"Ukrainian Society: Global and Local Projections". A Conference in Memory of Natalia Panina

On 10 December 2017, the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine hosted the **11th Annual International Conference** in memory of their colleague, an eminent Ukrainian sociologist ***Natalia Panina (1949–2006)***. The theme of the conference, **"Ukrainian Society: Global and Local Projections"**, was intended to highlight some global trends that Ukrainian sociologists need to focus on.

Ukrainian Sociological Association and Natalia Panina Sociological Centre were co-organisers of this special event.

Dozens of social scientists from around Ukraine and their foreign counterparts have gathered in the Institute to pay homage to this remarkable woman on her birth anniversary: probably not coincidentally, she had been born on the International Human Rights Day. Natalia Panina was a person of exceptional courage and integrity, who put human honour and dignity above all else. Her commitment to science was exemplary, and she did not allow anything that was even remotely unprofessional. She attached the utmost importance to good reputation, and strongly opposed everything that even slightly resembled research misconduct. For this reason, she elaborated and promoted "The Code of Professional Ethics for Sociologists". On top of that, Natalia Panina was a brilliant scholar famous for her pioneering works in the fields of sociology, social psychology and political science.

It would be no exaggeration to say that sociology of post-Soviet Ukraine (at least, its "core" whose task is to give a true picture of today's society by studying public opinion) owes its very existence to Natalia Panina. In the early 1990s, together with a few like-minded enthusiasts such as Volodymyr Paniotto, who is currently the Director General of Kyiv International Institute of Sociology, Mykola Churylov, who has been heading up "Taylor Nelson Sofres Ukraine" for many years, and Yevhen Golovakha, Deputy Director of the Institute of Sociology, who was also her life companion, Natalia Panina developed and implemented a set of concepts and research techniques to look into a society undergoing major transformations. This was the first time that Ukrainian society as a whole had been scientifically analysed. Indeed, those research studies carried out at the dawn of Ukraine's independence marked a new era for Ukrainian social sciences.

However, it would be a mistake to assert that by the time the USSR collapsed there was no such thing as Ukrainian sociology at all. As a field of study, sociology in Ukraine had started to exist (to be more precise, re-emerged) in the late 1960s[1]. At that time, it was predominantly located at large industrial enterprises and known as industrial sociology. Sociologists who worked there addressed such issues as working conditions, staff turn-

[1] Under the Stalin regime, sociology was effectively banned for decades — from the early 1920s to the mid-1950s. Then, although the term "sociology" was reintroduced, it only could be referred as to Marxist-Leninist or Soviet sociology. "Bourgeois", or Western sociology had to be uncompromisingly criticised.

over, workers' involvement is social activities, etc.; some of them went further and researched into management styles at the enterprises (though all of the research results ought to be interpreted through the prism of Soviet ideology). In a sense, industrial sociologists could provide background for further development of applied social research — they acted as interviewers and used standardised questionnaires. But they only surveyed a limited number of people, the plant's employees. It was not until 1982 that Ukrainian sociologists joined nationwide social surveys. As part of the Soviet Union, Ukraine participated in the project "A Way of Life of the Soviet Man"; about 5,000 persons were interviewed. A set of questions related to respondents' opinions on norms of social behaviour were later included in a questionnaire used for social surveys conducted annually by the Institute of Sociology. Yet, there was not an efficient republic-wide network of interviewers working on a regular basis at that time. Most sociologists had not as yet carried out a representative survey on their own; besides, they had not majored in sociology (since the first sociology departments within universities were set up in the mid-1980s). Those who called themselves sociologists had been mainly philosophers, economists or historians. Note that the Institute of Sociology, which was formally established in November 1990, had actually started out twelve years before as the Department of Sociology in the Institute of Philosophy of the UkrSSR's Academy of Sciences.

