

Citizenship Identity as the Key Factor of the Political and Legal Awareness Development in Ukraine: The Comparative View

Beckmann Bernhard¹, Arabadzhiev Dmytro Iuriiiovych², Holonič Ján³

Head of Steinebeis University, Chairman EBG, Germany

Head of the Department of General Legal and Political Sciences, Doctor of Political Sciences, Associate Professor, Zaporizhzhya National Technical University.

Philosophiae doctor, Faculty of Education, Comenius University, Department of Social Work

Review: PhDr. Beáta Áčová, PhD.

St. Elizabeth University of Health and Social Sciences, Bratislava, SK

Submitted: 10.03. 2019

Accepted: 04.04.2019

Resume

The article pays tribute to the specifics of citizenship identity. The concept is viewed in the context of its ethnic and linguistic self-identifying. The article is focused on the comparative view of the constituents of citizenship identity and its future dynamics. The citizenship identity is described herein, introduced on the regional and national level. The article highlights the gnoseological and ontological potential of identity. The author of the article argues that under modern paradigm citizenship identity is built of national, macroregional, and regional identities. The analysis set a perspective for further investigation in the field of optimizing of the political and legislative system of Ukraine with visible shift to nationhood patriotism and political and legal awareness of the citizens.

Key words: citizen, citizenship,

community, participation, membership, rights, identity.

One of the problems influencing both the fulfillment of economic reforms and steady democratic development of the post-Soviet countries on their way to a citizen society is the destruction of some traditional identity-forming patterns typical for the post-Soviet social space followed by the formation of the new countries. Citizenship identity, which is not only about being a citizen but also about taking an active part in the country's current political and social processes, is the corner stone of the political and legal awareness of an individual.

The key terms here are «a citizen» and «citizenship». «The Encyclopedia of State Governance» provides us with a statement

that a citizen is a person that has the legal right to belong to a particular country population. Such person is a full citizen of the country and finds himself under the protection of its law with a number of rights and duties. Here it goes as well about a citizen occupying some position in the state sector of economy or being on a state military service, about the one who looks out for the welfare of the whole society. «A citizen» is also treated as the title of honor. It is also referred to as a city resident. Besides, a citizen may be viewed as a member of some community or a people under the same governance. In this very case, to call somebody a citizen means to refer to any particular person as a constituent element of a people, land or a state. People become citizens as adults. Finally, you can use «a citizen» as a social title when addressing the grown-ups.

Unlike foreign citizens or people possessing no citizenship, full citizens of some country have the political rights and freedoms. Hence, the term «citizenship» is used to define the political and legal position of a person in the precise country, when the person is both law-abiding and protected by the law. Being a citizen means to have rights and freedoms, the most important of which are civil and political. It is also about duties and an opportunity to take part in determining the way that particular society takes up to develop itself by means of public administration.

If by «a citizen» we mean the one who looks out for the welfare of the whole society, then we suggest that such a person may get some insight as for what the welfare of the whole society might be, not speaking about such concepts as a people or a motherland. A citizen may as well be aware of how the law of the country and its political mechanism work. A citizen may be socially and philosophically reflective. Thus by referring to citizens we may also view them in a new conceptual framework of citizenship identity, which is about their legal status and awareness as a constituent part of the state and social system. For the sake of social welfare, a citizen may want to get to know what the parameters of citizenship identity are. It also needs to be clarified, what factors, except the legal ones, provide their influence on the process of individual formation of citizenship identity. It comes up to us, that the main identifiers of the concept under consideration should be territory, culture, language and traditions.

The general concept of identity and, precisely, citizenship identity, find its best and most profound explanation in the scientific inquiry of both Ukrainian and foreign scholars, namely O. Babkina, L. Naghorna, I. Tyschenko, S. Horobchyshyna, V. Fadeev, I. Kuras, M. Obushnij, I. Kresina, S. Yefremov, A. Ivanets, V. Stepanenko, O. Maiboroda, L. Shklyar, O. Oliynyk, O. Pakhlyovska,

G. Palij, R. Dodonov, S. Mofa, M. Stepyko, O. Kindratets, V. Tyshkov, J. Collar, B. Andersen, E. Smith etc. A few scholars focusing their analysis on the comparative view of citizenship identity in the context of its major influence on the development of political and legal awareness of citizens on the regional and republican level are V. Verbets, S. Mityaeva, O. Proskurina and V. Tsyba, the latter being the most prominent on the list.

Concerning Ukraine, some geopolitical parameters of identifying oneself as a citizen need to be specified because of their gnoseological and practical value and in their due reference to the upgrading of the mechanism of social and economical regulation currently taking place in our country. The process is accompanied by social and cultural transformation, when a new system of values finds its place in the society and some new political behaviorist patterns are established. Vagueness of the identity system and diffusion of identifiers come from social fluctuation and a number of different social attractors.

