The UN SCORE for Eastern Ukraine (USE) is a sophisticated analytical tool designed to improve the understanding of societal dynamics in the five eastern oblasts of Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, Kharkiv, Luhansk, and Zaporizhzhia. USE helps to identify strategic entry points for policies and programs that contribute to strengthening social cohesion.

USE is based on the Social Cohesion and Reconciliation (SCORE) Index methodology, originally developed in Cyprus by the Centre for Sustainable Peace and Democratic Development and UNDP. The SCORE Index has since been implemented across several countries in Europe and elsewhere to assist international and national stakeholders in the design of evidence-based solutions that can strengthen social cohesion and reconciliation efforts.

USE is jointly implemented by three UN entities – UNDP, UNICEF, and IOM. The first USE wave was conducted in 2017 and was funded by the UN, with a major contribution from the EU.

The USE process began with a series of consultations with authorities and civil society representatives in Kyiv and in each of the five oblasts in order to develop a conceptual model of what constitutes social cohesion in eastern Ukraine (Figure 1).

The first USE wave, which was completed in October 2017, captured the views of some 10,000 people residing in the five oblasts in the east of Ukraine. Specifically, it comprised a face-to-face general population survey of 5,300 respondents; a school survey of 3,300 pupils in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts; 72 in-depth interviews; and a face-to-face survey of 1,500 people residing in the non-government controlled areas who commute to the government-controlled areas across the five checkpoints in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts. The results presented in this brief are shown at the oblast level in Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv, and Zaporizhzhia oblasts, and at the sub-oblast level in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts to allow for a more granular analysis. For more information on USE and the results of the first wave please visit use.scoreforpeace.org.
UN SCORE for Eastern Ukraine

Tolerant and socially responsible citizenship

Governance and human security

Civic behaviour and values

Intergroup relations

Psychosocial functioning

SOCIAL COHESION IN EASTERN UKRAINE

Civic optimism

Foreign policy preferences such as EU or NATO membership

Identity-based & structural social exclusion

Interdependent vs. independent values

Media’s impact on society

Migration tendency

School dropout tendency

Neighborhood support

Non-violent active civic engagement

Online vs. traditional media exposure

Perceived EU benefit

Political vision for NGCAs

Professional & entrepreneurial aspirations

Pro-Russian narrative

Readiness for civic participation

Readiness for political violence

Social tolerance

Soviet nostalgia

Support for authoritarianism

Uncompromising pro-Ukraine narrative

Contact with various groups in society

Openness towards various groups in society

Academic performance

Adverse experience of adults, children & adolescents

Risky adolescent sexual behavior

Aggression

Anxiety

Different forms of bullying & victimization

Callous unemotional traits & narcissism

Collaborative problem-solving skills

Delinquency

Depression

Empathy

Executive functioning skills

Exposure to conflict

Exposure to psychological adversity

Family coherence

Parental involvement

Peer support

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder

Physical & psychological abuse

Self-confidence & social skills

Substance use

School connectedness & safety

Self-harm & suicidality

Quality of life & life satisfaction

Accessibility & quality of education institutions

Accessibility & quality of healthcare

Availability of social welfare support

Capacity of local authorities

Perceived economic opportunities

Economic/Food/Health security

Environmental security

Investment environment

Judicial security

Participation in decision-making

Perceived level of & perceived increase in corruption

Personal security

Political security

Provision of public services & infrastructure

Trust in central, local & social institutions

Figure 1. USE conceptual model for social cohesion in eastern Ukraine
USE Outcome 4: 
Tolerant and socially responsible citizenship

This brief outlines the key findings from USE Outcome 4: tolerant and socially responsible citizenship (Figure 2).

Across eastern Ukraine, the average score for this outcome is 4.9, where 0 indicates that people are completely intolerant and irresponsible citizens, and 10 indicates that people are fully tolerant and responsible citizens.

All five oblasts feature homogeneous scores for this outcome and there are no significant relevant differences between men and women. However, a breakdown by income and education demographics shows significant variations – the higher the income and the level of education, the more tolerant and socially responsible citizens tend to be.

Tolerant and Socially Responsible Citizenship

Regional Average: 4.9

Understanding tolerant and socially responsible citizenship

This outcome is comprised of three components: social tolerance, non-violent active civic engagement, and readiness for political violence.¹

The regional average for social tolerance is 5.5, where 0 indicates full-fledged intolerance towards minorities and marginalized groups and 10 reflects complete and genuine tolerance. There are no significant differences between the five oblasts with regards to levels of social tolerance (Figure 3). However, within Donetsk oblast, there is a notable variation between the cluster with the highest score (central Donetsk) and the lowest score (south-western Donetsk). For a more detailed analysis of social tolerance, see the brief on Social connectedness and belonging.

