

CONTENTS OF SOCIAL COHESION: KEY ACCENTS OF CONTEMPORARY SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE IN THREE SOCIAL SPACES

Volodymyr Yevtukh¹, Maksym Kolesnichenko^{1,2}

Abstract. The article is devoted to the analysis of key concepts related to the interpretation of the contents of the “social cohesion” phenomenon in three social spaces — North-American, European and Ukrainian. Attention is focused on the works of researchers from the middle of the 20th to the first twenty years of the 21st century. It is emphasized that the discourse of this period is characterized by two trends in the statements of Western researchers: a) opinions are expressed that the phenomenon remains in the center of research attention; b) sometimes research attention to the phenomenon decreases. The authors present the most generalized and most widespread definitions of the concept of “social cohesion” in the scientific discourse, analyze certain new trends in its interpretation in comparison with previous periods, drawing attention to the fact that recently there has been a tendency to increase the operationalization of the concepts in the discourse.

The article contains an analysis of the development of a large pool of researchers of social cohesion from the countries of North America and Europe, as well as the basis for the development of scientific discourse in the Ukrainian social space and the possibility of its inclusion in the global discourse.

Keywords: contents of social cohesion, scientific discourse, North-American social space, European social space, Ukrainian social space, interdisciplinarity, measurement models of the content of social cohesion

1 Actuality and state-of-the-art

The issue of social cohesion today is one of the most urgent problems of social development for all countries of the modern world. According to David Schiefer (German Center for Integration and Migration Studies) and Jolanda van der Noll (University of The Hague, Netherlands), in the last 20 years the issue of social cohesion has attracted extraordinary attention both in academic circles and in the political sphere [42, 579]. Such a statement, in our opinion, is connected with dynamic processes of social differentiation both within countries and on the international arena — between countries. The actualization of the problem of social cohesion is evidenced by the attention given to it by the management bodies of world, continental, regional and local territorial

¹ National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. yevtukh@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2746-2283>

² kmv@isgis.org.ua, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7685-2662>

and administrative associations. We are talking about the UN, the European Union, the Council of Europe, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the World Bank, associations of local communities, etc. [8, 24, 27, 38].

Such interest in the problem in the 1960s and 1970s and in subsequent years gave a powerful impetus to the development of scientific discourse around issues related to the phenomenon of “social cohesion”. It is the period from the second half of the 20th century to the present time that we consider the key conceptual approaches of the modern scientific discourse regarding the definition of the contents of social cohesion. We note in advance that in the works in which these approaches are presented, the main emphasis is on the following issues: clarifying the nature of social cohesion, its content and the peculiarities of its functioning in various socio-political and socio-cultural contexts. Within such contexts, we choose three social spaces: North-American, European (mostly Western European) and Ukrainian. The logic of such a choice is rooted in the following: for the first two, social cohesion is one of the most relevant topics in their social development for a long time, and here they have accumulated a powerful experience of researching the phenomenon; however, according to general laws, each of them has its own peculiarities in the dynamics of this phenomenon, which, in fact, is reflected in the conceptual approaches to its interpretations in the scientific discourse; as to the Ukrainian social space, attention (both theoretically and practically) to social cohesion is beginning to intensify here, and there are many connections with its dynamics in the aforementioned spaces, and under these circumstances, taking into account the experience of foreign practices, it is important to determine conceptual approaches to interpreting the trajectory of its development in order to assess its role in social processes and strengthen its foundations in Ukraine.

At the initial stage of the study of the phenomenon of “social cohesion”, the works of Émile Durkheim and Le Bon, which laid down the principled approaches to its study, became decisive. The scientists based their reflections on social cohesion on the interaction between individuals and society, the degree of strength of social ties and the presence/absence of social conflicts.

At the current stage of the scientific discourse, a number of foreign scientists (Caroline Beauvais, Frances Brazier, Xavier Fonseca, Jane Jenson, Jolanda van der Noll, Stephan Lukosch, David Schiefer) carried out a thorough analysis of the course of the scientific discourse itself, with emphasis on its key moments, primarily related to social processes in this or that country (mainly in the USA, Canada and European countries). A large number of works by foreign researchers address the specific problems of the functioning of social cohesion and, in this connection, the dynamics of its contents.

We will name those researchers who, according to Brazier Frances, Fonseca Xavier, Lukosch Stephan laid the foundation for the study of the problem and made a significant contribution to defining the content of the phenomenon of “social cohesion” and its role in social development at the current stage: Mateo Alaluf, Kurt Back, Bernard Paul, Leif Braaten, Caroline Beauvais, Dorwin Cartwright, Charles Cooley, William McDougall, Leon Festinger, John French, Mark Granovetter, George Homans, Irving Janis, Sharon Jeannotte, Lewin Kurt, Christian Larsen, David Lockwood, Alber Lott, Bernice Lott,

Judith Maxwell, Talcott Parsons Bertram Raven, Stanley Schachter, Joseph Stokes [27] etc. Each of the named researchers (represented and represent different socio-humanitarian, technical, natural sciences and medicine and different countries) to one degree or another developed (and continues to develop) the principles of studying social cohesion, primarily its contents.

