

DOI 10.15407/sociology2026.01.171

UDC 316

YAROSLAV BURDIN,

PhD Student in Sociology at the Department of Methodology and Methods of Sociological Research, Faculty of Sociology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (4d, Hlushkova Ave., Kyiv, 03680, Ukraine)

burdin_yaroslav@knu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4284-1565>

SVITLANA SALNIKOVA,

PhD in Sociology, Associate Professor at the Department of Methodology and Methods of Sociological Research, Faculty of Sociology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (4d, Hlushkova Ave., Kyiv, 03680, Ukraine);

Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology, Ukrainian Catholic University (Sventsitsky St., 17, Lviv, 79011)

sv.salnikova@knu.ua, s.salnikova@ucu.edu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6368-9480>

SCOPUS ID: 56366614900

MYKOLA SYDOROV,

PhD in Mathematics, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Methodology and Methods of Sociological Research, Faculty of Sociology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (4d, Hlushkova Ave., Kyiv, 03680, Ukraine)

myksyd@knu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5333-8393>

SCOPUS ID: 58662565000

SERHII DEMBITSKYI,

Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Doctor of Sciences in Sociology, Deputy Director of the Institute of Sociology, NAS of Ukraine (12, Shovkovychna St., Kyiv, 01021)

sociotest.solutions@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7958-3557>

SCOPUS ID: 57189518563

Faith in victory as an indicator of national resilience

Introduction

The full-scale Russian aggression against Ukraine, launched in 2022, has become a challenge for Ukrainian society. Despite the protracted war and significant losses, sociological studies demonstrate a high level of societal resilience, manifested in the

Citation: Burdin, Ya., Salnikova, S., Sydorov, M., Dembitskyi, S. (2026). Faith in victory as an indicator of national resilience. *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing*, 1, 171–184, <https://doi.org/10.15407/sociology2026.01.171>.

Публікується на засадах ліцензії Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).

preservation of social cohesion, psychological endurance, and widespread confidence in victory. In particular, as of June 2023, 97% of Ukrainians expressed confidence in Ukraine's victory, with the share of those who "fully believe" remaining consistently high even after a year of active hostilities (Alexseev & Dembitskyi, 2024). Defining national resilience as the ability of a community to adapt and withstand existential threats while preserving key social functions and collective identity (Norris et al., 2008; Ungar, 2012), we proceed from the assumption that citizens' faith in Ukraine's victory can be considered a key indicator of national resilience. This assertion is based on previous observations that recorded the consolidation of Ukrainian society after the onset of Russia's full-scale invasion in 2022, as well as the growth of institutional trust and the strengthening of patriotic identity (Reznikova & Korniiivskyi, 2024; Bezrukova et al., 2025).

The question remains open as to which specific factors determine the formation of citizens' confidence in Ukraine's victory. Research indicates that the information environment plays a significant role: in particular, online media and related narratives shape social optimism and directly influence citizens' perceptions of the prospects of victory (Marukhovskiy et al., 2024). Generational differences also emerge as an important factor: young people more often demonstrate higher levels of optimism and confidence in the future, which is linked to greater civic engagement and a tendency toward social optimism (Mirchuk & Pavlenko, 2022). At the same time, regional and linguistic characteristics remain significant in explaining differences in the level of faith in victory, which must be taken into account in the development of reconstruction strategies (Slyusarevskyy, 2024). Researchers also devote particular attention to trust in state institutions, which is reflected in confidence in victory, but is often considered in conjunction with other factors—such as the sense of support and evaluation of political leadership (Balakireva & Dmytruk, 2022). Despite the presence of certain empirical evidence, the influences of personal wartime experience—which may enhance emotional involvement and optimism—as well as the role of civic identity and value orientations as predictors of confidence in victory, remain insufficiently studied.

The purpose of this article is to provide a theoretical substantiation of the approach to measuring national resilience through the prism of faith in victory and to conduct an empirical analysis of the social and psychological predictors of this phenomenon.

Research Question and Objectives

The research question of our study lies in measuring national resilience through the example of a specific indicator (mass faith in victory) and identifying the factors that determine it. In the scientific literature, societal resilience is described as a multi-dimensional phenomenon encompassing the ability to maintain basic functions, collective cohesion, and psychological optimism during crises (Masten, 2001; Norris et al., 2008; Dagdeviren et al., 2020). War creates an extreme "stress test"¹ for this phenomenon.

¹The Ukrainian context has become the subject of particular attention among researchers: the phenomenon of resilience of the Ukrainian population is actively studied within social psychology, sociology, and public health research, in particular: (Kimhi et al., 2023; Koubová & Kimhi, 2024; Goodwin et al., 2023; Reznikova & Korniiivskyi, 2024; Kutsenko, 2025).