It is generally accepted by the sociologists, that the concept of identity still needs to find its fixed position in the system of social dominants. Citizenship identity itself is a semantically ambiguous term, and may refer to both self-identity and the state of being identical, which somehow makes it a bone of scholastic contention. There are two

competing models that bring forth identities. The first one is derived in compliance with the main principles of essentialism, thus looking for the very authentic, culturally determined essence of identity, where cultural parameters describe cultural experience of a society. Here identity is the extract of the society identity taken as a whole. According to the essentialists, such naturally-determined identity stands for its integrity and monolithic structure. Furthermore, it provides its self-legitimacy and recognition by the other communities (Nahorna, 2003, p. 17).

How to identify itself remains an important issue for any people. It is of vital necessity for its conscious existence. It is essential for Ukraine, as we have to establish our new identity in order to set in motion the formation of political nation of co-citizens. The whole process of setting it into gear is made much more difficult by the number of historical milestones, like fighting our political independence, the three so-called revolutions (the Granite Revolution of 1990, the Pomaranch Revolution of 2004–2005, the Revolution of Honor of 2013–2014) followed by the military occupation of the Ukrainian land, to mention just a few. The chosen paradigm of state and national development had nothing to do with the national ethnic one, thus providing no power lever for the title population. It also didn't provide any potential for the uniting of the nation in order to make it politically relevant. For the recent

years we have been witnessing the crisis of the Ukrainian social identity accompanied by the rivalry between the communist, liberal and nationalistic ideologies, the latter introduced by the Russian and Ukrainian nationalisms (Nahorna, 2003), irredentism, and absenteeism, which are parallel to alienist position of an average person in the relationship between an individual and the society, an individual and politics, when a citizen is not willing to determine himself in the political, nation building and state developing reference frame.

Nowadays ethnic and national identity, its importance and functions, is viewed antagonistically through the dialectics of ethnos and nation, the nature of national consolidation, different classifications of nationalism. That the ethnic identity got more important in the end of the XX century can be explained through reaction of citizens on the sped-up globalization process with its distorted image of nations classified into the so-called wealthy and poor ones. Economic change, resulting in more conflicts inside our society, and the further modernization of the communication and transport facilities, leading to the consolidation of different diaspora ethnic communities, also paid their tribute to the growing function of ethnic identity.

When it goes about the concept of identity, we mean the result of the self-identifying process of an individual or a group

of individuals via the so-called «image of Self» and the «image of Us». The individuals refer themselves to these or those communities, their choice depending upon age, occupation, gender, territory where they live, ethnicity, confession etc. The lexeme «identity» semantically embraces «similarity», «originality» and «authenticity», the latter being the most often used in the Humanities discourse. Sociologists define the concept of identity as the number of some specific features crucial for identifying a social community among other communities and for the social self-identifying of an individual or a group of individuals. However, the concept of identity is still liable to dispute (Nahorna, 2003, p. 16).

The article focuses upon the study of citizenship identity. The issue under consideration is how citizenship identity determines the development of political and legal awareness inside a society. To achieve the aim, such objectives are set:

- to find out how deeply individuals become aware of the dominant identity;
- to define the key criteria to tell whether an individual is aware of his or her citizenship;
- to monitor active citizenship;
- to consider major parameters of home affairs;
- to consider how the National Idea is formulated on the basis of the pole;

- to find out the political preferences inside our society;
- to study the vectors of the international cooperation;
- to outline the major civil values relevant to describe the modern Ukrainian society.

To achieve the aim and the objectives, we conducted some field analysis and provided dynamic assessment of the public opinion expressed on the regional level. To make our assessment proper and precise, we included the results obtained on the national level. The research also gives a vivid picture of the social groups classified according to the social demographic and geographic criteria. The comparative view looks both after Zaporizhzhya region and the whole country of Ukraine.

While considering the issue of citizenship identity we refer to the number of key concepts, namely «citizenship», «a citizen», «legal literacy and awareness», «political participation», «identity».

The concept of citizenship is ambivalent. First of all, it refers both to political and legal right of an individual to belong to some state. Hence an individual operates under the law of the country and has the civil rights and duties, as well as freedoms. He or she can participate in public administration of the affairs of the state and correspondently some authority in public administration can be vested in a citizen. At

the same time, the concept of citizenship is about moral values, ideology and philosophy of an individual. Here citizenship shows itself depending upon the way an individual identifies himself as a citizen. It is important whether a citizen is law-abiding with lots of self-respect. You should also need to know whether a citizen respects the rights and freedoms of other people, the society morality, if he is willing to stand for his civil rights and keep to his civil duties.

