

Sketching a future for sociology and sociologists

A conference in memory of Natalia Panina and Myroslav Popovich

On 10 December 2018, the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Ukraine was proud to host an international conference in honour of two prominent figures in the field of philosophy and social sciences — **Myroslav Popovich (1930–2018)** and **Natalia Panina (1949–2006)**. The theme of the conference, “**The sociology of the future and the future of sociology in the 21st century**”, was supposed to elicit views about what the future may have in store for this discipline, what sociology will be like in the century called by a perceptive scholar Yevhen Golovakha as early as 2001 a century of “escalating anthropogenesis”, what sociologists will soon have to deal with and what they should do in order to gain and retain a competitive edge.

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

Opening the plenary session of the conference, **Valerii Vorona**, Director of the Institute of Sociology and Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, together with **Vil Bakirov**, Chancellor of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University and President of Ukrainian Sociological Association, cordially greeted the participants and guests, wished the conference a great success and expressed gratitude to all those who had worked hard to make the event happen.

The conference, also known as the International Sociological Readings in memory of Natalia Panina, has been held annually since 2007 on the same date — on the anniversary of her birth, which (perhaps not fortuitously) coincides with the International Human Rights Day. But “this time”, as Dr Vorona noted, “the Institute has brought together sociologists and philosophers to pay homage to another acclaimed scholar as well — Myroslav Popovich, who, being a philosopher, also showed a genuine interest in sociology and had substantially contributed to the revival of this realm of scientific knowledge”.

Both Natalia Panina and Myroslav Popovich were outstanding personalities, recognised and respected far beyond their homeland. Both of them were — and continue to be — admired for their extraordinary talent, dedication and integrity. They took part in numerous research projects, authored and co-authored dozens of books and research papers, gave countless interviews to the press and broadcast media. Their commitment and professionalism were recognised with special awards: Natalia Panina was awarded the State Prize in Science and Technology, while Myroslav Popovich was honoured with the Order of Prince Yaroslav the Wise and with the rank of Chevalier of the Légion d’Honneur. And their efforts paved the way for the sociology as we know it today.

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. At the dawn of Ukraine’s independence, 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 Golo-

vakha, presently Deputy Director of the Institute of Sociology, who was also her lifelong companion, Dr Panina developed a set of concepts and research techniques in order to scientifically analyse a society undergoing major transformations. However, to put these trailblazing ideas into practice, the researchers had plenty of work to do. First, there was no efficient republic-wide network of interviewers operating on a regular basis at that time. There were no guidelines for building a sample representative of Ukraine's population either. Most sociologists had not as yet carried out a representative survey on their own; besides, they had not graduated in sociology (it was not until the mid-1980s that the first sociology departments within universities were set up). To fill these gaps, Natalia Panina and colleagues adapted a set of sampling techniques for prospective use in Ukraine and trained a team of fieldworkers and supervisors. Thus, nationwide social surveys were started. It was decided to conduct them annually in order to record and analyse the changes in key social indicators. The project known as "*Ukrainian society: the monitoring of social changes*" came into being in 1992 and shortly afterwards united sociologists from around Ukraine.

The survey results have been published not only in monographs and reputable academic journals 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 data to the public.

Being an exceptionally skilful and dedicated scholar, Dr Panina attached the utmost importance to professionalism and good reputation, utterly opposing everything that even slightly resembled research misconduct. She elaborated and promoted "*The code of professional ethics for sociologists*", which was approved by the 5th Congress of Ukrainian Sociological Association in 2004. In addition, Natalia Panina successfully collaborated with social scientists from the USA (Stony Brook University), Germany, Poland, Hungary, Russia (Levada Analytical Centre), France, etc. 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".

Similarly, Myroslav Popovich's contribution to the national science is inestimable too. And his versatility is indeed incredible. He explored an immense variety of topics and published the results of his inquiries in about 400 scholarly works, including monographs. "*The world view of ancient Slavs*" (1985), "*Mykola Hohol*" (1989), "*Ukraine and Europe: the right and the left*" (1996), "*Essays on the history of Ukrainian culture*" (1998), "*The red century*" (2005), "*Hryhorii Skovoroda: the philosophy of freedom*" (2008) and "*Being a human*" (2011) are the most famous among them. Talking about "The red century" book, **Anatolii Yermolenko**, Director of H. S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, emphasised that it is not only an exhaustive study of the past century from a historical standpoint but also a concise encyclopaedia of phobias, drawbacks, divergences and latent threats which resulted in countless victims. "If you had time to read only one book on the history of communism", added Dr Yermolenko, "this book would be the best choice. 'The red century' explores that tragic epoch in detail, but at the same time it does not require any special knowledge of the subject. It is accessible to everyone regardless of their interests or educational background".