Despite the growing body of literature, the issue of operationalizing national resilience in quantitative research requires further exploration. A common approach is based on multifactorial scales that cover institutional, social, and psychological indicators (Norris et al., 2008; Kutsenko, 2025). At the same time, the search for an indicator capable of reflecting societal changes at a high level of generalization remains a relevant task. In this study, we propose to consider mass confidence in victory as such an indicator. We interpret this indicator as the psychological component of national resilience, a kind of “barometer” of societal resilience. If, even under conditions of prolonged hostilities and personal losses, citizens maintain faith in victory, this indicates the presence of a significant resource of collective endurance and resilience.

For the validity of such an approach, it is necessary to clarify why faith in victory reflects resilience and which factors influence its maintenance. Available data point to two possible scenarios. First, confidence in victory may take the form of an almost nationwide consensus, varying only slightly depending on individual characteristics. Thus, surveys conducted in 2022–2023 showed a high level of faith in victory across all regions and social groups; even large-scale personal losses did not lead to a significant decline in this indicator (Alexseev & Dembitskiy, 2023). Second, there are grounds to assume that certain socio-demographic and psychological factors may strengthen or weaken confidence in victory. Goodwin et al. (2023) recorded that resilience was higher among young people, respondents with high levels of interpersonal trust, and residents of primarily Ukrainian-speaking regions. According to the Razumkov Centre (2025), in the fourth year of the war, society maintained resilience by relying on three “pillars”—trust in the Armed Forces, support from international allies, and conviction in victory.

Thus, the research problem lies in the absence of a systematic analysis of the predictors of confidence in victory. Existing works by Ukrainian scholars outline individual aspects—from national resilience (Kutsenko, 2025) to the role of civic identity and the interaction between the state and society (Reznikova, 2024), or the dynamics of socio-psychological resources in different years of the war (Zlobina, 2024). However, there is a lack of comprehensive studies that directly test the relationships between the level of faith in victory and specific independent variables. This gap defines the research task—to construct a conceptual model in which confidence in victory is considered as a function of a set of factors (from individual wartime experience to macro-social attitudes) and to test it on empirical data.

Theoretical Framework

The concept of resilience emerged within developmental psychology as the ability to successfully adapt under conditions of high adversity, with a focus on the interaction between risk factors and protective mechanisms. Pioneering studies outlined the empirical foundations of this concept and emphasized that resilience is not a rare “trait” but the result of normal adaptive systems at work (Garmezy, 1971; Werner & Smith, 1982; Luthar et al., 2000; Masten, 2001). Subsequent development acquired a socio-ecological dimension: resilience is understood as a process arising from the interaction of the individual with the context, rather than as a static characteristic

attributable to a single person (Ungar, 2012). This shift (from “who is considered resilient” to “which environments enable resilience”) is critically important for transferring the concept to higher levels of analysis.

The transition from individual to community and national resilience in the literature is accompanied by the operationalization of sets of adaptive capacities through which communities maintain functionality in crises. In the influential model of community resilience, this process is linked to four interrelated blocks (economic development, social capital, information and communication systems, and community competence), which together determine preparedness for threats and recovery afterward (Norris et al., 2008). In parallel, the structural approach highlights the “rules of the game” (formal institutions and informal norms), resources (material, human, social), and power relations as fundamental parameters of social adaptability, through which inequality of access to resources and asymmetries of power directly affect the ability to recover (Dagdeviren et al., 2020). Importantly, these approaches do not contradict but complement each other: adaptive capacities describe “what works” in communities, while the structural perspective outlines “why and for whom” these mechanisms operate.

In the context of war, the significance of macro-processes of resilience increases, while psychosocial components (identity, trust, and expectations about the future) become central mechanisms for maintaining collective functionality. Empirical studies conducted during and after the onset of Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022 demonstrate high levels of national resilience among Ukrainians, with distinct differences by age, trust, and linguistic-regional context (Goodwin et al., 2023; Koubová & Kimhi, 2024). Comparative assessments also record the predictive role of individual, community, and societal resilience in different countries of the region, confirming the multilevel nature of this phenomenon (Koubová & Kimhi, 2024). Monitoring studies register high levels of collective resilience, though in 2024 a tendency toward weakening is observed: support factors continue to operate, but the effectiveness of their influence decreases (Zlobina, 2024).

The information environment acts as a separate node of influence on resilience, mediating risk assessments, time horizons of expectations, and coordination of collective actions. Studies of online media indicate that changes in the information field affect optimism and citizens’ perceptions of the prospects for peace and the course of the armed conflict; this effect is particularly noticeable among young people, who demonstrate higher levels of social optimism and civic activity (Marukhovskiy et al., 2024; Mirchuk & Pavlenko, 2022). Thus, communication channels not only transmit information but also support or weaken the network of adaptive capacities described in models of community resilience (Norris et al., 2008).

