

UDC 339.9+316.4

Sidenko V.R., Dr. Habil (Economics),
Corresponding Member of the NAS Ukraine,
Razumkov Centre

NEW GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE FORMATION OF SOCIAL VALUES

The article summarizes the new global challenges and proves that adequate responses on them are linked with a global-scale adjustment of value foundations underlying human activities and adherence to agreed global principles of economic behaviour. The author formulates main conditions necessary to succeed in adaptation of externally set value orientations. The paper determines the changes that took place in the Ukrainian society under the influence of global processes and exposes their irregular, asymmetric and deforming character, which complicates substantially the processes of social modernization.

Keywords: *globalisation, global challenges, global crises, social values.*

Formulation of the problem: Contemporary global transition and its challenges. Proceeding from 1980s, the processes of development and modernization in the contemporary world have been experiencing a growing impact of globalization – not only economic but also political and cultural. It is paradoxical that globalization, which gains substantial impetus from factors related to a search of more efficient responses to the growing global challenges, has become itself a major challenge to mankind. It happened due to endogenous drawbacks of the neoliberal shape of modern globalization and its contradictory relationship with the essence of cardinal structural changes within the world system – economic, social, political, and ideological.

The latter is convincingly proved by the prolonged global economic instability, and especially the deep crisis of 2008-09, which throw bright light on the phenomena of significant extension of the field of global problems and risks, and point out to the emergence of new global challenges. The focal and strategically important position among these new global challenges is occupied by the necessity to perform *radical transformation of the contemporary global world-system* and actually safeguard its *transition to a cardinally different model*, which, according to wide-spread expectations, might be characterized by a post-industrial economy with prevailing research-intensive industries, a knowledge-based society, and a human-oriented, environment-friendly and socially fair economy.

Such cardinal changes will not be possible outside the context of profound shifts in human consciousness as well as world outlook orientations, in the systems of dominating identities and values, and the modes of understanding the sense of human existence. And all of these pending changes attract growing attention of scholars that try to find out common responses to key questions arising in this context.

Analysis of actual publications. The relationship of the issues of globalization and accompanying global changes with the evolution of social values foundations has been at the core of the expanding volume of scientific research and publications performed both individually and collectively, i.e. within corresponding research networks. A basis for such approach was laid down by S. Schwartz (1994), who was first to distinguish *universal*¹ values that are peculiar to all world cultures and which comprise “achievement, benevolence, conformity, hedonism, power, security, self-direction, stimulation, tradition, and universalism”. However, this definition did not become commonly accepted. Thus, the Global Values Network, being a widely recognised source dealing with these matters, provides an alternative definition of ten components of the system of global values: “unity, community, life, freedom, connection, sustainability, creativity, empowerment, choice, and integrity”.

¹ Evidently, the definitions “global” and “universal” maybe treated with regard to values as equivalent notions.

This difference emphasises the debatable character of many aspects of this issue. An important contribution to the research of this problem area, especially regarding the definition of mutual conditionality between social values and modernisation and post-modernisation in various parts of the world has been made by a well-known American researcher R. Inglehart (1997), who has deployed, together with his supporters, large-scale research within the framework of the World Values Survey/European Values Survey (WVS'EVS) network. Important contribution to this research has been also made by G. Ritzer (1992–1998) as can be seen in his comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon of standardization (McDonaldization) of consciousness under globalization.

In Ukraine, the most prominent fundamental investigation performed along this line is presented by Pakhomov and Pavlenko (2013), though it is not free from internal debate between its co-authors. This book is characterized by a broader approach to value foundations, which provide in-depth analysis of the evolution of spiritual values and general philosophic outlooks that make the basis of contemporary development under globalization.

Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that the bulk of research papers explaining the link between globalizing processes and evolution of values do not pay due attention to the *newest* global challenges that are intrinsically related to the global social transition now underway. Despite the fact that attempts to systematize and range such newest challenges have been performed, inter alia, by the World Economic Forum (2011-13), Pew Research Centre (2013) and others, there is the lack of an in-depth theoretical analysis of the very mode by which the *newest* global challenges influence changes in value orientations, though traditions of such research have existed since the first reports of the Club of Rome at the beginning of 1970s.