A citizen is a person that identifies himself as a resident of some country. A citizen has enough legal status to be law-abiding and to gain from his civil rights.

Legal awareness is a form of a public awareness that broadly embraces the concepts of public opinion, feelings, emotions, ideas, theories, and goal setting. When you study such parameters, you get an understanding whether an individual, a social group, and even a society as a whole give high rank of the legislation system or whether it needs to undergo reforms. Legal awareness is also about any issue under political and legal regulation.

We refer to political participation when describing the process of getting of citizens engaged into political power relations. Political participation also describes political steps and activities by the citizens to express their viewpoints and preferences in order to produce some influence on

authorities and get their social interests satisfied.

Identity is about self-identifying one's social status, when an individual distinguishes oneself as a member of some community or a social group, where he performs a number of functions.

According to John Rose (Rawls, 1971), an ideal society model includes the institutions, fundamental for the society. It guarantees citizenship, civil rights and freedoms, equal opportunities and access to material resources.

The phenomenon of citizenship comprises three constituents, these are membership, rights, and participation (Bellamy, 2008). For a citizen, membership means being a member of some nation or community, when you have your civil rights because of that membership, and you can take an active part in public administration of civil rights and the social life as a whole. Besides, citizens self-identify themselves with other members of the society, and this identification is called citizenship identity.

Citizenship identity is the important process of self-identifying of a citizen with some civil society of this or that state. It is also the phenomenon of collective consciousness, or collective subjectivity (Gritsanov, Abushenko, Evelkin, Sokolova, Tereshchenko, 2003, p. 349).

Both definitions of citizenship identity emphasize the relationship between an

individual and a state or a society. The first definition focuses on the specifics of explicit territory identification, which is hierarchical in its nature, from the bottom regional level to the top global one. From this point of view, citizenship identity functions as a part of territory identity. When the parameter of territory is the defining one, identity is a piece of individual knowledge about geopolitical formation. The concept of citizenship identity is similar to that of a national identity when the latter is viewed under paradigm of a nation as collective citizenship, a community that is organized according to the state political criteria (Reznik).

The second definition involves understanding of the specifics of the processes of development of a civil society. Here it goes about active citizenship that proves itself under condition when citizenship identity is well-balanced and regulated due to the self-organizing mechanism of a civil society. Under such conditions, the individual perception of citizenship stands far from formal. It spreads widely, when mutual relationship between a citizen and a state look like a social contract. In fact, it is some kind of exchange: a citizen stays law-abiding and loyal to the state, which in its turn provides him with social support, protects his civil rights and freedoms (Reznik).

Theoretically, self-identifying of citizens and legitimizing of state political institutions is parallel in time. It is worth

mentioning, that bottom level of self-identifying is the individual himself. Actually, when a society undergoes political transformation, whether intensive enough or not, like it happens to the modern Ukrainian society, a civic identity, in its turn, undergoes meaningful changes to the very extent a citizen accepts the redeveloped political landscape.

Ethnic identity comes from collective memory of common origin, culture, language, traditions, territory, history etc. that distinguishes one ethnic group from the other. Any ethnicity is an ethnic stereotype, the distinguishing factors being psychological traits, national character, temper, ethnographic potential.

The concept of national identity, if to compare it with the ethnic one, is more vague. According to E. Smith, it is an abstract, multilevel and multifunctional structure, it is also transformation-bound. It is characterized historically, when we speak about an occupied territory, collective myths and memory, shared culture, civil rights and duties, economy. It is also about authenticity, individuality of a nation, the National Idea, popular with electorate. It can get diffused with the other types of identity, like social class, confession, ethnic ones, in a weird way. Its ideology does the same, merging in a chameleon-like manner with different ideological hybrids of liberalism, fascism, and communism (Smit, 1994, p. 149–150).

Unlike ethnic identity, the national one comes from consciousness, political will, and citizenship. V. Tsyba outlines the mentality of the citizens of the country, where the reforms are successful and the standard of living is high. According to the scholar, a competitive nation with national identity of its citizens is formed when certain criteria are kept, namely acceptance and respect towards the national symbols – the Anthem, the Emblem, and the Flag; knowledge of the history of the country and how it is accepted by its citizens; knowledge of its title people» culture and the way it consolidates the nation; the national language proficiency requirements; spiritual consolidation of the nation of the same confession; reasonable residency requirement for the immigrants in order to get them adapted to both social, ethnic and cultural environment (Tsyba, 2011). Thus both the Constitution and the national law of the country are recognized, as well as civil rights.

