UDC 330.1:339.9–047.52

Deyneka T.
Doctor of Economics,
Professor of the Department of Economics and International Economic Relations,
Poltava State Agrarian Academy, Ukraine;
e-mail: tetyanadeyneka888@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8498-040X
Shkurupii O.
Doctor of Economics,
Professor of the Department of Economics and International Economic Relations,
Poltava State Agrarian Academy, Ukraine;
e-mail: olga.sh0123@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5818-7651
Pedchenko N.
Doctor of Economics, Professor,
First Vice-Rector of Higher Educational Establishment of Ukoopspilka
«Poltava University of Economics and Trade», Ukraine;
e-mail: pedchenko_ns@ukr.net; ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5093-2453
Tul S.
Ph. D. in Economics,
Associate Professor of the Department of International Economics
and International Economic Relations,
Higher Educational Establishment of Ukoopspilka
«Poltava University of Economics and Trade», Ukraine;
e-mail: tulsvetlana@ukr.net; ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3637-4197
Verhal K.
Ph. D. in Economics, Associate Professor,
Director of the Educational and Scientific Center for Quality Assurance in Higher Education,
Higher Educational Establishment of Ukoopspilka
«Poltava University of Economics and Trade», Ukraine;
e-mail: vergal.ks@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6611-0489

UKRAINE'S GLOBAL STATUS AS AN INDICATOR OF ITS CURRENT PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Abstract. It was ascertained that the global status of a country is determined by a set of its characteristics as an entity of international relations identifying the place it occupies among other countries over a certain historical period of time. The global status is defined as the relative position of countries in the system of international relations. The main factors that determine the global status of countries are economic development; achievements in science, technology and innovation; development of social spheres (health care, education, social protection); the outcome of distributing and exercising power within the state (domestic policy) as well as between states (foreign policy); the effectiveness of institutions; and governance efficiency in the field of environmental management. It is proved that the global status of countries depends primarily on how effectively each of its spheres functions in terms of the interests of society's development. At the same time, it depends on the synergistic effect — the coordinated action of all components of the socio-natural system (aggregate endogenous factor) and the degree of the country inclusion in the system of modern international relations, which is largely due to globalisation (exogenous factor). It is stated that the country's acquisition of a different global status compared to the previous one reflects the status dynamics. That means a change in the roles played by countries in the system of international relations, i.e. the process of transforming their behavior on the world stage. These starting points of the study of the place and role of individual countries in the modern globalized world became the basis for the analysis of Ukraine's position (by areas of activity and in general). The global status of Ukraine is defined and interpreted through correlation with the criteria derived from the theory of world-system analysis. Based on these methodological principles, modern problems have been identified and the possibility of further development of Ukraine has been assessed.

***Keywords*:** world economy, global status of countries, problems and contradictions of social development, socio-natural system, globalisation.

JEL Classification B41, F62, F63, F64, F68

Formulas: 0; fig.: 0; tabl.: 4; bibl.: 27.

Дейнека Т. А.
доктор економічних наук,
професор кафедри економіки та міжнародних економічних відносин
Полтавської державної аграрної академії, Україна;
e-mail: tetyanadeyneka888@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8498-040X

Шкурупій О. В.
доктор економічних наук,
професор кафедри економіки та міжнародних економічних відносин
Полтавської державної аграрної академії, Україна;
e-mail: olga.sh0123@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5818-7651

Педченко Н. С.
доктор економічних наук, професор,
перший проректор Вищого навчального закладу Укоопспілки
«Полтавський університет економіки і торгівлі», Україна;
e-mail: pedchenko_ns@ukr.net; ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5093-2453

Туль С. І.
кандидат економічних наук,
доцент кафедри міжнародної економіки та міжнародних економічних відносин
Вищого навчального закладу Укоопспілки
«Полтавський університет економіки і торгівлі», Україна;
e-mail: tulsvetlana@ukr.net; ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3637-4197

Вергал К. Ю.
кандидат економічних наук, доцент,
директор Навчально-наукового центру забезпечення якості вищої освіти
Вищого навчального закладу Укоопспілки
«Полтавський університет економіки і торгівлі», Україна;
e-mail: vergal.ks@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6611-0489