It is important to note that “Scholars of social cohesion argue, however, that — beyond the emphasis on social cohesion as a desirable characteristic of a community, and the common narrative of social cohesion being in decline — there is little agreement on what social cohesion precisely entails. Subsequently, various authors suggested new definitions and frameworks of social cohesion, which in turn were picked up and criticized by other protagonists in the field” [42]. For example, Canadian researcher Paul Bernard described social cohesion as a “quasi-concept, that is, one of those hybrid mental constructions that politics proposes to us more and more often in order to simultaneously detect possible consensuses on a reading of reality, and to forge them” [19]. However, despite this kind of situation in statements about the phenomenon of “social cohesion”, it remains in the list of urgent problems of social development in almost all countries of the world, and, therefore, the relevance of its research remains. True, researchers of the modern stage are trying to focus attention on the dynamics of its current contents. David Schiefer and Jolanda van der Noll stated in this context that “Despite the lack of consensus, recent decades have seen an inflationary use of the concept by scientists and policy makers as an instrument to monitor societal development and to adapt policies to face societal challenges, such as globalization or diversity” [42].

Speaking about the peculiarities of research of the phenomenon of “social cohesion”, we should emphasize the interdisciplinary factor of its study, since social cohesion itself is a multidimensional phenomenon; for this, in the text, we present the field of socio-humanitarian knowledge developed by this or that discourse actor.

2 Definition of social cohesion

In order to find out (at least, in the most generalized sense) the content of the phenomenon of “social cohesion”, we used three groups of sources — dictionary publications, official documents of international and regional organizations that focus on issues of social cohesion, and research by experts on this issue .

So, social cohesion, according to dictionary editions, is “The interdependence between the members of a society, shared loyalties, and solidaity” [43], “The bonds or “glue” that maintain stability in society” [20].

The determinate feature of the second group of sources (and it is represented by official documents of such organizations as the UN, the European Union, the Council of Europe, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the World Bank, etc.) in the definition of the concept of “social cohesion” is primarily the emphasis on the potential of its use as “as a policy framework”. For example, the OECD recommended social cohesion as a policy objective to its member states in a high-level conference “Beyond 2000: The New Social Policy Agenda in 1996”. The European Union (EU) declared eco-

conomic and social cohesion as a main policy goal in the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992 and the Lisbon Agenda in 2000” [44]. The Council of Europe, in our opinion, has advanced the most comprehensive definition of social cohesion as a policy framework. In its New Strategy for Social Cohesion, it defines social cohesion as “the capacity of a society to ensure the welfare of all its members, minimizing disparities and avoiding polarization” [24]. The Strategy identifies four main areas of welfare: equity in access to rights, the dignity and recognition of each person, autonomy and personal fulfillment, and the possibility of participating as a full member of a society [17].

Regarding the third group of sources, it is almost the most significant in our context, based on the statement of the question declared in the title of the article. In this story, we dwell on the general fundamental characteristics of the concept of “social cohesion”, and further on we will reveal the peculiarities of its functioning in specific socio-cultural contexts: we will be talking about three dimensions of scientific discourse in relation to the specifics of social spaces (geographical and regional units) — North-American, European and Ukrainian. At the same time, we will emphasize the three most important features that make it possible to reveal the essence of the phenomenon and which can be used as the basis of searches for determining its content: 1) social cohesion focuses on the adaptation of new groups — members of large collectives, in other words, social cohesion encompasses attention of all groups — members of these collectives; 2) social cohesion is a process that does not end with the achievement of a result; 3) social cohesion covers various spheres of social life, such as economic, political and socio-cultural [46]. For an operationalized use of the definition of the concept of “social cohesion”, you can use the definition proposed by the authors of the research project, carried out by a group of German researchers with the support of the Bertelsmann Foundation in 2012, and the proposals of the participants of the seminar “Dimensions of Social Cohesion. A New System of Indicators” (2013): “We, thus, define social cohesion as the extent of social togetherness in a territorially defined geopolitical entity. Social cohesion is a characteristic of the ‘collective’ residing in this entity, rather than of individual members. A cohesive society can be characterized by reliable social relations, a positive emotional connectedness of its members to the entity and a pronounced focus on the common good. Each of these three domains unfolds in three dimensions, which can be measured separately” [26, 5].

To this we will add two more (actually, descriptions of characteristics), which, according to some researchers, should constitute the essence of social cohesion: 1) “social cohesion involves the construction of common values and commonality in interpretation, the reduction of differences in wealth and income, and, usually, the formation of people feel that they are involved in a common enterprise, that they face common challenges, and that they are members of the same community” [35]; “the willingness of members of society to cooperate with each other in order to survive and thrive” [46].

We agree with the opinion that “although different approaches stress different elements of social cohesion based on certain ideologies or concerns of agents from particular policy fields, the majority of the approaches eventually capture similar core dimensions. In other words, there is in fact more overlap between the approaches than (...) disagreement implies”. There are “three core

dimensions of social cohesion that the majority of social cohesion approaches agree on: social relations, sense of belonging, and orientation towards the common good. Three other, often incorporated, components of social cohesion—(in)equality, quality of life, and shared values—we argue, should however be treated as antecedents or consequences of social cohesion, rather than inherent essential components” [42].

