowns. When these models are no longer maintained, resources essential for societal development become dispersed, and conditions emerge for disorder and escalating social entropy.

The functionality of the social action system depends on three additional subsystems alongside the cultural one: Social subsystem – responsible for integration; Personality subsystem – responsible for goal attainment; Behavioral organism subsystem – responsible for adaptation [6]. When any of these subsystems – or a majority of them – fail to perform their functions, systemic disruptions occur within what Parsons calls the real sector of social interaction. These disruptions create conditions that accelerate social entropy and lead to chaos in social cooperation and interaction. As a result, the productive forces driving societal development lose their constructive potential, giving rise to hostility and conflict. If unresolved, these conditions threaten social collapse and may culminate in social catastrophe.

As historical experience demonstrates, limited capacity for social construction — the ability to design and implement preventive measures against social catastrophes — often underpins the occurrence of such crises. A retrospective view may fail to address the realities of both current and future contexts, especially when future developments introduce unforeseen dynamics and challenges. Moreover, societies can exhibit a tendency to forget past difficulties and cling to present comforts, further impairing their capacity to adapt to evolving circumstances [7]. Beyond these challenges, our further examination of the limitations in successful social construction of the future has allowed us to develop a classification of causes underlying society's inability or restricted capacity to extend its vision beyond the present. This classification draws on the research conducted by Jared Diamond, which we have previously referenced. According to Diamond's analysis, the following factors hinder the timely prevention of existential threats and constrain the potential for social construction of the future:

- ◆ Illogical and irregular emergence of threats;
- ◆ Distance between decision-making centers and affected areas;
- ◆ “Creeping” normalization of abnormal conditions;
- ◆ Collective forgetfulness of past challenges;
- ◆ Inability to perceive or acknowledge risks;
- ◆ Incompetence in decision-making and reversal of actions;
- ◆ Conflict of interests among social groups;
- ◆ Behavioral misconduct within specific social groups;
- ◆ The logic of collective action dilemmas;
- ◆ Conflict between the authorities and the public;
- ◆ Irrational behavior and motivations;
- ◆ Tension between preserving values and abandoning them for survival;
- ◆ Competition among social groups for prestige;
- ◆ Failure to recognize the tragedy of common resource use;
- ◆ Conflicts between short-term and long-term goals;

- ◆ Manifestation of “crowd psychology” in rational decision-making;
- ◆ Psychological rejection of inconvenient truths;
- ◆ Disparity in resource availability and costs;
- ◆ Inability to anticipate threats [7, pp. 501–521].

THE FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF REALITY

At the core of social construction of reality — including on an intuitive level — lies the need to create a social environment that fosters development rather than undermines it from the outset. This environment must remain closely interconnected with the natural surroundings from which humans, through ontogenetic development, have gradually become separated over the course of life¹. As a result, human nature is formed and developed. It is fundamentally socio-cultural in its essence, since the personality in the social sense differs fundamentally in terms of many parameters from the biological environment where the person lives. Thus, for the success of the *social construction of reality*, it is necessary to *determine the social space, in particular the one that embodies the image of the future*. This condition is *fundamental*.

Another *fundamental component* of social construction of reality is the socially-driven processes of personality formation, which focus on the development of the “Self” within a sociocultural environment. This involves a separation from the innate genetic Self and a transition toward a social Self, which becomes the foundation for shaping the individual as a social subject. Concurrently, the Self also functions as an object — a construct in constant flux, undergoing socialization throughout life under the influence of the surrounding environment. In this sense, the individual can be seen as a “Self-creator,” actively shaping their identity within the social context.

Through such social construction, the image of the social Self emerges, reflecting the values, norms,

¹ The detailed, separate components and features of social construction, which are presented below, are made on the basis of a generalization of the methodology [8, p. 80–151].

and expectations of the sociocultural environment. This image takes on various forms — beyond the national dimension — depending on the cultural setting. However, the Self is not confined to these immediate boundaries. In a globalized context, the individual can transcend previous limitations, redefining their identity in ways that respond to new circumstances and possibilities. *The ability to reconstruct the Self in this way plays a crucial role in adapting to the challenges of contemporary sociocultural spaces.* The primary focus here is on the sociocultural dimensions that shape the Self, rather than on the biological aspects of identity. *In the social sense, it is essential to foster a Self that is capable of stabilizing the surrounding environment.*

It is also important to note another *fundamental feature* of social construction that follows the formation of the social image of the Self, capable of interaction and personal action. This involves the habitualization of the real actions that the Self performs. These actions result from habits, which are eventually reformulated (institutionalized) into a pattern of actions representing the Self as a sociocultural image of the environment. In the social sense, this pattern of actions, which entails a specific sequence of execution, first becomes habitual and then institutionalized. Thus, in social construction, alongside the formation of the Self as an image or pattern — a product of the sociocultural environment interacting with the natural environment — there arises *the construction of an institutionalized environment.* This can result from the habitualization of action sequences and their control, as well as the organization of actions by institutions that structure both the activities of the individual and their interactions within the sociocultural environment. This interaction ensures social control over the life activities of the Self within the group it belongs to, and more broadly, within society. Consequently, institutions both control and regulate actions characteristic of a given society in a sociocultural context. Institutionalization thus becomes the third fundamental element of social construction of reality, which is facilitated by the externalizing capabilities of the Self.