Against this background, faith in victory is considered a psychosocial indicator of national resilience during wartime. At the individual level, its foundation lies in optimism and hope as cognitive-motivational orientations that link expectations of a positive outcome with readiness to sustain purposeful behavior despite threats (Carver et al., 2010; Bonanno, 2004). At the collective level, “faith in victory” aligns with perceptions of the community’s ability to achieve desired results through the consolidation of identity, trust, and coordination of actions—that is, resilience

manifests as shared expectations and support for collective efforts (Norris et al., 2008; Goodwin et al., 2023). Ukrainian empirical data confirm this interpretation: despite the duration of the war and increasing burdens, confidence in victory remains high and is associated with support for democratic narratives and civic agency (Alexseev & Dembitskyi, 2024; Reznikova & Korniiievskiy, 2024; Bezrukova et al., 2025). It is worth noting that throughout the entire history of independence, Ukrainians have consistently assessed their future optimistically—this is a “nation of optimists.” According to KIIS data, the level of optimism fluctuates (88% – October 2022, 73% – December 2023, 57% – December 2024, 43% – May–June 2025, 56% – September–October 2025), yet those who see Ukraine as a prosperous state within the European Union outnumber those who believe that in ten years Ukraine will be a ruined country with significant population outflow (5% – October 2022, 19% – December 2023, 28% – December 2024, 47% – May–June 2025, 31% – September–October 2025) (Hrushetskyi, 2025).

At the same time, the use of “faith in victory” as an indicator requires clear articulation of its advantages and limitations. The advantages lie in its high relevance to the wartime context, sensitivity to political and informational signals, and simplicity of measurement in surveys. The limitations include potential fluctuations under the influence of short-term events, risks of socially desirable responses, and the fact that the indicator reflects expectations of outcome but does not encompass the full spectrum of recovery capacity. To ensure validity, it is necessary to control contextual factors and test convergent validity with respect to institutional trust, participation, value orientations, and informational practices; it is particularly important to account for the role of media as a mechanism for shaping expectations and coordination (Norris et al., 2008; Dagdeviren et al., 2020; Marukhovskiy et al., 2024). In conclusion, “faith in victory” emerges as a proxy indicator theoretically embedded in the multilevel framework of resilience: it reflects psychological (optimism/hope), meso-level (civic participation/trust), and macro-level (institutional capacity/information environment) mechanisms that together sustain resilience in wartime (Carver et al., 2010; Bonanno, 2004; Norris et al., 2008; Goodwin et al., 2023; Alexseev & Dembitskyi, 2024).

Empirical Data, Model, and Hypotheses

Empirical data from the annual sociological monitoring “Ukrainian Society” conducted by the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine within the framework of the USAID Project “Transformation of Communications” in Ukraine were used for this study. The dataset was collected by the sociological group Rating using the CATI-CAWI method (June 27 – July 4, 2023): RR = 23.4% for CATI recruitment, RR = 42.5% for CAWI survey, and N = 4101. The empirical data from this nationwide monitoring survey allow for quantitative testing of the relationships between the dependent variable (faith in victory) and a set of independent factors.

The general model, on the basis of which we interpret results and test hypotheses, was specified and operationalized as follows. First, the dependent variable (“faith in Ukraine’s victory”) was measured by the question (“How confident are you in Ukraine’s

victory in the war with Russia?") with four ordered responses: from "not confident at all" to "fully confident." During data preparation, the scale was transformed so that higher values corresponded to greater confidence (1 = "not confident at all," ..., 4 = "fully confident"). A cumulative logit model with proportional odds (PLUM/LINK=LOGIT) was built on this variable, with estimation of thresholds and "location" coefficients. In the final specification, a subsample with valid responses was used (N = 2597). Second, predictors were grouped into blocks directly corresponding to the proposed hypotheses.

- **War experience.** Includes the binary variable "Volunteering" (1 – respondent performs any volunteer/support actions for the Armed Forces or victims; constructed from the list of actions in question nrw6) and the index of personal losses "Personal losses" (sum of traumatic events).
- **Identity and trust.** Includes the binary variable "Civic identity" (identification as a citizen of Ukraine), an index of social distrust/anomie, and a proxy for institutional trust—evaluation of the President's performance.
- **Optimism and information environment.** Consists of a three-level scale of social optimism based on the question "What do you think about the future of Ukraine?" ("the situation will worsen / remain unchanged / improve") and a categorical variable (preferred type of news source: national telethon "United News," alternative Ukrainian media, others).
- **Civic participation.** Contains the index "Community participation" (number of civic practices/actions; constructed from the same set of items as volunteering).
- **Values.** Includes the dichotomous variable "Pro-democratic orientations" (support for democracy as the best form of government) and the ordinal variable (scale from 0 to 10) "Value of statehood" (importance of the existence of an independent Ukrainian state).

All models control for educational level, type of settlement, and subjective social status. This construction directly reproduces the theoretical framework in which "faith in victory" appears as an integral psychosocial indicator combining individual cognitive expectations, meso-level participation and trust, and macro-level value orientations.