3 Three spatial dimensions of scientific discourse

Introducing remarks: general objectives impacting the contemporary interpretations of social cohesion’s contents

Focusing on modern concepts of the content of social cohesion, we are aware that the principles of defining the phenomenon itself are rooted in time starting from Émile Durkheim and Gustave Le Bon and the work of their followers until the middle of the 20th century. We note that even then different interpretations appeared, and in modern conditions they are strengthened and more than before, correlated with specific socio-cultural circumstances in which the phenomenon of social cohesion functions and in which the actors of scientific discourse are included (meaning the social space of that or that country).

We assume that the narratives of the study of certain aspects of social cohesion in the period we have determined were influenced by statements that were spread in the North -American and European social spaces, that the supposed decrease in the level of social cohesion has recently been recorded [42]. The reasons for such a situation, according to many Western researchers, were: a) the process of globalization and its associated economic changes (professor of sociology of the Università degli Studi di Milano Antonio Chiesi; Australian researchers Kath Hulse and Wendy Stone from Swinburne University of Technology; Canadian researcher Jane Jenson ; American researcher Deborah Mitchell; French sociologist Alain Touraine); (b) global migration movements and growing ethno-cultural diversity (Canadian researchers Caroline Beauvais and Jane Jenson; Pauline Hope Cheong from State University of New York at Buffalo, Rosalind Edwards and Harry Goulbourn from London South Bank University, John Solomos from University of Warwick; Jan Niessen, director of the Migration Policy Group; American political sociologist Rodert David Putnam; professor of psychology from Duke University Dan Ariely; Canadian politologists from Université du Québec à Montréal Allison Harell and Dietlind Stolle; specialists from different scientific Institutions in the USA, Great Britain and Spain James Laurence, Katarina Schmid, Miles Hewstone; Australian researchers Rebeka Wickes, Renee Zahnnow, Gentry White, Loraine Mazerolle, Walters Robert, Zeller Bruno); (c) the development of new information and (computer-based) communication technologies (Caroline Beauvais, Sara Ferlander, Jane Jenson, David Timms); (d) the inclusion of additional member states as members of the European Union (Kath Hulse and Wendy Stone, professor in law from Cardiff Jo Hunt).

Perhaps the most characteristic feature of the discussions in the North-American space, as well as in the European space, by the way, was that “contemporary approaches to social cohesion are more strongly circled around its

operationalization and usability for policy makers” [42], for example Jane Jenson . Researchers of the course of scientific discourse in various social spaces noted that “although different approaches stress different elements of social cohesion based on certain ideologies or concerns of agents from particular policy fields, the majority of the approaches eventually capture similar core dimensions” [42].

The complexity of the trajectory of the dynamics of social cohesion and the influence of external factors on it prompted Western researchers to intensively develop measurement models of its contents [18, 26, 27, 39, 40, 41], which is quite a noticeable trend in the modern scientific discourse regarding this phenomenon.

As to the third spatial dimension (Ukrainian), its formation is influenced by the search for optimal ways of developing social cohesion in connection with the pro-European (pro-Western in the broad sense of the word) choice of Ukraine, and, therefore, it involves the effective use of Western experience in this area.

Contemporary interpretations of cohesion’ contents in North-American social space

The analysis of the literature on issues related to the phenomenon of social cohesion provides an opportunity for the statement that in the North-American pool of scientific space, the names of such researchers were the most notable: American philosopher Herbert Schneider (1892-1984); American social psychologists Dorwin Cartwright (1915-2008), Alvin Zander (1913-1998), Irving Janis (1918-1990), Albert Lott, Bernice Lott, Bertram Raven, Leon Festiger (1919-1989), John French, Stanley Schachter; American sociologists Mark Granovetter, George Homans (1910-1989), Talcott Parsons (1902-1979); American sociologist and psychologist Kurt Back; Canadian researchers of social cohesion and related problems Roderic Beaujot, Caroline Beauvais, Jane Jenson, Sharon Jeannotte, Will Kymlicka, Judit Maxwell, Fernando Rajulton, Ravana-Zenaida, etc.

The key accents of the discourse of researchers from the countries of North America in determining the contents of social cohesion were their socio-cultural, economic and to some extent political aspects. At the same time, it became noticeable that the discussions were tied to what can be achieved in societies under the conditions of the formation of stable foundations of social cohesion — an unconditional conflict-free political and social situation and the prejudice of counter-resistance in the interaction of different layers of the population, especially from the point of view of its multi-ethnic (multi-cultural) composition.

Analysis of the works of the listed researchers currently working in the North- American social space makes it possible to find several important interpretations of the “social cohesion” phenomenon, which differ to some extent from such researchers of previous periods. First of all, this concerns the opinions of the Canadian researcher and practitioner in the field of social cohesion, Judith Maxwell, who believes that the content of social cohesion is determined by shared values and a common understanding of this phenomenon, the level of differences in wealth and income, and a sense of involvement in joint entrepreneurship [35]. Actually, we can emphasize the importance of the factor

of creation of common values and common interpretations of social phenomena by group members.

