






# “Social resilience management of Ukrainian territorial communities during the Covid-19 pandemic”

## AUTHORS

Andriana Kostenko   
Tetiana Kozyntseva   
Valentyna Opanasiuk   
Oleksandr Kubatko   
Olena Kupenko 

## ARTICLE INFO

Andriana Kostenko, Tetiana Kozyntseva, Valentyna Opanasiuk, Oleksandr Kubatko and Olena Kupenko (2022). Social resilience management of Ukrainian territorial communities during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 20(3), 1-11. doi:[10.21511/ppm.20\(3\).2022.01](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20(3).2022.01)

**DOI** [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20\(3\).2022.01](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20(3).2022.01)

**RELEASED ON** Tuesday, 05 July 2022

**RECEIVED ON** Saturday, 09 April 2022

**ACCEPTED ON** Sunday, 15 May 2022

## LICENSE



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

## JOURNAL

"Problems and Perspectives in Management"

## ISSN PRINT

1727-7051

## ISSN ONLINE

1810-5467

## PUBLISHER

LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”

## FOUNDER

LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

**36**



NUMBER OF FIGURES

**0**



NUMBER OF TABLES

**3**

© The author(s) 2022. This publication is an open access article.



## BUSINESS PERSPECTIVES



LLC "CPC "Business Perspectives"  
Hryhorii Skovoroda lane, 10,  
Sumy, 40022, Ukraine  
[www.businessperspectives.org](http://www.businessperspectives.org)

**Received on:** 9<sup>th</sup> of April, 2022

**Accepted on:** 15<sup>th</sup> of May, 2022

**Published on:** 5<sup>th</sup> of July, 2022

© Andriana Kostenko, Tetiana Kozyntseva, Valentyna Opanasiuk, Oleksandr Kubatko, Olena Kupenko, 2022

Andriana Kostenko, Doctor of Political Science, Department of Psychology, Politology and Socio-Cultural Technology, Director of Center for Social Research, Sumy State University, Ukraine.

Tetiana Kozyntseva, Ph.D. (Philosophy), Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Politology and Socio-Cultural Technology, Sumy State University, Ukraine.

Valentyna Opanasiuk, Ph.D. in Political Science, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Political Science and Socio-Cultural Technologies, Sumy State University, Ukraine.

Oleksandr Kubatko, Doctor of Economics, Department of Economics, Entrepreneurship and Business Administration, Sumy State University, Ukraine. (Corresponding author)

Olena Kupenko, Doctor of Pedagogical Science, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Politology and Socio-Cultural Technology, Sumy State University, Ukraine.



This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Conflict of interest statement:**

Author(s) reported no conflict of interest

Andriana Kostenko (Ukraine), Tetiana Kozyntseva (Ukraine),  
Valentyna Opanasiuk (Ukraine), Oleksandr Kubatko (Ukraine), Olena Kupenko (Ukraine)

# SOCIAL RESILIENCE MANAGEMENT OF UKRAINIAN TERRITORIAL COMMUNITIES DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

## Abstract

The Covid-19 pandemic changes people's behavior, determines the interpersonal distance of communication, and deepens the digitalization processes of public life. This paper aims to establish the social trust impact on the social sustainability of Ukrainian territorial communities in the Covid-19 pandemic. For an empirical study, four territorial communities of Ukraine were taken, which geographically represent the whole of Ukraine. It used the online survey method based on Google forms. A randomly selected 1530 respondents aged 18+ were interviewed in 2021, where the quota sampling by gender, age, and territorial community has been preserved. The study proves that the family remains the basis of social stability for Ukrainians. In difficult situations, the population expects help from their relatives and is ready to help themselves. However, institutional social trust is highly deficient, with only 5.8% of citizens wishing for help from local authorities in the face of the pandemic. The survey shows that the poorest part of the population is prone to atomization and demonstrates the lowest interpersonal and institutional trust level, weakening social stability due to the risks of numerous divorces, labor migration, and the problems of family members' isolation during the Covid-19 pandemic. The pandemic has widened the gap between the poorest and wealthiest groups. Therefore, social resilience management should aim to improve institutional and interpersonal social trust. Furthermore, public authorities should unite the community using economic, social, cultural, and religious instruments since atomized individuals cannot withstand local and global challenges efficiently.

## Keywords

social trust, socio-economic situation, Covid-19 pandemic, sustainable development, economic inequality

## JEL Classification

A13, B55, Z13

## INTRODUCTION

The importance of trust in society, especially in the face of challenges (e.g., environmental issues, Covid-19, military conflicts, infodemic, etc.), is an essential factor in social and economic security. The loss of confidence in the government during the pandemic resulted in the reshuffle of the Slovak government (Turska-Kawa et al., 2022). In addition, it caused a significant loss of trust in its own population and respondents from other markets in the world's largest economies, the United States and China. The infodemic provoked a drop in confidence in the media, as recorded in the annual Edelman Trust Barometer survey (Edelman, 2021). Rural vaccination in India is also connected with trust in the healthcare sector and information on vaccine threats (Alagarsamy et al., 2022).