So, the main challenges facing Ukrainian sociology (at least, in terms of applied social research) in those days were linked to the lack of trained interviewers and well-developed networks. There were no guidelines for building a sample representative of Ukraine's population either. To fill the gap, Natalia Panina and colleagues adapted a set of sampling techniques for use in Ukraine and trained a team of fieldworkers and supervisors. Thus, nationwide social surveys were started. It was decided to conduct them on a regular basis in order to record and analyse the changes in key social indicators. Thus, the project known as "Ukrainian Society: Monitoring of Social Changes" came into being. This project, initiated by the Institute of Sociology, brought together sociologists from around Ukraine. In 2014, a group of the Institute's scholars who had been the most involved in the project (including Natalia Panina) were awarded the State Prize in Science and Technology.

The survey results have been published not only in academic journals and monographs, but also in authoritative media outlets. Many of the Institute's researchers have been frequent guests on radio and TV programmes — so that both the relevant authorities and the general public could get familiar with their findings. Undoubtedly, they remember Natalia Panina's insightful instructions on how to communicate professionally with journalists and present the research data to the public.

Natalia Panina successfully collaborated with social scientists from the USA (Stony Brook University), Germany, Poland, Hungary, Russia (Levada Analytical Centre), France, etc. One of the joint research projects she took part in was related to the school performance and psychological well-being of children evacuated from Chornobyl. She authored or co-authored over 200 academic papers, several monographs and manuals. All of her works have been widely recognised. As Evelyn J. Bromet, Professor of Psychiatry and Preventive Medicine at Stony Brook University pointed out, "it is simply astonishing that one investigator could have had such enormous foresight and influence on her field".

Just as Natalia Panina inspired everyone with whom she worked, so too she was highly supportive of young researchers. The "Junior Sociologist of the Year" contest held annually since 2007 was originally designed to honour her support and encouragement of sociologists at the start of their careers, and the Natalia Panina Prize is the first award in Ukraine established by an academic community. According to the rules, contestants shall write an essay on a topic designated by the Contest Jury, which is closely related to the central theme of the conference. So far, a diverse range of topics have been covered, in-

cluding the current status of sociology, up-to-date techniques for data collection and analysis, professional culture, sociological imagination, the Euromaidan events, etc.

Having summarised Natalia Panina's invaluable contribution to the national social science, ***Valerii Vorona,*** Director of the Institute of Sociology and Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, moved on to the next issue — the role of sociology today, in a globalising society. "We live in the world changing at an ever-increasing pace," noted Dr. Vorona. "Some changes are perceived and interpreted positively, while others are not. But whatever way they are interpreted, they are enormous and irreversible. It is difficult to predict what sociology will be like in a few decades or even years, what sociologists will have to deal with. They should do their best in order to gain and keep their competitive edge." ***Vil' Bakirov,*** Chancellor of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University and President of Ukrainian Sociological Association, added that "nowadays we are witnessing many stormy events like protests, revolts, revolutions. We have thoroughly described and explained some of them. But we have only scratched the surface. We must go well below the surface and comprehend the deep-seated driving forces of large-scale social changes, which are extremely hard to explain. We must discover universal principles that explicate basic social processes and are applicable to Ukrainian society, which is fairly different from Western European ones. This is the assignment that the upcoming sociologists should set themselves." ***Yevhen Golovakha,*** Deputy Director of the Institute of Sociology, commented that "the new generation of sociologists have unarguable advantages over their predecessors, first of all, instant access to information. They have all the latest data at their fingertips; they also have mastered state-or-the-art research techniques. Figuratively speaking, the world is their oyster. However, they should in no way discard classical theories and approaches. These are what constitute the very basis of any research." In addition, he expressed thanks to everyone participating and wished the conference a great success.

Then it was the keynote speakers' turn to walk up to the lectern and share their ideas and findings.

Serhii Makeev, Head of the Social Structures Department at the Institute of Sociology, and ***Natalia Kovalisko,*** Professor at the Ivan Franko National University of L'viv, opened the main part of the plenary session.