Several research papers are of significant interest in this respect, first of all Yu. Yakovets [12] offering scientific explanations for the trend towards formation, beginning from the second quarter of the 21st century, of a post-industrial integral civilization and a post-industrial technological production paradigm, with prevailing

sixth and seventh technological orders (following the concept of Kondratiev long waves), incoming Humanistic and Noospheric Civilization based on co-evolution of human society and nature, integral economic system, integral socio-cultural system, and multipolar world functioning on the basis of a partnership of civilizations. He put emphasis on the peculiarity that current profound global transformations are caused by almost simultaneous completion and reciprocal resonance action of several long waves of global development, including Kondratiev long technological (approximately 50-year) wave leading to the formation of a new technological order, and super-long civilization cycles associated with epochal changes in social order, in modes of economic and social links, and in the long run, in the cultural format of human life.

The objective of this research is to reveal the influence of the newest global challenges, which are closely related to the global transition to qualitatively different world system that is currently unfolding its initial phase, on the evolution of social values, the latter being an intrinsic factor of the named systemic transition.

The main results of the research are the following.

Key global problems and their impact on the evolution of social value foundations

The development of the world economy since 1980, the period characterized by the triumphant pace of globalization based on neoliberal prescriptions, has produced an unprecedented stock of various imbalances and asymmetries within the global system, which were gradually shaking the mechanisms of macroeconomic stabilization, thus making them less efficient. These global imbalances and asymmetries began to acquire the features of risks and lead to increased uncertainties; moreover, they appeared to be factors of approaching *structural crisis* in different areas of socio-economic development, and, in the longer run, of an *overall systemic crisis* of the world order.

The systemic crisis of the contemporary neoliberal globalism is associated with the synergetic interaction of a set of structural crises appearing actually in all “local”

spheres that make up the world system supporting human life – nature and ecological environment, demographic structure, technology, market economy, as well as social, political and cultural environments. In their most aggregated form, contemporary key global challenges comprise the following:

1. *Rapid intensification of ecological crisis.* The growing pollution of the environment will not merely restrict more and more opportunities for accelerated economic development and expanded consumption but also stimulate intensification of an adjacent global problem of health care suffering from ever growing ecological press. A new dimension of this issue is represented by the appearance of explicit negative effects of global climate change that endangers primarily the stability of world food procurement, but not only this.
2. *The shortage of traditional natural resources.* The accelerated exhaustion of natural, mineral and traditional energy resources backs up the price-rising trend related to them, as well as the need to invest enormous capital to search new sources of energy and raw materials. The most threatening among these shortages is the growing deficit of fresh water, which may become an important factor of global instability already in the near future.
3. *The intensification of the demographic imbalance associated with an accelerated ageing of population.* It creates ever more significant burden for old-age social security systems and has already acquired the role of a specific factor of increased instability of public finances in the expanding group of vulnerable developed market economies, first of all in Europe. According to some estimates, developing countries, i.e. China, may also face the threat of this negative phenomenon.
4. *Growing problems with food provision* under such conditions when demand for food-stuffs in less developed nations is significantly expanding alongside with their economic growth, and, on the other hand, there is the need to supply food to the least developed countries with an extremely poor development potential.

5. *Proliferation of health risks* that are determined by the growing pollution of the environment, mutations among dangerous viruses and causative agents of dangerous diseases having potential to spread globally, as well as ever more frequent mental and psychological disorders happening under intensified life rhythm and the negative effects (still requiring further research) of the new information and communication technologies, primarily of the Internet addiction disorder (AIAD).
6. *Substantial increase in social inequality throughout the world* that has reached an unacceptably high level. It creates significant structural barriers for stable development of the world economy and for securing global political stability, produces social disintegration in the world, and provokes dissemination of radical ideologies and religious movements. Apart of this, it fosters upsurge in spontaneous migration processes, including illegal migration that is closely linked with organized criminal activities.
7. *Spreading cross-border crime* is one of the most negative outcomes of neoliberal globalization: since globalization had reached its peak at the beginning of 2000s, illicit turnover have grown up to fantastic dimensions².
8. *Deformation of market structures and the crisis of investment efficiency*. The exhaustion of the resource to ensure sustainable efficiency of investments in traditional technologies determines the trend of falling incentives for productive use of capital. On the other hand, the growing virtualization of money and foreign exchange markets arising out of the “derivatives revolution” have produced unprecedented growth of fictitious capital, which has become the principal source of global financial instability.
9. *The crisis of global economic governance*. The 2008-09 global crisis revealed the profound inadequacy of present-day methods employed to regulate the world