Social confidence as a factor of social resilience has been actively studied in recent decades. However, the literature analysis shows insufficient attention to studying territorial communities' social sustainability in the Covid-19 pandemic. There is currently little empirical

evidence on interpersonal and institutional social trust as a condition for strengthening the social resilience of territorial communities in Ukraine to overcome the adverse effects of the Covid-19 pandemic. At the same time, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations, 2015) claims the importance of analyzing the impact of the pandemic on different population groups as a determining factor in the social sustainability of communities. However, the prospects for measuring interpersonal and institutional trust as a condition for forming social stability in a territorial community should be considered broadly.

---

## 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

In recent years, several systematic studies on social resilience have been conducted. In the initial stage, resilience is considered from the point of view of models and dimensions of specific countries or communities affected by natural disasters or risky events (Revell & Henderson, 2019; Ainuddin & Routray, 2012). Also, Norris et al. (2008) began to consider social resilience from the perspective of several disciplines. They presented it as a metaphor, a theory, a set of possibilities, and a disaster preparedness strategy. Finally, Wilson (2012) uses cross-sectoral analysis of natural and social sciences to determine social sustainability. The study relies on the socio-ecological subfield and decision-making theories, the theories of transit, and the social capital theory.

Fan and Lyu (2021) apply empirical data to analyze the social resilience of communities, which makes it possible to compare social resilience indicators in different countries. At the level of local communities, social sustainability is viewed in a triune way as the ability of social actors to cope with difficulties, adapt to daily challenges based on historical experience, and transform, i.e., to create institutions that ensure individual well-being and reliability (Keck & Sakdapolrak, 2013).

Understanding the term “resilience” differs depending on the methodological approach. In particular, from the environmental viewpoint, resilience is seen as the ability of an ecosystem to absorb and recover as a result of external (natural, environmental, or artificial) shocks (Holling, 1973). As for the social sciences and humanities, resilience is viewed as social actors’ ability to withstand external and internal challenges (external military aggression, economic and social shocks, humanitarian challenges, and environmental disasters), recover from shocks, and adapt to change.

This study focuses on the local level, i.e., on the territorial communities that are intermediaries between a personal and micro level, on the one hand, and the macro and global levels, on the other. The formation of social stability at the level of territorial communities is a condition for its scaling to the macro level and “individualization” as a separate person.

Trust breaches multiply anomie and disorganize the structure of a specific social environment (Garfinkel, 1963). The loss of confidence reduces people’s resilience in economic, political, and social challenges, which can be reflected in non-compliance with the norms and rules of public life and the destruction of tolerance concerning people and institutions (Lord, 2019). When considering the conditions for creating a healthy economy, economic efficiency and success (Fukuyama, 1995) refer to its somewhat irrational factor, fixed in social capital, as a materialized trust.

Pointing to the significant potential of trust, scientists do not pay enough attention to the issue where the essential signs of trust should be presented. Typically, trust is described within everyday rhetoric as constitutive expectations from a citizen. It regards the fact that the actions one performs, the rules one follows are regulations and norms for other people (for example, a game (Garfinkel, 1963)), or trust correlates with a broader concept but without pointing to its features (e.g., trust, identified as a value (Coleman, 1988)).

Sztompka (2016) tries to explain the concept of “trust,” believing that trust is “confidence and confidence-based actions,” which indicate that undefined actions of other people or institutions can be helpful. Through the binary opposition, he considers the phenomenon “the culture of trust – the culture of cynicism.” Social trust is not a homogeneous phenomenon, and therefore interperson-

al and institutional social trust are distinguished (Putnam, 1993). Institutional trust (in the institutions of civil society and government institutions), in Newton's (2007) opinion, is "deeper" and can be considered an analog of interpersonal trust. In turn, interpersonal trust appears in two forms – among acquaintances and strangers (Kwon, 2019).

When considering the determinants of interpersonal trust, two approaches are used. In the first one, trust is regarded as an individual quality (Newton, 2007), and in the second – as the quality of society (Putnam, 1993). It is reasonable to have an individual approach to the criteria (for example, depending on gender, religion, education, age, etc.). The second one requires studying the systemic characteristics of public institutions.

Scientists usually create a set of variables and indicators (which are not well established today) to implement confidence into research practice. The individual approach applies the following indicators: life satisfaction, happiness, household income, personal success, etc. For the institutional – healthcare conditions, economic and educational development. World Values Survey uses trust in government, the church, trade unions, the media, political parties, the police, the armed forces, etc., to study institutional confidence. For investigating interpersonal confidence – trust in acquaintances, strangers, neighbors, people of other faiths, and nationality (Morrone et al., 2009).