Historically, Europe faced the process of formation of the identity starting from the regional (local) one. Far later there arrived the national type of identity referred to as a form of being a member of some community, consolidated by the idea of citizenship, with Germany, France, Spain, and Italy to be just a few examples. In fact, every European state had passed a period of the regional identity before there appeared the national one, which used to simply overlap the identity occupying the lower position in the hierarchy. That's

how the Bavarians share the identity with the Saxons, and the Catalans have the same identity basis as the Andalusians (Belitser).

The concept of citizenship identity can be explained via the following three criteria. First and foremost, it cannot emerge on its own. You need a citizen to interact with the other citizens and altogether they need to actively participate in public administration of the social, political, and economical life of the country. Second, the concept of citizenship identity does not mean the same as intellectual development and morality, but has much to do with both issues. Finally, citizenship identity is a holistic concept, to develop one means to enable oneself to view things in a critical way and to gain some empathy towards them. It also requires an ability to identify oneself as a citizen among other citizens not necessarily bearing the same views. It as well suggests that a citizen actively participates in public debates brainstorming the best solutions for the development of both the society and the state (Knefelkamp, 2008).

The comparative view of the citizenship identity as the key factor determining the political and legal awareness of the citizens, both regionally and throughout the country, showed some significant dynamic change in the way the citizens imagine the constituent elements of identity. In 2011–2012, introducing the facilities of the «Politics and Education» Zaporizhzhya

Regional Scientific Methodical Centre, we conducted a comparative study of such informative blocks as dominant identity block, civil participation block, both home and foreign affairs blocks, as well as moral values and associations block. The whole study had taken place long before the Russian military intervention to the Donbass territory and the annexation of the Crimea, accompanied by the information war and the aggressive steps against the civilization. Later, in 2014–2016, the Razumkov Research Center conducted its own study of the identity on the national level, based upon the results of the comparative outlook by the «Politics and Education» Zaporizhzhya Regional Scientific Methodical Centre. The Razumkov Research Center study took place some time after the Revolution of Honor and the tragic for the Ukrainian nationhood set of events.

First in the line of experiment came the study of the how deeply the citizens were aware of their dominant identity. It produced a result of the overwhelming majority of the local residents being aware of the Ukrainian political nation as their dominant identity. They did not identify themselves as representatives of some ethnos. Nor did they represent themselves according to the territorial criteria. They were hardly involved into globalization or integration. This index correlated with that of the ethnic identity. Here we postulate that the Russian analytical unit and political class representatives had

earlier neglected the very index, which led to the failure of the «Novorossia» geopolitical project on the territories of the Southern and Eastern Ukraine in 2014.

22% of the respondents put their family status on top of the hierarchy of identities on the national level. 59% was the number reflecting the same top position of the family status when we summed up the results of the first, second, and the third choice made by the respondents. Southern and Western region respondents identified themselves mainly as the citizens of Ukraine (39 and 35% correspondently when we summed up the results of the first, second, and the third choice made). Unlike them, only 11% of respondents that live in the Eastern region of our country gave citizenship the top priority. Nationality was of the least importance for the respondents from the Eastern (10%), Southern (15%) and Donbass region. Southern, Western, and Central regions found it the most important to refer to Ukraine as to the territory of permanent residence. The answers were 26%, 24%, and 23 %, correspondently. The Ukrainian citizenship was a bit more important for the ethnic Ukrainians than to the ethnic Russians (30 and 25% correspondently). The same statistics revealed itself when speaking about nationality (23 and 18 % correspondently) and referring to Ukraine as to the territory of permanent residence (22 and 15% correspondently) (Razumkov Centre, 2016).

The studies brought to surface the basic criteria the Ukrainians applied to define their citizenship. Regionally, the Ukrainians were more proud of their country and the Ukrainian citizenship.

The moderate statistics was about those respondents who picked up patriotism as the main criteria of their citizenship identity. More than a half of respondents thought that the improved standard of living was the best way to make deeper the citizenship awareness.

Patriots usually look out their country. Hence, on the national level, 68% of respondents felt that they were patriotic in that way, while 21% of those who don't consider themselves patriots felt that they were responsible for their country. Generally speaking, 54% respondents felt that they should have looked out their country, while 37% didn't have such a feeling. 68% of respondents in the Western and 56% of respondents in the Central regions thought that they bore some responsibility for the further development of Ukraine. 73% of the respondents in the Southern, Eastern and Donbass regions stood for the idea, that «strong patriotism supports the country» position on the global arena» (with only 13% standing against). The same 73% thought that «Ukraine needs patriots for its own consolidation» (with 12% standing against). 18% expressed the opinion that «strong patriotism of Ukrainians leads to their

negative attitude towards immigrants» (with 57% standing against that idea). 18% supposed that «strong patriotism of the Ukrainians leads to their negative attitude towards national minorities» (with 56% standing against that idea). 23 % supported the idea that «strong patriotism of the citizens of Ukraine leads to their intolerance (51% don't support the idea) (Razumkov Centre, 2016).