ГЛОБАЛЬНИЙ СТАТУС УКРАЇНИ ЯК ІНДИКАТОР ЇЇ СУЧАСНИХ ПРОБЛЕМ І МОЖЛИВОСТЕЙ

Анотація. З'ясовано, що глобальний статус країни визначається сукупністю її властивостей як суб'єкта міжнародних відносин та ідентифікує місце, яке в певному історичному проміжку часу вона посідає серед інших. Визначено, що глобальний статус — це співвідносне становище країн у системі міжнародних відносин. Досліджено основні чинники, які визначають глобальний статус країн: розвиток економіки; досягнення у сфері науки, техніки та інновацій; розбудова соціальних сфер (охорони здоров'я, освіти, соціального захисту); результат розподілу і реалізації влади всередині держави (внутрішня політика) і між державами (зовнішня політика); дієвість інститутів; ефективність управління у сфері природокористування. Доведено, що глобальний статус країн є залежним передусім від того, наскільки досконалим з погляду інтересів розвитку суспільства функціонують кожна з її сфер. Одночасно він залежить від синергетичного ефекту — узгодженої дії всіх складових соціоприродної системи (агрегованого ендогенного чинника) і від міри включення країни в систему сучасних міжнародних відносин, що визначальним чином зумовлено впливом глобалізації (екзогенного чинника). Констатовано, що набуття країною іншого глобального статусу порівняно з тим, що був до цього, відображає статусну динаміку. Під цим розуміється зміна ролей, що відігравали країни в системі міжнародних відносин, тобто процес трансформації їхньої поведінки на світовій арені. Вказані вихідні положення дослідження місця та ролі окремих країн у сучасному глобалізованому світі стали основою аналізу позицій України (за сферами діяльності та в цілому). Визначено глобальний статус

ISSN 2306-4994 (print); ISSN 2310-8770 (online)

України та здійснено його тлумачення через співвіднесення з критеріями, які виведені в теорії світ-системного аналізу. На основі зазначених методологічних засад виявлено сучасні проблеми і піддано оцінці можливості подальшого розвитку України.

Ключові слова: світова економіка, глобальний статус країн, проблеми та суперечності суспільного розвитку, соціоприродна система, глобалізація.

Формул: 0; рис.: 0; табл.: 4; бібл.: 27.

Introduction. The most pressing issue facing Ukrainian society today is whether the state will be able to contain the progressive economic downturn and regain (in the long run) the position of an industrialized country capable not only of accepting innovations but also of producing them as it approaches the world economic and technological leader countries. Things which are currently the subject of controversy among scholars and practitioners were beyond doubt in the 1990s.

After leaving the USSR, Ukraine had sufficient preconditions to firmly establish itself among the countries of the semi-periphery, which later gave a fairly high chance of the possibility of its confident movement to the core countries. Assessing the starting conditions of Ukraine, Heiets V. [1] noted that they were not the worst of all the economies of the post-socialist republics of the former USSR. However, the state has not even been able to maintain the level of 1990, while most post-socialist countries have moved far ahead. According to the analysts [2] with reference to the IMF calculations, in 2018 GDP at purchasing power parity in Ukraine was 85.1 % compared to 1991.

Practice has shown the ineffectiveness of the reforms carried out in the country and revealed the dysfunction of state regulation, which, in fact, all this time was subordinated to the interests of the oligarchic governing elite of Ukrainian society. Ukraine's chances of embarking on a path leading to the core countries have also been significantly reduced by the global crisis of 2008—2009 and the military-political situation in the country (from 2014 till now).

All this has led Ukraine to currently balance between the state of the periphery and the semi-periphery. In this regard, it must be recognized that the state has more problems with economic development than the potential and opportunities to change its status.

Analysis of recent research and statement of the problem. The formation of the country's global status is influenced by many factors, the main of which being economic development, advances in science, technology and innovation, development of social spheres (health care, education, social protection), the outcome of distributing and exercising power within the state (domestic policy) as well as between states (foreign policy), the effectiveness of institutions, the efficiency of governance in the field of environmental management. Thus, the global status is determined by the aggregate set of parameters of the country's development, identifying its place among other countries over a certain historical time interval [3; 4].

The basics of identifying the place that countries gain in the system of intertwined interstate relations depend on understanding of the world-economy and its belonging to the world-system according to I. Wallerstein [5]. The factors that have determined the current state of the country have been studied in various aspects by many scientists, economists, and politicians. Among them are K. Y. Lee [6], R. Sharma [7], D. Acemoglu, J. Robinson [8], J. Ikenberry [9], T. Blommaert, S. Van den Broek [10], A. Benoist [11], H. Kissinger [12], K. Skinner [13], K. Shvab [14] et al. Ukraine's position in the modern world has been analyzed in the works of V. Heiets [1], V. Tarasevych [15], B. Danylyshyn [16], L. Shynkaruk [17] et al.

The purpose of this publication is to determine the global status of Ukraine, which serves as an indicator of its current problems and opportunities. The task is to clarify the conditions, ability and feasibility of Ukraine's desire to take a stable position among the semi-periphery countries with the prospect of bringing its state closer to the core countries.

Results of the study. In case of generalized identification of Ukraine's status in the system of modern international relations — in accordance with the gradation of countries by groups of core / semi-periphery / periphery — the opinions of scientists differ. V. Tkachenko [18], for example, believes that Ukraine has completely lost its former position in the world economy. He defines its current state by the term not even «periphery», but «double periphery» and evaluates it through the expression «tragedy of the situation». Unlike this view, V. Tarasevych [16] perceives the situation

somewhat more optimistically. The scientist believes that the country still retains the semi-peripheral status gained in Soviet times. However, he also ascertains a sharp drop in GDP per capita to the level of the poorest countries, accelerating deindustrialization and structural degradation of the economy, as well as deterioration of most social indicators and notes that it indicates an increasing trend towards peripheralization or belonging to the «third world» economies.