Explaining the theme of the presentation **("The Global and the Local in the Narrative of Inequality")**, the researchers drew the audience's attention to the word "narrative" — as the most appropriate way of understanding and interpreting the inequality concept.

To date, there is no comprehensive definition of inequality, although many sciences, economics in particular, have been studying it for a long time. Inequality is prone to confusion in public debate as it often means different things to different people. There are many ways of measuring inequality, but sometimes they lead to inconsistent and contradictory results. There is no single criterion that allows drawing clear-cut distinctions between the rich and the poor. Economists, for instance, draw on household income data as the basic indicator of inequality: the more unevenly income is distributed, the more unequal the country is. But these figures may not include such income sources as welfare payments, disability allowances, gratuitous help from family members, undeclared rental income, etc. Another essential point is that inequality is not limited to the income gap. Gender, race, social status matter as well. Sociologists, for example, argue for the use of the category of social class (devised mainly by John Goldthorpe) when describing inequality. Some of them (Claude S. Fischer) relate inequality to unequal access to public goods.

There is no consensus among researchers regarding how to calculate inequality accurately. The Gini coefficient, the most commonly used measure of income inequality, is being criticised and replaced by the Palma index (the ratio of the income share of the top

10% to that of the bottom 40%). However, regardless of the way it is calculated, inequality is unlikely to be reduced. Instead, it keeps rising. Quite a few scholars contend that inequality is a greater evil than poverty, although "ending poverty in all its forms everywhere" has been declared the primary goal on the United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda. Inequality is pervasive — it affects both rich and poor countries. This is the central idea of Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett's book "The Spirit Level: Why Greater Equality Makes Societies Stronger". Using the United Nations, the World Bank, the World Health Organisation and the US Census data sets, the researchers have shown that unequal societies are plagued by lots of social problems such as reduced life expectancy, poor physical and mental health, social estrangement, consumerism, etc. What is more, the effects of inequality are not confined to the poor. As a whole, unequal societies are less functional, less cohesive and less healthy than their more equal counterparts.

The speakers pointed out one more disquieting phenomenon known as misperception of inequality — in other words, ordinary people's opinions on whether (and to what extent) their country is equal or not, as well as their ideas about the change in inequality in their country over time[2]. Usually, people are more prone to overestimate social inequality, although the underestimations also take place. In fact, they project local perceptions (largely influenced by a person's immediate environment, stories about "the rich and famous" in media, etc.) onto their estimates of national inequality. This often intensifies their concerns about unfairness in society and shapes their political behaviour. Vladimir Gimpelson and Daniel Treisman underscored that perceived inequality — not the actual level — correlates strongly with demand for redistribution. On the other hand, people tend to oppose economic globalisation and European integration believing that it only benefits the elites. As a French economist Thomas Piketty aptly noted, "it is understandable that people turn their backs on the EU"[3].

National economies are not the only area undergoing profound transformations in the age of globalisation — its impact is extending to the sociopolitical fabric of countries the world over. Nation-states, despite remaining the primary building blocks for social and political governance, are likely to be overshadowed by metropolitan cities. The latter, having taken up the role of powerful centres for science, technology, commerce, finance and culture, are being increasingly regarded as the true drivers of globalisation and sources of alternative political agendas. The influence of nation-states is waning; furthermore, they are often labelled "outdated", "unnatural, even dysfunctional, units for organising human activity and managing economic endeavour" in today's world. Instead, cities are considered "the engines of the greatest upsurge in innovation, creativity and problem-solving in human history"[4].

The concentration of power in metropolises is hardly an oddity. Throughout history, they have possessed economic, political and cultural prominence (like city-states in Mesopotamia, ancient Greece and medieval Italy, the Hanseatic League encompassing all key seaports in the north-western and eastern parts of Europe). As a French philosopher *Henri*

---

2 Gimpelson, V., Treisman, D. (2015). *Misperceiving Inequality. NBER Working Paper 21174*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

3 "The Myth of National Sovereignty Helps Big Corporations Screw Us Over". Thomas Piketty on Globalisation Ills. (2014). Retrieved from: http://www.theeuropean-magazine.com/thomas-piketty—2/9351-thomas-piketty-on-globalizations-ills.