If it goes about the linguistic, ethnic, and confession identity, regionally we can speak of 82,7% and 78,4% of respondents claiming to be of Ukrainian nationality. 90,6% of teachers and 81,6% of students appeared to be orthodox. Ukrainian proved to be the mother tongue for the majority of respondents (68,3% of teachers and 58% of students). 52,5% of teachers and 18,4% of students communicate in spoken Ukrainian, while 42,3% and 73,4% correspondently claimed to use Russian in everyday communication.

Regionally the data received in 2011–2012 show some kind of diffusion of both linguistic and ethnic identity. The majority of respondents identified themselves as the Ukrainians with Ukrainian being their mother tongue and Spoken Russian being used for their everyday communication. Thus we can speak of some kind of transformation the Zaporizhzhya region undergoes, with a new kind of diffused linguistic and ethnic identity emerging there. It is also striking how

Standard Russian is replaced by its contaminated spoken form in the communicative practice of the majority of local residents. The so-called «surzhyk», which is a deeply contaminated diffused form of Ukrainian and Russian, is used both in official and everyday communicative practice by the majority of the respondents.

Nationally, in 2016 Ukrainian was the mother tongue for the 69% of respondents (the majority). Russian was the mother tongue for the 27% of respondents. Only 2% thought of some other language as their mother tongue. Previously, in 2011, Ukrainian appeared to be the mother tongue for the 61% and Russian for 36% of respondents, with 2% thinking of some other language as their mother tongue. At home, 55% of respondents use Ukrainian and 41% use Russian for family communication. 1% of respondents use some other language. Previously, in 2011, the statistics was 52%, 45%, and 1% correspondently. All in all, only slight changes touched the everyday communication, while more people stuck to using Ukrainian as their mother tongue. Thus choice of a language for everyday communication proved to be more resistant to changes than the linguistic identity of citizens of Ukraine. In the Western, Central, and Southern regions the majority of respondents claimed Ukrainian to be their mother tongue (97%, 86%, and 63% correspondently), whereas in the Eastern and Donbass regions

people prefer to speak Russian (52% and 66% correspondently) (Razumkov Centre, 2016).

Monitoring of the forms of civil participation and activity showed that the respondents seemed to put more trust in public organizations and public councils while little attention did they pay to political parties delegates who performed as political agents trying to get the respondents involved into the process of public administration of the country. There was a positive tendency towards non-aggressive methods of civil participation and civil activity. To sum it up, having passed through the Revolution of Honor and the dramatic events of 2014, the respondents appreciated the institution of election, feedback, and sociologic methods in public administration as one of the key factors of developing citizenship identity.

Having analyzed the political tendency and the way the National Idea got developed on the regional level, we came to the conclusion that almost 50% of the respondents considered «national culture, language, and traditions» to be of utmost importance for the consolidation of our nation. 19% of the respondents thought that «national spirit» is important, and 10% made their choice in favor of another factor – «national history». The whole tendency showed that for the respondents mental factors influencing national identity grew very important. The key factors listed above, as well as the diffusion of linguistic and ethnic

identity, stood for the weak side of the consolidation plan.

The 2016 pole hold on the national level revealed that the majority of the respondents (56%) were sure that Ukraine would overcome its difficulties and become a wealthy developed state. 22% had no hope, while the 22% left had no idea whether it might happen or not. Statistics showed that only few respondents were sure that the standard of living in Ukraine would get improved in the coming future. 39% of the respondents thought that chances were strong for them to improve their standard of living, 55% thought that only their children and grandchildren were likely to live a wealthy living. The most optimistic statistics came from the Western and the Central regions of Ukraine, where 71% and 60% of respondents (to present figures correspondently) were certain that Ukraine would become a high standard of living country. Such optimism proved to be characteristic for the young (63% of the respondents aged 18 to 29). Only 51% of the respondents aged 60 and above had the same certainty. Among the respondents, it was quite characteristic for the ethnic Ukrainians to share the same optimism (59%), while only 39% of ethnic Russians with permanent residence in our country believed that there might be a possibility for their children and grandchildren to achieve a high standard of living in Ukraine. It is worth mentioning, though, that the same number of

ethnic Russians (39%) produced no such certainty (Razumkov Centre, 2016, p. 8).

