

Yu. V. Honcharov¹,
 orcid.org/0000-0002-3800-8038,
I. Yu. Shtuler²,
 orcid.org/0000-0002-0852-8526,
O. A. Ovechkina³,
 orcid.org/0000-0001-8259-6626,
M. V. Shtan⁴,
 orcid.org/0000-0002-4938-555X

1 – Academician Stepan Demianchuk International University of Economics and Humanities, Rivne, Ukraine, e-mail: goncharov_yv@ukr.net
 2 – National Academy of Management, Kyiv, Ukraine
 3 – V. Dall East Ukrainian National University, Severodonezhsk, Ukraine
 4 – National Academy of Management, Kyiv, Ukraine

DIGITIZATION AS A MEANS OF IMPLEMENTING CHANGES IN THE TRANSITIVE MODEL OF POWER-PROPERTY-LABOR RELATIONS IN UKRAINE

Purpose. Substantiation of choice of the model of digitalization of domestic transitive economy and society, the implementation of which should prevent the development of negative consequences and strengthen the cumulative effect of positive factors.

Methodology. Operationally, research was conducted based on the key provisions by economic theory and political economy, modern concepts of property, power and wage labor. Special research methods were used: grouping and systematization, logical generalization of major characteristics of the global digitalization of national economies. To achieve the purpose, general scientific methods of research on processes and phenomena were used, namely: methods of analysis and synthesis to create a methodological apparatus for studying the effects of digitalization on the social structure and economy of different countries. The application of the system-structural approach allowed developing and comparing models of digitalization of Ukrainian economy.

Findings. Digitization is revealed in three aspects: process, result and factor of social and economic changes of the countries which are at different levels of development. Each of the aspects emphasizes the importance of digitalization in the transformations of economic sectors, significant changes in the economic, socio-cultural, institutional and legal systems of society. It is proved that digitalization exacerbates the issues of accelerated reindustrialization of industry on the basis of technological innovations, immediate solution of a complex of unemployment and employment problems, the emergence of new forms by non-economic exploitation. If ignoring the solution of the problems mentioned, a negative effect is inevitable: intellectual and technical backwardness, raw material orientation of the economy, critical disharmony of society, and others. The comparison of digitalization models showed that the implementation of the model of updating a range of industries can ensure the development of the digital sector and digital economy in Ukraine.

Originality. The originality of the study is to find a model of digitalization that will be most conducive to progressive changes in the economy. One of such models is the model of complex renewal of industries under the conditions of Ukraine's integration into the European digital market, which will ensure reindustrialization of production, stabilize the employment market, harmonize the social structure of society, and so on.

Practical value. The results of the study can be used by government officials, scientists and business leaders in the process of adjusting the concept of digital economy and applying the proposed models of its implementation in accordance with the realities of the transitional state of all spheres of Ukrainian society.

Keywords: *transitive model of economy, digital employment, digitalization consequences, digitalization models*

Introduction. The transition from an industrial to a post-industrial model of the capitalist economy in most developed countries was affected by the processes of intellectualization and digitalization launched by the global capital, which also covered countries with a transitional economy and radically change the established life and mechanisms of functioning of national societies. Studies have shown that digitalization requires new ways of using and restoring production conditions and resources, new models of interaction between owners and non-owners of production factors and mechanisms for resolving the contradictions of their economic interests; provokes a significant number of negative consequences in the production and labor market. Taking into account the above, the domestic economy, moving in the mainstream of global digitalization, needs to find its own model of digitalization, to provide decent preferences and incomes.

Literature review. Theoretical and practical problems of the development of national economies and their interaction in the world economy are always in the field of view of scientists in many fields of knowledge and scientific schools. Special attention of researchers is paid to the issue of transformations of the national economic space, relations between owners and non-owners of modern production factors, caused by the emergence of new world economic processes that are of an explosive nature.