As for Myroslav Popovich's another work, "Hryhorii Skovoroda: the philosophy of freedom", it aimed to portray this philosophical genius in a different light. A remarkably open-minded writer, Dr. Popovich was strongly opposed to the idea of "canonising" this person (as well as anybody else), which used to be a common practice in the Soviet Union. Actually, the **philosophy of freedom** was the principle that M. Popovich himself faithfully followed throughout his life. He never fitted the mould of a typical Soviet scholar. Needless to say, thinking and speaking freely in a repressive, dogma-burdened society like

the Soviet one was quite challenging, if ever possible. But integrity, maturity and perseverance (or what the President of Ukrainian Philosophical Foundation *Serhii Proleiev* referred to as “**the courage to use your own reason**”¹) stopped him from turning away from the chosen path. And what else set M. Popovich apart was his everlasting commitment to core humanistic values: freedom, honesty, responsibility and justice.

As said at the beginning of this article, Dr Popovich had a keen interest in social sciences, sociology in particular. He aspired to revive this area of knowledge in Ukraine as early as the 1960s and put his aspirations into action by heading up a newly founded department at the Institute of Philosophy, which focused on the methodology, methods and techniques of social research. Myroslav Popovich held the post for three years (1967–1969) and launched a series of discussions on such issues as designing a theoretical and methodological framework for applied social research, carrying out a sociological survey at industrial enterprises, putting forward and verifying a hypothesis in sociological research, etc. In a sense, the department was the forerunner of the Institute of Sociology, which has been a full-fledged academic institution since November 1990.

Just as M. Popovich was an indefatigable researcher and a man of massive erudition, so too he took a very active part in Ukraine’s political life. In 1989, in the times when the Communist Party was the only one allowed by law, he became a co-founder of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Narodnyi Rukh) and was closely involved in the drafting of guiding principles for this organisation. He was also one of the members of the First December public interest group established in 2011 on the 20th anniversary of the referendum on Ukraine’s independence.

Myroslav Popovich was a true patriot — yet he never endorsed Ukraine’s independence in a manner which could have discouraged those to whom the idea of living in a sovereign state was unfamiliar. He was frequently seen in Maidan during the Orange Revolution in 2004–2005 and the Revolution of Dignity in 2013–2014. Later, in 2015, M. Popovich wrote: “Maidan is far more than just an overthrow of the government... Unlike, for example, the Revolution on Granite in 1990, which ended with a mere replacement of one government with another, Maidan has changed Ukraine’s political order. And this will never be reversed”².

He passed away on 10 February 2018, leaving an invaluable scientific legacy. A few days later, the President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko posthumously bestowed the Medal of Freedom upon Dr Popovich “for outstanding accomplishments in the establishment of Ukraine’s sovereignty and independence, consolidation of Ukrainian society and development of democracy, for long and productive academic and sociopolitical activity”.

Having introduced the audience to some key facts of the life of this remarkable philosopher and thinker, Dr Proleiev once again underlined that both Myroslav Popovich’s and Natalia Panina’s works had marked a new era for Ukrainian science and would always be of benefit to the whole Ukrainian nation. “Unarguably, they will inspire many generations to come”, he concluded.

Then it was the other keynote speakers’ turn to walk up to the lectern and share their ideas and findings. *Olga Kutsenko*, Head of the Department of Social Structures and Social Relations of the Faculty of Sociology (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv) delivered a speech titled “**The future of sociology from the perspective of the 19th ISA World Congress**”. The Congress, which took place in Toronto on 15–21 July 2018, invited about 5,800 social scientists and practitioners from 101 countries in order to discuss the most pressing problems of our time and work out feasible solutions. The slogan

¹ A quotation from Immanuel Kant.