There is no straightforward approach to the effectiveness of a particular type of trust. However, most researchers believe that an effective tool for strengthening social ties in society is trust, which is formed through the destruction of ethnic, religious, etc., restrictions and egress beyond consanguineous relations through building networks of public organizations, associations, and unions. Namely, horizontal ties in society affect the efficiency boost of physical and human capital. In turn, that results in economic development and greater government efficiency. On the contrary, Rothstein and Uslaner (2005) see the basis of generalized trust in addressing the issue of economic equality and equal opportunities. Therefore, this study empirically proves the relationship between the socio-economic status of citizens and social trust in the community. In turn, it affects the re-

silience of communities and social capital in the Covid-19 pandemic. In this structure of social capital, most researchers treat trust as the most significant factor in the formation, functioning, and development of human capital (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1993; Fukuyama, 1995; Newton, 2007; Garfinkel, 1963).

The challenges faced by society indicate the need to build trust on new principles. It involves using vertical links and building a system that allows society to function in a "gray zone" – a situation of long-term uncertainty (e.g., Covid-19, when the crisis is permanent). In such circumstances, the approach to understanding resilience must change. It consists not only in overcoming the situation and the ability to resist it but also of the possibility of adapting to new "norms" (Gjörw, 2020).

When examining regional forms of human interaction in solving community problems, it is pointed to a slight influence of trust in the central government concerning adaptive capacity. The latter is a decisive factor in community resilience (Afkhami et al., 2022). Thus, social trust and cohesion formation depend on the global nature of challenges or threats and regional contexts.

## 2. AIMS AND HYPOTHESIS

This study aims to establish the impact of social trust on the social sustainability of Ukrainian territorial communities in the Covid-19 pandemic. The research hypothesis is that social trust is a factor in the formation of social resilience of territorial communities, and the socio-economic situation of citizens correlates with the level of social trust.

The study objectives are to establish a connection between the concepts of "social resilience" and "social trust" and assess the level of social trust in the community in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic. In addition, the paper empirically establishes a correlation between the socio-economic situation of citizens and social trust in the community. It also identifies the connection between citizens' socio-economic situation and the resilience of local communities in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic.

### 3. METHODOLOGY AND DATA DESCRIPTION

The empirical stage of the study implies the use of the online survey method. The survey was conducted by the Center for Social Research of Sumy State University among the adult population of four territorial communities of Ukraine: Ivano-Frankivsk, Mykolaiv, Sumy, and Cherkasy. The selected territorial communities united around the administrative centers of the regions, which are comparable in terms of socio-economic characteristics and have an average level of development against the background of other areas in Ukraine. The selected communities represented the western, southern, northeastern, and central parts of Ukraine. The results of the survey were analyzed using the program "OSA."

The field stage of work took place from March 20 to May 10, 2021. The study surveyed 1,530 respondents aged 18+, 55.5% are women and 44.5% are men representing the population of specified territorial communities.

The survey covered different age groups: 18-29 aged – 19.2%; 30-39 – 20.7%; 40-49 – 23.6%; 50+ – 36.4%. Among the respondents in a vulnerable situation are: 18.1% have not enough for basic needs (food, utilities, medicines); 47.6% have enough for basic needs but no more. Given the current quarantine restrictions, the questionnaire was selected for the respondents in accordance with the sample parameters through the Google Forms service.

The study representativeness error of a 0.95 probability: does not exceed 4% – quota sampling by gender, age, and territorial community. Respondents were selected randomly. The questionnaires were processed using the OSA program.

It investigated the community's overall level of social trust and interpersonal and institutional level of social trust in the Covid-19 pandemic (Sumy State University, 2021). Social confidence, in general, was assessed in the question, "Whose support do you count on the most in case of deterioration of the situation?" The following answers worked as indicators: "only on myself," "I do not count on anyone." Interpersonal social trust was assessed in the same question according to the answers-indicators: "on

family members," "on colleagues/friends," and "on residents of the community." Institutional social trust was assessed in the same question by the answers-indicators: "on representatives of local authorities," "on representatives of regional or central authorities," "on volunteers and public organizations," "on the religious community," "philanthropists/sponsors/business," "on doctors" of the same question. Social trust in the community was also under assessment based on citizens' answers regarding their ability to influence decisions in the community.

To measure social sustainability in the community, the paper formulated a block of questions on the influence of the pandemic on various aspects of life, in particular, on security (including at home), health, employment (including unpaid work and homework), and income/earnings (paid job). However, the issue of sustainability was not formulated directly, as the citizens of Ukraine do not use this term.

### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sustainable societies can ensure the well-being of their members or can guarantee to return to a state of well-being after overcoming difficulties. According to the current study results, 46.7% of Ukrainian respondents noted that they have enough funds for basic needs, but no more. Another 18% of respondents stated that they lacked the resources for basic needs, such as food, utility costs, medicines, etc. About a third of respondents (29.3%) note that they can afford to buy clothes and small appliances and have minimal savings. Only 6% of respondents have enough money for all their needs.