On the regional level, we analyzed the data to find out what issues were considered to be of utmost importance in the field of foreign affairs. Within the 2011–2012 time span, three vectors got maximum attention. Firstly, 26% of the respondents claimed that it would be absolutely correct to give national interests top priority when building the international relationship. Secondly, 44% of the students stood for the international relationship with the countries of the former USSR (18% of them made their choice in favor of the Eastern Slavonic Alliance, with Russia, Byelorussia being its members; 19% supported the idea of coalition with the Eurasian Bloc, with Russia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Byelorussia and some other post-Soviet countries being its members; 7% supported the idea of international cooperation with the Russian Federation). Finally, 17% of the respondents stood for the idea of building international relationship with the EU (13,7%) and NATO (0.7%). In 2011 only 11% of the respondents thought that Ukraine should stay off any blocs or political alliances.

Thus it becomes clear, that prior to the events of 2014, the majority of the respondents had supported the idea of building international political relationship in order to develop foreign economic and political activity of the country within the

economic and political space of the former USSR. Such tendency had been characteristic of the senior age group of the respondents. 89% of them had admitted that Ukraine and Russia share the same history. 68% had stood for the alliance between the two countries in the field of economy, culture, education, and politics.

The set belief that the Ukrainians and Russians have ties of kinship used to be one of the most fundamental in the former USSR. It replaced the other one, postulating the threesome nature of the Russian people in the Russian Empire, when the Byelorussian and the Ukrainian peoples were in no way recognized as the independent ones. Nowadays the latter is gradually turning into the official doctrine in the Russian Federation. According to V. Putin, our two peoples are not two independent nations, but rather one, monolithic, that got separated into the two ones and engaged in a political row (Putin, 2016). A few Ukrainians still believe that those ties do exist. However, recently their number has decreased. In April 2014, soon after the Russian intervention to the Crimea, the idea of kinship was shared by 62% of the respondents. In November 2016, the statistics was only 51% against 34% of those who stood against (before it had been 28%) (Razumkov Centre, 2016, p. 14). The least number of supporters, 28%, came from the Western region, if to compare with other regions. In the Central region there were 41%

of the respondents (against 36% who did not share those main premises) standing for the idea of kinship. That's the average majority number. In the Southern, Eastern, and Donbass regions the majority of respondents (61%, 87%, and 55% correspondently) stood for the idea of kinship between the Russians and the Ukrainians. Only 47% of the ethnic Ukrainians and 82% of the ethnic Russians were positive about the main premises discussed here. From the young to the senior age groups, the same tendency got stronger (from 42% of the young people aged 18 to 29 to the age group of respondents being in their sixties and above) (Razumkov Centre, 2016, p. 14–15).

To find out what the main civil values of our modern Ukrainian society were, we suggested six options for the respondents to assess. The pole was held on the regional level of Zaporizhzhya. The respondents were to conduct 5-scale assessment of such values as «order», «freedom», «democracy», «powerful state», «human rights», and «well-being of a people». The whole pole had to reveal details about the liberal or paternalistic social tendencies.

Liberal democratic values dominated, with «freedom» having scored 1936 points, «human rights» – 1897, and «democracy» – 1737). The so-to-say absurd fact that «democracy» occupied the bottom position can be easily explained. When Ukraine fought its independence, democracy was used as

some kind of undercover for corruption, poor reforms, authoritarian behavior, oligarchs, the closed nature of the ruling political elite, as well as the non-transparent political changes. Hence, its low status as a value.

In 2011, the most popular social characteristic was «total mess» (got a score of 282 points), «poverty» (215 points), «social and economic destruction» (170 points), and «pressure» (148 points). Such way to assess social conditions leads to the conflict between the values that constitute political awareness, from one side, and the social practice, from the other. Thus, social and political ties tear apart, with the society going anomies. The citizens and the state alienate from such society as well.

To sum it up, citizenship identity appears to be the dominant one. It goes hand in hand with the process of diffusion of the ethnic and linguistic identity, with Ukrainian being the mother tongue for most respondents and Spoken Russian being used for everyday communication.

The pole of 2011–2012 showed that the majority of respondents view themselves as citizens, ready to take an active part in the social and political life of Ukraine. However, one can see poor social, political, and economic conditions as the reason for diffusion of linguistic and political identity on the former-USSR geopolitical terrain. Again, there's much criticism of sociopolitical and

economic processes taking part in our country.

In Ukraine, citizenship is formed due to a number of influential factors, namely national, macroregional, and regional identity, bearing huge gnoseological and ontological potential. Under certain conditions, these levels of citizenship identity can not only stay in harmony, but also bring to consolidation the Ukrainian society, by forming active patriotism on the proper economic, historical, territory, social, cultural, and national basis. The further research of the issue under consideration (sociological research, focus groups, case study, conferences, «round tables» etc) will help to determine how to optimize the way political and legal awareness may develop.

The research conducted on the national level showed the hierarchy of identities of the citizens of Ukraine, from self-identity to citizenship and national identity, then it goes further to class, confession, and political identity. The majority of respondents position themselves as the citizens of Ukraine and the residents of this or that region. The young put more emphasis on the national identity.