¹ Social tolerance relates to the degree to which one is tolerant towards minorities or marginalized groups such as Muslims, Jews, Roma, drug addicts, etc. in terms of personal interaction and accepting them within the community. Non-violent active civic engagement relates to engagement in civic and political matters using non-violent means, such as participation in public hearings, petitions and demonstrations. Readiness for political violence relates to the propensity to use violent means to achieve change in society.
Social Tolerance

The consistently low levels of **non-violent active civic engagement** throughout eastern Ukraine (Figure 4) are particularly relevant to understanding responsible citizenship. Further analysis reveals three main reasons for such limited engagement. The first is an inertia generated by a common view among eastern Ukraine’s residents that the authorities neither seek to include citizens in decision-making processes, nor are particularly responsive to citizens’ demands. The second is the lack of information (i.e., citizens have a low level of knowledge concerning the issues on the agenda of local councils and those of other authorities). The third, though of lesser importance, is that people find civic engagement to be too time-consuming relative to other aspects of life (e.g., work, family time, etc.).

Figure 3: Scores for social tolerance

Figure 4: Scores for non-violent active civic engagement
Examining the levels of trust in public institutions offers further insights into why people do not engage in policy and decision-making processes. While trust is significantly higher in local/social institutions than in central ones, the two heat maps below illustrate a low level of trust in institutions in general (Figures 5 and 6). Low levels of trust may act as a strong disincentive for people to engage with the institutions that serve and represent them.

**Figure 5:** Trust in local/social institutions

**Figure 6:** Trust in central institutions
Additionally, the scores for political security provide another important explanation for the reluctance to engage with the authorities and institutions (Figure 7). The analysis indicates that in general, and in south-western Donetsk oblast in particular, people do not feel confident expressing their views without fear of negative consequences, particularly if such views differ from the authorities.

The propensity for political violence, also relevant in particular to understanding socially responsible citizenship, is consistently low throughout eastern Ukraine (Figure 8), with Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts scoring 1.0 and 1.2, respectively. A demographic breakdown indicates that men and the younger segment of society (aged 18-25) are more inclined to accept or even turn to violence to achieve societal change.
Despite the consistently low scores, for readiness for political violence, it is nevertheless important to understand what drives the propensity to turn to violence to achieve societal change. The below illustration (Figure 9) shows that people with aggressive traits and those who have themselves experienced or know someone who has had a traumatic experience\(^2\) are more prone to turn to violence to achieve the desired change in society. Conversely, people with high levels of empathy are less likely to turn to violence, as are those (according to the data) who express a high level of satisfaction with the provision of infrastructure.

![Figure 9: Factors impacting on readiness for political violence](image)

**Conclusion**

Levels of civic engagement are low throughout eastern Ukraine. The strongest disincentive is that people do not feel that their voices are being heard by the authorities. This perception indicates the need for better information about citizens’ rights and ongoing political processes such as decentralization. This should be coupled with capacity building and educational programs on civic responsibility and civic engagement. Another entry point to increase civic engagement and public participation may include the creation of mechanisms to facilitate public consultations at the community level. This could be done through, for example, online platforms to inform citizens about council, and other, meetings and their respective agendas, and provide an opportunity for citizens to contribute without requiring them to travel to the meeting venue. This would help to address the question of citizens not knowing what issues are on the local/regional council agendas, and to overcome the problem that some people consider such engagement to be too time-consuming. However, such measures should also be developed taking into account the low levels of political security, which speaks to the need of creating ‘safe spaces’ where different and alternative views can be expressed without any fear of political, social or economic repercussion.

Addressing the issues of low trust in institutions as a means of increasing civic engagement may be done through improving service delivery and more participatory decision-making mechanisms. Nonetheless, improving the delivery of services requires a local approach since the types of services considered to be in most need of improvement differ considerably throughout eastern Ukraine. For example, the provision of social services is perceived as being notably low in Zaporizhzhia oblast, while improving the public transportation network is a more pressing issue in Luhansk oblast. Two important aspects stand out and should also be taken into account in designing interventions. First, trust in local/social institutions is consistently lower in urban areas than it is in rural areas. Second, satisfaction with levels of service delivery and trust in institutions are both linked to perceptions of corruption. For more information about scores for individual services (including e.g., provision of justice, provision of healthcare, provision of road networks etc.) please consult use.scoreforpeace.org.

---

\(^2\) Adverse experiences of adults refer to stressful or traumatic experiences of adults one personally knows (e.g., domestic violence, bullying, theft, sexual harassment and violent death).