The survey also included questions about concretizing general assessments and identifying the most pressing threats. For example, respondents expectedly consider the economic crisis and coronavirus critical threats to the population. About 87.5% of the current risks include increased prices for essential goods and medicines and rising tariffs; 82.7% pointed to the economic crisis; 81.7% pointed to the coronavirus epidemic.

Respondents identified environmental threats as the second priority (72%). Basic economic prob-



lems are overcoming the environmental issues and cannot adequately address the innovative strategies for greening the economy (Melnyk et al., 2013; Sineviciene et al., 2021; Karintseva et al., 2021). In addition, the compensation mechanism for environmental damage is not adequately implemented in Ukraine (Veklych et al., 2020). It is worth noting that against the background of the listed threats, the third group of threats comprises the war in Donbas (56.2%), political crisis (53.4%), and riots (52.3%). The lowest (46.2%) threat in March-May 2021 referred to spreading fakes and misinformation. This priority sounded in estimates in cuts of individual territorial communities, respondents' sex, and age.

There is a relatively high sense of threat among Ukrainians. Trust is considered a quality designed to help cope with threats, i.e., as a basis for the community's resilience (Table 1).

Family members remain the basis of the social stability in Ukrainians, as the population tends to expect help from their relatives and is ready to render aid themselves. At the same time, in difficult situations, Ukrainians more often assist their family members. Thus, 78% of respondents confess that they expect support from their family members in case the Covid-19 condition worsens; 55.7% – turned to their family members for help during the year, and 61.2% helped family members during the year (the tools provided the opportunity to indicate several options on relevant issues).

The question arises as to whether it is possible in crisis to regard reliance on oneself and one's family as a factor in strengthening the community atomization, which in the future may lead to the weakening of social stability. After all, Putnam (1993) and Fukuyama (1995) believe that trust built on consanguineous ties reduces the effectiveness of social relations in society.

According to the study results, in selected territorial communities, there is a significantly lower level (compared to a consanguine one) of interpersonal social trust between colleagues and friends: 30.8% expect support, 21.6% – ask for help, and 44.3% – provide assistance.

While interpersonal social trust is fixed at the family level and with a small percentage at the level of friends and colleagues, expectations for help from various institutions are meager. Only 6.2% of residents count on volunteers and public organizations; 5.8% – rely on representatives of local authorities. The statistical error includes expectations regarding the regional and central leaders, volunteers and public organizations, the religious community, philanthropists/sponsors/businesses, and doctors.

The research data in selected territorial communities indicate the weakness in the analyzed communities of “vertical” ties between citizens and government institutions. “Horizontal” links are limited mainly to kinship. The latter ones are at

**Table 1.** Indicators of interpersonal and institutional social trust in selected territorial communities

Social trust indicators	Whose support you count on the most, %	Whom you turned to for help during the year, %	Whom you assisted during the year, %
<b>Social trust in the community</b>			
only on myself/on my own	62	50.9	-
on no one	4.6	-	-
<b>Interpersonal social trust</b>			
family members	78	55.4	61.2
friends/colleagues	30.8	21.6	44.3
community residents /strangers	2.3	-	7.3
<b>Institutional social trust</b>			
representatives of local authorities	5.8	2.4	-
representatives of regional or central authorities	3.9	0.7	-
volunteers and public organizations	6.2	1.6	4.3
religious communities	3.8	2	2.8
patrons/sponsors/business	1.2	0.2	-
doctors	1.9	2.2	3.8

risk of further destruction due to the transformation of the family institution and many divorces, labor migration, and the problems of isolating family members living in different places under the quarantine restrictions of the Covid-19 pandemic. These risks received the following confirmation: the answer to the question “Whose support do you count on the most in case of worsening the situation related to the spread of Covid-19?” the option “only on myself” was chosen by 62% of respondents. It proves significant defragmentation of Ukrainian society. Such conclusions are comparable to Putnam (1993) and Fukuyama (1995): trust built only on consanguine ties testifies to the low efficiency of social relations in society.

Guided by the principle “Leave no one behind” from the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations, 2015), the focus is on the analysis of social trust, depending on the respondents’ assessment of their socio-economic situation (Table 2).

It is compared to the stated level of social trust of the respondents who rated their socio-economic situation higher than those who feel less socially protected. For example, all respondents trust their family members most of all or rely only on themselves. However, groups of the population who noted that they “do not have enough for basic needs” are less likely to count on support from “family members” and depend on themselves. That means

the poorest part of the population is supposed to be prone to atomization and demonstrates the lowest interpersonal and institutional trust level.

Against the background of general distrust of institutions, it is clear that those who have minimal savings and enough for all needs still more often express confidence in representatives of local governments (NGOs), regional and central authorities, volunteers, and public organizations. Moreover, the latter have the most trust from those with enough funds for all needs (however, they make up only 17% of this subgroup). Correspondingly, institutional trust is higher in socially protected groups of the population, but it cannot be assessed as sufficient.