² It made up to 20 per cent of global trade, including: money laundering – over \$1 trillion annually; illegal drug traffic – \$800 billion; counterfeiting – \$400 billion; illegal arms sales – \$10 billion; human trafficking – \$10 billion; cross-border sales of art – \$3 billion [13].

economy, and their inability to secure a long-term stable development. Simultaneously, it turned to be a crisis of theoretical foundations of the mainstream of contemporary economics based on neoliberal principles.

10. *The crisis of the geopolitical structure of the unipolar world* is predetermined by an obvious domination of the countries of the so-called “Golden Billion” in the decision-making process on key global issues, while the absolute majority of the world’s population resides in the third world, with their leading countries coupled with a number of emerging economies developing at a considerably higher rate.

11. *The global cultural crisis* is associated with the spread of primitive standards of mass consumption society that exerts destructive influence on national cultural landscapes, causing deformations in philosophical systems and social value orientations.

Of course, the mentioned challenges are quite heterogeneous by their origin and are differently accepted by the world’s population and its political leaders. As witnessed by the global opinion poll survey made by the US *Pew Research Center* in June 2013 [11], the global community recognizes global climate change and international financial instability as top global threats.

The Davos World Economic Forum in its Global Risks 2011 report [9] pointed to two most important risks – economic disparity (wealth and income disparities, both within countries and between countries) and global governance failures (caused by weak or inadequate global institutions, agreements or networks). In the similar 2013 report [10], the WEF emphasized five risks to be most significant by their likelihood: severe income disparity, chronic fiscal imbalances, rising greenhouse gas emissions, water supply crises, and mismanagement of population ageing. And top risks by their impact are major systemic financial failure, water supply crises, chronic fiscal imbalances, diffusion of weapons of mass destruction, and failure of climate change adaptation.

Thus, *the main role in the contemporary world belongs to the risks of ecological, resource supply, social and global governance origin*, as they currently prevail over traditional risks of geopolitical character.

It must be stressed as well that the overall landscape of global problems and risks is permanently changing through the outstanding dynamics of a number of risks. For instance, the recent period brought about the rise in the likelihood of such risks as unforeseen consequences of new life science technologies and climate change mitigation, while the most significant growth of the impact has been seen for unforeseen negative consequences of regulation, unilateral resource nationalization, and chronic labour market imbalances [10]. Thus, risks are determined not only by certain primary factors but by also by secondary factors arising out of fallacious actions or mistaken policies regarding counteraction to certain risks and global problems, as well as with erroneous or potentially dangerous new technological solutions (innovations).

The latter testifies the advent of a *paradigmatic crisis*, and a reply to it must imply a *restructuring of certain philosophic foundations of socio-economic activities in the contemporary world, which is impossible without an adjustment of a value basis underlying human activities*. It must be specially emphasized that the existence of global challenges is relevant for actually all countries of the globe, irrespective of their geographical location, size, and the attained level of development or cultural tradition.

Since 1990s, the formation of new philosophical foundations of world development has been targeted at a new value basis which has been incarnated in the idea of a need for sustainable development, i.e. the type of development that would be stable in the long run and would not undermine the basis of existence of future generations. This essentially value-measured transformation gave birth to the formation and formalization, at the international level, of a new

concept of sustainable development³, with its contents being permanently enriched through adding new meaningful elements. This is proved by the continuous enrichment of the notion of sustainable development in the documents adopted by the UN global forums on these matters, where we can witness a transition from the initial purely ecological bias to a more complex perception of the problem, with the growing role of social issues and problems of global governance for the world economy.