The research also showed that the recent events played their part in the process of emerging of the citizenship identity in Ukraine. Heroism and self-commitment of the Ukrainian soldiers and volunteers in their fight against the Russian aggression and

separatist movement, the very aggression that came with the Crimea intervention and annexation, the support by the Russian Federation of the separatist movement on the Donbass terrain, war casualties and huge economic problems, finally, the Maidan, led to the increase of patriotism. At the same time, poor 2014–2016 reforms by the government resulted in the decrease of patriotic feelings. However, the level of patriotism is still high: the two thirds of the respondents consider themselves to be patriots of Ukraine, while 75% claim to be active patriots of the country. The majority of them really believe that Ukraine will overcome both political and economic difficulties for their children and grandchildren to live happily. It's necessary to point out again that age and nationality stay among the most important criteria. Recent political and economic changes influenced the linguistic identity of the citizens. There are more citizens to consider Ukrainian to be their mother tongue. At the same time, they prefer to speak Russian when it's about everyday communication. Thus we arrive at the visible contradiction, with spoken practice being more rigid and the linguistic identity of the Ukrainian citizens undergoing some transformation. The Southern region of the country is the example. When communicating with their family members, young people prefer to speak Russian. The respondents think that they know Ukrainian better than the

Ukrainian literature, culture, traditions, history of arts. Statistics shows that the less acquainted with the issues above are the residents of the Donbass region. Actually, the whole Donbass region seems to stay sideway from the social, cultural and information space of the country. You don't need to have a high level of Ukrainian language proficiency to start feeling that it needs to be improved. The respondents from Donbass expressed the highest necessity to master Ukrainian. The respondents from the Southern and Eastern regions do not think it is of great necessity for them. The younger the respondents are, the greater their necessity for mastering Ukrainian is. Another factor influencing the positive trend is how well a person is educated. The majority of the respondents feel that the citizens must use Ukrainian both for everyday and formal communicative practice. They also stand for the state support and regulations aimed at the development of the Ukrainian language. Other languages shouldn't be taken into account, if to keep in mind the long years of oppression of our national language. The average majority of respondents don't think other languages spoken on the territory of Ukraine shouldn't get some support from the state. The respondents didn't agree on whether we'd better keep our national regional and ethnic traditions safe or we'd better strive for the cultural unification (Razumkov Centre, 2016).

As early as in 2011–2012, the comparative view showed that there was rather pessimistic forecast for the development of citizenship identity. The 2014 research proved the tendency remained the same. However, 2016 saw the positive change.

The government seems to stay deaf when it comes to the public opinion. It totally ignores the discussion launched to solve the issue of citizenship identity and keeps using the vague concept of «nation» to refer to ethnos, nationality, and citizenship. Local sociocultural identity can hardly serve as a remedy to compensate lack of citizenship identity. The Eastern region of Ukraine is already the place of political rows, half of the Ukrainian territory got occupied by the Russian troops, and no dialogue between the occupied and non-occupied territory can be established, so that we can speak of a huge ethnic political conflict. To prevent it, the authorities should have relied upon the results of the poles and afterward recommendations by the scholars. Then they could have introduced the model of the multinational Ukrainian society consolidated under the roof of the Ukrainian political nation.

The major obstacle for such society to emerge is no fixed political planning. The government has no citizenship identity project. National information space stays open for any kind of influence from outside. The citizens of our country feel disappointed

as for their social perspectives and the future of the whole country. It is of utmost necessity for the state authorities to create a friendly environment for the further development of the communication processes inside the society, so that the participants of active social debates might come to a consensus on the vital for state building policy issues.

The state policy aimed at the development of the citizenship identity must be extremely pro-Ukrainian towards its national language, culture, and morality. It must find its basis in the concept of the National Idea.

The government must consolidate the nation. That's why building of the citizenship identity, shared by all the citizens, must be the main vector of political development of the country, with the Ukrainian people standing as a whole. Such type of identity can be developed via the following steps:

- to make the idea of consolidation of the whole nation attractive, it is necessary to launch a huge social advertizing campaign;
- to propose the revitalizing National Idea;
- to provide national information policy project;
- to systemically provide educational programs aimed at bringing up the patriots of Ukraine, with the key patriotic concepts being state sovereignty, support of democratic traditions, real active participations of the citizens and local

communities in the public administration of the country.

The national citizenship identity and patriotism prove to be the sharp tool applied to formation process of national ideology, taking into account macroregional, regional, ethnic, subethnic, and linguistic identities. The issue of citizenship identity is now studied by the scholars and analysts at scientific centers, educational institutions, and public organizations. If not to take its peculiarities into account, the government is likely to speed up the process of alienation between an individual and the state. It may also lead to absenteeism, irredentism, low participation in public administration of the country, no interest in state political issues. The government may as well lose the sovereignty and legitimacy on some part of the country.