The novelty of this study lies in the comparative analysis of the transitive model of power-property-labor relations in Ukraine under the influence of digitalization, which is presented in a tabular form and covers the following comparison criteria: coverage of industries, achievement of goals, the state of social inequality, the nature of changes in the economy and society, the ratio of financial and material resources with the allocation of the following models: a model of selective renewal of industries, a model of renewal of a certain number of industries, a model of renewal of a complex of industries.

Among the scientific works in which the theoretical issues of the development of national economic systems are solved under the influence of global processes (financialization, intellectualization, networking, digitalization, etc.), it is worth highlighting the works by V. Bazilevych, A. Galchinsky, V. Geets, Y. Honcharov, M. Ermoshenko, L. Melnyk, V. Serzhanova, A. Sosin, V. Tarasevych, A. Chukhno, I. Shtuler, and others.

Unsolved aspects of the problem. The conducted theoretical study on the mechanisms and consequences of digitalization, set out in many scientific and publicistic sources, showed that with all the power of the global digitalization process, counter-trends may arise, causing a decrease in its pace and cumulative effect: a slight increase in the number of successful digital projects and the amount of expected digital dividends; national features of the implementation of digitalization; deepening gaps between countries that have joined the digita-

lization process in terms of the number of Internet users, the technical quality of network services, and the development of the digital employment market. In this regard, one of the unresolved issues of the general problem of adaptation of various countries to the requirements put forward by digitalization is the prompt mobilization of the components of Ukraine's economic potential and their effective use for accelerated and successful Ukraine's entry into the global digitalization process, while preventing the highly probable appearance of a negative effect from a set of certain negative consequences of digitalization. The article draws a generalized conclusion about the need to manage the digitalization process in order to prevent and correct undesirable consequences and a balanced choice of its appropriate model.

Purpose. The purpose of the article is to study the impact of digitalization on the property-power-labor relations that have developed in the transitional economy of Ukraine. To achieve this goal, the following questions were posed:

1) based on the study of scientific works and journalistic materials, to determine the main consequences of digitalization for: a) the domestic economy as a whole, its material and technical base; b) hired workers and the unemployed regarding the change of their social and property status; c) owners of real estate and land, the legality of their speculative enrichment;

2) to identify the existence of non-economic forms of coercion, reproducible in the context of digitalization;

3) to develop and compare the main digitalization models that can reduce or neutralize the negative consequences of this process.

Methods. To achieve the goal of this article, general scientific and special methods of researching processes and phenomena influenced by digitalization were used, namely: methods of analysis and synthesis, methods of induction-deduction and analogy, systemic-structural approach, methods of systematization, grouping, logical generalization. In the process of working on the article, research was carried out based on the main provisions of economic theory and political economy, modern concepts of property, power, and hired labor.

Results. Digitalization is now becoming the most popular trend in the socio-economic transformations of countries at different levels of socio-economic and cultural development. All subjects of the digitalization process, which has acquired a global character, expect mainly positive consequences of this phenomenon [1]. It is noteworthy that digitalization is described as a process, result, factor and goal setting of socio-economic changes. Digitization-process is presented as saturation of the physical world with electronic-digital devices, systems, which makes an integral interaction of the virtual and physical (creation of a cyber-physical space). Digitization-result is assumed as the transformation of existing and the creation of new sectors of the economy on a digital basis. Driver digitalization is understood as a factor of fundamental changes in the economic, social and personal activities of society. Digitization-goal-setting is presented as a list of goals that must be achieved: technological and digital modernization of the industry, the creation of new high-tech industries; stimulation of the production and consumption of information, communication and digital technologies.

Digitalization as a new trend in the development of national economies and as a process of globalization of the world economy has not gone unnoticed by domestic researchers. In the works by many scientists, questions are raised on identifying the consequences of the deployment of modern world trends that can radically affect the functioning of national economies. So, in the article by K. I. Pugachevska and K. S. Pugachevska, it is determined that the global digitalization process in developed economies has caused the accelerated development of the "digital" sector, represented by the electronic industry, digital infrastructure, the provision of digital services, based on reindustrialized industrial produc-

tion, the use of skilled labor. The relevance of the reindustrialization of the Ukrainian industry, especially the electronic one, is thus conditioned, in the opinion of these and many other authors, by the need to eliminate the dependence of manufacturers on imports of digital products; at low rates of capital renewal, this industry will not allow ensuring the competitiveness of domestic enterprises in the digital sector of the forming economy [2, 3].