In conclusion, it can be argued that institutionalization is the result of either habitual actions and interactions, or actions and interactions that are repeated frequently enough to become understandable to all participants. This repetition stabilizes both the action and interaction of each Self. The above-mentioned process is the next step in the social construction of reality, where the social world, including the expanding early institutional order, remains in the process of construction [8, p. 97].

Social construction occurs when the surrounding social world operates under an expanding institutional order. In other words, the expansion of the social world — whether driven by endogenous or exogenous factors — is necessary for the social construction of reality. Endogenous factors refer to internal dynamics, such as changes in the number of participants in social interaction. Each new participant introduces new qualities based on their prior institutional experience (or institutional memory), thereby enriching the existing institutional framework. The expansion of a previously established institutional order — whether formal or informal — can also be influenced by other internal triggers. Changes, such as an increase in participants, objectively create conditions that demand innovative adjustments in activity. As P. Berger and T. Luckmann demonstrate, achieving interaction, control, and even the establishment of new norms requires attention beyond what was anticipated by previously established practices. This creates a need for innovative solutions, which constitute another fundamental feature of social construction. Thus, in the search for innovative ways to improve the institutional framework, opportunities arise for innovative social construction. Old institutional processes may fade, some may strengthen their influence, while new ones emerge, requiring novel institutional solutions. The institutional order must adapt; otherwise, the ability to maintain interaction and its effectiveness under changing conditions — whether driven by internal (endogenous) or external (exogenous) factors — will be compromised. In

these new conditions, the impact of innovation within social construction becomes more pronounced, transforming the nature of institutional interaction and how it is regulated. Institutionalization — whether triggered by internal or external changes — materializes as a process governed by its own laws of emergence, formation, and development within the objective social space. This space must maintain coherence and structure, preventing the rise of social entropy. In the realm of economic construction, institutionalization manifests itself through focused research efforts aimed at protecting the social environment from chaos and instability. These efforts seek to minimize conditions that could foster social entropy, thereby ensuring stability and order.

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION AND TRUST

We are immersed in a life governed by the second law of thermodynamics: disorder increases while order decreases... In a world where entropy generally tends to rise, there are local and temporary islands that reduce entropy, and the presence of these islands allows some of us to demonstrate the existence of progress [9]. However, within social life, the phenomenon that combats social entropy is not merely an “island” but a phenomenological process — socialization. This process integrates all components of the general system of actions, inherently characterizing social life and the construction of social reality. Social entropy, as an indication of relational breakdown, manifests itself particularly through diminished trust and reduced interaction effectiveness. As a result, institutional processes become disrupted, leading to destructive social behavior. Such behavior often arises in response to complex situations, which, on a psychological level, are typically described as critical, extreme, or highly stressful. Each of these factors — whether occurring in isolation or in combination — can trigger psychological reactions such as irritability, anxiety, stress disorders, loss of confidence, and diminished trust. Together, these effects frequently cause disruptions in the process of social construc-

tion. For example, signs of these disruptions can be observed in Ukraine from 2014 to 2018, based on sociological surveys conducted by the Institute of Social Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine.

The Institute’s studies focused on assessing civic dynamics, the factors influencing these dynamics, and the potential for social construction. These investigations, particularly regarding social tension levels, revealed a pervasive sense of dissatisfaction among citizens with the state of their lives. The surveys highlighted a growing feeling of powerlessness to influence societal processes: between 2015 and 2018, approximately 70% of respondents consistently expressed their inability to affect the societal processes surrounding them. Meanwhile, only 22% believed they had any impact on these processes, with this percentage showing a declining trend. Even fewer respondents (between 10–14%) expressed satisfaction with their ability to influence the current situation. The low level of civic participation was attributed not only to the lack of enabling conditions but also to insufficient motivation [10, pp. 60–61].

Russia’s full-scale military aggression, which began in 2022, has had a profound impact on social life processes in Ukraine. The war, with its extreme and stressful nature, has intensified anxiety and concern among the population, while also deeply affecting trust.