It becomes obvious that, if in the previous periods of scientific discourse, American and Canadian researchers clearly tied the content of the phenomenon of “social cohesion” to the social characteristics of groups and relationships in their environment, then contemporary interpretations of the content of social cohesion are to some extent shifted to the evaluation of findings the effects of social and psychological factors in the process of interaction of various actors. For example, Talcott Parsons emphasized the fact that the stability of social cohesion is significantly influenced by norms and values (actually, moral and behavioral norms) generated by politics, religion, family, education, and the economy, since the latter should function for the good of society. Obviously, the presence of such factors becomes the basis for the creation of a certain community, the members of which engage in interpersonal interaction [27].

Caroline Beauvais and Jane Jenson propose to consider social cohesion as an ongoing process, which, in our opinion, is quite logical in the environment of defined groups, emphasizing the importance of the level of internal solidarity and values shared by group members. Ultimately, researchers emphasize that such a process is a kind of compromise of the interaction of five factors — belonging to a group, inclusion in a group, participation in group activities, recognition by other group members, legitimacy of actions regarding the course of the process [18].

Interesting, in our opinion, is the conclusion of the American social psychologists Albert Lott and Bernice Lott that the degree of sympathy is an indicator of group cohesion; they put forward a new definition of social cohesion as a group attribute , which is determined by the amount and strength of mutual positive attitudes between people in the group [34]. Obviously, taking into account this definition of social cohesion, the American sociologist from Stanford University Mark Granovetter, to some extent adjusts his theory of primary groups with regard to the degree of strength of internal ties. Social cohesion, according to the researcher, is influenced by the extent to which the friendship networks of people of different groups overlap [28], we would add, coincide. Actually, this is also about the importance of individual interaction of members of this or that community in the formation, and even more so, in our opinion, of the stabilization and dynamics of social cohesion.

Canadian researchers Fernando Rajulton, Ravanera Zenaida, and Roderic Beaujot proposed an effective model for measuring the level of social cohesion based on six components that were once discovered by a professor at the University of Montreal (Canada) Jane Jenson [31]. These components are: inclusion/exclusion, equality/inequality, legality/illegitimacy, participation/passivity, recognition/rejection, belonging/isolation [40].

Note that the dynamics of scientific discourse is ensured by the discovery of new properties of this or that phenomenon, or at least by its new interpretations based on the accumulated material and techniques of their analysis. An example of such an approach can be the continuation of the search for the interpretation of Judith Maxwell’s definition of social cohesion, which is significant for the second period of the discourse, by the researcher Sharon Jeannotte. She, clarifying the functioning of the phenomenon in Canadian conditions, singles

out the following features: the continuous process of community development with shared values, shared challenges and equal opportunities in Canada is based on a sense of trust, hope and reciprocity between all Canadians [30]. The latter characteristics is a really important foundation for the formation and functioning of social cohesion, especially in the psychological dimension. Talcott Parsons views social cohesion as levels of order and stability held together by shared norms and values in a society, given that politics, religion, family, education and the economy must function for the good of society. They enable people to identify common goals and contribute to their achievement, as well as to share moral and behavioral norms that are the basis for interpersonal relationships [27].

As we can see, in this period of discourse, special attention is paid to the role of socio-psychological factors in the formation of social cohesion and its development, in particular, interpersonal interaction of members of groups, communities, societies, in particular, the level of collective mentality, which plays an important role in interaction in any community, and which, according to Herbert Schneider, forms the basis of social cohesion of the group. It is about an inner collective mentality with different levels of reciprocity and a common way of feeling and thinking [27].

Some reflections on social cohesion in european social space

Issues of social cohesion research in the European (mainly Western European) scientific space are taken care of by: Dutch scientists Frances Brasier, Fonseca Xavier, Stephan Lukosch, Jolanda van der Noll; sociologists Mateo Alaluf (Belgium), Leif Braaten, (Norvege, 1928-2018), Antonio Chiesi (Italy), David Lockwood (Great Britain, 1929-2014), British psychologist William McDougall, Danish economist Christian Larsen, German -American psychologist Kurt Lewin, sociologist David Schiefer (Germany), professor at the Dublin City University Joseph Stokes etc.

As we mentioned above European researchers suggest to consider the content of social cohesion in its three main dimensions: (1) the quality of social relations (including social networks, trust, acceptance of diversity, and participation), (2) identification with the social entity, and (3) orientation towards the common good (sense of responsibility, solidarity, compliance to social order) [42].

A team of European authors (Delhey Jan, Boehnke Klaus, Dragolov Georgi, Ignacz Zsofia S., Larsen Mandi, Lorenz Jan, Koch Michael), having studied the effect of various factors in the context of constructing social cohesion, came to the conclusion that “H1-universalistic: The level of social cohesion in a society is positively influenced by economic development, low income inequality, liberal democracy, and secularization/post-materialist values. H2-universalistic: The subjective well-being of a population is positively influenced by a society’s level of social cohesion” [25].