Based on the results of studying a sufficiently large amount of material, we can note that most of the works of domestic and foreign researchers are concentrated on superficial-empirical problems of reindustrialization and digitalization, such as: T. Posnova's definition of creative capital as digital skills of skilled workers, the development of which accompanies the process of reindustrialization of domestic industry and generate digital income in the future, etc. [4], or the definition of the positive ("creative") impact of digitalization on the quality of the workforce and the state of employment, in the work by A. Bilyk [5], or an increase in the list of elements of the digital sector on the way of its transformation in the digital economy in the work by A. Matveichuk [6].

We must assert that there have appeared works with a sufficiently deep theoretical level of research on the digitalization process with the allocation of social, psychological, axiological, and other aspects, and their cumulative impact on the transformation of the social structure of society, the emergence of new social groups (the so-called media class, premium class next to the precariat, salariat, and so on) [7]. Only if digitalization is successful in the material and technical base of the economic system, it is more likely to expect positive changes in the basic subsystem of property relations, in the employment market, in the social structure of society, and to cope with negative changes, provoke virtually unregulated digitalization like "spontaneous wild" privatization of the early 2000s.

The analysis of the reasons that have led to the increased attention to the implementation of the concept of digitalization is presented in the report of the leading expert of social and gender programs at the Center of O. Razumkov. A. Pishchulina's publications noted that: firstly, the digitalization of national economies is due to qualitative changes in global capital on a digital basis; secondly, counter-trends of digitalization are emerging in national economies through: a) an unexpected slowdown in the growth of digital dividends; b) a decrease in the average growth rates of labor productivity in the world economy in conditions; c) deepening inequality by European countries in terms of the effectiveness of the implementation of "end-to-end technologies" (robotization, blockchain technology, neural networks, artificial intelligence, quantum, virtual and augmented reality, and others) [8].

The described features of digitalization actually characterize the modern "first" stage of its implementation. The scientist believes that this is a reality that all countries are faced with, and which sets the requirements that must be taken into account when developing and implementing their own model of the digital economy. The researcher formulated the main threats to the economy and society of Ukraine arising from the accelerated (actually forced) digitalization: a) reduction and elimination of jobs during the annual emigration to Europe of almost 10 000 graduates of Ukrainian engineering universities; b) an increase in the unemployment rate of highly skilled workers and the number of emigrants; c) the seizure of new markets by transnational corporations; d) growing dependence on foreign companies-leaders in the field of information and communication technologies.

In a more categorical tone, an assessment of the real consequences of digitalization for society, the individual and the state is provided by the domestic researcher A. Sosnin, who noted that the state of digital electronics (which has not yet become a sector of the economy) has already determined the growth of Ukraine's technological dependence on foreign

manufacturers and the weakening of economic security of the country as a whole; gradual disappearance of a number of mass and traditional professions for Ukraine; an increase in uncontrolled social tension; vulnerability of individuals to penetration into private life and simplification of the conditions for manipulating public opinion [9].

Assessing the first real consequences of the digitalization process, Western researchers no longer limit themselves to the remark that “the hopes of total computerization have not justified themselves”. In reality, it turns out that digitalization manifests itself, among other things, as a kind of coercion mechanism at enterprises of various forms of private property, even in developed countries. There is a risk when a conflict situation may arise, in which not so much a decrease in the number of hired intellectuals as an increase in the number of managers participating in the integrated mechanism of economic and non-economic coercion of “creative people” through psychological pressure, discrimination, manipulation, bullying, and so on).