It is difficult to disagree with the existence of risks for further socio-economic development of Ukraine. In fact, the development of Ukraine is strongly influenced by negative factors of both external and internal origin. At the same time, the effectiveness of changes in different areas of activity of Ukrainian society is different, which is confirmed by the analysis of the international organizations ratings (*Table 1*).

Table 1

Ukraine's reflection in international rankings, 2009—2018

Year as of reporting on the relevant date	KOF	LPI	GCI	GII	HDI	FSI	EPI
2009	47	n/a	82	79	85	110	×
2010	46	69	89	61	69	109	87
2011	53	74	82	60	76	110	×
2012	44	71	73	63	n/a	113	102
2013	47	64	84	71	78	117	×
2014	44	63	76	63	83	113	95
2015	42	70	79	64	81	84	×
2016	41	107	85	56	84	85	44
2017	45	122	81	50	90	90	×
2018	42	111	83	43	88	87	109
For reference: the number of countries in the ranking on the last date of the survey	203	149	140	126	189	178	180

Note: KOF — Index of Globalisation KOF; LPI — Legatum Prosperity Index; GCI — Global Competitiveness Index; GII — Global Innovation Index; HDI — Human Development Index; FSI — Fragile States Index; EPI — Environmental Performance Index; FSI — rating is determined inversely (indicator 178 in 2018 is the best; 1 is the worst).

Source: Compiled on the basis of international ratings of the following organizations: KOF Swiss Economic Institute; The Legatum Institute; World Economic Forum; Cornell University, INSEAD, WIPO; United Nations; The Fund for Peace; Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy.

If we take the middle of each rating as a benchmark, Ukraine's place will be determined as follows: according to the KOF Index of Globalisation, the Global Innovation Index and the Human Development Index, the country is in the top half of the list — in the group of countries with higher than average indicators; by the Fragile States Index, the Global Competitiveness Index, the Environmental Performance Index and the Legatum Prosperity Index — in the group of countries with below-average indicators.

The use of standardized data (Ukraine's place in each of the ratings to the total number of countries in it) allows specifying the current state of Ukraine in the main areas. It is identified as follows: the level of globalisation of the country (the degree of its inclusion into this process) is assessed by a coefficient of 0.21, processes in technological sphere — by a coefficient of 0.34, in social as well as spiritual and cultural spheres — 0.47, in the spheres of policy and functioning of state institutions — 0.49, in the economic sphere — 0.59, in the sphere of environmental management — 0.72, the wealth and public welfare available in the country according to the integrated approach to measurement is estimated by the coefficient of 0.74.

Thus, the state inherent in the development of various spheres of Ukrainian society is assessed in a fairly wide range. The presence of this discrepancy does not allow accurately determining the country's place in the system of modern international relations. In view of this, it is extremely difficult to find an answer to the question of Ukraine's status and describe it in the categories of world-system analysis without involving an indicator by which all parts of the socio-natural complex are assessed in unity and interconnectedness.

The methodology of studying the global positioning of countries, which makes it possible to determine the place of Ukraine among other countries, involves the construction of multiple clusters of two constants (LPI and KOF) and five variables (GCI, GII, HDI, FSI, EPI). The primary data of the

ISSN 2306-4994 (print); ISSN 2310-8770 (online)

ten-year time interval in 7 positions for each of the countries, the information about which is contained in all ratings at the same time, were subjected to mathematical processing. Logically organized analysis tools (respectively selected set of international indices) allowed to determine the effectiveness of the spheres of society of different countries according to the specified parameters of their identification — economic sphere (KOF — LPI — GCI), technological sphere (KOF — LPI — GII), social as well as spiritual and cultural spheres (KOF — LPI — HDI), political sphere and functioning of state institutions (KOF — LPI — FSI), environmental management (KOF — LPI — EPI). The Index of the Global Status of Countries (IGSC) is deduced on the basis of the received data.

Application of a comprehensive approach to determining the place of Ukraine in the modern world confirms that the country's positions by the development of the main areas of activity are, in fact, assessed ambiguously. Standardized indicators demonstrate that its place varies from the lower limit of the third cluster (in assessing the competitiveness of the national economy) to the middle of the second cluster (in assessing the use of natural resources) (*Table 2*).

Table 2

Ukraine in comparison with the countries — typical representatives in clusters according to spheres of social activity (standardized indicators)

Country — typical representative of clusters	Economic sphere	Technological sphere	Social and spiritual-cultural sphere	Sphere of policy and functioning of state institutions	Sphere of environmental management
	Model parameters				
	KOF — LPI — GCI	KOF — LPI — GII	KOF — LPI — HDI	KOF — LPI — FSI	KOF — LPI — EPI
№ 1	0.13	0.23	0.10	0.92	0.11
№ 2	0.34	0.48	0.31	0.68	0.33
№ 3	0.53	0.56	0.53	0.39	0.55
№ 4	0.82	0.83	0.81	0.24	0.89
Ukraine	*0.61*	*0.40*	*0.43*	*0.47*	*0.24*

Source: Calculated by the authors.