Along this line, we see a gradual formation of a new value framework, which allocates due space to considerations associated with the necessity to identify oneself not only as a member of a certain local community and a citizen of a certain national state, but as a *citizen of the world* as well. There is a growing awareness of the need to adhere to certain *global principles of behaviour*, because otherwise we might face an uncontrolled expansion of global risks, with hardly anyone able to evade them. Therefore, we are witnessing an unprecedented pace of dissemination of new international and even global agreements regarding the regulation of various aspects of human activities. The most significant among them comprise:

- United Nations Millennium Development Goals targeted at solution of the most painful problems of the world;
- Principles of development agreed at the International Conference on Financing for Development (Monterrey, Mexico, 18–22 March 2002);
- The UN Convention against Corruption adopted in 2003 and applicable since 2005, as well as the joint World Bank – UN Stolen Asset Recovery (StAR) Initiative;
- The July 2009 outcome document of a United Nations conference on the measures to tackle the global crisis [14];

³ An outstanding role here belongs to the adoption by the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED, or Earth Summit) of the Rio Declaration on these issues.

- The G20 Global Plan for Recovery and Reform adopted at its 2009 London Summit;
- The G8 Declaration “Responsible Leadership for a Sustainable Future” adopted at its summit in L’Aquila, Italy in 2009;
- The Decent Work Agenda passed by the International Labour Organization;
- Voluntary instruments embracing Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) standards, Responsible Business Conduct (RBC) and UN Global Compact⁴; OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises;
- The instruments of the 1992 UN Framework Convention on Climate Change;
- Introduction of the International Partnership for Energy Efficiency Cooperation (IPEEC), the launched International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), the activities of the Global Bioenergy Partnership (GBEP); Global Partnership for Agriculture and Food Security (GPAFS).

All in all, the mentioned key principles emphasize the following: the need for better coordination of actions and cooperation, inadmissibility of such actions of countries that make adverse impacts on other participants of the world economy;

⁴ A strategic political initiative of the United Nations launched in July 2000 and designed for businessmen that commit themselves to bring their transactions and strategies in conformity with ten universal principles in the area of human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption: businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights; make sure that they are not complicit in human rights abuses; uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labour; the effective abolition of child labour; the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation; support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges; undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility; encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies; and work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.

avoiding protectionism and securing free movement of goods, services and investments; providing improved regulation of global economic processes and primarily with regard to international financial markets, and creating relevant early warning systems for possible global imbalances and crisis conditions; securing legality, transparency and accountability of intra- and international financial transactions, preventing tax evasion; radical reforming of the leading international financial institutions, with the aim of enabling them to perform efficiently their functions of global governance and granting development aid to member states; allocating more resources for development assistance and antirecessionary measures in developing countries; the formation of a new business ethics, in particular regarding corporate social responsibility; rejecting restrictions in relation to labour rights and social security in the course of the recession.

The cultural and value dimensions of the contemporary globalization

The globalizing process that has reached unprecedented scale during the last decades exerts an extremely potent general cultural impact on the systems of prevailing social values. Contemporary globalization leads to serious modification of the most deeply rooted foundations that determine human behaviour within a socium. It maybe said that the very process of contemporary globalization appears as a process of growing interaction of differing, by form and contents, national social value systems laying the preconditions for an initiated formation of a *new integrity of the global value system*. However, this process is currently being on its initial stage and is full of ambiguities and controversies. The global values that are being shaped make up an extremely *dynamic* system, in which substantial transformations are permanently taking place – with a continuous emergence of new values alongside with the ruination of the old and familiar values and identities [15].

At that, there is a set of preconditions and mechanisms which causing dissemination of cultural homogenization in the contemporary world as an important element of the process of global convergence.

First, the expanding transnationalization of various human activities is essentially impossible without a certain approximation and even partial unification of general institutional frameworks that had been formed within nation states. The appearance and expansion of various transnationalized structures (transnational corporations – TNCs, transnational professional and public networks, intergovernmental and non-governmental international organizations) is, objectively, requiring and creating preconditions for a more homogeneous global institutional environment.

Second, the unprecedented intensification of cross-border information flows in the processes of international communication has created qualitatively new opportunities not only for a dissemination of knowledge and advanced foreign experience. The formation of a global information environment shapes up a powerful channel to exert influence on the formation and evolution of social value systems in different countries, as the latter are permanently and systematically influenced by differing value systems.