Turning to the realities of the modern domestic capitalist system, which is a hybrid of the models of “state-party” socialism and “state-oligarchic” capitalism, it can be assumed that the forced “implantation” of the digital model of economic relations without solving the problems defined in the text: a) will increase the negative consequences of deindustrialization; b) will deepen the existing class contradictions and create new ones; c) will not contribute to the harmonious development of forms of property and productive forces; c) will strengthen the action of the old and cause the emergence of new dangerous tendencies (marginalization, “exclusivity” of the previously problematic labor force); d) will make class differentiation critical, before which the Ukrainian trade unions, which are still in the budgetary structures, become powerless.

We add that at the level of public administration, digitalization will cause further deformation, and not the development of classical market institutions, competition, not to mention an increase in the efficiency of the derived institution of social trust, including trust in the “electronic sphere” of the activities of government entities [10]. Digitalization, in our opinion, is most likely to become the most influential factor in consolidating the deformed links of the existing basic complexes of institutions “power-property-management-labor”,

and significantly deforms the labor market, hence, disintegrates the social structure of society.

With this in mind, the following should be noted: firstly, digitalization acts as an objective global process, which spreads by the world economy and penetrates into national economies; secondly, domestic subjects of various branches of government and levels of government should adequately respond to the inevitability of digital reality, developing the most effective digitalization concepts for the national economy; thirdly, the main issues of scientific discussions and debates should be about according to what models and mechanisms the digitalization process will be carried out.

Study on guidance and regulatory documents, as well as analytical reviews devoted to this main issue [1, 12], showed that the main models of digitalization in Ukraine can be:

1) a model of selective renewal of industries at least in the tertiary sector of the economy (service sector) with lagging primary and secondary sectors with a significant raw material orientation of the economy. The selectivity of the industries selected for renewal is combined with the probabilistic process of speculative enrichment of the semi-parasitic rentier class, which revives, and is only interested in rental income, and not in the nature (innovative or non-innovative) of use of property;

2) the model of renewal of a significant number of industries, that will not lose or increase their attractiveness for domestic and foreign investors;

3) a model of complex renewal (transformation) on a digital basis of a system of productive forces, a transitive economic system, a system of institutions, a social system of society through the integration of Ukraine into the Single Digital Market of the European Union.

Comparative analysis of certain models is presented in Table.

The results of the comparative analysis of the transitive model of power-property-labor relations in Ukraine under the influence of digitalization are of a practical nature, since they give grounds to determine the following:

1) according to the criterion of coverage of sectors of the economy with digitalization processes, it is preceded by a comprehensive renewal model, it can provide a gradual maximally complete digital update of the material and technical base, starting not from raw materials, but from processing in-

Table

Comparative analysis of digitization models

Comparison criteria	Model of selective renewal of industries	Model of updating a certain number of industries	Model of renewal of a complex of branches
1. Coverage of industries	Coverage of a small number of raw material industries	Coverage of a number of competitive industries from the standpoint of global capital	Maximum coverage of industrial sectors and infrastructure
2. Achieving goals			
2.1. Mobility	Absence and blocking of forms of social mobility	Weakness of professional and network mobility	Development of new forms of mobility due to digitalization
2.2. Welfare of the population	Significant deterioration	Stabilization	Increase
2.3. Possibility of self-realization	Absence of any conditions	Lack of sufficient conditions	Availability of conditions
2.4. Conditions for providing qualified prestigious work	Absence	Possibility	Availability
3. The state of social inequality	Complete disharmony of society	Significant probability of social polarization	Possibility of social harmonization
4. The nature of changes in the economy and society	Negative changes	Mostly negative changes	Positive changes
5. The ratio of financial and material resources	Resource potential – donor, financial potential – recipient, with low efficiency of management capacity		Balancing financial and resource potentials and their development

dustries and digital infrastructure. On the other hand, the first and second models will lead to the further destruction of industrial non-resource sectors of the primary and secondary sectors, according to the apt expression of the Georgian scientist V. Papava about the presence of stagnating necro-enterprises (now of any form of ownership) in transitive economies, one can call “necroindustries” with backward material and technical base, and which will be of no interest to foreign investors [13], however, commodity industries will not fall out of sight of global capital;