A comprehensive assessment of Ukraine's place in the IGSC eliminates the discrepancy of positions by spheres. This indicator for the country is 0.5, which refers the country to the third cluster, while absolutely accurately identifying it as a typical representative of this group of countries (middle, centroid). Hence, according to the subject area of identification, Ukraine clearly does not belong to the core countries (the status of which is defined as high) nor does it belong to the countries aspiring to the core (the status of which is defined as above average). So, the state does not fall into the higher group — neither into the cluster of leading countries nor into the cluster of candidate countries (*Table 3*). Ukraine belongs to the countries of the third group, which have a greater attraction to the lower (fourth) cluster than to the higher (first and second) ones. This fact should be seen as a challenge to the country, as the volatility of the acquired status threatens losing it.

Table 3

Cluster parameters and Ukraine's place in the modern world

Cluster / country	Parameter boundaries of clusters	the Index of the Global Status of Countries, IGSC
Cluster 1 and the country, its typical representative	0.00—0.20	0.159
Cluster 2 and the country, its typical representative	0.21—0.38	0.178
Cluster 3 and the country, its typical representative	0.39—0.72	0.500
Cluster 4 and the country, its typical representative	0.72—1.00	0.790
Ukraine	×	*0.500*

Source: Calculated by the authors.

In Ukraine qualitative changes for the better involve the emergence of a harmonized socio-natural complex, which is formed by an internally coherent social system (economic, political, social, and spiritual spheres) and the system (sphere) of human interaction with nature.

Development by spheres in their synergetic interaction shapes the quality of the system as a whole. However, the socio-natural complex of Ukraine is still too far from a harmonious state.

According to The Global Competitiveness Report (2018), the development of the national economy is constrained by underdeveloped institutions (110th place), instability of the financial system (117th place) and macroeconomic indicators (131st place). Assessing the state of Ukraine in the economy and in the field of state regulation, it should be mentioned that Ukraine does not ensure the efficiency of environmental management. The loss of forest cover is impressive (the value of the position in the Environmental Performance Index is 14.0 out of 100). Values for such positions as climate change and power engineering, air pollution, biodiversity and habitat also do not reach the middle of the rating. Under these circumstances, the state is expected to lose human capital due to the reduction of its health component. According to the Legatum Prosperity Index (2018), Ukraine ranks the 137th in this position. The Legatum Institute Analytical Center confirms a high level of environmental pollution in the country (105th place), the activity of risk factors (128th) and lack of social capital (119th), and shows that the welfare of the population of Ukraine is not facilitated by poor management (129th place) and inefficiency of the business environment (106th) [19—21].

Thus, the partial indicators on the basis of which the global status of Ukraine is calculated clearly show that the current problems of the state are primarily accumulated in the areas of economy, policy and functioning of state institutions, as well as environmental management. Determining opportunities for improving the global status of Ukraine are concentrated mainly in the social, spiritual and cultural spheres, as well as in the field of technology.

Indeed, Ukraine's position in the globalized world demonstrates the complexity of the current period of functioning of the national system. However, we cannot rule out the fact that Ukraine has the potential for development, which under favorable conditions can not only bring the country out of the crisis in the medium term, but also provide preconditions for its social, economic and spiritual prosperity. It is primarily about the importance of human potential created in the country for further development of the state. It is human potential that can ensure innovative progress in all spheres of society, provided that corruption is overcome in Ukraine, humanistic state regulation is established and effective institutions are created. Only in this way can positive changes in the international status of the state take place and the country's movement to the core area in a planetary society begins.

The implementation of the measures to address the challenges facing the government and Ukrainian society ought to be regarded as being urgent. Objectively assessing the current state of Ukrainian society, it should be noted that today none of the spheres of its activities is free of the development problems (including the sphere of human development and development of innovations). In view of this, inaction or postponement of institutional reforms in Ukraine can deprive the state of any opportunities for further progress.

Today, the education level of Ukrainians is extremely high. According to the literacy rate (99.5 %), the country ranks fifth in the world (Human Development Index, 2018) [22]. However, the knowledge of Ukrainians remains significantly as their potential. Poverty encourages people to emigrate and do unskilled but well-paid work. Today, the country ranks 112th in the world by this indicator; according to the IMF, GDP at purchasing power parity per capita in 2018 was USD 9,283 [23]. Possibilities for transforming human potential into the development capital are also reduced by the unsatisfactory state of medical care, poor ecology and, as a result, limited life expectancy, which is lower than the world average. Meanwhile, man is the source of knowledge and producer of innovation; they, in turn, become a necessary prerequisite for systemic transformations in general including each of the spheres of human activity, in particular.