Surveys conducted by the Razumkov Center between 2018 and 2024 highlight a persistent problem of trust, particularly toward institutions currently active in Ukraine. Our research focuses on issues related to trust and distrust, especially in terms of the interaction between various social groups. These dynamics reflect the tensions within society and signals the potential for change.

A key area of analysis is the level of trust in the public sector, which includes the state apparatus — the entity with which citizens most frequently interact. We also assess the population’s trust in nongovernment organizations (NGOs), where people participate directly and can express both trust and distrust toward these institutions. This

spectrum of relations between the population and public authorities plays a decisive role in determining whether orderliness or disorder will prevail in society.

The Razumkov Center’s research (summarized in Table 1) reveals that trust in government institutions has generally remained negative throughout the observation period, with one notable exception: September–October 2022, during the early months of the military invasion. This brief shift toward positive trust levels requires further investigation beyond the scope of this study. As of March 2024, the balance of trust vs. distrust toward state authorities had almost returned to 2018 levels, indicating that both prewar conditions and the war itself have produced long-lasting effects. Additionally, the population has become more sensitive to interaction with government institutions, reflecting increased scrutiny and heightened expectations. The decline in government effectiveness is limiting the ability to implement government policies successfully. This deterioration reduces the efficient use of resources, increa-

ses the cost of ensuring compliance with state decisions, and heightens the overall expense of administrative oversight.

According to surveys conducted by USAID and other international organizations, the population of Ukraine has experienced an increased sense of agency and civic responsibility during the years of full-scale aggression. The findings reveal that citizens felt more empowered in 2023 compared to 2021, though there remains significant room for improvement – especially at the community level, where the ability to influence local changes still faces challenges [18]. Research into horizontal aspects of social cohesion at the community level supports this conclusion, highlighting the persistent lack of civic engagement. One key observation is the low participation in local governance. The least frequently mentioned activity was participation in local governance and decision-making, with 83% of respondents stating they had never attended events organized by local authorities. This indicates the need to invest in mechanisms and initiatives that encourage citizens

*Table 1. Dynamics of Trust in the Government Apparatus (Officials) in 2018–2024 (based on Razumkov’s Center data), %**

Response option	Time of the Survey						
	June 2018	February 2019	July 2020	March 2021	September–October 2022	February–March 2023	March 2024
Do not trust at all	50.8	46.1	36.5	36.8	9.6	19.7	35.2
Rather do not trust	34.5	36.8	41.2	42.9	34.3	44.0	40.9
Fully trust	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.5	6.8	5.8	3.0
Rather trust	7.4	7.7	13.3	11.5	48.6	19.5	13.0
Hard to answer	6.1	8.1	7.5	7.3	0.6	10.9	7.9
Trust/Distrust balance**	-76.7	-73.8***	-63.0	-66.7	11.5	-38.4	-60.1

Note: * The balance of trust represents the difference between the share of respondents who trust and those who do not trust a particular institution. Specifically, the balance is calculated as the difference between the combined share of those who answered “Rather trust” and “Fully trust,” and the combined share of those who responded “Do not trust at all” and “Rather do not trust”. When distrust outweighs trust, the resulting figure is marked with a negative sign.

** The calculations used in this analysis were performed by the Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

*** Additionally, it is important to note that in some surveys, the term “government institutions?” is used instead of “state apparatus (civil servants)” to refer to relevant bodies.

Sources: [11–17].

to take part in local decision-making processes. Strengthening civic engagement offers dual benefits: it reinforces social networks while simultaneously fostering cooperation and solidarity within the community as a public good [19]. Although citizen engagement showed some improvement in 2023 compared to 2021, it still aligns closely with trends observed between 2014 and 2018, reflecting a certain stability in engagement patterns. While the positive shift during the war years is notable, the horizontal level of civic participation – local governance and decision-making – remains insufficient. The relatively low level of civic participation in 2023, which did not exceed 20%, mirrors the data from 2014–2018, pointing to a resilient pattern of conservatism. This consistency suggests that both existing conditions and motivation levels have remained relatively unchanged, limiting the population’s influence on social processes.