2) according to the criterion of achieving the goals of mobility of individuals, the most undesirable for the transitive economy of Ukraine is precisely the first model of probabilistic renewal, which will not ensure the implementation of the goals of citizens of society in relation to maintaining the possibilities of all types of mobility (social, professional, spatial, network, communicative, etc.), which will have an extremely negative impact on the social capital of society;

3) according to such target criteria as: provision of prestigious qualified work, the prospects for personal self-development, the third model of digitalization is, undoubtedly, the leader. The introduction of any of the first two models will make the goals of personal self-improvement, obtaining of a prestigious high-paying job unfulfilled for the majority of the population. Against the background of an increase in negative and irreversible changes in employment, a decrease in real incomes of the bulk of the population, disharmonization of the social structure of society, all kinds of prospects for self-development will be blocked;

4) according to the criterion of the nature of changes in the economic system and society, the first model will be determined as unfavorable, because it will most likely be followed by negative changes in the plane of relations [owner/owner of natural resources-rentier – industrialist – hired worker] [11], the main emphasis will be made on the virtual enrichment of owners of property rights to material objects (housing, real estate, including land) and financial instruments (securities), while from the list of persons for whom digitalization will ensure income growth, carriers of not only physical, but also intellectual labor withdraw. The enrichment of the share of the population will take place according to the status of property owners, who will be interested in obtaining rent, at best, leasing income, or quasi-market income through the speculative resale of digitized property rights, certificates of rights to securities [11].

If only a tiny part of the population consolidates its status as an owner of real estate, then the majority of citizens by the status of hired workers from alienation from property, poverty and unemployment will lose almost all types of mobility and fall into the “trap of inclusiveness”, which greatly distorts the unstable social structure of Ukrainian society. At the same time, for another part of the population (entrepreneurs), enrichment according to the status of producers will become difficult, “unfashionable” and outdated, therefore, any types of innovative activity will not be interesting;

5) according to the criterion of the formation of the necessary funds of material resources and financial resources, the first two models have the greatest chances to come true. To prove this statement, the following should be noted:

- *firstly*, the means of activating the resource potential of Ukraine for the implementation of digitalization are planned to be carried out exclusively from neoliberal positions: to find those resources that can be sold in order to get some funds. For each component of the country's resource potential, calculations were made of the amounts that the government could receive through the new fourth stage of privatization, confidently hoping that only a worthy contender could become the owner in accordance with applicable rules and prescribed conditions. From this it is clear why the issue of privatization is being raised again, which is related to land, which the population perceives negatively through the mass of destruction and

violations in the recent past. [12]. At the same time, the state of depreciation of domestic fixed assets is such that it casts doubt on the possibility of their renewal due to their unattractiveness as investment objects for domestic and foreign investors. So, the revival of the production and energy infrastructure is likely, hence the development of information infrastructure enterprises seems to be difficult;

- *secondly*, the attitude of the authorities to the problems of the employment market is also envisaged from the neoliberal positions of the theory of democratic capitalism: solving the issues of employment, spatial and network mobility, obtaining additional income in the form of interest, dividends, and so on has largely accounted for by the most economically active population. The answer to the question of how realistic such attitudes to the employment market are, is given by an analysis of the trend in the level of GDP per capita in different countries, according to the results of which Ukraine, together with Belarus and Moldova, fell into the group of countries of the “Congo level”, with not even reaching the pre-crisis level of 1990 [11]. This fact brings certain doubts to such a “vision” of the government as the introduction (based on the results of mass digitalization) of a “model of a worthy citizen”, according to which an ordinary Ukrainian will turn into a person with such wealth that he/she will either open his/her own small business or invest in someone else's big capital, like a “small shareholder” in the American version of democratic capitalism. This raises a number of questions: what role should the government assign to wages in the structure of a citizen's income, and what share will it make, and what the prospects of the motivational mechanism will be like for both workers and entrepreneurs of digitalized production?