M. Alaluf, for example, believes that social cohesion is the meaning of the identity of the nation, which consists of various (different from each other) traditions, cultures, languages [27]. In our opinion, this statement requires a more detailed elaboration, in particular, in view of the latest trend in the research of social phenomena in modern Western societies. This refers to the opinion of

the Canadian political philosopher, a well-known researcher of multiculturalism from “Queens” University William Kymlicka that in multinational states, people primarily profess citizenship, and not national identity [32, 256]. Sociological surveys of Ukrainian researchers to a certain extent confirm the thesis put forward by William Kymlicka: in many cases, the number of those who define themselves primarily as citizens of one or another state significantly exceeds the number of those who identify themselves through national identity [12, 350]. This opinion may be relevant to a number of European countries, where a considerable number of people from other countries live; they, adapting to the socio-economic and socio-cultural conditions of the countries of settlement and integrating into this or that society, become citizens of these countries of residence, and for them citizenship as a factor of belonging to their community is brought to the fore.

In the development of scientific discourse, the idea of David Lockwood, which revolves around the role of social networks in the dynamics of social cohesion, may be productive. Positive interaction, a researcher of primary groups, let’s recall, he was Charles Cooley (groups formed on the basis of family ties and ties with others), and secondary networks (voluntary associations, family organizations, active associations of civil society), strengthens degree of social cohesion [27].

In a similar vein, the degree of group cohesion is interpreted by other participants of the discourse. Thus, the Norwegian professor of psychology Leif Braaten (1928-2018) defined group cohesion as the equivalent of good relationships for an individual, which, if present, can help an individual become the person he/she aspires to be. By the way, L. Braaten, taking into account positive relationships in the middle of the group, created a multidimensional model that supports the establishment, development and achievement of a high level of cohesion [21].

4 Social cohesion in ukrainian social space: prospects of investigation

As to measuring the contents of social cohesion in the Ukrainian research space, it is just beginning, since part of this space, related to the study of the phenomenon, is in the stage of formation. It is worth saying that today’s social circumstances force Ukrainian scientists to be more intensive and more carefully about the importance of social cohesion in social processes. Here we are talking about the circumstances caused by military actions on the territory of Ukraine, which require a high degree of social cohesion. We note that the development of topics related to the issue of social cohesion took place even before the mentioned circumstances; the latter motivated both theorists and practitioners to intensify efforts in this direction.

In recent years, several works have appeared in Ukraine that allow us to talk about the fact that a research environment is beginning to take shape here, the focus of which is on the functioning of social cohesion [1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15] . Among the topics that provide grounds for the development of certain conceptual approaches to the understanding of the phenomenon of “social cohesion” and in particular its contents are social processes and their

regional features, regional aspects of socio-economic development, social policy, processes of social cohesion in youth in general and in school and student environments in particular, the issue of immigrant integration in the Ukrainian social space [4, 36].

Related to the discourse on social cohesion in the Ukrainian scientific space are topics concerning the tolerance in the relations of different strata of the population and inter-ethnic tolerance in particular [3, 13, 14]. An important moment in the development of the scientific discourse is the study of the experience accumulated by foreign researchers [1, 6, 8]. The latter helps Ukrainian scientists to form their positions regarding the role of social cohesion in social development, to make comparisons in order to formulate the concepts of understanding social cohesion as adequately as possible, by the way, the peculiarities of its content in Ukrainian society.

The basic source for formulating an evaluation of the state of social cohesion and researching its prospects is the monitoring of social changes in Ukraine, which has been carried out by the team of the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine for almost thirty years, publishing its findings in the special publication “Ukrainian Society: Monitoring of Social Changes”. Of special interest in the context of our presentation are the following sections: “Economic situation”, “Social well-being and public attitudes”, “Social changes”, “Inter-ethnic relations and the language of communication.” Working out the monitoring data and articles related to it, it is possible to draw certain conclusions about the possible state of social cohesion in Ukrainian society and its dynamics in the future. For example, by 2020, Ukrainians assessed the economic situation at the level of an average score from 1.3 (1998) to 3.4 (2005 and 2019), in 2020 this indicator was 3.0. These data are significantly below the average indicator of the 11-point scale (0-11 points) [12, 443].

In the context of reflections on the prospects of social cohesion in Ukrainian society, it is worth considering the tension indicator. According to domestic sociologists, “for Ukrainian society, which is constantly in a process of transformation, social tension has become its “background” characteristic. At the same time, the social situation is destabilizing in various spheres due to the loss of balance in the social system, and therefore, the risk of both loss of controllability of the system (systemic tension) and an increase in the population’s experience of tension (subjective tension), which may ultimately turn into protest behavior, increases” [5, 95]. In 2020, the tension index was 6.28 points on a 10-point scale; in several previous years, these indicators ranged from 6.79 (2017) to 7.25 (2019) points. We remind you that 1.00 points is a “calm situation” and 10.00 points is a “critical situation” [5, 95].

As for such an important indicator as the index of social well-being of Ukrainians, taking into account more than thirty indicators, from 1996 to 2020 it ranged from 33.7 percent (1998) to 40.9 percent (2019), in 2020 it was 40.0 percent. Note that this is the average value (conditional zero); the very range of the social well-being scale is measured from 20 to 60 points [12, 494]. Ukrainians’ assessment of the social changes that took place during the period in various spheres of social life, which was studied in the monitoring, was on the borderline below the average indicator (5.0): for example, the material conditions of the family — from 1.8 in 1994 to 2.3 in 2020 [12, 526].