² For more detail see: Patriotism without nationalism: Ukraine bids farewell to philosopher Myroslav Popovich. *Ukraine Crisis Media Center* (2018, February 16). Retrieved from <http://uacrisis.org/64546-patriotism-without-nationalism-myroslav-popovich>.

of this flagship event, *“Power, violence and justice: reflections, responses and responsibilities”*, spoke for itself. As the then President of the International Sociological Association Margaret Abraham¹ pointed out, “sociologists have been concerned with power, violence and justice since the inception of the discipline”. These phenomena have always left an indelible imprint on society and impacted human lives in multiple ways. However, different countries (and cultures) have a different understanding of power and violence and differently respond to them. Hence, one of the aims of the Congress was to look from a new angle at the structural dimensions of power and violence, as well as at the major socio-historical institutions through which they operate. The participants were also seeking answers to such questions as how power flows through these institutions, what are their contradictions and fault lines, why “anormative social regulation now dominates social control” (M. Archer), where and how we can expect human agency and emerging struggles for justice to be potentially successful.

Recent years have been marked by “burgeoning authoritarianism”, extreme instability and intensifying enmities. New geopolitical power configurations and confrontations are emerging, with violence being used as a tool to oppress and also to resist oppression. Sociologists feel compelled to revisit research topics and bring to the forefront such issues as forced migration and displacement, dispossession, land appropriation, race- and gender-based crimes, “brutalisation of politics and society” (G. Mosse), movements for social justice and even, as Randall Collins once put it, “symbiosis of terrorist tactics and high tech”. By the same token, research patterns are also needed to be changed: scholars will have to climb down “from the tower of academia” and modify their “channels of communicating”, clarify their “findings and insights into a manner that can be heard”, “engage in collective action to build a better and more just world” (M. Abraham).

As for overall vision of the future of sociology, this realm of knowledge should (quite expectedly) be global, inclusive and at the same time take local contexts into consideration. Hence, indigenous knowledge, which used to be peripheral to this discipline, will continue to gain in importance. In turn, this involves what has recently been termed “decolonisation of sociology” (Z. Zevallos), a shift “from the West to the rest” (M. Abraham), “emancipation from Western knowledge production hegemony” (S. Hanafi) and elaboration of a “sociological theory beyond the canon” (S. Alatas and V. Sinha). The newly elected ISA President Sari Hanafi also proposed that sociologists from different countries strive for dialogue, instead of adhering to “antagonistic binary categories” (like tradition/modernity or East/West).

The future of sociology is impossible to imagine without considering the very basics of this discipline. These are **methods of empirical research** whose staple is a sample survey. The history of this technique can be traced back to the 1824 United States presidential election, when “The Harrisburg Pennsylvanian” newspaper undertook the first-ever public opinion poll, now known as a “straw vote”², or, more formally, as non-probability sampling. Roughly speaking, straw polls were a crude version of the modern public opinion survey. The straw poll era lasted for over 100 years — until 1936, the year when the national poll organised by George Gallup correctly predicted the outcome of the presidential election, whereas the forecast made by “Literary Digest”, an influential weekly magazine of the time, turned out to be flagrantly wrong. In fact, what helped G. Gallup obtain accurate results was a novel polling technique based on a nationally representative sample. From then onwards, public opinion polls were carried out regularly, and they covered a lot of subjects apart from Americans’ electoral preferences. For instance, Gallup inter-

¹ Since 1949 (the year when the ISA was founded), its presidents have served three- or four-year terms from one World Congress to the next.

² “The American heritage dictionary of idioms” explains that “straw poll” alludes to a straw used to show in what direction the wind blows, in this case the wind of public opinion.

viewers were asking about wartime rations in the 1940s, about the Korean War in the 1950s, civil rights riots in the 1960s and the Watergate scandal in the 1970s. Consumer behaviour was also studied by means of public opinion surveys. Face-to-face (F2F) interview had been the fundamental social survey technique for decades. However, a disquieting trend appeared in the early 1990s: the percentage of respondents willing to participate in surveys began to fall. Low response rates were attributed to different factors: from the “respondent fatigue” phenomenon to physical barriers (like gated entryways), which hampered interviewers’ work. F2F was gradually being replaced by other methods: computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI), computer-assisted self-interviewing (CASI)¹ and online surveys. More or less, they have proved their usefulness. In Ukraine, as mentioned earlier, public opinion polls had not been carried out before 1992. Yet, Ukrainian researchers have quickly caught up with their Western counterparts, and today social surveys are being conducted on a massive scale.