Consequently, the survey results prove the existence of a particular impact of citizens’ socio-economic status on trust in the community. The socially vulnerable population, and even those who get no more than basic needs, have less confidence in the world around them, both at the interpersonal and institutional levels. Therefore, increasing the population’s welfare and boosting their incomes will potentially contribute to the growth of institutional trust and hence social sustainability.

Even more noticeable appeared to be the impact of socio-economic factors on the community’s resilience, assessed in this study according to respondents’ responses concerning maintaining or chang-

**Table 2.** Indicators of interpersonal and institutional social trust between people in selected territorial communities (in the context of respondents’ assessments of their socio-economic development)

Social trust indicators	Not enough for basic needs, %	Enough for basic needs, but no more, %	I have minimal savings, %	Enough money for all conditions, %
<b>Social trust in the territorial community</b>				
I depend only on myself	67	62.8	59.3	53.4
I do not count on anyone	5.1	5.4	2.3	8
<b>Interpersonal social trust</b>				
on family members	68.1	79.1	82.2	79.5
on friends/colleagues	22.8	27.7	39.4	38.6
on the community residents	3.6	2.1	1.8	2.3
<b>Institutional social trust</b>				
on local authorities’ representatives	3.6	4.4	8.9	9.1
on representatives of regional or central authorities	2.5	2.7	5.7	8
on volunteers and public organizations	3.6	4.5	8.5	17
on religious community	2.9	3.3	5	4.5
on patrons/sponsors/business	1.8	0.8	0.7	5.7
on doctors	3.6	1.2	1.6	3.4

**Table 3.** Assessment of social sustainability depending on residents' socio-economic status

Social economic status indicators	Increased, %	Decreased, %	Has not changed, %	It is hard to answer, %
<b>How has the pandemic affected your income/earnings (paid employment)?</b>				
not enough for basic needs	2.2	56.5	31.2	10.1
enough for basic needs, but no more	1.6	51.1	38.5	8.8
I can afford to buy clothes and small appliances; I have minimal savings	4.3	41.6	44.4	9.6
I have enough money for all my needs	11.4	20.5	56.8	11.4
<b>How has the pandemic affected your health?</b>				
not enough for basic needs	1.1	62.3	22.1	14.5
enough for basic needs, but no more	0.8	43.7	36.5	19
I can afford to buy clothes and small appliances; I have minimal savings	1.1	36.6	49.2	13
I have enough money for all my needs	1.1	33	53.4	12.5
<b>How has the pandemic affected your safety (including at home)?</b>				
not enough for basic needs	1.1	57.6	23.9	17.4
enough for basic needs, but no more	1.4	39.7	36.3	22.7
I can afford to buy clothes and small appliances; I have minimal savings	3.4	37.1	39.8	19.7
I have enough money for all my needs	6.8	25	54.5	13.6

ing several characteristics of their lives resulting from the Covid-19 pandemic (Table 3).

Consequently, those who do not have enough funds for basic needs (56.5%) and those who have enough for basic needs but no more (51.1%) report a decrease in their income and earnings. The answer “has not changed” was given only by 31.2% of the former and 38.5% of the latter. It evaluated such data as an indicator that most of the respondents from these two subgroups failed to demonstrate resilience in the face of pandemic challenges. About 56.8% of respondents with sufficient funds for all their needs noted that their income has not changed, and 11.4% stated an increase in their budget revenues. Only 20.5% of them declared a decrease in income. The responses of those with minimal savings characterize them as a risk group in case of subsequent difficulties. In this study, 41.6% of respondents stated a decrease in their income, and 44.4% said their income has not changed.

Similar trends are also evident in the dynamics of feeling healthy and safe. As many as 62.3% of respondents who do not have enough for basic needs appear to have health deterioration. On the other hand, those who meet no more than basic needs and those who have minimal savings are less likely to indicate a decline in health than a loss of income. At the same time, the percentage of “hard to

answer” responses is boosting significantly. Thus, the study regards this as an indicator for classifying this subgroup as a health risk subgroup.

The same is valid for safety, where there are two risk groups – those with no more than basic needs and minimal savings. The subgroup of those lacking basic needs is again largely volatile. At the same time, most of those who have enough funds for all their needs demonstrate resilience.

Overall, a statistically significant increase in the gap between the poorest and wealthiest members of communities due to the pandemic is found. Even subgroups of those with basic needs and those with minimal savings do not add resilience to communities, demonstrating risks of own stability in the face of further difficulties, which is a risk to the sustainability of the whole community. Ukraine specializes in producing agricultural products, and proper investment in that sector could promote economic sustainability and innovative growth and reduce the gap between rich and poor (Klymchuk et al., 2020; Benetyte et al., 2021). Therefore, one of the policy recommendations is not only to support the vulnerable communities but to create new jobs related to disruptive industrial technologies (Sineviciene et al., 2021).