The low levels of trust in state institutions, as demonstrated by surveys from 2018 to 2024, have hindered effective social interaction in Ukraine. This persistent issue represents a serious obstacle to fostering positive societal change. The ReSCORE 2023 and ReSCORE 2021 surveys emphasize the importance of strengthening the sense of civic responsibility through programs that enhance political efficiency at the local level by helping individuals feel empowered to influence decision-making processes [18, p. 6]. However, while belief in the ability to initiate change within communities is an essential condition for development, it is insufficient on its own. This gap arises from significant limitations, such as the low trust in state institutions, which restricts the realization of civic initiatives (see Table 1). Since the current trust deficit undermines effective cooperation between the public and government institutions, leveraging the high trust in civil and

Table 2. Dynamics of Trust in NGOs and Volunteer Organizations in 2018–2024 (the latter is given in the brackets) (based on Razumkov’s Center data), % of respondents

Response option	Time of the Survey						
	June 2018	February 2019	July 2020	March 2021	September–October 2022	February–March 2023	March 2024
Do not trust at all	15.8 (7.3)	17.7 (8.9)	12.2 (7.7)	12.7 (8.8)	Not questioned	4.9 (1.2)	6.3 (1.6)
Rather do not trust	21.4 (13.9)	23.3 (14.2)	24.0 (16.7)	20.3 (15.5)		15.2 (5.3)	17.7 (7.3)
Fully trust	5.2 (16.5)	5.3 (13.8)	5.9 (16.3)	7.2 (20.1)		17.2 (43.0)	10.4 (33.1)
Rather trust	38.2 (48.7)	39.6 (53.2)	41.0 (46.6)	46.0 (45.0)		48.6 (44.9)	51.0 (51.5)
Hard to answer	19.4 (13.6)	14.0 (10.0)	16.8 (12.8)	13.8 (10.5)		14.1 (5.6)	14.6 (6.5)
Trust/Distrust balance*	6.2 (44.0)	3.9** (43.9)*	10.7 (38.5)	20.2 (40.8)		45.7 (81.4)	37.4 (75.7)

Note: * The authors explain that the trust balance represents the difference between the percentage of respondents who express trust and those who express distrust. The balance is calculated as the difference between the sum of respondents who answered “Rather trust” and “Fully trust,” and the sum of those who answered “Do not trust at all” and “Rather distrust”. In cases where the share of distrust exceeds that of trust, the calculated balance is assigned a negative value.

** Data calculated by the Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

Sources: [11–17].

volunteer organizations offers a strategic opportunity (see Table 2). Over the 2018–2024 period, trust in civil and volunteer organizations has remained consistently high, even amidst the challenges of full-scale war. In fact, this trust level has grown 1.4 times as compared with the prewar years. These organizations now enjoy a positive trust-to-distrust balance, making them pivotal in reducing the trust gap with government institutions. Strengthening collaboration between state and civil society could foster public trust in governance, enhancing the overall effectiveness of joint efforts. Civil and volunteer organizations play an essential role in bridging the trust gap by actively participating in the governance process. This opens avenues for expanding citizen involvement not only within civil society but also in government structures. Increased cooperation can improve the social construction of reality by fostering active participation across both sectors, contributing to societal resilience and transformation. This evolving trend points toward a shift in Ukraine’s governance philosophy – from the traditional concept of a welfare state toward a social investment and development model.

The social investment and development can and should be achieved through the expansion of state social design policies, which consist of two interrelated approaches. The first approach is the historically known strategy of population resettlement according to the distribution of productive forces across the country. One of the most successful social design projects was the transfer of land rights in the U.S. during the mid-19th century. The social design policy in America at that time embodied principles of rational prosperity, which, according to research by S. Cohen and B. DeLong, remained prevalent throughout the 19th and much of the 20th centuries [20]. At the core of such policies are economic socialization processes, where economic actors internalized sustainable management principles. The idea of economic socialization was further enriched by socialization of the economy, which can be viewed as the integration of humanistic principles into

economic activities – transforming economic operations into social relations. As a result, both the economy and economic activities became socialized. Socialized economic activity ensures the gradual accumulation of social knowledge, fosters socialization, and forms social order, which is consolidated in institutions such as habits, skills, and behavioral norms of economic actors [21, p. 63].

The lack of adequate motivation among the population to influence societal processes – a key component of social construction – has been highlighted in studies conducted by the Institute of Social Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine. On the one hand, the research showed that respondents have the ability to perceive the social nature of everyday life. However, it also revealed a deficiency in existing conditions for individual self-knowledge and personal development – qualities that, if developed and externalized, could empower individuals to shape social realities through meaningful influence on social processes. Such engagement could lead to essential social changes by harmonizing individual development with societal functioning, fostering rooted and sustainable development. When scaled, this activity could become a powerful driver for strengthening the social nature of life at both the individual and societal levels.

According to the definition provided above, nationally rooted development is based on two interconnected characteristics. The first characteristic emphasizes national attributes that shape the life of society. Sociological surveys conducted in Ukraine in this area reveal strong national identification, as demonstrated by overwhelming public support for the country’s independence.