Having given an informative picture of the evolution of social survey methods, **Volodymyr Paniotto**, Professor at the Sociology Department of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Social Technologies (National University of “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy”), made the audience familiar with some of the state-of-the-art techniques that are widely applied in marketing research, such as eye tracking (exploring consumers’ visual behaviour through measuring their eye activity) and facial coding (capturing facial muscle movements that correspond to a displayed emotion and thereby measuring emotional response to a product)². He also talked of Big Data, or large, dynamic and complex data sets containing a wealth of information, which are often seen as a major competitor of conventional surveys. Naturally, technological advances will enable the emergence of ever more sophisticated research methods, and many of them will probably yield instant results. However, Dr Paniotto does not think that traditional public opinion surveys will vanish soon. In his view, the most essential change will involve commingling the data that they produce with the information from other sources (including Big Data). Therefore, new approaches to blending survey and non-survey data, as well as new guidelines for respondent recruitment and principles of research ethics should be elaborated.

The next presenter was **Slawomira Gruszewska**, Professor at the University of Szczecin (Poland). Apart from studying post-communist societies in comparative perspective, Dr. Gruszewska is also recognised as a psychologist and a social worker. Her latest book “*Dar dna*” (“*The gift of the bottom*”) is both a collection of moving stories told by people who had to suffer various hardships and a description of psychological treatments provided to those people. The focus of S. Gruszewska’s speech was on **the tasks that sociologists and psychologists are supposed to perform** in a society where hierarchy of social and ethical values (good financial standing, knowledge, cultural baggage, health, family, friends, empathy, individualism, etc.) is considerably changing.

The plenary meeting concluded with the presentation “**The sociology of understanding: from a science without a future to the science for the future**” given by **Oksana Dutchak**, PhD Student at the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Sociology and Law (National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”), who is also the winner of the 2017 Natalia Panina Prize. The main points that were touched upon included the role of public sociology in shaping collective con-

¹ According to the “Encyclopaedia of survey research methods”, *computer assisted self-interviewing (CASI)* is a technique for survey data collection in which the respondent uses a computer to complete the survey questionnaire without an interviewer administering it to the respondent. A primary rationale for CASI is that some questions are so sensitive that if researchers hope to obtain an accurate answer, respondents must use a highly confidential method of responding.

² Both techniques require special hard- and software.

sciousness and fighting “vulgar” individualism in society, as well as the necessity of bridging the gap between scholarship and social activism.

The second part of the conference commenced with a short but effective welcome speech by **Oleksandr Stegnii**, Vice Chair of the “**Junior Sociologist of the Year**” Contest Jury, Leading Research Fellow of the Department of Methodology and Methods of Sociology (Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine). First of all, Dr Stegnii appreciated the contestants’ hard work, creativity and interest in the event. Then he briefly traced the history of the contest. He reminded the audience that Natalia Panina had been highly supportive of young researchers, which is why the “Junior Sociologist of the Year” had originally been designed to honour her support and encouragement of sociologists at the start of their careers. “The Natalia Panina Prize is not an award established by the government, it is the first award in Ukraine initiated by an academic community”, underscored Dr Stegnii. **Paolo Kutuev**, Head of the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Sociology and Law at the National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”, added that “young scholars have always demonstrated a passionate interest in the event”. Overall, above 100 sociologists, from both Ukraine and abroad (including Germany and Turkey), have submitted their essays since 2007 — the year when the contest was held for the first time.

In 2018, twelve talented and enthusiastic young researchers from Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv and Mykolaiv took part in the contest. Although their essays were centred around the one topic assigned by the Jury (which ought to be closely related to the theme of the conference), they covered a wide range of issues, from human and non-human social actors¹ (B. Dykan) to the necessity of revising the existing class schemes and choosing different classification criteria, e. g. moral principles (A. Tashchenko). The contestants’ opinions on the role of sociology in society and its prospects (even in the short run) also fairly diverged.

Anyway, before reflecting on the future of sociology it makes sense to analyse the present state of this area of knowledge. From now on, as **Oleksandr Holikov** puts it, “sociology must not ignore its positioning in the space of the social”. Sociopolitical context — in other words, what makes one society or state different from the other — is crucial. Sociology has no future if it does not “take on board” (and without any reservation) such powerful artefacts of human thought as “freedom”, “alienation”, “society”, “complexity”, etc.