Another factor reflected in the question “How do you assess your ability to influence decisions in the



community?” aggravates the situation. A relatively high number of people (28.8%) stated that they were aware of the forms of public participation but did not have the opportunity to influence the government. About 21.8% said they were not interested. It demonstrates the rupture of “vertical” ties in communities. Only 15.2% of respondents declared their ability to influence decision-making. As one might expect, most of them are those who have enough funds for all their needs. About 34.1% of those who do not know how to affect the government but want to uphold their interests have prospects for improving the situation. What can be changed when the prospects for improving the economic situation are uncertain? Lynes (1984) singled out the “5 giants” of social policy: poverty, ignorance, need, laziness/unemployment, and diseases.

The results of this study are similar to Berawi (2020), who pointed out that social cooperation is essential to building resilient health systems. Fernández-Prados et al. (2020), using the data from the Spanish Sociological Research Centre, proved the relevance of confidence in political leadership with resilience to political measures, such as lockdown during Covid-19. They also highlighted the urgency of political communication in fostering social resilience. The simple and straightforward political measures in Spain were the factors that stimulated the trust in authorities. Having seen the low trust of citizens in the authorities during the Covid-19 pandemic in Ukraine, the measures for participative and supportive governance, resource accessibility, and citizen involvement proposed by Alizadeh and Sharifi (2022) could be used to promote social resilience. Similar recommendations are found by Wernli et al. (2021): participatory and supportive governance is seen as a measure to achieve higher levels of social capital and social trust in the direction of social resilience growth. Thus, specifically, it was recommended to local authorities to move in the direction of inclusive and participatory governance. The results received for Ukraine contradict the results received for American

society regarding interpersonal social trust. Thus, in Ukraine, during the Covid-19 pandemic, interpersonal social trust among the community residents in different economic groups is about 2-4%. In contrast, according to Franke and Elliott (2021), within American society, more than half of the respondents (56.1%) trusted their neighbors, while only one in six (16.2%) said they did not have such trust.

To manage social resilience, it is needed to account for many instruments. Social insurance is only one element in overcoming them; education, health care, and employment are equally important. So, education was emphasized, highlighting the blocks of family competence, healthy lifestyle, financial literacy, and career guidance. The structure of social stability includes several interrelated management directions. First, they are social capital management as bonds that hold society together at different levels (vertical and horizontal). They are formed by relationships between people, fixed in certain norms associated with trust and reliability. Next, human capital management is the ability of the social community members to overcome life’s difficulties, apply individual and collective experience to get out of difficult situations in everyday life, and change the sets of institutions to boost their reliability and personal security. Finally, economic potential management ensures the endurance of the community in difficult situations, resources to restore previous and create new forms of economic activity, and guarantees for some time compliance with the principles of social protection and social justice.

The proposed structural elements of social resilience management are not comprehensive and may include other components: state and public institutions, legal acts, and ethical standards. Social capital identifies the social structure allowing for the specifics of its functions. Social capital interacts with human and physical capital and tends to strengthen and expand through the network of public participation and standards of interaction.

---

## CONCLUSION

This paper aimed to assess the impact of social trust on social resilience in Ukrainian territorial communities during the Covid-19 pandemic. Specifically, it is confirmed that increased social trust is a factor in social resilience improvement within territorial communities. This study covered the north-eastern, western, central, and south regions of Ukraine. The Covid-19 pandemic affected the poorest

groups in Ivano-Frankivsk, Mykolaiv, Sumy, and Cherkasy territorial communities. There is a growing gap in the socio-economic status of a small group of the richest and more numerous groups of poorer people. The pandemic reflected a low level of trust in communities. The paper proved that territorial communities in Ukraine during the Covid-19 pandemic should be defined as unstable and one where there are tendencies to further losses of resilience. The institutional trust is higher in socially protected groups of the population, but it cannot be assessed as sufficient. The participation of the group, which is classified as “can afford certain purchases beyond the basic needs and have minimal savings,” is in the face of the subsequent possible threats; they are in the “gray zone” and a risk group according to the given study model. In conjunction with an increase in economic inequality, low institutional trust, as mentioned above, keep people apart from social resilience. Therefore, there appears a need to systematically build the community’s social stability management by strengthening institutional trust and overcoming the socio-economic stratification of society. It is also vital to monitor existing public sentiments, trust, and resilience and then employ the data to make rational management decisions at the level of territorial communities. To improve social resilience, professional community analysts and politicians are needed.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS OF RESEARCH

The study of age effect on the problem of trust and resilience remained beyond the scope of this analysis. The previous study analysis of the available database considers it a promising direction. Besides, the array of data on the issues of assistance provided by people to each other requires special attention in the future.

Based on how dynamic the situation and risks for Ukraine are, the study must state the need for constant monitoring of the data and taking them into account when making management decisions at the level of territorial communities. Special attention is drawn to the question: where should cohesion in communities occur – around threats, the future, activities?