Based on the theoretical review, we formulate the following hypotheses:

- **War experience.** Direct involvement (service, volunteering), experienced losses, and coping may strengthen or weaken faith through mechanisms of emotional engagement, sense of control, and post-traumatic growth/stress (Bonanno, 2004; Alexseev & Dembitskyi, 2023). **Hypothesis 1 (H1):** Involvement in collective actions (service/volunteering) is associated with higher faith in victory, controlling for traumatic pressure.
- **Civic identity.** Stronger identification with the political nation increases readiness to support collective goals and the assessment of their attainability (Reznikova & Korniiievskyi, 2024). **Hypothesis 2 (H2):** Higher civic identity is associated with greater faith in victory.
- **Trust in institutions / interpersonal trust.** Institutional trust reduces uncertainty and increases evaluations of the effectiveness of collective efforts; interpersonal

trust facilitates cooperation (Goodwin et al., 2023; Razumkov Centre, 2025).

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Trust in key institutions, as well as interpersonal trust, positively correlates with faith in victory.

- **Social optimism and information environment.** General positive expectations and consumption of congruent narratives in online media are linked to assessments of victory prospects (Marukhovskiy et al., 2024; Mirchuk & Pavlenko, 2022). **Hypothesis 4 (H4):** Higher social optimism and positive information consumption are associated with greater faith in Ukraine's victory.
- **Civic participation.** Engagement in collective actions (volunteering, self-organization) fosters a sense of efficacy and belonging (Norris et al., 2008). **Hypothesis 5 (H5):** Active participation in civic/volunteer practices increases faith in victory.
- **Values.** Prioritization of sovereignty, freedom, and democratic trajectory is linked to rejection of compromises such as “peace at any cost” and, accordingly, to higher expectations of victory (Razumkov Centre, 2025; Reznikova, 2022). **Hypothesis 6 (H6):** Pro-Ukrainian and pro-democratic values are positively associated with faith in victory

Survey results

Regression models

To test hypotheses H1–H6, hierarchical ordinal regression with a cumulative logit (PLUM) was applied. The dependent variable was the ordered scale of “faith in Ukraine's victory” (“not confident at all” ... “fully confident”). The modeling was carried out in four steps: (M1) control variables; (M2) addition of the “war experience” block; (M3) addition of “civic identity” and “institutional/personal trust”; (M4) the final model with “information environment,” “values,” and “civic participation.”

Note on the proportional odds assumption: the test of parallel lines does not reject the null hypothesis only in M1 ($\chi^2(10) = 7.69; p = .659$). Starting from M2, statistically significant deviations were recorded (M2: $\chi^2(14) = 25.33; p = .031$; M3: $\chi^2(24) = 110.04; p < .001$; M4: $\chi^2(36) = 98.79; p < .001$). This limitation was taken into account in interpretation: results are presented as approximate cumulative effects (in parentheses—cumulative odds/OR = $\exp(\beta)$ for key predictors).

Model Quality and Increment in Explanatory Power

As shown in Table 1, the sequential addition of blocks improves the consistency of the models with the data. A comparison of “Intercept only” and “Final” indicates a significant increase in model fit quality at each step (M1: $\chi^2 = 132.63; df = 5; p < .001$; M2: $\chi^2 = 205.43; df = 7; p < .001$; M3: $\chi^2 = 719.21; df = 12; p < .001$; M4: $\chi^2 = 1114.58; df = 18; p < .001$). Simulation-based fit metrics (Pearson/Deviance) do not reveal systematic deterioration in model-data consistency; for M3–M4, p-values approach 1, which is typical in the presence of sparse cells in multidimensional cross-tabulations. The pseudo- R^2 (Nagelkerke) increases from 0.043 in M1 to 0.384 in the final model, demonstrating a substantial gain in explanatory power when moving from purely structural controls to the full model that incorporates psychosocial resources of resilience.

Table 1

Ordinal Regression for the Dependent Variable “Faith in Ukraine’s Victory”
(Comparison of Four Models)

Indicators	Model 1: Control	Model 2: + Experience of war	Model 3: + Identity and trust	Model 4: Final
-2 Log Likelihood (Final)	1077.58	2594.38	6442.42	5069.40
χ^2 (df), p	132.63 (5), p < .001	205.43 (7), p < .001	719.21 (12), p < .001	1114.58 (18), p < .001
Pearson χ^2 , p	405.37, p = .033	1551.24, p = .100	8469.82, p = 1.000	6744.34, p = 1.000
Deviance χ^2 , p	395.44, p = .068	1442.10, p = .761	6408.21, p = 1.000	5064.77, p = 1.000
Cox & Snell R ²	0.039	0.060	0.208	0.349
Nagelkerke R ²	0.043	0.066	0.230	0.384
McFadden R ²	0.017	0.026	0.100	0.180
Test of Parallel Lines	$\chi^2(10) = 7.69$, p = .659	$\chi^2(14) = 25.33$, p = .031	$\chi^2(24) = 110.04$, p < .001	$\chi^2(36) = 98.79$, p < .001

Effects of predictors: stepwise results

Model 1 (control): Higher education is associated with lower cumulative odds of being in higher categories of belief ($\beta = -0.166$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 0.85$), while subjective social status is associated with higher odds ($\beta = 0.255$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.29$). Residents of regional centers have lower cumulative odds compared to villages (reference) – $\beta = -0.313$; $p = .001$; $OR \approx 0.73$.