The World Economic Forum (WEF) studies the innovations in the sphere of institutions, education, infrastructure and business. Among the indicators that record factors favorable for the stabilization / growth of Ukraine's global status are knowledge and technology (27th place), human capital and research (education, research and academic resources) (43rd place), creativity (45th place), development of innovative business (patents, intellectual property, employment of women

ISSN 2306-4994 (print); ISSN 2310-8770 (online)

and minorities, working conditions, etc.) (46th place). At the same time, the WEF captures the same problems in the development of Ukrainian society as the other authoritative international organizations do. These are the risks, the action of which may destroy the foundations of life in Ukrainian society. Therefore, without a proper response from the government and civil society as a whole, threats may arise that could become irreversible in the future. Among the indicators that record the presence of real systemic risks, it is necessary to mention political environment (122nd place in the WEF ranking), political stability and security (123th place), environmental sustainability (115th place), institutions (policy, regulatory climate and business conditions) (107th place), infrastructure (access to government services, cost of resources, energy saving indicators) and innovation market development (loans, investments, competition) (89th place for the last two of these positions) (the Global Innovation Index, 2018) [24].

In addition to the development potential created within the society and the degree of its implementation, it is necessary to take into account the influence of the external environment. Ukraine is included in all spheres of globalized society (*Table 4*). The level of the country's involvement in political processes is especially high. It is facilitated by the state's membership in many international organizations, its participation in international missions, a large number of international multilateral treaties that have been ratified, the presence of embassies of Ukraine in different countries, and so on.

Table 4

Ukraine's place in the ranking of countries in the Index of Globalisation

Indicator	Rank	Index
KOF Globalisation Index: Economic Dimension	80	63.70
KOF Globalisation Index: Social Dimension	86	69.75
Globalisation Index: Political Dimension	30	89.37
Globalisation Index overall	42	74.25

Source: KOF Swiss Economic Institute: The Index of Globalisation 2018 [25].

The Index of Globalisation of Ukraine in the economy and social spheres is above average. In this regard, it is necessary to emphasize the presence of both positive and negative aspects of the country's involvement in global processes. Undoubtedly, an increase in any country's activity in world economic processes (the development of international trade, the growth of business activity in foreign markets, the intensity of trade and investment flows, etc.) is assessed as a positive phenomenon. Participation in integration processes taking place in the social sphere also promotes development and increases the status of countries. The spread of international cultural ties, tourism, information and communication infrastructure, cross-border remittances, etc. have a positive impact on the countries.

However, when it comes to Ukraine, one cannot ignore the peculiarities of its participation in global processes taking place in the economic and social spheres. Highlighting the main thing, we note that the peculiarity of the country's international economic ties is due, firstly, to the excessive openness, and, secondly, to the predominance of imports over exports in the structure of international trade. Exports to GDP in 2018 amounted to 45.2 %, and imports — 53.8 % [26]. In addition, the raw materials orientation of exports has been established in Ukraine. The country generates most of its foreign exchange earnings in volatile markets. This makes it dependent, above all, on the state of the world markets for grain and metal. Falling prices for these and some other raw materials and primary processed goods immediately affect the country's economy, causing balance of payments crises and devaluation of the hryvnia. Thus, with such an export structure and significant openness of the economy, one should not expect that the impact of globalisation on the country's development will be exceptionally positive; under these conditions, the risks caused by globalisation become much more predictable. Contrasting against this background is the qualitative structure of imports of goods to Ukraine having a large share of high-tech products. Most accounted for are machinery, equipment and mechanisms, chemical products, land transport, railcars and locomotives, aircraft, ships.

The specifics of the social sphere development is determined primarily by the low level of welfare of the population, so in the openness of the global space, a large number of active people aged 15 to 70 have left and continue to go abroad. Ukraine has become a donor of migrant workers. At the same time, the situation is becoming increasingly critical for the country itself. According to the UN, by 2050 the population of Ukraine may decrease by 18 % — up to 36 million people [27]. Along with the outflow of labor (especially with the simultaneous active emigration of talented youth), the country's opportunities to strengthen its innovative positions are getting reduced. Losing human resources (primarily intellectual and creative ones), Ukraine loses development potential.

Conclusion. Thus, in the absence of effective measures by the state, the risk of deterioration of the global status for Ukraine is quite high. Ukraine's acquisition of a global status higher than the current one depends primarily on how effective the country's economic and social reforms will be. With the positive effect of them, the social sphere is still able to respond quickly enough by mobilizing human capital, and the national economy is able to create and implement innovation potential in traditionally priority sectors of the economy. Innovative progress is quite real in mechanical engineering, military-industrial, aerospace complexes. Technological revival of other industries is also probable. The possibility of taking advantage of new sectors (especially ICT) should be mentioned separately.