4 For more detail see: Eger, J. M. (s. a.) Globalisation 3.0 is Shifting Power From Nations to Cities Around the World. Retrieved from: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-m-eger/globalization-30-is-shift_b_9766282.html.

Lefebvre (1902–1991) pointed out in his book "The Urban Revolution" (1970), people living in cities "experience the intertwining of the threads of their activities". In addition, the likelihood of nation-states' relegation to the background is not surprising either. Political boundaries between states have never been immutable; rather they have changed to a greater or lesser extent, and states have been sometimes unable to maintain their existence. Let's not forget either that globalisation itself, albeit it does not erase formal interstate boundaries, tends to make them easily transcendable — above all, due to the rapid development of information and communication technology.

Globalisation goes hand in hand with urbanisation. Cities already have demographic weight on their side: it is estimated that in 2016, 54.5% of the world's population lived in urban settlements. Big cities are swiftly becoming cosmopolitan, bringing together people from ethnically and culturally diverse backgrounds. According to the World Atlas, 37% of London's, 38% of Singapore's, 46% of Toronto's, 62% of Brussels' and 83% (!) of Dubai's population are foreign-born. However, despite this dramatic shift of power from nation-states to cities, they are still inextricably linked with each other. Neither is likely to go away, and both of them will need one another. But as long as forms of relations between nation-states and big cities (often referred to as city-states) remain unchanged, conflicts between them will be unavoidable either. As ***Pal Tamas,*** Director of the Social Policy Research Centre at Corvinus University of Budapest, put it, these may be political anxieties about the nature of cultural changes, or tensions between international market forces (represented by entrepreneurs, foreign investors) and state control (represented by government officials), or cities' aspirations for a greater degree of autonomy.

Unfettered urban growth also entails considerable problems such as traffic congestion, air pollution (which is typical of East Asian metropolises), social and cultural disparities between different districts of the same city, affordable housing crisis. The connection between cities' use value (which implies their usefulness to people) and exchange value (which views them primarily as places for investment) seems to have been broken. Cities are being expected to attract capital, even from dubious sources, rather than to serve their residents' needs, who, in Lefebvrian terms, now have to reclaim their "right to the city".

One of the main reasons why people decide to leave their home country for a more prosperous and promising one is clear: they are seeking a better life, especially those who are moving out for good. Labour migrants usually do not have plans to settle. They are interested in getting a better paying job, or getting any job if they come from unemployment-hit areas. However, regardless of whether a person is going to live in another country permanently or stay there temporarily, they will experience considerable difficulties adjusting to a new environment — even in countries that are geographically, historically and culturally close to Ukraine. As for job opportunities offered to immigrants, they may vary not only from one country to another, but also within the same country. ***Slawomira Gruszewska,*** Professor at the University of Szczecin (Poland), who has been carrying out comparative social studies for many years and therefore is quite keen on researching into Ukrainian reality, supplied the conference attendees with relevant and very helpful information about **job prospects and working conditions for Ukrainian immigrants in each region of Poland.** The researcher also outlined the major risks that labour migrants usually face in that country: difficulties in obtaining work permit and health insurance, an employer's unwillingness to draw up an employment contract, expensive apartment rentals in some cities such as Warsaw, strict and unfriendly workplace rules, late wage/salary payments, situations when a person has to take a less agreeable job or work on an unrecorded basis, employment fraud and even criminal proceedings.