Citizenship identity is also very important for the development of political and legal awareness, political and territory consolidation, building of the civil society, when the state can protect its citizens and meet the challenges.

Further study of the phenomenon of the citizenship identity may include the following aspects and issues: how to solve the problem of the negative influence of the external environment; political and legal culture as the constituent element of civic aptitude of the citizens that can express their

social preferences and opinions with open eyes and mind.

References:

1. Bekh, I.D. The Paradigm of Spirituality of an Individual. *Theoretical and Methodical Pedagogical Problems of Upbringing Children and Students*, 20, 12–23.
2. Kovbasyuk, Yu.V., Troshchynskyi, V.P., Surmin, Yu.P. (eds.) (2010). *Encyclopedia of State Administration*. Kyiv.
3. Rymarenko, Yu.I. (eds.) (1996). *Small Encyclopedia of Ethnic and State Studying*. Kyiv: Dovira, Geneva.
4. Obushnyi, M.I. (1999). *Ethnic and National Identity as a Phenomenon Used for Studying Ukrainians* (Abstract of Doctor of Political Science Thesis: 23.00.05). Kyiv.
5. Nahorna, L. (2003). The Concept of ‘National Identity’ in the Ukrainian System of Terminology. *Political Management*, 2, 14–30.
6. Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press. Retrieved from <http://espectroalejandria.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/82985311-a-theory-of-justice.pdf> (accessed 01 July 2018).
7. Bellamy, R. (2008). *Citizenship: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: University Press.
8. Gritsanov, A.A., Abushenko, V.L., Evelkin, G.M., Sokolova, G.N., Tereshchenko, O.V. (eds.) (2003). *Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Minsk: Knyzhnyi Dom.
9. Knefelkamp, L. Lee (2008). Civic Identity: Locating Self in Community. *Diversity & Democracy*, 11, 2, 1–3. Retrieved from <http://www.diversityweb.org/DiversityDemocracy/vol11no2/vol11no2.pdf> (accessed 01 July 2018).
10. Tatunts, S.A. (1999). Ethnic Minorities in the Communicative Practice. *Scientific Journal of Moscow University. Series 18. Sociology and Politology*, 4, 80.
11. Smit, E. (1994). *National Identity*. Kyiv: Osnovy.
12. Tsyba, V. (2011). The Democratic Reforms of the State. Dialectic, Social, and Psychological Aspects. *Political Management*, 4, 56–70.
13. Belitser, N. Regional Identity and Regional Separatism in Modern Europe. Retrieved from <http://www.ucipr.kiev.ua/publications/regionalna-identichnist-i-regionalnii-separatizm-u-suchasni-evropi> (accessed 01 July 2018).
14. Arabadzhyiev, D.Yu. (2012). Monitoring of Political and Citizenship Identity of the Students: Regional Aspect. *Grani*, 7 (87), 101–105.
15. Arabadzhyiev, D.Yu. (2013). Monitoring of National, Macroregional, and

Regional Identity as a Factor Influencing Citizenship Identity. *Nova Paradygma*, 118, 117–125.

16. Arabadzhiev, D., Malovanyi, M., Bohomolova, N. (2014). The Phenomenon of Citizenship Identity in the Mentality and Social Activity of Students (Regional Aspect, Potential Context is. *Theory and Practice of Horting*, 2, 8–14.

17. Putin: Russians and Ukrainians Standing for One People. Retrieved from <https://russian.rt.com/russia/news/328567-putin-russkie-i-ukraincy> (accessed 01 July 2018).

18. Nahorna, L. (2008). The Phenomenon of the Regional Identity: Methodological Aspect. *Scientific Bulletin of the Institute of Political, Ethnic, and National Research Named after I. F. Kuras at NAS of Ukraine*, 40, 28–43.

19. Reznik, O.S. Citizenship Identity. *Encyclopedia of the Modern Ukraine*. Retrieved from http://esu.com.ua/search_articles.php?id=31975 (accessed 01 July 2018).

20. Razumkov Centre (2014). *The Results of the Sociological Research 'The External Political Orientation of the Citizens of Ukraine'* Hold on May 13 2014. Retrieved from http://old.razumkov.org.ua/ukr/news.php?news_id=477 (accessed 01 July 2018).

21. Razumkov Centre (2016). *The Results of the Sociological Research*

'Consolidation of the Ukrainian Society: Dynamics, Challenges, and Perspectives. The Information and analytical data for further dispute' Hold on December 16 2016. Retrieved from <http://old.razumkov.org.ua/ukr/upload/Identi-2016.pdf> (accessed 01 July 2018).