Talking about the current state of Ukrainian sociology, the young researchers drew attention to a number of problems. For instance, **Oksana Kovtun** focused on what is lacking in Ukraine’s present higher education system (in particular, when it comes to the teaching of sociology) and what we ourselves can do to bridge “the gap between university and the real world”. **Tymofii Brik** added that he is firmly against the idea of explaining the history of sociology to students as “a path from one crisis to the next”. In his view, such dramatisation is no good for this discipline. Sociologists, by definition, should comprehensively study society and fulfil their potential as researchers. Of course, they should continuously develop their creativity. But it does not mean that every single day they should take on the task of “building up or rescuing” sociology. He believes it would be better for this discipline to “become a little more cheerful and less pompous”.

Particular attention was given to the applied strand of sociology, i. e. public opinion research. In this regard, **Bohdan Bondarets** expressed concern that both the general public and even academic communities (especially in the post-Soviet space) think of sociology as a mere series of public opinion surveys and unduly reduce the available repertoire of research methods to the gathering of empirical evidence by using a questionnaire. He stressed that sociology needs to get rid of this “demoscopic bias”, and sociologists ought to learn how to develop and formulate theories that adequately describe social reality. Oksana Kovtun, by contrast, is entirely convinced that “sociologists won’t be successful

¹ As they are called in actor-network theory.

until they have designed hundreds of samples, until they have travelled dozens of routes to interview hundreds of people”.

Certainly, conducting a social survey in compliance with all rules — from constructing a representative sample to training interviewers — calls for a lot of effort, responsibility, as well as professional knowledge and skills. A well-established tradition of public opinion research is one of the strengths of Ukrainian sociology, and it should not go unnoticed. “A full-fledged school of public opinion studies has already been formed in Ukraine”, points out Tymofii Brik. Yet, as he ironically concludes, “we rarely, if ever, talk about this in public — “perhaps for fear of being regarded only as pollsters”.

Most of the young researchers are quite sure that the further development of national sociology is closely linked to the active involvement of Ukrainian social scientists in cross-national and cross-disciplinary projects. However, collaboration with researchers from other fields may not be always beneficial to sociology. A case in point is the “intervention” (as *Danylo Sudyn* characterised it) of physicists into this discipline and their attempts to explain social phenomena using models which traditionally describe natural processes. These attempts, in addition to being untenable (since social and natural phenomena are completely different things and therefore cannot be analysed with the same method), throw sociology back to the time of voluminous disputes between proponents of *Geistwissenschaften* (“the sciences of spirit”) and *Naturwissenschaften* (“natural sciences”), witnessed by 19th-century German intellectual circles. In fact, D. Sudyn is fairly apprehensive that sociology will eventually lose its position in the system of social sciences.

He drew the audience’s attention to another worrisome trend, which really puts sociology in jeopardy — when sociological research is commissioned to (or voluntarily undertaken by) laypeople, who, as the name implies, do not possess the relevant knowledge and skills. Such “researchers” get the wrong results, which are, nonetheless, communicated to the public. The saddening outcome is a distorted picture of social reality and undermined trust in sociology.

Well, what can sociologists do in order not to let themselves be “pushed” to the fringe? T. Brik suggests that they should communicate to as many audiences as possible, establish good contacts with different social groups which are able to “create intuitively sociological narratives” and “generate demand for coherent social theories”. They also should take greater advantage of participant observation for studying various social events and practices. Another task is rethinking classical sociological theories — the extent to which they could be applicable in today’s world. “Nowadays, when technology has become a natural part of our life, we can easily master new research techniques”, says Brik. “Likewise, we have access to statistical databases. We take these opportunities for granted and do not ask ourselves, for example, whether Max Weber would have come to the same conclusion about the difference between Catholics and Protestants if he were alive and could make use of statistics. We do not reflect on whether he would have formulated his well-known hypothesis about the link between Protestantism and economic prosperity in the same way. We tend to stick to classical theories instead of looking at them through the lens of present-day reality and delineating new research problems”. Nevertheless, revisiting a theory does not mean that we must refute it.

Obviously, the sociology of the future will almost wholly rely on advanced technology. On the one hand, this gives grounds for some optimism. As D. Sudyn aptly observed, “technical progress has made us believe that the future is an enhanced version of the present”. On the other hand, the ongoing expansion of information technology and its presence in every area of human life (including scientific research) pose a serious challenge to sociology. In fact, its ability to predict the future of society is already being tested.