Model 2 (war experience): Adding volunteering and personal losses increases the explanatory power of the model (Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.066$). Volunteering is positively related to belief ($\beta = 0.594$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.81$), while the sum of losses reduces it ($\beta = -0.152$; $p = .001$; $OR \approx 0.86$). The effects of education and status remain in sign and significance.

Model 3 (identity and trust): Including civic identity, evaluation of the President’s activity (proxy for institutional trust), and the indicator of anomie sharply increases pseudo- R^2 (to 0.230). Strong civic identity is one of the most influential predictors ($\beta = 0.862$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 2.37$). Trust is also positively related to belief ($\beta = 0.161$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.17$). Anomie is negative ($\beta = -0.384$; $p = .003$; $OR \approx 0.68$). The effect of volunteering weakens but remains significant ($\beta = 0.510$; $p < .001$), while the impact of personal losses becomes statistically non-significant ($p = .137$).

Model 4 (final): Adding social optimism, civic participation, values, and news consumption forms the final model with Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.384$. The strongest individual effect is social optimism ($\beta = 0.936$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 2.55$): an increase of one point nearly doubles-and-a-half the cumulative odds of being in higher categories of belief. Next in strength are the value of statehood ($\beta = 0.276$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.32$), civic identity ($\beta = 0.616$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.85$), civic participation ($\beta = 0.240$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.27$), and trust in the President ($\beta = 0.068$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.07$). Education retains a negative relationship ($\beta = -0.189$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 0.83$), subjective status

remains positive but weak ($\beta = 0.069$; $p = .044$; $OR \approx 1.07$). The effects of volunteering and personal losses in the final model do not reach significance ($p = .314$ and $p = .093$, respectively). Among territorial differences, the lower level of belief in regional centers (compared to villages) remains significant – $\beta = -0.324$; $p = .006$ ($OR \approx 0.72$). Type of news consumption does not show statistically significant associations with belief in victory after controlling for other factors ($p > .50$).

Table 2

Ordinal regression for the dependent variable “Belief in Ukraine’s victory”

Predictor	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald	<i>p</i>	Direction of Effect
Education	-0.189	0.032	34.37	0.000	Lower level of education → higher belief in victory
Subjective status	0.069	0.034	4.05	0.044	Higher status → stronger belief in victory
Volunteering	0.119	0.119	1.01	0.314	Not significant
Personal losses	-0.089	0.053	2.83	0.093	Tendency toward lower belief in victory
Civic identity	0.616	0.097	40.66	0.000	Stronger identity → stronger belief in victory
Social optimism	0.936	0.057	269.88	0.000	Higher optimism → stronger belief in victory
Community participation	0.240	0.064	14.30	0.000	Activity → stronger belief in victory
Trust in the President of Ukraine	0.068	0.015	19.24	0.000	Higher trust → stronger belief in victory
Value of statehood	0.276	0.029	89.84	0.000	Priority of statehood → stronger belief in victory
Anomie	-0.164	0.151	1.17	0.279	Not significant
Pro-democratic orientations	0.158	0.100	2.46	0.117	Tendency, but not significant
Type of settlement	-0.324 (village vs regional center)	0.117	7.63	0.006	Village → lower belief in victory
Type of news consumption	Not significant				–

Pseudo R^2 (Nagelkerke) = 0.384

Approximate cumulative odds ($OR = \exp(\beta)$): Social optimism ≈ 2.55 ; Civic identity ≈ 1.85 ; Value of statehood ≈ 1.32 ; Community participation ≈ 1.27 ; Trust in the President ≈ 1.07 ; Education ≈ 0.83 ; Regional center (vs. village) ≈ 0.72 .

Within H1 (war experience) we tested whether participation in collective actions and experienced losses are related to belief in victory. In Model 2, volunteers had higher cumulative odds of being in higher categories of belief ($\beta = 0.594$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.81$), and this relationship remained in Model 3 ($\beta = 0.510$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.67$). In the final Model 4, after adding identity, trust, values, and optimism, the effect of