- *thirdly*, the quality of Ukraine's management potential remains problematic, judging by some indicators of assessment of the effectiveness of management activities. According to the “Audit of the Ukrainian economy 2030”, which compares countries by different indices, including the rule of law index, out of 128 countries analyzed by this index, Ukraine ranks 72nd, Moldova – 82 and Turkey – 107, and in terms of Corruption perception Ukraine ranks 126th, Turkey – 91st, Moldova – 120th, while these countries move in a circle of a specific institutional environment with a politicized administrative market. The main indicator signaling a rather high probability of deformation of the optimistic “visions” of the implementation of the digital economy model in Ukraine is the low level of the power efficiency index in Ukraine (37.9 %) compared to the “flagships” of the capitalist industry in Germany (72.6 %) and Canada (78 %), even with a low level of attractiveness of the market environment [12];

- *fourthly*, there will be a certain contradiction between the formation of funds of financial resources and natural resources for digitalization. The point is that the resource potential will act as a donor of financial potential, and financial potential – as a recipient. This statement is supported by the provisions of the program for the rapid accumulation of wealth (primarily financial resources) of the country for the successful implementation of digitalization, thanks to: 1) trade in digitized public property (land, forest, minerals, and so on); 2) formation of a market for digitalized property rights to private property and securities; 3) external purchases (imports) of technologically new equipment for those industries products of which (mainly raw materials) are in demand by the world market, or rather, by global capital, and so on [12].

Each of the considered digitalization models has, in our opinion, a certain probability of coming true. Taking into account the power potential of domestic clan-bureaucratic structures, on the one hand, and the democratic potential of the SDM of the EU, on the other hand, we can assume that the main competition will take place between the first and second models. The third, being a more promising model, is possible provided that significant work is done to bring the internal institutional and legal environment to the requirements

that the Ukrainian side of the SDM puts forward. The entry into the SDM provides for such public policy measures as: abolition of roaming charges, guarantees of net neutrality, provision of cross-border deliveries of parcels, electronic identification and the provision of electronic trust services for the implementation of electronic transactions, protection of personal data and compliance with cybersecurity rules, protection of copyright and related rights on the SDM, online consumer protection, etc. [14]. The main thing that is recognized by many officials and researchers is the practical application of unified approaches and standards in the digital sphere of the EU, the real elimination of barriers to cross-border online transactions, careful implementation of programs and plans developed and adopted [15].

From the material presented, it naturally follows that the digital capabilities of national economic systems grow only under the following conditions: first, the creation of intra-national grounds for the deployment of digitalization, preferably with the least negative consequences of neoliberal recommendations; secondly, close cooperation with the EU countries, namely to ensure Ukraine's integration into the global digital capital with the receipt of the corresponding national digital dividends, even in the presence of a weak material and technical base.

Conclusion. The results of the study allow us to draw the following conclusions:

- the most popular trend of socio-economic transformations of countries at different levels of socio-economic and cultural development is digitalization;
- approaches to understanding digitalization are defined as a process, result, factor and goal of socio-economic change;
- increased attention to the implementation of the concept of digitalization is determined by a number of reasons, which are being studied and classified by a group of domestic and foreign scientists;
- at the level of public administration, digitalization will not cause the development of classical market institutions, competition, but further deformation;
- it is determined that the main ones in Ukraine can be three models of digitalization, comparative analysis of which is presented in a tabular form and covers the following comparison criteria: coverage of industries, achievement of goals, the state of social inequality, the nature of changes in the economy and society, the ratio of financial and material resources;
- it was found that the main competition will occur between the model of selective renewal of industries and renewal of a certain number of industries.

Generalization of scientific sources on the issue of digitalization made it possible to determine what is considered from different positions and aspects. Digitalization is considered as: the process of transforming the physical world into cyber-physical space; the result of a comprehensive transformation of economic sectors; driver of changes in the economic, socio-cultural, institutional and legal systems of society; a new reality where commodity and employment markets and the like must adapt. Digitalization will thus lead to cardinal changes in all spheres of the life of society, and, in turn, will exacerbate the issue: first, the accelerated reindustrialization of industry based on technological innovations; urgent solution to the complex of problems of unemployment and employment caused by digitalization; mandatory solution of additional issues related to the emergence of new forms of non-economic exploitation of the employed and social disharmonization of society as a whole.