In the complex of problems that significantly affect the state of social well-being of the population, which is directly related to the state of social cohesion, there is the problem of personal security of the citizen in the living environment (in the broad sense of the word, society), “since the phenomenon of security and security itself permeates all levels of social life” and “this phenomenon is present in all spheres of human activity” [16, 423]. According to domestic researchers, the set of numerous problems inherent in Ukrainian society “contributes to people’s state of uncertainty, lack of confidence, hopelessness and causes them to experience their insecurity in society. The key that opens the way to overcoming this complex socio-psychological problem is in overcoming crisis phenomena in all spheres of society, stabilizing the everyday life of citizens” [16, 440].

To determine the state of social cohesion and the parameters of its prospects in Ukrainian society, it is necessary to take into account such a factor as the polyethnicity of its population (to a certain extent). In this context, the index of social distance plays a decisive role in the interaction of carriers of various ethno-cultural traditions. Let’s reproduce the situation with regard to some representatives of the immigrant pool: for those from Arab countries, the average score was (1992-2020) from 5.1 (1992) to 6.1 (2012); 5.9 (2020); for Turks, this index varies from 4.9 (1992) to 5.9 (2002-2004); 5.5 (2020); For the speakers of various ethnicities, we have the following picture: the lowest average score of social distance among Ukrainian residents of Slavic origin (2020): Ukrainians — 2.4; Belarusians — 4.3; Poles — 4.7; of Russians — 4.8. For other ethnicities included in the monitoring (Americans, Hungarians, Georgians, Jews, Crimean Tatars, Moldovans, Germans, Romanians), it ranged from 4.8 (for Germans) to 5.3 (for Romanians) [12, pp. 478–484].

Such a situation in interethnic interaction indicates the possibility of achieving a sufficiently high level of social cohesion in Ukrainian society, of course, under the conditions of strengthening the egalitarian (equal) foundations of the social policy of the Ukrainian state.

Based on the listed publications, it can be stated that a platform is being formed in the Ukrainian scientific space for the study of the phenomenon of social cohesion, and specific social studies such as the monitoring of social changes provide a data base for their deployment in various directions.

5 Conclusion

The analysis of modern studies of the phenomenon of social cohesion in different countries allows us to single out several main trends: 1) social cohesion continues to be the focus of attention of scientists of many countries (we focused on three social spaces, although research has recently intensified in the Asian social space and in Australia [22, 45]), 2) a notable feature of modern scientific discourse, according to some researchers, is its weakening, but this does not mean a loss of interest in the phenomenon; 3) the search for the reasons for the modern dynamics of its content is tied to those socio-economic and political situations that are characteristic of the residence country of certain researchers; 4) modern research is characterized by a large degree of practicality associated with the thesis “what does social cohesion provide for the social

development of this or that country”; 5) the emphasis on interdisciplinarity (because a phenomenon itself) is more noticeable than in previous periods, and therefore in this direction of its study; 6) for the specified three social spaces, the fundamental principles of the formation of the “social cohesion” construct remain constant in the scientific discourse, but there is a noticeable shift in the interest of researchers towards the study of the influence of individual and psychological factors on the dynamics of the contents of social cohesion and challenges to the development of policies for managing these dynamics; 7) an important component of the research of a certain pool of Western scientists is the effort to build effective models for measuring the content of social cohesion; 8) the inclusion in the context of the article of the possibilities of forming social cohesion in the Ukrainian social space showed that: a) the latter in the context studied by us is a component of the modern global space, and here too the problems of social cohesion are quite acute; b) to a large extent, the concepts of both the content itself and its study are built taking into account historical experience and the latest modern trends of Western scientific discourse, primarily researchers and practitioners from North-American and European countries.

References

- [1] Deineko Oleksandra. 2021. Krytychnyi ohlyad modeli vymiryuvannya sotsial'noyi zhurtovanosti Dzh. Chana Perspektivyv adaptatsiyi do ukraïns'koho kontekstu (Critical review of the model for measuring of social cohesion of Chan J.: Perspectives of adaptation to Ukrainian context). *Visnyk NYUU imeni Yaroslava Mudroho. Seriya: Filofofiya, filofofiya prava, politolohiya, sotsiolohiya*: 4(51). <https://doi.org/10.21564/2663-5704.51.242243>.
- [2] Deineko Oleksandra. 2021. Sotsial'na zhurtovanist' yak katehoriya derzhavnnoi polityky: osoblyvosti konstruyuvannya v ukraïns'komu zakonodavstvi (Social cohesion as a category of state policy: peculiarities of constructing in Ukrainian legislation). *Visnyk NYUU imeni Yaroslava Mudroho. Seriya: Filofofiya, filofofiya prava, politolohiya, sotsiolohiya*. 2(49). <https://doi.org/10.21564/2663-5704.49.229332>.
- [3] Drozhzhyna S.V. 2006. Tolerantnist' yak diyevyi chynnyk demokratyzatsiyi suchasnoho ukraïns'koho suspil'stva (Tolerance as acting factor of democratization of Ukrainian society). *Multiversum. Filisofs'kyi visnyk*. 55, 46–51.
- [4] Yevtukh V.B., Kisla G.O., Savenkova L.V. Immigranty u konteksti etnonatsional'nykh peotseviv (Immigrants in context of ethno-national processes). Kyiv: Interservis. 192 s.
- [5] Zlobina O. 2020. Stan sotsial'noyi napruzhenosti suchasnoho ukraïns'koho suspil'stva za otsinkamy naseleennyi (The state of tension of Ukrainian society in estimations of population). *Ukraïns'ke suspil'stvo: monitoring sotsial'nykh zmin*. Vypusk 7 (21). Kyiv: Instytut sotsiologiyi NAN Ukraïny, 95–101.
- [6] Kolesnichenko M.V. 2021. Problematyka sotsial'noyi kohesiyi e zarubizhnomy naukomyi dyskursi (Problems of social cohesion in foreign scientific discourse). *Osvitniy dyskurs. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*. Vypusk 35 (7). Kyiv, 17–32.