volunteering disappears ($\beta = 0.119$; $p = .314$), which indicates the following: the relationship of volunteering with belief in victory is mainly mediated by psychosocial resources. The sum of personal losses in Model 2 was negatively related to belief in victory ($\beta = -0.152$; $p = .001$; $OR \approx 0.86$) but becomes statistically non-significant in Models 3–4 ($p > .09$). Thus, H1 is partially confirmed: the simple relationship of participation/losses with belief in victory weakens after accounting for identity, trust, values, and expectations. **Under H2 (civic identity)** stronger self-identification with the political nation consistently and substantially increases the probability of high belief in victory: in Model 3 $\beta = 0.862$ ($p < .001$; $OR \approx 2.37$), in Model 4 $\beta = 0.616$ ($p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.85$). Hypothesis confirmed. **For H3 (trust)** institutional trust, measured by evaluation of the President's activity, has a stable positive effect (Model 3: $\beta = 0.161$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.17$; Model 4: $\beta = 0.068$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.07$). The index of anomie in Model 3 is related to a decrease in belief in victory ($\beta = -0.384$; $p = .003$; $OR \approx 0.68$), but in Model 4 this relationship disappears ($p = .279$). Thus, trust is partially confirmed: the institutional component is a reliable predictor, while anomie depends on the composition of the model. **Under H4 (social optimism and information environment)** social optimism turned out to be key: each step upward on the scale increases cumulative odds of high belief by about 2.5 times (Model 4: $\beta = 0.936$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 2.55$). In contrast, type of news consumption after controlling for other factors does not make an independent contribution ($p > .50$). Thus, the hypothesis is confirmed regarding optimism, but not regarding the channel of receiving news. **H5 (civic participation)** confirmed: an increase in the participation index is associated with greater belief (Model 4: $\beta = 0.240$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.27$). **H6 (values)** partially confirmed: the importance of statehood has a stable positive effect (Model 4: $\beta = 0.276$; $p < .001$; $OR \approx 1.32$), while pro-democratic orientation shows only a tendency and does not reach statistical significance ($p = .117$).

Methodological limitations

Applying regression analysis to the specified models, certain methodological limitations should be taken into account. First, starting from Model 2, the test of parallel lines indicates a deviation from the proportionality assumption—therefore, the estimated coefficients should be interpreted as average cumulative effects. Second, the presence of sparse combinations of predictors and missing values reduces the “valid N ” in the models, which affects the variance of the estimates. Despite these caveats, the consistency of results between models and the increase in pseudo- R^2 confirm the robustness of the key conclusions.

Conclusions

To substantiate the approach to measuring national resilience through the prism of belief in victory, the authors consider resilience as a multilevel concept, conceptualized at the individual, community, and national levels, and emphasize the growth of macro-processes of resilience and the significance of its psychosocial components (identity, trust, and expectations about the future) as mechanisms for maintaining collective

functionality in wartime. At the same time, the indicator of mass confidence in victory is interpreted as a psychological component of national resilience, a kind of “barometer” of societal stability. In sum, “belief in victory” appears as an indicator theoretically embedded in the multilevel framework of resilience—it reflects psychological (optimism/hope), meso-level (civic participation/trust), and macro-level (institutional capacity/information environment) mechanisms that together sustain resilience in war. Accordingly, the conceptual model of confidence in victory is considered as a function of a set of factors (from individual war experience to macro-social attitudes) and is tested on empirical data from the monitoring survey *Ukrainian Society* of the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine using regression analysis methods.

The general conceptual model “belief in Ukraine’s victory” (dependent variable) has a set of predictors grouped into six blocks (war experience, civic identity, institutional/personal trust, social optimism and information environment, civic participation, values), on the basis of which hypotheses were formulated.

Among all predictors, volunteering, anomie, and type of news consumption have non-significant effects on belief in victory; personal losses and pro-democratic orientations show a tendency toward reduction; positive effects are found for civic identity, social optimism, civic participation, institutional trust, priority of statehood, and subjective status, while education has inverse effect (as the level of education increases, the level of belief decreases) and for larger settlements the level of belief in victory is lower than for smaller ones.

Testing hypothesis **H1 (war experience)** shows that the relationship of war experience (participation in collective actions and experiencing losses) with belief in victory weakens after identity, trust, values, and expectations are introduced into the model. Hypothesis **H2 (civic identity)** is confirmed: the higher the self-identification with the political nation, the stronger the belief in Ukraine’s victory. Hypothesis **H3 (trust)** is confirmed only at the institutional level: evaluation of the President’s activity has a stable positive effect; anomie or social distrust not only predictably reduce belief in victory but also “disappear” in the final model. Similarly, hypothesis **H4 (social optimism and information environment)** is confirmed only for social optimism, which significantly influences belief in victory, while the channel of news consumption does not: so-called positive information consumption of the “United News” telethon, alternative Ukrainian media, etc., does not add belief in victory over the Russian aggressor. Hypothesis **H5 (civic participation)** is also confirmed: active participation in civic/volunteering practices increases belief in victory. **Hypothesis H6 (values)** is partially confirmed: priority of statehood has a stable positive effect, while pro-democratic orientation is not statistically significant.