Administratively, Poland consists of 16 subnational entities called "wojewodztwa" (voivodeships). According to the most up-to-date figures provided by the National Labour Inspectorate and several local employment agencies in Poland, Ukrainian immi-

grants are unevenly distributed across the country. They are mostly concentrated in Lubelskie (Lublin) and Wielkopolskie (Greater Poland) voivodeships — as of 31 May 2017, about 75,000 and 60,000 Ukrainians worked there, respectively. Far fewer Ukrainian immigrants work in Podlasie (8,000) and Kuiavian-Pomeranian (4,800) voivodeships. Warmia-Mazury voivodeship offers the worst job prospects for Ukrainians — due to high unemployment rate in that region.

Dr. Gruszewska remarked that job opportunities for Ukrainian immigrants have widened recently. Although Ukrainians are still most often employed as construction/restoration workers, gardeners and caregivers, there is a growing demand for engineers, teachers, doctors and nurses. Besides, young Ukrainians going to Polish universities (e. g., Maria Curie-Sklodowska University in Lublin) stand a good chance of getting hired. Usually, they start working while studying.

The next presenter was ***Olena Simonchuk,*** Senior Research Fellow of the Social Structures Department at the Institute of Sociology and a renowned expert in the field of social and class analysis of Ukrainian society. She gave a detailed and thought-provoking description of **the dynamics and socio-demographic make-up of protest attitudes in post-Soviet Ukraine.** For this purpose, Dr. Simonchuk used the data of annual nationwide representative surveys conducted by the Institute from 1994 to 2017. Emphasis was placed on the change in a protest potential index; to be more precise, on a figure reflecting the so-called "destabilising ability" of protest potential. By definition, it shows the likelihood of mass protests that are supposed to destabilise the country. Mass protests are likely to happen when this index reaches 4.4, i. e. an assumed threshold value.

The calculation technique for the index of destabilising ability protest potential (IDAPP)[5] involves a respondent's answering the question whether and in which protest actions they would participate if their rights/interests were infringed. The respondent should select one or more options from 13 included in a list. Those who do not find any of the protest actions effective and, therefore, are not willing to protest, are classified as "potentially passive". Conversely, "potentially active" respondents are ready to stand up for their rights by means of protests. Some of them choose only lawful (and peaceful) actions while others are also inclined to unlawful protests, which are unsanctioned and often violent (occupying government buildings, joining illegal armed groups, etc.).

In a democratic society, protests are generally seen as a kind of dialogue between the authorities and ordinary citizens, a way of expressing public discontent over controversial issues and finding possible solutions to them. Large-scale protests occur only if there are enough people ready to pour into the streets. And they are likely to turn into violent actions and thus destabilise the country's overall situation if there is a relatively large proportion of people who do not hesitate to resort to unlawful protests.

To date, Ukraine has experienced at least four waves of mass protests: in 1998 (coal miners' strikes), 2000–2001 ("Ukraine Without Kuchma", a campaign calling for the then president Leonid Kuchma's resignation), 2004 (the Orange Revolution) and 2013–2014 (Euromaidan). These events, despite being different in terms of causes, character, scope and driving forces, coincided with an upsurge in the IDAPP: 4.2, 4.6, 4.6 and 5.4 respectively.

The speaker also exhaustively compared the IDAPP of different social groups of Ukrainian society. According to the survey data, younger (18–29 and 30–55-year-olds) and better educated respondents are more favourable to protests, men are more likely to engage in protest actions than women. Urban residents are more willing to protest than

5 For more detail see: Golovakha, Ye. I., Panina, N. V. (1999). The Protest Potential of Ukrainian Society. [In Russian]. *Sociological Studies,* 10, 31–40.

their rural counterparts. In general, the differences regarding the respondent's sex, age, educational attainment, social class and settlement type have been stably reproduced over a 23-year period, whereas others (region of residence, nationality and native language) have undergone significant changes. For example, mine workers from Eastern Ukraine (mostly Russian-speaking) were a driving force in the late 1990s strikes while residents of western and central regions, whose mother tongue is Ukrainian, constituted the majority of the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan participants. Interestingly, during Euromaidan the highest IDAPP (7.0) was recorded among rural people, who are usually not very eager to take part in protests.