For instance, the Act of Independence was reaffirmed during the latest survey, with 92.6% of respondents supporting it. Additionally, there have been positive changes in respondents’ symbolic perceptions of national identity. When asked, “What is personally symbolic of Ukraine for you?”, respondents most frequently named the following “materialized” symbols: State symbols (77.1%); National clothing and embroidered towels (62.3%);

Ukrainian language (52.1%); Traditional foods and beverages (50.6%); Ukrainian folk songs (50.3%). As compared to 2015, the frequency of choosing these symbols increased by approximately 10% [10, pp. 36, 38]. Together, these elements reflect the public's understanding of Ukraine as a sovereign, independent, and social state, embodied in materialized symbols that represent national attributes. These national attributes, seen as materialized symbols, are rooted in the social life of Ukrainian society and align with the concept of nationally rooted development. In addition to material symbols, such development is also characterized by socio-psychological markers – for example, a strong sense of belonging to the country. The SCORE 2023 and SCORE 2021 surveys further confirmed this, reporting that levels of national belonging were already high in 2021, with this indicator being the strongest among others [18]. The report emphasizes that these processes are not sudden but deeply embedded in the social and cultural landscape of Ukrainian society. An essential feature of nationally rooted individuals is their capacity and motivation to influence societal processes. This involvement is crucial for fostering sustainable development and social renewal, ensuring that individuals not only integrate into but also actively shape the ongoing dynamics of society.

The survey results mentioned above indicate that only up to 22% of respondents felt actively engaged, and no more than 14% were satisfied with their ability to influence the current situation. In our view, this level of civic engagement did not create a critical mass of individuals embedded through their “representation” in the deeper layers of society – those who could serve as a rooted force capable of driving essential social change. The primary reason lies in the fact that most respondents lacked both the opportunities and, crucially, the motivation to generate the energy necessary for change by influencing social processes. In other words, they were not in a position to act as a source of resources that could catalyze transformative processes in society, leading to improvements in living conditions. Such improvements

would primarily depend on the endogenized development of both society and the economy – an approach that emphasizes internal, self-sustained progress rather than relying on external factors [22, pp. 259–311]. This capacity for internally driven development is one of the most critical components of nationally rooted development.

In previous works, the author has outlined the vision of the endogenous nature of social progress as a source of economic growth and discussed the principles of endogenizing economic development through equal relationships between the state, business, and economic agents, as well as the institutional foundations required for this process. According to the author, these institutional conditions not only create opportunities for the population to influence social processes but also foster a sense of empowerment, which motivates individuals on a psycho-emotional level to make meaningful contributions. This influence unfolds in two stages: first through self-awareness, made possible by the existence of institutional frameworks for societal participation, and later through self-expression. This process strengthens as individuals develop confidence that participants in collective action will not exploit each other's vulnerabilities. As noted by J. Barney and M. Hansen, such mutual assurance presupposes the presence of trust, which is essential for effective cooperation [23]. As discussed earlier, trust in Ukrainian society is reflected in high levels of confidence in civic and volunteer organizations, a critical element for social construction. Trust is crucial because it reflects the inclination to manifest a dialectical symbiosis in social interactions, which, according to P. Margulis, is a constitutive element of symbiosis [24]. Symbiotic relationships foster mutual benefits among individuals, leading to increased social negentropy – a process that enhances collective well-being. This enables people to “...work together to create strong communities, which, in turn, empower individuals to become capable, autonomous personalities” [25]. Such dynamics facilitate renewal of social life by generating new realities. Thus, socialization emerges

as a unique phenomenon, defined by a subject-subject approach to understanding socialization, as illustrated in the role-playing stage known as “play.” During this stage, individuals develop a “self-image” and form their social self as a construct. This occurs through internalization (the assimilation of norms and behaviors), enabling individuals to act and interact, thereby participating in the social construction of reality. Through these actions, individuals also contribute to nationally rooted development, as they simultaneously integrate into society and shape it through externalization (expressing their internalized values outwardly). This framework aligns with the theoretical model developed by G. H. Mead [26], which conceptualizes socialization as a two-stage process. The first stage involves imitation and replication, while the second involves selective behavior shaped by personal choices. This selective behavior reflects an adaptation to social norms and cultural values, as well as the construction of an individual’s personal framework. According to G. Kelly [27], individuals use this framework not only to shape their behavior within the context of their society but also to actively participate in constructing their social reality [28]. This construction is made possible through the individual’s capacity for externalization that reflects the ability to project personal values and norms back into the social environment.

Human socialization across time and space is a complex and ambiguous process, with varied content and consequences. Internalization – the process of adopting values, social norms, and behavioral rules – occurs through adaptation. However, the nature of this adaptation differs: some norms are internalized on a psychological level, guiding individual behavior naturally, while others are followed reluctantly, without personal meaning. In these cases, the individual complies merely to avoid conflict and prevent actions by others that could restrict their ability to interact socially within a group or society.