In general, Ukraine's prospects should be considered in the context of the extent to which the results of its national development will correspond to the defining trend the planetary society is currently moving in. We are talking about a post-industrial society, the basis of which is the economy of the appropriate type. In order for Ukraine to be in the «fairway» of this global trend, it is necessary that innovation is perceived in society as the basis of all processes which are taking place. In other words, it is necessary for the idea of innovation to be recognized as the basis for creating its future life — institutionally stable and efficient, intellectually, culturally, spiritually rich and at the same time the one that has a high level of material well-being. Innovations must cover all forms of relations: technical and economic, techno-social and techno-natural. The imperative of innovations universality should extend to the socio-natural complex as a whole, ensuring its perfection and harmonization of its components.

Література

1. Геєць В. М. Суспільний капітал — 25: одержавленість чи державотворчість? *Економіка України*. 2016. № 8 (657). С. 3—6.
2. Романюк О. Чи дійсно Україна найбідніша в Європі: як новий рейтинг пересварив економістів. *Сегодня*. 2018. URL : https://ukr.segodnya.ua/economics/enews/bednost-ukrainy-peressorila-ekonomistov-1180274.html (дата звернення: 07.03.2021).
3. Дейнека Т. А. Соціально-економічні суперечності процесу глобалізації суспільства (політико-економічний аналіз) : монографія. Київ : КНЕУ, 2018. 510 с.
4. Pedchenko N., Shkurupii O., Deyneka T.,Verhal K., Tul S. Vector and structural changes in the modern world. *Financial and credit activity: problems of theory and practice*. 2020. Vol. 3. № 34. P. 441—450.
5. Wallerstein I. The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century. New York : Academic Press, 1974. 410 p.
6. Ли К. Ю. Из третьего мира — в первый. История Сингапура 1965—2000 : пер. с англ. Москва : Манн, Иванов и Фербер, 2019.
7. Sharma R. The Rise and Fall of Nations: Ten Forces of Change in the Post-Crisis World. London : Penguin, 2017.
8. Аджемоглу Д., Робінсон Д. Чому нації занепадають. Походження влади, багатства та бідності. Київ : Наш Формат, 2017. 435 с.
9. Айкенберри Дж. Будущее либерального мирового порядка. *РСМД: Российский совет по международным делам*. 2016. 9 августа. URL : https://russiancouncil.ru/analytics-and-comments/analytics/budushchee-liberalnogo-mirovogo-poryadka (дата обращения: 07.03.2021).
10. Блуммарт Т., Ван ден Брук С. Четвертая промышленная революция и бизнес. Как конкурировать и развиваться в эпоху сингулярности. Москва : Альпина Паблишер, 2019. 204 с.
11. Бенуа А. Вперед, к прекращению роста! Эколого-философский трактат. Москва : Институт Общегуманитарных Исследований, 2012. 112 с. URL : https://libs.ru/book/382949/read (дата обращения: 07.03.2021).
12. Киссинджер Г. Мировой порядок / пер. с англ. В Желнинова, А. Милюкова. Москва : Изд-во АСТ, 2015. 512 с.
13. Скиннер К. Человек цифровой. Четвертая революция в истории человечества, которая затронет каждого : пер. с англ. Москва : Манн, Иванов и Фербер, 2019. 304 с.
14. Шваб К. Четвертая промышленная революция : пер. с англ. Москва : Изд-во «Э», 2018. 208 с.
15. Данилишин Б. Яку економіку ми маємо будувати? *ZN,UA*. 2017. URL : https://zn.ua/ukr/macrolevel/yaku-ekonomiku-mi-mayemo-buduvati-255559_.html (дата звернення: 07.03.2021).

ISSN 2306-4994 (print); ISSN 2310-8770 (online)