In conclusion, the speaker underlined that the IDAPP for Ukraine as a whole remained relatively high (4.3) in 2017. However, this is not a worrying but an encouraging sign — as the percentage of people choosing lawful protest actions continues to rise. At the time of the survey, there were about 1.5 times as many people who preferred defending their rights and interests peacefully compared to 2004 — the year of the Orange Revolution, which, in a sense, became a turning point in Ukraine's post-Soviet history. This convincingly indicates that Ukrainian society is getting mature.

The plenary meeting concluded with the presentation **"Local Projections of Ukrainian Sociology on the Internet as a Global Network: The Experience of Analysing Google Scholar Data"** delivered by ***Serhii Dembitskyi,*** Senior Research Fellow of the Institute's Department of Methodology and Methods of Sociology, who is also the winner of the 2016 Natalia Panina Prize.

His research had a twofold aim: first, to find out which of Ukrainian sociologists are cited the most and so to measure their impact; second, to determine the ranking of sociology among other social sciences (history, archaeology, law, psychology, political science, etc.). For this purpose, Dr. Dembitskyi had analysed over 4,000 Google Scholar profiles (including deceased researchers) belonging to the cluster "Social Sciences". Initially, all the information concerning Ukrainian sociologists (bibliographical references and citation indices) had been gathered from the website "V. I. Vernads'kyi National Library of Ukraine, Social Communications Research Centre" and processed using the *R* statistical software. Then, this data set was merged with that on Google Scholar containing the number of citations for each paper.

According to the research findings, the most highly cited Ukrainian sociologists are as follows: Yevhen Golovakha (e. g., his paper on a person's psychological age has received 164 citations so far); Natalia Panina (the paper "Comparison of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder Symptom Subtypes in Ukrainian Schoolchildren", co-authored by Kenneth D. Gadow, Joyce Sprafkin and others, has received 127 citations); Natalia Kostenko ("Cultural Identities: Transformations and Recognitions", 38 citations); Serhii Makeev ("Social Structuration in Today's Ukraine", 28 citations) and Anatolii Ruchka ("Distinctive Features of Systemic Transformation of Today's Ukrainian Society", 17 citations). Sociology is ranked third based on citation metrics (after public policy & administration and archaeology). However, these conclusions require further consideration as some Ukrainian social scientists have not created a Google Scholar profile yet.

The second part of the conference commenced with a welcome from ***Oleksandr Stegnii,*** Vice Chair of the **"Junior Sociologist of the Year"** Contest Jury, Leading Research Fellow of the Institute's Department of Methodology and Methods of Sociology. Dr. Stegnii appreciated the contestants' hard work, creativity and interest in the event, then he told a brief history of the contest. He reminded that the Natalia Panina Prize was not an award established by the government; it had been initiated by an academic community. ***Pavlo Kutuev,*** Head of the Chair of Sociology and Law at the National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", added that young researchers had always shown a lively interest in the event. Overall, nearly 100 sociologists,

from both Ukraine and abroad (including Germany and Turkey), had submitted their essays. Their papers were published each year in a conference proceedings book.

According to the conference schedule, each of the contestants was supposed to deliver a short presentation (up to five minutes) clarifying the main points of their essays and then field the audience's questions.

The researchers spoke on a wide range of issues such as lack of social solidarity coupled with distrust of social institutions, challenges posed by globalisation to universities, commodification of education, citizens' growing alienation from the state. All the speakers communicated their ideas, challenges and concerns in a straightforward and enthusiastic manner. Some of them sounded overly critical, especially when it came to the tasks that sociology should undertake. But is it easy to take a middle-ground approach in times when every mould is being broken?