There is no gainsaying the impact of technology on human relationships either. In that regard, *Tetiana Stetsenko* raised the issue of “loneliness” and “people’s inability to communicate effectively”. What is more, quite a few of us are unable to “create informal

groups and work together towards a common goal". This sounds strange, if not outright paradoxical, given that the latest inventions, the Internet in particular, offer abundant opportunities for cooperation. But this reveals another problem defined by T. Stetsenko as "slow adaptation of public consciousness to the outcomes of technological innovations". There are countless scientific discoveries and technological achievements that we humans can take pride in. At the same time, we have not created anything noteworthy in terms of interpersonal relationships. We have not made any progress in the social sphere either. Discussing the subject of cutting-edge technology and its ever-increasing role in today's society, **Anna Tashchenko** talked of "techno-optimists", who advocate the use of artificial intelligence in the finance and banking sector, as well as in legal proceedings. They consider it necessary to replace human employees with robots in these institutions mainly because the latter do not enjoy trust and respect from people any longer. Needless to say, phenomena like this ought to be spotted and analysed by sociologists.

Investigating into new social phenomena definitely requires new special skills, particularly those related to processing ever-growing amounts of information collected from a variety of sources. A case in point is the above-mentioned Big Data. To analyse their content, new techniques and approaches are needed. The applicability of Big Data to conventional research methodology is the issue that has occupied the minds of the vast majority of experts and sparked off numerous debates. The most fervent proponents of Big Data technologies are trying to persuade "the rest" to do away with traditional methods such as social survey because it takes time and has limitations. They depict Big Data analysis as a revolution in social sciences, which promises huge opportunities to researchers because it is capable of tracking an individual's routine activities at any time (without a need to communicate with them directly) and thereby allows overcoming the limitations of traditional surveys. Yet, however revolutionary it may seem, Big Data is no substitute for conventional research methods — since, as D. Sudyn puts it, only some of our activities can be recorded with this technique, namely those leaving a digital footprint (e. g. online purchases). Besides, Big Data cannot explain the underlying motivation of our actions.

Nevertheless, the young scholars realise that rapid digitalisation and proliferation of new technologies will soon bring about substantial (and maybe even dramatic) changes in research methodology and practice. At the same time, they are somewhat worried that the next generations of sociologists might be "disconnected" from the contribution of their predecessors who did not have much experience of living in a digital world.

Clearly, in a world where "inclusion and exclusion" will become "a universal code of the system" (O. Holikov) this "well-equipped" sociology will have to assume far more responsibility for the state of society than it used to. For this reason, views on both the role of social research and the use of research findings should be changed. Still being the heart of applied sociology, social survey should "turn from a tool for obtaining empirical data into a means of provoking positive changes in society" (I. Kozlova), which implies the wide use of sociological data in policy-making — exactly what Anthony Giddens characterised as "a deepening involvement of sociology with the formation of practical social policies and reforms".

After the presentations, there was a round-table *discussion* as to whether (and how) 21st-century sociology could be universal and what assignments should prospective sociologists set to themselves. Andrii Horbalyuk, Dean of the Faculty of Sociology (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv), Olena Lisiienko, Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Sociology and Management of Sociocultural Activities at K. D. Ushynsky South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University (Odesa), Svitlana Khutka, Executive Academic Director of National Research Centre "Social Indicators" and twice (in 2010 and 2012–2013) the "Junior Sociologist of the Year" second prize winner, Tetiana Bahaieva, a representative of Bounty SCA Ukraine, and Olena Zlobina, Head of the Department of Social Psychology (Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine) were among those joining the discussion and airing their views.

Then followed the most exciting bit: **Yevhen Golovakha**, **Anatolii Yermolenko** and **Volodymyr Paniotto**, who is also a co-founder of Natalia Panina Sociological Centre, announced the honourees. **Tymofii Brik**, Assistant Professor at Kyiv School of Economics and Chairman of the Supervisory Board of the Analytical Centre CEDOS, won first prize for a top-notch and optimistic essay “Mills on a motorbike”, in which he set forth his views on issues that should be primarily addressed by social scientists and also stressed the importance of developing sociological imagination¹. Second prize went to **Danylo Sudyn**, Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Ukrainian Catholic University (Lviv). As mentioned previously, D. Sudyn is concerned that sociology will be “taken over” by natural sciences; to be more precise, by researchers from that field who overlook (or ignore) the complex nature of social phenomena and attempt to use inappropriate methods for their explanation. Not unexpectedly, the title of Sudyn’s essay, “Sociology in the 21st century: Is it likely to die at the hands of behaviourism and natural sciences?”, is an accurate reflection of his concerns. Third prize was shared between **Alina Kalashnikova**, Senior Lecturer at the Department of Applied Sociology and Social Communications of the Sociological Faculty of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, and **Oleksandr Holikov**, Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology of the same university, for their thought-provoking (albeit somewhat downbeat) essays “The illusion of a future” and “Illusions of the future of an illusion”. **Oksana Kovtun**, National Coordinator of the Biobehavioural Studies at the Centre for Public Health of the Ministry of Health of Ukraine (Kyiv) was awarded the Iryna Popova Prize. This special prize was established in honour of Iryna Popova (1931–2008), a distinguished Ukrainian scholar, who is considered to be a founder of the Odesa School of Sociology. O. Kovtun’s essay (“Be courageous and open to change”) was recognised as having social and practical significance.