This distinction suggests the two types of adaptation: the first is adaptation to surrounding con-

ditions [3, p. 166]. It represents a narrative function of socialization, where the individual successfully adapts, resulting in social identity formation. A socially integrated individual possesses the capacity for social actions and interactions that align with the group’s expectations. Survival adaptation: In the second type, adaptation mirrors the struggle for survival under challenging circumstances, reflecting an environment that demands continuous adjustment for basic existence. As noted, all living beings struggle to survive and preserve their species under the given life conditions [3, pp. 166–167]. However, under such conditions, the opportunities for meaningful participation in social life diminish over time. The second form of adaptation leads to the growth of social entropy, where individuals may gradually disengage from meaningful social identification with their environment, particularly in group interactions. This withdrawal not only limits their ability to act and influence social processes but also may motivate them for increasing social entropy.

The conclusions formed above were substantiated, particularly during the period from 2014 to 2018, by surveys which indicated that during the period under review, there was “public dissatisfaction with the current government, which led to a persistence of protest sentiments within society and a deepening of protest ideology. At the same time, there was also a quasi-loyal attitude toward the authorities” [10, p. 99]. As a result, society at that time seemed divided into two groups, which was expected, given that social group interaction is one of the conditions enabling group support, solidarity, and shared motivation to help social individuals adapt to and overcome difficult situations. The problematic nature of social interaction forces individuals, in situations where individual resources are insufficient to address complex situations, to turn to group resources [29, p. 6], because such resources hold the potential for both the socialization and resocialization of individuals in relation to new conditions [22, p. 161–258].

In this case, we refer to so-called secondary socialization, which occurs as a result of events that

not only complicate life but also bring about substantial changes. In Ukraine, the ongoing war currently represents such an event, challenging both society as a whole and each individual, who must adapt to conditions that have transformed their quality of life and the nature of social processes, thereby influencing their consciousness. The primary objective remains to preserve human identity even in wartime, allowing individuals to interpret challenging life circumstances as opportunities for personal development. Through the processes of internalization and externalization (i.e., socialization), individuals contribute to the social construction of reality, which, in turn, fosters resilience and a drive for victory, as well as a higher quality of life. Furthermore, this facilitates the resolution of uncertainty and disorder

caused by war, supporting the renewal of negentropic processes. Thus, socialization under these new conditions, shaped by overcoming life's challenges, serves to mitigate the social entropy induced by war.

This research is part of the project “Formation of the Foundations of Nationally Rooted Stability and Security of the Economic Development of Ukraine in the Conditions of the Hybrid ‘Peace-War’ System”.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is very grateful to R.Ya. Levin, Candidate of Pedagogic Science, for his assistance in collecting the sociological survey data given in Tables 1 and 2 hereof.

REFERENCES

1. Humanistic psychology and its representatives. Prykarpattia National University named after V. Stefanyk [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://studfile.net/preview/5259124/page:4/> (Last accessed: 15.04.2024).
2. Giddings, F. H. (2016). The theory of socialization: A syllabus of sociological principles. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform. 64 p. URL: https://books.google.com.ua/books/about/The_Theory_of_Socialization.html?id=yApyjwEACAAJ&redir_esc=y (Last accessed: 16.04.2024).
3. Moskalenko, V. V. (2013). *Socialization of personality*. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
4. Heyets, V. M. (2024). Signs of the social quality of wartime life in Ukraine and the task of its postwar uplift. *Economy of Ukraine*, 4, 3–35 [in Ukrainian]. <https://doi.org/10.15407/economyukr.2024.04.003>
5. Radziwill, O. A. (2013). The reasons for the growth of social entropy and the sociological and legal means of its containment. *Scientific Bulletin of Institute of International Relations of the National Aviation University*, 2(2), 74 [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://jrn1.nau.edu.ua/index.php/IMV/article/view/3104> (Last accessed: 15.04.2024).
6. Talcott, Parsons. (1971). *The System of modern societies*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. URL: https://www.google.com.ua/books/edition/_/vM4VAAAIAAJ?hl=ru&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi0l6LclP-GAxXjBtsEHTGYBbgQre8FegQIIBAH (Last accessed: 16.02.2024).
7. Diamond, D. (2021). *Collapse. Why some societies decline, while others develop successfully*. KM-BUKS Publishing Group [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://book-ye.com.ua/catalog/sotsiologhiya/kolaps-chomu-odni-suspilstva-zanepadayut-a-inshiuspishno-rozvyvayutsya/> (Last accessed: 20.01.2024).
8. Berger, P., Lukman, T. (1995). Social construction of reality. Treatise on the sociology of knowledge. Moscow [in Russian]. URL: https://ktpu.kpi.ua/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/0458680_BCA67_piter_berger_lukman_t_socialnoe_konstruirovaniye_realnosti_tr.pdf (Last accessed: 16.04.2024).
9. Wiener, N. (1982). *Cybernetics and society (collection)*. AST Publishing House. (Science: discoveries and discoverers). URL: <https://magicbook.com.ua/uk/product-31680.html> [in Russian] (Last accessed: 28.04.2024).
10. Slyusarevskiy, M. M., Gumenyuk, O. I., Dvornyk, M. S., Chernysh, L. P. (2019). Social situation in Ukraine: peculiarities of reflection of transformational processes in public opinion (2014–2018): reference book. National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine, Institute of Social and Political Psychology. Kyiv [in Ukrainian]. URL: https://library.pdpu.edu.ua/images/2020/novi-knigi/Soc_sit_v_Ukr.pdf (Last accessed: 10.05.2024).
11. Trust of Ukrainian citizens in public institutions (June 2018). Oleksandr Razumkov Ukrainian Center for Economic and Political Research [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/dovirahromadian-ukrainy-do-suspilnykh-instytutiv> (Last accessed: 14.05.2024).