If these pressing problems are ignored, the digitalization process, which has acquired the features of a global one, will inevitably lead to a number of extremely negative consequences. Turning to the realities of the modern domestic capitalist system, it can be assumed that a decision has already been made to accelerate the introduction of digitalization, which is extremely difficult to implement.

In these conditions, when digitalization unfolded as an irreversible process, the Ukrainian economy must quickly adapt to its requirements, perhaps according to one of three digitalization models: the model of selective renewal of industries is financially speculative in the way of accumulating the necessary funds, and probabilistic in the way of targeted spending; the model of renewal of a significant number of industries associated with an insignificant probability can show its innovative character, if the necessary funds are found and their intended use takes place; a model for renewing a complex of industries, which is most likely to show the innovative nature of industry changes by joining the EU's single digital market and fulfilling its specific requirements. Further research in this direction should be related to the urgent development and implementation of socially oriented measures to support the population, especially the unemployed, in the process of introducing a certain chosen digitalization model.

References.

1. *Digitalization is the revolution happening today. The Games for Business learning platform* (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://digital-transformation.gamesforbusiness.com/#solution>.
2. Pugachevska, K. Y., & Pugachevska, K. S. (2018). Digitalization of the economy as a factor in increasing the country's competitiveness. *Market infrastructure*, (25), 39-45.
3. Dobrova, T. G. (2017). Reproduction of industrial potential - a strategic task of economic policy of Ukraine. *Strategic guidelines for the development of the economy of Ukraine: materials of the International scientific-practical conference*, (pp. 24-27), Odessa, October 6-7, 2017. Retrieved from <http://dspace.pdpu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/dspace.pdpu.edu.ua/jspui/handle/123456789/4594>.
4. Posnova, T. V. (2019). Creative human capital as a factor of innovative economic development. *Economic space*, (141), 172-182.
5. Bilyk, O. I. (2019). The impact of the digital economy on reducing the negative effects of social risk. *Problems of economics and management*, (4), 8-16.
6. Matviychuk, L. O. (2018). Digital Economics: Theoretical Aspects. *Bulletin of Zaporizhzhia National University. Economic sciences*, 4(40), 116-127.
7. Geys, V. M., & Gritsenko, A. A. (Eds.) (2019). *Objective preconditions and imperatives of becoming a medium class in the context of overcoming the contradictions between efficiency and justice. Socio-class transformations and formation of a new quality of education as components of the reconstructive development of the economy of Ukraine: a monographic collection*. Kyiv: NAS of Ukraine, SI "Institute of Economics and predictions NAS of Ukraine", (pp. 6-25). Retrieved from <http://ief.org.ua/docs/scc/11.pdf>.
8. Pyschulina, O. (2019). *Two sides of digital technologies: "digital dictatorship" or preservation of stability*. Retrieved from <https://razumkov.org.ua/statti/dvi-storony-tsyfrovykh-tekhnologii-tsyfrova-dyktatura-abo-zberezhennia-stiikosti>.
9. Sosnin, O. (2020). Digitalization as a new reality of Ukraine. Retrieved from <https://lexinform.com.ua/dumka-ksperta/tsyfrovizatsiya-yak-nova-realnist-ukrayiny/>.
10. *Project "Digital Agenda of Ukraine – 2020" ("Digital Agenda" – 2020) Conceptual framework (version 1.0) Priority areas, initiatives, projects of "digitalization" of Ukraine until 2020* (2020). Kyiv: Hi-tech office Ukraine. Retrieved from <https://ucci.org.ua/uploads/files/58e78ee3c3922.pdf>.
11. *Audit of the economy of Ukraine 2030*. Retrieved from <https://nes2030.org.ua/docs/doc-audit.pdf>.
12. *Ukraine 2030E – a country with a developed digital economy* (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://strategy.uifuture.org/kraina-z-rozvinu-toyu-cifrovoyu-ekonomikoyu.html>.
13. Papava, V.G. (2015). The necroeconomics of post-Soviet post-industrialism and the model of economic development of Georgia and Russia. *Journal of Business and Economics*, 6(5), 976-983.
14. *Ukraine's integration into the European Union's Digital Single Market: challenges, opportunities and barriers. December 3, 2019, Brussels. Report of the Ukrainian side of the EU-Ukraine Civil Society Platform* (n.d.). Retrieved from https://docs.google.com/document/d/1MVXHW-y2q4BNoeg5Rkwsh3DzZQU6F_msyBRZEmbAYpw/edit.
15. Yavorskiy, P., Taran, S., Shepotylo, O., & Gamanyuk, O. (n.d.). *Integration of Ukraine into the EU digital single market. Potential benefits. Consolidated report*. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KDJ_kQ7tkYnxtBP5jaxCzPr4PEadAYod/view.