In 2018, Ukrainian philosophical community launched the prize in honour of Myroslav Popovich. **Oleksii Viedrov**, a research fellow at the Department of Social Philosophy (H. S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine), became the first recipient of this prize for a comprehensive monograph “*Social sciences and social progress: epistemological and ethical underpinnings of social sciences from the perspective of the philosophy of communication*”.

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 tireless commitment and continued support.

Below are the essays submitted by the rest of the “2018 Junior Sociologist of the Year” contestants:

“The role of the state and civil society in resolving a conflict in Eastern Ukraine: Looking to the future” (**Andrii Bahinskyi**, Senior Lecturer at the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Sociology and Law, National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”)

“Reflections on the past and the future, or why sociology is not a demoscropy” (**Bohdan Bondarets**, Lecturer at the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Sociology of Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University, Mykolaiv)

“The sociology of the future: Is it likely to be a gadgetology?” (**Bohdan Dykan**, PhD Student at the Department of Sociology of the Sociological Faculty of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University)

¹ Charles Wright Mills (1916–1962), who coined the term “sociological imagination”, noted that it “enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society. That is its task and its promise”.

“Quality of sociological data: The issue that will never lose relevance” (*Yelena Kovalska*, Assistant Lecturer at the Department of Methodology and Methods for Sociological Research of the Faculty of Sociology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

“Life after the report, or where and how a policy sociologist¹ seeks motivation” (*Inha Kozlova*, Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Ukrainian Catholic University, Lviv)

“Sociology and the future” (*Tetiana Stestenko*, an independent researcher, Kyiv)

“Artificial intelligence and sociology in the “land of unlearned lessons” (*Anna Tashchenko*, Assistant Lecturer at the Department of Social Structures and Social Relations of the Faculty of Sociology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

OL’HA MAKSYMENKO,
MA in Psychology, leading sociologist
at the Department of Methodology and Methods of Sociology,
Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv

Received 26.02.2019

Внутрішньо переміщені особи: реалії та перспективи

30 січня 2019 року в Українському кризовому медіа-центрі відбувся **прес-брифінг “Внутрішньо переміщені особи: реалії та перспективи”**². Основна частина заходу була присвячена презентації та обговоренню результатів опитування Інституту соціології НАН України 2015–2018 років щодо ставлення населення до внутрішньо переміщених осіб (ВПО) і, зокрема, можливостей та обмежень політичної участі переселених осіб. Тема, що набуває гострої актуальності напередодні президентських та парламентських виборів в Україні, викликала жваву дискусію серед спікерів та представників преси.

Моніторинг Інституту соціології НАНУ “Українське суспільство” — щорічне загальнонаціональне опитування населення, яке від 2015 року висвітлює динаміку змін у ставленні населення до ВПО та оцінює суб’єктивний інтеграційний потенціал громад, які приймають вимушених переселенців. Запитання щодо ставлення населення до ВПО, зокрема, готовності місцевого населення до взаємодії з переміщеними особами на приватному, професійному та громадському рівнях, ставилися респондентам упродовж 2015–2018 років у всіх регіонах України за винятком Криму та окупованих територій Донецької й Луганської областей. Кожного року було опитано 1800 респондентів віком від 18 років.

¹ Michael Burawoy defines *policy sociology* as “the application of professional sociology to the interests and problems of clients (organisations, agencies, corporations)”.

² Прес-брифінг проводився за підтримки Фонду “Демократичні ініціативи” імені Ілька Кучеріва в рамках Програми сприяння громадській активності “Долучайся!”, що фінансується Агентством США з міжнародного розвитку (USAID) та здійснюється Раств в Україні.