12. Level of trust in public institutions and electoral orientations of Ukrainian citizens (February 2019). Oleksandr Razumkov Ukrainian Center for Economic and Political Research [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/riven-doviry-do-suspilnykh-instytutiv-ta-elektoralni-oriientsii-gromadian-ukrainy> (Last accessed: 15.05.2024).
13. The beginning of a new political year: trust in social institutions (July 2020). Oleksandr Razumkov Ukrainian Center for Economic and Political Research [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/pochatok-novogo-politychnogo-roku-dovira-do-sotsialnykh-instytutiv-lypen-2020r> (Last accessed: 15.05.2024).
14. Assessment of the situation in the country, trust in the institutions of society and politicians, electoral orientations of citizens (March 2021). Oleksandr Razumkov Ukrainian Center for Economic and Political Research [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/otsinka-sytuatsii-v-kraini-dovira-do-instytutiv-suspilstva-ta-politykiv-elektoralni-oriientsii-gromadian-berezen-2021r> (Last accessed: 15.05.2024).
15. Citizens' assessment of the situation in the country, trust in social institutions, political and ideological orientations of Ukrainian citizens in the conditions of Russian aggression (September-October 2022). Oleksandr Razumkov Ukrainian Center for Economic and Political Research [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/otsinka-gromadianamy-sytuatsii-v-kraini-dovira-do-sotsialnykh-instytutiv-politykoideologichni-oriientsii-gromadian-ukrainy-v-umovakh-rosiiskoi-agresii-veresen-zhovten-2022r> (Last accessed: 15.05.2024).
16. Citizens' assessment of the situation in the country and the actions of the authorities, trust in social institutions (February-March 2023). Oleksandr Razumkov Ukrainian Center for Economic and Political Research [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/otsinka-gromadianamy-sytuatsii-v-kraini-ta-dii-vlady-dovira-do-sotsialnykh-instytutiv-liutyi-berezen-2023r> (Last accessed: 15.05.2024).
17. Assessment of the situation in the country, trust in social institutions, belief in victory, attitude to the elections (March 2024). Oleksandr Razumkov Ukrainian Center for Economic and Political Research [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://razumkov.org.ua/novyny/otsinka-sytuatsii-v-kraini-dovira-do-sotsialnykh-instytutiv-vira-v-peremogu-stavlennia-dovyboriv-berezen-2024r> (Last accessed: 15.05.2024).
18. Social cohesion in Ukraine: Part I. Trends according to RESCORE 2023 and SCORE 2021 indices. (2024). USAID, UNDP. Ukraine, [in Ukrainian]. URL: https://api.scoreforpeace.org/storage/pdfs/PUB_Social-Cohesion-in-Ukraine_UKR_March.7.2024.pdf (Last accessed: 16.04.2024).
19. Social cohesion in Ukraine: Part II. Assessment of horizontal relations using the RESCORE 2023 index. (2024). USAID, UNDP [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://www.undp.org/uk/ukraine/publications/sotsialna-zhurtovanist-v-ukrayini-otsynuvannya-horizontalnykh-vidnosyn-za-dopomohoyu-indeksu-rescore-2023-chastyna-ii> (Last accessed: 16.04.2024).
20. Stephen, Cohen, DeLonge, Bradford. (2023). The American economic miracle and Alexander Hamilton. (Series "History of Economic Miracles"). Kyiv [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://nashformat.ua/pdf-preview/amerykanske-ekonomichne-dyvo-i-aleksander-gamilton-709663> (Last accessed: 16.04.2024).
21. Zaitsev, Yu. K. (2002). *Socialization of Ukraine's economy and systemic transformation of society*: monograph. Kyiv [in Ukrainian]. URL: https://kneu.edu.ua/ua/science_kneu/scientific_schools/ssp/spe_praci3/spe_naukpraci/spe_soc_econom_ukr/ (Last accessed: 18.04.2024).
22. Heyets, V. M. (2020). *The phenomenon of instability is a challenge to economic development*: monograph. Kyiv. <https://doi.org/10.15407/akademperiodyka.403.456> [in Ukrainian].
23. Barney, J. B., Hansen, M. H. (1994). Trustworthiness as a Source of Competitive Advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(S1), 177. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250150912>
24. Margulis, L. (1998). *The Symbiotic Planet*. New York.
25. Westbroek, J., Nijhuis, H., Van der Maesen, L. J. G. (2020). Evolutionary Thermodynamics and Theory of Social Quality as Links between Physics, Biology, and the Human Sciences. *International Journal of Social Quality*, 10(1), 57–86. <https://doi.org/10.3167/IJSQ.2020.100104>
26. Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society*. USA The University of Chicago Press. 400 p. URL: https://www.google.com.ua/books/edition/Mind_Self_Society/22jtBwAAQBAJ?hl=ru&gbpv=1&dq=Mead+G.+H.+Mind.+Self+and+Society.+USA+The+University+of+Chicago+Press,+1934.&printsec=frontcover (Last accessed: 26.04.2024).
27. Kelly, J. A. (2000). *Theory of personal constructs*. St. Petersburg [in Russian].
28. Berger, P. L., Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. URL: <https://amstudugm.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/social-construction-of-reality.pdf> (Last accessed: 20.05.2024).