Summarizing, psychological and identification resources make the greatest contribution to sustaining belief in victory: social optimism (cognitive-motivational expectation) and civic identity (collective belonging) form the “core” of individual confidence. They are complemented by value orientations (priority of statehood) and civic participation, which is consistent with socio-ecological approaches to resilience, where the interaction of motivational expectations, identity, and cooperative practices is key (Norris et al., 2008; Ungar, 2012). Comparatively weaker or unstable effects of

volunteering and personal losses indicate that war experience alone does not guarantee higher belief in victory—decisive are the interpretive frameworks (optimism, values, identity) through which people make sense of this experience (Bonanno, 2004; Carver et al., 2010). Territorial differences (lower belief in regional centers compared to villages) may reflect different configurations of social capital and local information contexts, which require separate detailed study.

Thus, regression analysis confirms that belief in victory is a valid indicator of national resilience in wartime, determined primarily by social optimism, civic identity, value priority of statehood, institutional trust, and civic participation. Structural characteristics (education, type of settlement) and war experience (volunteering, losses) play secondary or mediated roles, yielding to psychological and normative resources. Such a combination of individual expectations, collective belonging, and participation corresponds to multilevel concepts of community and national resilience (Norris et al., 2008; Ungar, 2012) and is consistent with existing observations of the Ukrainian case (Goodwin et al., 2023; Reznikova & Korniiievskiy, 2024; Alexseev & Dembitskyi, 2024).

References

- Alexseev, M.A. & Dembitskyi, S. (2024). Victory-in-freedom: Ukraine's democratic resilience in the face of war. *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing*, 2, 40–55. <https://doi.org/10.15407/sociology2024.02.040>
- Balakireva, O.M. & Dmytruk, D.A. (2022). War in Ukraine: Population perception and its impact on the quality of life. *Ukr. Socium*, 1(80), 116–122. <https://doi.org/10.15407/socium2022.01.116>
- Bezrukova, O., Vil'kova, O., & Petrenko-Lysak, A. (2025). Social perception of war: a study of Ukrainian society under Russia's full-scale invasion. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 38(1), 70–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2025.2467217>
- Bonanno, G.A. (2004). Loss, trauma, and human resilience: Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? *American Psychologist*, 59(1), 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.1.20>
- Carver, C.S., Scheier, M.F., & Segerstrom, S.C. (2010). Optimism. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(7), 879–889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.01.006>
- Dagdeviren, H., Capucha, L., Calado, A., Donoghue, M., & Estêvão, P. (2020). Structural Foundations of Social Resilience. *Social Policy and Society*, 19(4), 539–552. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746420000032>
- Hrushetskyi, A. (2025). *Are Ukrainians Moving Towards Unity and How do Ukrainians See the Future of Ukraine*. Kyiv: KIIS. Retrieved from: <https://kiis.com.ua/?lang=eng&cat=reports&id=1565&page=1>
- Garnezy, N. (1971). Vulnerability research and the issue of primary prevention. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 41(1), 101–116. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1971.tb01111.x>
- Goodwin, R., Hamama-Raz, Y., Leshem, E., & Ben-Ezra, M. (2023). National resilience in Ukraine following the 2022 Russian invasion. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 85, 103487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2022.103487>
- Kimhi, S., Kaim, A., Bankauskaite, D., Baran, M., Baran, T., Eshel, Y., Dumbadze, S., Gabashvili, M., Kaniasty, K., Koubová, A., Marciano, H., Matkeviciene, R., Teperik, D., & Adini, B. (2023). A full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022: Resilience and coping within and beyond Ukraine. *Applied psychology. Health and well-being*, 16(3), 1005–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12466>
- Koubová, A. & Kimhi, S. (2024). Prediction of individual, community and societal resilience in the Czech Republic compared to Slovakia during the war in Ukraine. *BMC Public Health*, 24, 583. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-18075-y>

- Kutsenko, O. (2025). Resilience under fire: navigating societal challenges, agency, and innovation in times of war. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 38(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2025.2465177>
- Luthar, S.S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The Construct of Resilience: A Critical Evaluation. *Child Development*, 71(3), 543–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00164>
- Marukhovskiy, O., Marukhovska-Kartunova, O., Kolybabiuk, S., Pavlova, L., & Karchevska, O. (2024). The Role of Online Media in Shaping Public Opinion about the Prospects for Peace and Military Conflict. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology*, 16(2), 431–446. <https://doi.org/10.62271/pjc.16.1.431.446>
- Masten, A.S. (2001). Ordinary magic. Resilience processes in development. *Am. Psychol.*, 56(3), 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.56.3.227>
- Mirchuk, I. & Pavlenko, D. (2022). Psychoemotional State and Social Activity of Student Youth in the Conditions of War: A Sociological Analysis. *Visnyk of V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series Sociological studies of contemporary society: methodology, theory, methods*, 49, 47–54. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2227-6521-2022-49-05>
- 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>
- Razumkov Centre. (2025). “Red Lines for Ukraine”: Public Opinion and National Convictions (April–May 2025). Kyiv Security Forum. (May 13, 2025). Retrieved from: <https://razumkov.org.ua/images/2025/05/08/prezent.pdf>; , <https://razumkov.org.ua/en/component/k2/red-lines-for-ukraine-public-opinion-and-national-convictions-april-may-2025>
- Reznikova, O. & Korniievskiy, O. (2024). Resilience of the Ukrainian society in wartime: components and influencing factors. *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.47743/ejes-2024-0105>
- Slyusarevskyy, M. (2024). Peculiarities of content and trends in the dynamics of public perceptions of war and victory. *Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Psychology*, 20(2), 5–13. [https://doi.org/10.17721/BPSY.2024.2\(20\).1](https://doi.org/10.17721/BPSY.2024.2(20).1)
- Ungar, M. (2012). *The social ecology of resilience*. A handbook of theory and practice. Springer.
- Werner, E.E. & Smith, R.S. (1982). *Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth*. McGraw-Hill.
- Zlobina, O. (2024). Dynamics of Social and Psychological Resilience of the Population of Ukraine during the War. *Demography and Social Economy*, 58(4), 148–164. <https://doi.org/10.15407/dse2024.04.148>