- [7] Lishchyns'ky Ihor. 2019. Polityka terytorial'noyi kohesiyi (Police of territorial cohesion). *Zhurnal yevropeis'koyi ekonomiky*. 18, 387–403. dspace.wunu.edu.ua/bitstream/ÐŽÐĚÐ'ÐŸÐ'ÐąÐñÐŽÐŸÐŽ
- [8] Orzhel' O. Yu. 2012. Zastosuvannya dosvidu zhurtuvannya Yevropeis'koho Soyuzu dlya formuvannya polityky natsional'noyi konsolidatsiyi ukraïns'koho suspil'stva: etap vyroblennya indykatoriv (Adaptation of experience of European Union to formation of national consolidation of Ukrainian society: the stage of elaboration of indicators). *Investytsiyi: praktyka ta dosvid*. No 14.
- [9] Orzhel' O. Yu. 2012. Konsolidatsiya ukraïns'koho suspil'stva na osnovi natsional'noyi ideyi: perspektyvy i obmezhenya (z tochky zory yevropeis'koho dosvidy) [Consolidation of Ukrainian society upon the national idea: perspektyvy i limits (from European experience' view)]. *Ekonomika ta derzhava*. 8, 102–105. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/ecde_2012_8_32.
- [10] Orzhel' O. Yu. 2012. Kontseptual'ni pidkhody do vuznachennya sotsial'noho zhurtuvannya (Conceptual approaches to the definition of social cohesion). [www.dridu.dp.ua/zbirnik/2012-01\(7\)](http://www.dridu.dp.ua/zbirnik/2012-01(7)).
- [11] Polishchuk Yuriy. 2019. Vydy suspil'noyi konsolidatsiyi u pidkhodakh vitchyznyanykh doslidnykiv (Species of social consolidation in publications of domestic researchers). *Naukovi zapysky IPIEND im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrayiny*. 3–4(95–96), 73–93.
- [12] Ukrayins'ke suspil'stvo: monitoring sotsial'nykh zmin. 2020. 7(21). Kyiv: Instytut sotsiologiyi NAN Ukrayiny. 546 s.
- [13] Kharadzhy M.V. 2011. Sotsial'no-psykholohchni konteksty mizhetnichoyi tolerantnosti (Social-psychological contexts of interethnic tolerance). *Mizhnarodny forum: sotsiologiya, psykholohiya, pedahohika, menedzhment. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*. 6, 141–156.
- [14] Khyzhnyak O. Social'ne pryznachennya tolerantnosti (Social purpose of tolerance). *Mizhnarodny forum: sotsiologiya, psykholohiya, pedahohika, menedzhment. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*. 6, 141–156.
- [15] Shelest O.S. 2019. Suspil'na konsolidatsiya u vitchyznanomu politychnomu dyskursi: vid ponyattya do real'noyi praktyky (Social consolidation in domestic discourse: from the notion to real practice). <http://dspace.onu.edu.ua:8080/handle/123456789/30280>.
- [16] Shul'ha M. 2020. Perezhyvannya osobystystyu stany zakhyshchenosti v suspil'stvi (Zamist' pislyamovy) [Personal experience of a state of security in society (Instead of an afterword)]. *Ukrayins'ke suspil'stvo: monitoring sotsial'nykh zmin*. 2020. Vypusk 7 (21). Kyiv: Instytut sotsiologiyi NAN Ukrayiny, 418–440.
- [17] Babajanian Babken. 2012. Social protection and its contribution to social cohesion and state-building. Published by: GIZ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, 12. <https://cdn.odi.org/media/documents/7759.pdf>.
- [18] Beauvais Caroline, Jenson Jane 2002. Social cohesion: Updating the state of the research. CPRN Discussion Paper. No. F| 22. *Canadian Policy Research Networks*. 62 p. https://www.socialcohesion.info/fileadmin/user_upload/Beauvais_Jenson_02.pdf
- [19] Bernard Paul. 1999. La cohésion sociale: critique dialectique d'un quasi-concept. *Lien social et Politiques*. Numéro 41, 47–59. <https://id.erudit.org/005057ar>