16. Тарасевич В. М. Чверть століття незалежності України: актуальні контексти та імперативи соціально-економічних реформ. *Економіка України*. 2017. № 8 (669). С. 14—28.
17. Структурні трансформації в економіці України: динаміка, суперечності та вплив на економічний розвиток : наукова доповідь / [Шинкарук Л. В., Бевз І. А., Барановська І. В. та ін.] ; за ред. чл.-кора НАН України Л. В. Шинкарук ; НАН України, ДУ «Ін-т екон. та прогнозув. НАН України». Київ, 2015. 304 с.
18. Ткаченко В. Україна: «час війні й час миру». *Український історичний журнал*. 2017. № 1. С. 135—156.
19. Schwab K. (Ed.) The Global Competitiveness Report 2018. Insight Report. *World Economic Forum*. 2018. URL : http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GCR2018/05FullReport/TheGlobalCompetitivenessReport2018.pdf (date of access: 09.03.2021).
20. 2018 Environmental Performance Index. Global metrics for the environment: Ranking country performance on high-priority environmental issues. Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy, Yale University; Center for International Earth Science Information Network, Columbia University. In collaboration with the World Economic Forum. With support from the McCall MacBain Foundation and Mark T. DeAngelis. 2018. URL : https://epi.envirocenter.yale.edu/downloads/epi2018policymakerssummaryv01.pdf (date of access: 09.03.2021).
21. The Legatum Prosperity Index 2018. The Legatum Institute Foundation, 2018. URL : https://prosperitysite.s3-accelerate.amazonaws.com/2515/4321/8072/2018_Prosperity_Index.pdf (date of access: 09.03.2021).
22. Human Development Indices and Indicators 2018 Statistical Update. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Washington : Communications Development Incorporated, 2018. URL : http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2018_human_development_statistical_update.pdf (date of access: 09.03.2021).
23. GDP based on purchasing-power-parity (PPP) per capita. Report for Selected Countries and Subjects. International Monetary Fund. 2019. URL : https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2019/01/weodata/weorept.aspx?sy=2017&ey=2018&sic=1&sort=country (date of access: 10.03.2021).
24. Dutta S., Lanvin B., Wunsch-Vincent S. (Eds.) Global Innovation Index 2018. Energizing the World with Innovation. Cornell University, INSEAD, WIPO. 2018. URL : https://www.wipo.int/publications/ru/details.jsp?id=4330&plang=EN (date of access: 11.03.2021).
25. KOF Globalisation Index: Globalisation Lull Continues. 2018. URL : https://kof.ethz.ch/en/news-and-events/media/press-releases/2018/12/kof-globalisation-index-globalisation-lull-continues.html (date of access: 12.03.2021).
26. Експорт та імпорт України. Зовнішньоторговельний баланс України з 2005 по 2018 (млн грн). *Мінфін*. URL : https://index.minfin.com.ua/ua/economy/gdp/eximp (дата звернення: 13.03.2021).
27. Назвали масштаби трудової міграції українців. *finance.ua.* 2019. 12 травня. URL : https://news.finance.ua/ua/news/-/448683/nazvaly-masshtaby-trudovoyi-migratsiyi-ukrayintsiv (дата звернення: 14.03.2021).

Статтю рекомендовано до друку 18.04.2021

References

1. Heiets, V. M. (2016). Suspilnyi kapital — 25: oderzhavlenist chy derzhavotvorchist? [Public Capital — 25: State Ownership or State Creation?]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy — Economy of Ukraine, 8,* 3—6 [in Ukrainian].
2. Romaniuk, O. (2018). Chy diisno Ukraina naibidnisha v Yevropi: yak novyi reitynh peresvaryv ekonomistiv [Is Ukraine really the poorest in Europe: how the new rating quarreled with economists]. *Segodnya — Today.* Retrieved from March 7, 2021, from https://ukr.segodnya.ua/economics/enews/bednost-ukrainy-peressorila-ekonomistov-1180274.html [in Ukrainian].
3. Deineka, T. A. (2018). *Sotsialno-ekonomichni superechnosti protsesu hlobalizatsii suspilstva (polityko-ekonomichnyi analiz) [Socio-economic contradictions in the process of globalisation of society (political and economic analysis)]*. Kyiv: KNEU [in Ukrainian].
4. Pedchenko, N., Shkurupii, O., Deyneka, T., Verhal, K., & Tul, S. (2020). Vector and structural changes in the modern world. *Financial and credit activity: problems of theory and practice*, *Vol. 3*, 34, 441—450.
5. Wallerstein, I. (1974). The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century. New York: Academic Press.
6. Lee, K. Yu. (2019). *Iz tret'ego mira — v pervyj. Istoriya Singapura 1965—2000 [From the third world to the first. History of Singapore 1965—2000]*. Moscow: Mann, Ivanov i Ferber [in Russian].
7. Sharma, R. (2017). The Rise and Fall of Nations: Ten Forces of Change in the Post-Crisis World. London: Penguin.
8. Adzhemoglu, D., & Robinson, D. (2017). *Chomu natsii zanepadaiut pokhodzhennia vlady, bahatstva ta bidnosti [Why do nations fail. The origin of power, prosperity, and poverty]*. Kyiv: Nash Format [in Ukrainian].
9. Ikenberry, J. (2016, August 9). Budushchee liberal'nogo mirovogo poryadka [The future of liberal world order]. *RSMD: Rossijskij sovet po mezhdunarodnym delam — RIAC: Russian International Affairs Council.* Retrieved March 7, 2021, from http://russiancouncil.ru/inner/?id_4=8007#top-content [in Russian].
10. Blommaert, T., Van den Broek, S. (2019). *Chetvertaya promyshlennaya revolyuciya i biznes. Kak konkurirovat' i razvivat'sya v epohu singulyarnosti [Fourth industrial revolution and business. How to compete and develop in the era of the Singularity]*. Moscow: Al'pina Pablisher [in Russian].
11. Benoist, A. (2012). *Vpered, k prekrashcheniyu rosta! Ekologo-filosofskij traktat [Forward to the cessation of growth! Ecological and philosophical treatise]*. Moscow: Institut Obshchegumanitarnyh Issledovanij. Retrieved March 7, 2021, from https://libs.ru/book/382949/read/ [in Russian].
12. Kissinger, H. (2015). *Mirovoj poryadok [World order]*. (V. Zhelninov, A. Milyukov, Trans.). Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AST [in Russian].
13. Skinner, K. (2019). *Chelovek cifrovoj. Chetvertaya revolyuciya v istorii chelovechestva, kotoraya zatronet kazhdogo [Digital man. The fourth revolution in human history that will affect everyone]*. Moscow: Mann, Ivanov i Ferber [in Russian].
14. Shvab, K. (2018). *Chetvertaya promyshlennaya revolyuciya [The fourth industrial revolution]*. Moscow [in Russian].
15. Danylyshyn, B. (2017). Yaku ekonomiku my maiemo buduvaty? [What economy should we build?]. *ZN,UA*. Retrieved March 7, 2021, from https://zn.ua/ukr/macrolevel/yaku-ekonomiku-mi-mayemo-buduvati-255559_.html [in Ukrainian].
16. Tarasevych, V. M. (2017). Chvert stolittia nezalezhnosti Ukrainy: aktualni konteksty ta imperatyvy sotsialno-ekonomichnykh reform [A quarter of a century of independence of Ukraine: current contexts and imperatives of socio-economic reforms]. *Ekonomika Ukrainy — Economy of Ukraine, 8*, 14—28 [in Ukrainian].