Received 15.12.2025

Accepted for publication after review 15.01.2026

Published 03.03.2026

ЯРОСЛАВ БУРДІН, СВІТЛАНА САЛЬНІКОВА, МИКОЛА СИДОРОВ, СЕРГІЙ ДЕМБІЦЬКИЙ

Віра в перемогу як індикатор національної стійкості

Метою статті є (1) теоретичне обґрунтування підходу до вимірювання національної стійкості крізь призму віри у перемогу і (2) емпіричний аналіз соціальних та психологічних предикторів цього феномену. Розглядаючи резильєнтність як багаторівневе поняття, що концептуалізується на індивідуальному, спільнотному й національному рівнях, автори підкреслюють зростання ролі макропроцесів резильєнтності та значущості її психосоціальних компонентів як механізмів підтримання колективної функціональності в умовах війни. На масиві даних соціологічного моніторингу «Українське суспільство» (2023) побудовано різні варіації регресійних моделей, для яких віра в перемогу є залежною змінною, а множина предикторів згрупована за блоками: досвід війни, громадянська ідентичність, інституційна/особистіс-

на довіра, соціальний оптимізм та інформаційне середовище, громадянська участь, цінності; додатково до моделі введено соціальний статус, освіту, тип населеного пункту.

Виявлено, що психологічні (когнітивно-мотиваційне очікування) та ідентифікаційні ресурси (колективна належність) вносять найбільшу лепту в підтримання віри в перемогу; їх доповнюють цінності та громадянська участь; нестабільні ефекти має досвід, тож вирішальними виявляються інтерпретаційні рамки (оптимізм, цінності, ідентичність), через які люди осмислюють цей досвід.

Таким чином, регресійний аналіз підтверджує, що віра у перемогу є валідним індикатором національної стійкості у воєнний час, який детермінується насамперед соціальним оптимізмом, громадянською ідентичністю, ціннісним пріоритетом державності, інституційною довірою та громадянською участю. Структурні характеристики (освіта, тип населеного пункту) і воєнний досвід (волонтерство, втрати) відіграють другорядну або опосередковану роль, поступаючись психологічним і нормативним ресурсам.

Ключові слова: резильєнтність; віра в перемогу України; досвід війни; інституційна довіра; громадянська участь; соціальний оптимізм; регресійний аналіз.

YAROSLAV BURDIN, SVITLANA SALNIKOVA, MYKOLA SYDOROV, SERHII DEMBITSKYI

Faith in victory as an indicator of national resilience

The aim of the article is (1) the theoretical substantiation of an approach to measuring national resilience through the prism of faith in victory and (2) the empirical analysis of social and psychological predictors of this phenomenon. Considering resilience as a multilevel concept conceptualized at the individual, community, and national levels, the authors emphasize the growing importance of macro-processes of resilience and the significance of its psychosocial components as mechanisms for maintaining collective functionality under conditions of war. Based on the dataset of the sociological monitoring “Ukrainian Society” (2023), various regression model variations were constructed, in which faith in victory is the dependent variable, while the set of predictors is grouped into blocks: war experience, civic identity, institutional/personal trust, social optimism and information environment, civic participation, values; additionally, social status, education, and type of settlement were introduced into the model.

It was found that psychological resources (cognitive-motivational expectation) and identification resources (collective belonging) make the greatest contribution to sustaining faith in victory; they are complemented by values and civic participation; experience has unstable effects, so the decisive factors turn out to be the interpretive frameworks (optimism, values, identity) through which people make sense of this experience. Thus, regression analysis confirms that faith in victory is a valid indicator of national resilience during wartime, determined primarily by social optimism, civic identity, the value priority of statehood, institutional trust, and civic participation. Structural characteristics (education, type of settlement) and wartime experience (volunteering, losses) play a secondary or mediated role, yielding to psychological and normative resources.

Keywords: resilience; faith in Ukraine’s victory; war experience; institutional trust; civic engagement; social optimism; regression analysis