29. Chorna, L. G., Gornostay, P. P., Yaremchuk, O. V., Vus, V. I., Korobanova, O. L., Pletka, O. T. (2021). Problematic interaction in groups: phenomenology, factors, prevention. National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine, Institute of Social and Political Psychology. Kropyvnytskyi [in Ukrainian]. URL: <https://ispp.org.ua/2021/12/31/monografiya-problemna-vzayemodiya-v-grupax-fenomenologiya-chinniki-profilaktika/> (Last accessed: 20.05.2024).

Received 04.07.2024

Revised 04.07.2024

Accepted 08.07.2024

V.M. Geets (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2895-6114>)

Державна установа «Інститут економіки та прогнозування Національної академії наук України»,
вул. Панаса Мирного, 26, Київ, 01011, Україна,
+380 44 280 1234, gvm@ief.org.ua

СОЦІАЛІЗАЦІЯ НАЦІОНАЛЬНО УКОРІНЕНОГО РОЗВИТКУ

Вступ. Соціальний простір у вимірі соціальної якості життя визначається соціалізацією загалом і економічною соціалізацією зокрема.

Проблематика. Процеси, що мають фундаментальний характер з акцентом на національну укоріненість, дають можливість уникати непорядкованості в суспільному розвитку шляхом соціального проектування реальності, оскільки останнє передбачає наявність у суспільстві інституційного порядку, завдяки чому нівелюється зростання соціальної ентропії.

Мета. Розкрити і продемонструвати те, як соціалізація укорінення національного розвитку, формуючи здатність продукувати енергію творчості, стає джерелом ресурсів та механізмів оновлення життєдіяльності.

Матеріали та методи. Використано матеріали міжнародних та національних соціологічних обстежень та дані Державної служби статистики, МВФ, національних наукових установ. Застосовано абстрактно-логічний, монографічний, порівняльний метод, методи соціальних та статистичних спостережень.

Результати. Охарактеризовано складові соціальної та економічної політики в частині досягнення інституційної впорядкованості та її практичної результативності шляхом як державного соціального проектування реальності, так і формування інтеріоризаційного характеру діяльності особистостей.

Висновки. В умовах повномасштабного вторгнення російської федерації український соціальний простір зазнав суттєвої реструктуризації, що зумовило формування нових структуроутворюючих опор життєдіяльності: масштабної гуманітарної допомоги збіднілим верствам населення; зміни балансу довіри/недовіри до окремих суспільних інститутів; переоцінки цінностей і бажання почати «нове життя» з новою роботою. У сукупності саме вони становлять нові засадничі форми життєдіяльності українського соціуму і мають розглядатися в Плані повоєнного відновлення з акцентуванням на національно укоріненому розвитку.

Ключові слова: соціальний простір, соціалізація, соціальне конструювання, національно укорінений розвиток, інтеріоризація, екстеріоризація.