Considering the recent events in Ukraine related to Russia’s full-scale military aggression, further research would focus on the impact of external aggression on strengthening social resilience and confidence.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Andriana Kostenko.

Data curation: Tetiana Kozyntseva, Valentyna Opanasiuk.

Formal analysis: Oleksandr Kubatko, Olena Kupenko.

Funding acquisition: Andriana Kostenko, Oleksandr Kubatko.

Investigation: Tetiana Kozyntseva, Olena Kupenko, Oleksandr Kubatko.

Methodology: Andriana Kostenko.

Project administration: Andriana Kostenko.

Resources: Tetiana Kozyntseva.

Software: Tetiana Kozyntseva, Valentyna Opanasiuk.

Supervision: Andriana Kostenko.

Validation: Tetiana Kozyntseva, Valentyna Opanasiuk.

Visualization: Tetiana Kozyntseva, Olena Kupenko.

Writing – original draft: Andriana Kostenko, Olena Kupenko.

Writing – review & editing: Oleksandr Kubatko, Andriana Kostenko.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The paper was prepared in the framework of the research project “Sustainable development and resource security: from disruptive technologies to digital transformation of Ukrainian economy” (№ 0121U100470) and “Jean Monnet Chair in EU Economic Policies and Civil Society” (619878-EPP-1-2020-1-UA-EPPJMO-CHAIR).

## REFERENCES

- Afkhami, M., Zahraie, B., & Ghorbani, M. (2022). Quantitative and qualitative analysis of the dimensions of farmers' adaptive capacity in the face of water scarcity. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 199, 104715. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2022.104715>
- Ainuddin, S., & Routray, J. K. (2012). A community resilience framework for an earthquake-prone area in Baluchistan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 2, 25-36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2012.07.003>
- Alagarsamy, S., Mehroliya, S., Pushparaj, U., & Jeevananda, S. (2022). Explaining the intention to uptake COVID-19 vaccination using the behavioral and social drivers of vaccination (BeSD) model. *Vaccine: X*, 10, 100140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvacx.2021.100140>
- Alizadeh, H., & Sharifi, A. (2022). Social Resilience Promotion Factors during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Insights from Urmia, Iran. *Urban Science*, 6(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci6010014>
- Benetyte, R., Rubio, J. G., Kovalov, B., Matviychuk-Soskina, N., & Krusinskas, R. (2021). Role of R&D expenditure, CEO compensation and financial ratios for country's economic sustainability and innovative growth. *International Journal of Global Energy Issues*, 43(2-3), 228-246. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJGEI.2021.115147>
- Berawi, M. A. (2020). Empowering Healthcare, Economic, and Social Resilience during Global Pandemic Covid-19. *International Journal of Technology*, 11(3), 436-439. <https://doi.org/10.14716/ijtech.v11i3.4200>
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95-S120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/228943>
- Edelman. (2021). *Edelman Trust Barometer 2021*. Retrieved from <https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2021-01/2021-edelman-trust-barometer.pdf>
- Fan, Y., & Lyu, X. (2021). Exploring Two Decades of Research in Community Resilience: A Content Analysis Across the International Literature. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 14, 1643-1654. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S329829>
- Fernández-Prados, J. S., Lozano-Díaz, A., & Muyor-Rodríguez, J. (2020). Factors explaining social resilience against COVID-19: the case of Spain. *European Societies*, 23(suppl\_1), 111-121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2020.1818113>
- Franke, V. C., & Elliott, C. N. (2021). Optimism and Social Resilience: Social Isolation, Meaninglessness, Trust, and Empathy in Times of COVID-19. *Societies*, 11(2), 35. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc11020035>
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). Social Capital and the Global Economy. *Foreign Affairs*, 74(5), 89-103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/20047302>
- Garfinkel, H. (1963). A conception of, and experiments with, “trust” as a condition of stable concerted actions. In O. J. Harvey (Ed.), *Motivation and Social Interaction: Cognitive Determinants* (pp. 187-238). New York: Ronald Press.
- Gjörw, G. G. (2020). *Coronavirus, invisible threats and preparation for resilience* (NATO Review). Retrieved from <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2020/05/20/coronavirus-invisible-threats-and-preparing-for-resilience/index.html>
- Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 4(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245>
- Karintseva, O., Kharchenko, M., Boon, E. K., Derykolenko, O., Melnyk, V., & Kobzar, O. (2021). Environmental determinants of energy-efficient transformation of national economies for sustainable development. *International Journal of Global Energy Issues*, 43(2-3), 262-274. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJGEI.2021.115148>
- Keck, M., & Saktapolrak, P. (2013). What Is Social Resilience? Lessons Learned and Ways Forward. *Erdkunde*, 67(1), 5-19. <https://doi.org/10.3112/erdkunde.2013.01.02>
- Klymchuk, O., Khodakivska, O., Kovalov, B., Brusina, A., Benetyte, R., & Momotenko, I. (2020). World trends in bioethanol and biodiesel production in the context of sustainable energy development. *International Journal of Global Environmental Issues*, 19(1-3), 90-108. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJGENVI.2020.114867>
- Kwon, O. Y. (2019). *Social Trust and Economic Development* (368 p.). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784719609>
- Lord, K. M. (2019). Six Ways to Repair Declining Social Trust. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. <https://doi.org/10.48558/60r4-f118>