- 20 Best 1 definitions of social-cohesion — YourDictionary. <https://www.yourdictionary.com/social-cohesion>.
- [20] Braaten Leif. 1991. Group cohesion: A new multidimensional model. 15, 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01419845>.
- [21] Chan J., To H.-P., & Chan E. 2006. Reconsidering social cohesion: Developing a definition and analytical framework for empirical research. *Social Indicators Research*. 75(2), 273–302. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-005-2118-1>.
- [22] Cheong Pauline Hope, Edwards Rosalind, Goulbourne Harry, Solomos John. 2007. Immigration, social cohesion and social capital: A critical review. *Critical Social Policy*. 27(1):24-49. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/publication/240690663_Immigration_Social_Cohesion_and_Social_Capital_A_Critical_Review.
- [23] Council of Europe. 2004. A new strategy for social cohesion. European Committee for Social Cohesion (CDCS). http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/socialcohesiondev/source/RevisedStrategy_en.pdf.
- [24] Delhey Jan, Boehnke Klaus, Dragolov Georgi, Ignácz Zsófia S., Larsen Mandi, Lorenz Jan, Koch Michael. 2018. Social cohesion and its correlates: A comparison of Western and Asian societies. *Comparative Sociology*. 17, 426–455. www.doi.org/10.1163/15691330-12341468.
- [25] Dragolov Georgi, Ignácz Zsófia S., Lorenz Jan, Delhey Jan, Boehnke Klaus. 2013. Social Cohesion Radar measuring common ground: An international comparison of social cohesion methods report. Bertelsmann Stiftung. 56 pp. <http://aei.pitt.edu/id/eprint/74134>.
- [26] Fonseca Xavier, Lukosch Stephan, Brazier Frances . Social cohesion revisited: a new definition and how to characterize it. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2018.1497480>.
- [27] Granovetter Mark S. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1973. 78(6), 1360–1380. <http://snap.stanford.edu/class/cs224w-readings/granovetter73weakties.pdf>.
- [28] Hepburn Mary A. 1992. Multiculturalism and social cohesion in a democratic society: Is the United States experience a model or an example? <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pdf>
- [29] Jeannotte Sharon. 2003. Singing alone? The contribution of cultural capital to social cohesion and sustainable communities. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 9(1), 35–49. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228499276_Singing_Alone_The_Contribution_of_Cultural_Capital_to_Social_Cohesion_and_Sustainable_Communities.
- [30] Jenson Jane. Defining and measuring social cohesion. 2010. Commonwealth Secretariat and United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. 44 pp.
- [31] Kymlicka Will, 2001. Territorial boundaries: A liberal egalitarian perspective. Boundaries and justice: Diverse ethical perspective’/ Editors: David Miller, Sohail Hashmi. Princenton University Press. P. 249-275. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320841370_Territorial_Boundaries_A_Liberal_Egalitarian_Perspective.
- [32] Laurence James, Schmid Katarina, Hewstone Miles. 2019. Ethnic diversity, ethnic threat and social cohesion: (re)-evaluating the role of perceived

- out-group threat and prejudice in the relationship between community ethnic diversity and intra-community cohesion. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 45:3, 395–418. www.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1490638.
- [33] Lott Albert, Lott Bernice. 1961. Group cohesiveness, communication level, and conformity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 62(2), 408–412. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0041109>.
- [34] Maxwell Judith. 1996. Social dimensions in economic growth. Department of Economics, University of Alberta. 36 p.
- [35] Nesterova Marja. 2020. Researches of EU values study in education: Inclusion and social cohesion development. *Vyscha osvita Ukrainy*. 1(76), 49–54.
- [36] Niessen Jan. 2000. Diversity and cohesion: New challenges for the integration of immigrants and minorities. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing. 121 p.
- [37] OECD. 2021. Perspectives on global development: From protest to progress. OECD Publishing. Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/405e4c32-en>.
- [38] Rajulton Fernando, Ravanera Zenaida, Roderic Beaujot, 2007. Measuring social cohesion: An experiment using the Canadian National Survey of giving, volunteering and participating. *Social Indicator Research*, 461–492. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/40763388_Measuring_Social_Cohesion_An_Experiment_using_the_Canadian_National_Survey_of_Giving_Volunteering_and_Participating.
- [39] Ravanera Zenaida R., Beaujot Roderic. 2007. Measuring social cohesion: An experiment using the Canadian National Survey of giving, volunteering and participating. *Social Indicators Review*. www.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-006-0011-1.
- [40] Reeskens Tim, Botterman Sarah, Hooghe Marc. 2008. Is social cohesion one latent concept? Investigating the dimensionality of social cohesion on the basis of the Kearns and Forrest (2000) typology. 255–264.
- [41] Schiefer David, van der Noll Jolanda. 2017. The essentials of social cohesion: A literature review. *Social Indicators Research*. *An International and Interdisciplinary Journal for Quality-of-Life Measurement*. 132 (20), 579–603. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-016-1314-5>.
- [42] Social cohesion. Oxford Reference. oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100515609.
- [43] Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community. 2007. eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/TXT/uri=celex:12007L/TXT.
- [44] Walters Robert, Zeller Bruno. 2018. Citizenship and national identity has strengthened social cohesion in multicultural Australia. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3185137.
- [45] What is social cohesion. Scanlon Institute. <https://scanloninstitute.org.au/what-social-cohesion>.