17. Shynkaruk, L. V., Bevz, I. A., & Baranovska, I. V. (et al.). (2015). *Strukturni transformatsii v ekonomitsi Ukrainy: dynamika, superechnosti ta vplyv na ekonomichnyi rozvytok [The structural transformations in the economy of Ukraine: dynamics, contradictions and impact on economic development]*. L. V. Shynkaruk (Ed.). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
18. Tkachenko, V. (2017). Ukraina: «chas viini y chas myru» [Ukraine: «time of war and time of peace»]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal — Ukrainian Historical Journal, 1,* 135—156 [in Ukrainian].
19. Schwab, K. (Ed.) (2018). The Global Competitiveness Report 2018. Insight Report. World Economic Forum. Retrieved March 9, 2021, from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GCR2018/05FullReport/TheGlobalCompetitivenessReport2018.pdf.
20. 2018 Environmental Performance Index. Global metrics for the environment: Ranking country performance on high-priority environmental issues. (2018). Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy, Yale University; Center for International Earth Science Information Network, Columbia University. In collaboration with the World Economic Forum. With support from the McCall MacBain Foundation and Mark T. DeAngelis. Retrieved March 9, 2021, from https://epi.envirocenter.yale.edu/downloads/epi2018policymakerssummaryv01.pdf.
21. The Legatum Prosperity Index 2018. (2018). The Legatum Institute Foundation. Retrieved March 9, 2021, from https://prosperitysite.s3-accelerate.amazonaws.com/2515/4321/8072/2018_Prosperity_Index.pdf.
22. Human Development Indices and Indicators 2018 Statistical Update. (2018). United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Washington: Communications Development Incorporated. Retrieved March 9, 2021, from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2018_human_development_statistical_update.pdf.
23. GDP based on purchasing-power-parity (PPP) per capita. 2019. Report for Selected Countries and Subjects. (2019). International Monetary Fund. Retrieved March 10, 2021, from https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2019/01/weodata/weorept.aspx?sy=2017&ey=2018&sic=1&sort=country.
24. Dutta, S., Lanvin, B., & Wunsch-Vincent, S. (Eds.). (2018). Global Innovation Index 2018. Energizing the World with Innovation. Cornell University, INSEAD, WIPO. Retrieved March 11, 2021, from https://www.wipo.int/publications/ru/details.jsp?id=4330&plang=EN.
25. KOF Globalisation Index: Globalisation Lull Continues. (2018). Retrieved March 12, 2021, from https://kof.ethz.ch/en/news-and-events/media/press-releases/2018/12/kof-globalisation-index-globalisation-lull-continues.html.
26. Eksport ta import Ukrainy. Zovnishnotorhovelnyi balans Ukrainy z 2005 po 2018 (mln hrn) [Eksport ta import Ukrainy. Zovnishnotorhovelnyi balans Ukrainy z 2005 po 2018 (mln hrn)]. (n. d.). *Minfin*. Retrieved March 13, 2021, from https://index.minfin.com.ua/ua/economy/gdp/eximp [in Ukrainian].
27. Nazvaly masshtaby trudovoi mihratsii ukraintsiv [Named the scale of labor migration of Ukrainians]. (2019, May 12). *finance.ua*. Retrieved from March 14, 2021, from https://news.finance.ua/ua/news/-/448683/nazvaly-masshtaby-trudovoyi-migratsiyi-ukrayintsiv [in Ukrainian].

The article is recommended for printing 18.04.2021

ISSN 2306-4994 (print); ISSN 2310-8770 (online)