Цифровізація як засіб реалізації змін транзитивної моделі відносин влади-власності-праці в Україні

Ю. В. Гончаров¹, І. Ю. Штулер², О. А. Овєчкіна³,
М. В. Штань⁴

1 – Міжнародний економіко-гуманітарний університет імені академіка Степана Дем'янчука, м. Рівне, Україна, e-mail: goncharov_yv@ukr.net

2 – Національна академія управління, м. Київ, Україна

3 – Східноукраїнський національний університет імені Володимира Даля, м. Сєверодонецьк, Україна

4 – Національна академія управління, м. Київ, Україна

Мета. Обґрунтування вибору моделі цифровізації вітчизняної транзитивної економіки й суспільства, реалізація якої мала б запобігти розгортанню негативних наслідків і посилити кумулятивну дію позитивних факторів.

Методика. У процесі роботи здійснювались дослідження, засновані на ключових положеннях економічної теорії та політичної економії, сучасних концепціях власності, влади, найманої праці. Використовувались спеціальні методи дослідження: групування й систематизація, логічного узагальнення основних характеристик глобальної цифровізації національних економік. Для досягнення мети використані загальнонаукові методи дослідження процесів і явищ, а саме: методи аналізу й синтезу для створення методологічного апарату вивчення наслідків впливу цифровізації на соціальну структуру та економіки різних країн. Застосування системно-структурного підходу дозволило розробити й порівняти моделі цифровізації економіки України.

Результати. Розкрито цифровізацію в трьох аспектах: процес, результат і чинник соціально-економічних змін

країн, що знаходяться на різних рівнях розвитку. Кожний з аспектів підкреслює значущість цифровізації у трансформаціях галузей економіки, істотних змінах у економічній, соціально-культурній, інституціонально-правовій системах суспільства. Доведено, що цифровізація загострює питання прискореної реіндустріалізації промисловості на основі технологічних інновацій, невідкладного вирішення комплексу проблем безробіття й зайнятості, появи нових форм позаекономічної експлуатації. При ігноруванні вирішення вказаних проблем невідворотним є поява негативного ефекту: інтелектуально-технічна відсталість, сировинна спрямованість економіки, критична дисгармонізація соціуму тощо. Порівняння моделей цифровізації показало, що, реалізація моделі оновлення комплексу галузей може забезпечити розвиток цифрового сектору й цифрової економіки в Україні.

Наукова новизна. Новизна дослідження полягає в пошуку моделі цифровізації, котра буде найсприятливішою для прогресивних змін в економіці. Однією з таких моделей є модель комплексного оновлення галузей промисловості за умов інтеграції України до європейського цифрового ринку, що забезпечить реіндустріалізацію виробництва, стабілізує ринок зайнятості, гармонізує соціальну структуру суспільства тощо.

Практична значимість. Результати дослідження можуть бути використані представниками влади, науковцями й керівниками бізнесу у процесі коригування концепції цифрової економіки й використання моделей її впровадження у відповідності до реалій транзитивного стану всіх сфер життєдіяльності суспільства.

Ключові слова: транзитивна модель економіки, цифрова зайнятість, наслідки цифровізації, моделі цифровізації

Recommended for publication by M. M. Yermoshenko, Doctor of Economic Sciences. The manuscript was submitted 27.03.21.