21. Lynes, T. (1984). William Beveridge. In P. Barker (Ed.), *Founders of the welfare state*. Gower.
22. Melnyk, L., Shkarupa, E., & Kharchenko, M. (2013). Innovative strategies to increase economic efficiency of greening the economy. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 16(1), 30-37.
23. Morrone, A., Tontoranelli, N., & Ranuzzi, G. (2009). *How Good is Trust? Measuring Trust and its Role for the Progress of Societies* (OECD Statistics Working Papers, No. 2009/03). Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/220633873086>
24. Newton, K. (2007). Social and Political Trust. In R. J. Dalton & H.-D. Klingemann (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199270125.003.0018>
25. Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(1-2), 127-150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9156-6>
26. Putnam, R. D. (1993). The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life. *The American Prospect*, 13, 35-42. Retrieved from <http://faculty.washington.edu/matsueda/courses/590/Readings/Putham%201993%20Am%20Prospect.pdf>
27. Revell, P., & Henderson, C. (2019). Operationalizing a framework for understanding community resilience in Europe. *Regional Environmental Change*, 19(4), 967-979. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-018-1390-y>
28. Rothstein, B., & Uslaner, E. M. (2005). All for all: Equality, corruption, and social trust. *World Politics*, 58, 41-72. <https://doi.org/10.1353/wp.2006.0022>
29. Sineviciene, L., Hens, L., Kubatko, O., Melnyk, L., Dehtyarova, I., & Fedyna, S. (2021). Socio-economic and cultural effects of disruptive industrial technologies for sustainable development. *International Journal of Global Energy Issues*, 43(2-3), 284-305. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJGEI.2021.115150>
30. Sumy State University. (2021). *Sotsialna stiiikist terytorialnykh hromad v umovakh pandemii COVID-19 [Social sustainability of local communities in the COVID-19 pandemic]* (Report). (In Ukrainian). Retrieved from [https://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/bitstream-download/123456789/85720/1/Kostenko\\_social\\_sustainability.pdf?fbclid=IwAR29cfBoWHqIVnhf0l01emD3lMxjm4gKuZn3WYkb7sKK4vZUvAbx5u3PaKA](https://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/bitstream-download/123456789/85720/1/Kostenko_social_sustainability.pdf?fbclid=IwAR29cfBoWHqIVnhf0l01emD3lMxjm4gKuZn3WYkb7sKK4vZUvAbx5u3PaKA)
31. Sztompka, P. (2016). Two Theoretical Approaches to Trust; Their Implications for the Resolution of Intergroup Conflict. In I. Alon & D. Bar-Tal (Eds.), *The Role of Trust in Conflict Resolution*. *Peace Psychology Book Series* (pp. 15-21). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43355-4\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43355-4_2)
32. Turska-Kawa, A., Csányi, P., & Kucharčík, R. (2022). From the “Rally ‘Round the Flag” Effect to a Social Crisis of Confidence. Poland and Slovakia in the First Year of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Comparative Politics*, 15(1), 20-38. Retrieved from [https://rebus.us.edu.pl/bitstream/20.500.12128/22092/1/Turska-Kawa\\_From\\_the\\_rally\\_round\\_the\\_flag\\_effect\\_to\\_a\\_social\\_crisis\\_of\\_confidence.pdf](https://rebus.us.edu.pl/bitstream/20.500.12128/22092/1/Turska-Kawa_From_the_rally_round_the_flag_effect_to_a_social_crisis_of_confidence.pdf)
33. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (41 p.). Retrieved from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld/publication>
34. Veklych, O., Karintseva, O., Yevdokymov, A., & Guillamon-Saorin, E. (2020). Compensation mechanism for damage from ecosystem services deterioration: Constitutive characteristic. *International Journal of Global Environmental Issues*, 19(1-3), 129-142. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJGEN-VI.2020.114869>
35. Wernli, D., Clausin, M., Antulov-Fantulin N., Berezowski, J., Biller-Andorno, N., Blanchet, K., Böttcher, L., Burton-Jeangros, C., Escher, G., Flahault, A., Fukuda, K., Helbing, D., Jaffé, P. D., Jørgensen, P. S., Kaspiarovich, Y., Krishnakumar, J., Lawrence, R. J., Lee, K., Leger, A., ... Young, O. (2021). Building a multisystemic understanding of societal resilience to the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMJ Global Health*, 6, e006794. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2021-006794>
36. Wilson, G. A. (2012). *Community Resilience and Environmental Transitions* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203144916>