After the presentations, there was a round-table *discussion* which made the conference even more memorable. Ol'ha Balakirieva, Chair of the Board of an independent research organisation "Oleksandr Yaremenko Ukrainian Institute of Social Studies", Andrii Horbachyk, Dean of the Faculty of Sociology at the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Liudmyla Sokurians'ka, Vice-President of Ukrainian Sociological Association, Professor at V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Valentyna Podshivalkina, Professor at I. I. Mechnikov Odesa National University, Olena Lisiienko, Professor of the Department of Philosophy, Sociology and Management of Social and Cultural Activities at K. D. Ushyns'kyi South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University (Odesa), Natalia Kostenko, Head of the Sociology of Culture and Mass Communications Department at the Institute of Sociology, Refik Kurtseitov, Head of the Social Sciences and Humanities Department at Crimean University of Engineering and Pedagogy, were among those joining the discussion and airing their views.

Then followed the most exciting bit: ***Ol'ha Kutsenko,*** Chair of the Contest Jury, Professor at the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, and ***Volodymyr Paniotto,*** co-founder of Natalia Panina Sociological Centre, announced the honourees. The first prize went to ***Oksana Dutchak***, PhD Student of the Sociology Department at the National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute". She presented the essay "The High Cost of Cheap Labour: Ukraine as a Branded Clothing Manufacturer in Global Supply Chains". The second prize was shared between ***Alina Kalashnikova,*** Senior Lecturer of the Sociology Department at V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University ("Ukrainian Society: Global and Local Projections Under the Sign of Unpredictability") and ***Nadiia Korytnykova,*** Associate Professor of the same department ("Ukrainian Sociology in a Digitised Society") as the Jury had decided not to award the third prize.

Iryna Krapyva, Consolidated Information Analyst of the Marketing Department at "Telecommunications Technologies Ltd." (Odesa) received the Iryna Popova Prize. This is a special prize established in honour of Iryna Popova (1931–2008), an outstanding Ukrainian scholar, who is considered to be a founder of the Odesa School of Sociology. I. Krapyva's essay ("Projections for the Development of Ukrainian Society Under the Reform of Education System") was recognised as having social and practical significance. The essay submitted by ***Maksym Yenin,*** Associate Professor of the Sociology Department at the National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", was also highly commended by the Jury. It was focused on social movements in Ukraine from a post-Euromaidan perspective.

Closing the conference, ***Yevhen Golovakha*** congratulated the winners and the runners-up and wished them success in their endeavour. He also thanked all the participants for their commitment and continued support.

The audience watched two videos, which featured Natalia Panina presenting a paper at the conference "Sociology and Politics" (Kyiv, 19–21 June 2003) and Iryna Popova giving a welcome address at the 1st International Conference in memory of Natalia Panina on 10 December 2007.

The essays submitted to the contest "2017 Junior Sociologist of the Year" by other contestants:

"Global and Local Projections: The Symbolic as the Social" *(Andrii Bahins'kyi,* PhD Student of the Sociology Department at the National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute")

"Globalisation of Education in Ukraine: Challenges and Consequences" *(Bohdan Dykan',* PhD Student of the Sociology Department at the National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute")

"Camera Obscura(nti): Global and Local Projections of the Ukrainian Society" *(Oleksandr Holikov,* Associate Professor of the Sociology Department at V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University)

"The Concept of Identity: Ukrainian Context" *(Anastasiia Dons'ka,* PhD Student of the Department of Theory and History of Sociology at the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

"Global and Local Projections: The Code of Sociology" *(Oleksii Yakubin,* Senior Lecturer of the Sociology Department at the National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute")

"Ukrainian Society: Global and Local Projections" *(Ol'ha Onufrienko,* PhD Student of the Sociology Department at the National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute")

"Accept Yourself: An Honest View on Ukrainian Society" *(Olena Koval'ska,* Assistant Lecturer of the Department of Methodology and Methods for Sociological Research at the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

OL'HA MAKSYMENKO,
leading sociologist of the Department of Methodology and Methods of Sociology,
Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Received 26.02.2018