Third, the proliferation of TNCs has the effect of an expanding area of use for massively produced and globally standardized goods and services, and leads to enhanced domination of powerful trade marks that are ever more accepted as symbols of success and welfare. In this way, the global mass media create extensive strata of consumers which are homogenized regarding the priorities and structures of their consumer needs and even their behavioural features. A *globalised Homo oeconomicus* arises here with his behaviour effectively guided by globalized media: this phenomenon has justly acquired the title of McDonaldization [5–7].

These aspects of impact that globalization exerts on national value systems have not merely positive outcomes but negative influences and risks as well.

The principal problem is implied in the fact that, under the currently dominating conditions, it is the North Atlantic community that represents the main engine formatting global values; that is why the globalizing process has acquired the features of cultural *and value expansion of the Western civilization*, with the spread of ideals and value symbols inherent to western market democracies over to other countries. However, such processes, which functionally may be facilitated through the use of certain standardized or even stereotyped approaches, are likely to encounter substantial barriers linked with the specific historical way of development of the global “culture and value donors”, because the recipient countries had not had this western historical experience of value formation.

But possibly even greater problem is presented by the feature that different civilization groups in the contemporary world are staying in fact on *different stages of societal development and qualitatively different stages of modernization*. Modernization in the “Golden billion” countries is the process characterized, in particular, by post-modern values, with priorities of individualism, non-material aspirations of an individual (post-materialist values), personal satisfaction and emotions, networking instead of clearly defined hierarchy. But in the third world (developing countries) modernization is essentially a differing process resting rather on traditional family and nation-state values, material welfare endeavours, pursuit of hierarchy and clear definition of competences and status confirmation. In fact, these are entirely diverging approaches that are very resistant to any combination in a unified global system.

These countries pursue differing value priorities: while materialist values dominate in less developed countries, the majority of more developed ones (except East Asia and relatively less developed part of the EU) adhere to post-materialist values (Table 1). At that, the most evident domination of materialist values one can witness in the post-Soviet space (Ukraine and Russia), which originates from the triumphant philosophic materialism here.

Table 1

Inglehart's Post-Materialist index

Countries	Average (57 countries of the world)	EU: the most developed members (8)	EU: countries that acceded since 2004 and candidates for accession (6)	Other developed countries of Europe (3)	North America (2)	Developed countries of the southern Pacific (2)	East Asia: the most developed countries and territories (4)	East Asia: developing countries (4)	South Asia (1)	Western Asia and North Africa (6/5)	Latin America (9/8)	Sub- Saharan Africa (6)	Post-Soviet countries (4)	Incl. Russia	Incl. Ukraine
4-item*:															
<i>materialist</i> priorities – maintaining order in the nation, fighting rising prices;															
<i>post-materialist</i> priorities – giving the people more say in important government decisions, protecting freedom of speech.															
Materialist	32.2	20.1	35.7	12.1	15.9	12.7	41.9	36.2	37.0	41.1	27.4	33.8	46.3	55.3	48.4
Mixed	56.4	61.8	51.8	66.1	59.6	65.2	52.4	58.9	58.0	51.6	57.9	56.0	49.2	42.8	48.1
Post-materialist	11.3	18.0	7.5	21.7	24.5	22.1	5.7	4.9	5.0	7.4	14.7	10.1	4.5	1.9	3.5
12-item*:															
<i>materialist</i> priorities – maintaining order, fighting rising prices, maintaining a high level of economic growth, maintaining a stable economy, maintaining strong defence forces, and the fight against crime;															
<i>post-materialist</i> priorities – protecting freedom of speech, giving the people more say in important government decisions, more people say about how things are done at their jobs and in their communities, making our cities and countryside more beautiful, progress toward a less impersonal and more humane society, and progress toward a society in which ideas count more than money.															
Materialist	10.8	4.3	13.1	1.7	7.0	5.8	14.8	14.7	10.6	16.0	7.4	10.4	18.5	26.7	13.5
Post-materialist	2.1	5.3	0.8	8.9	4.7	4.4	0.7	0.5	0.9	1.1	2.2	0.9	0.4	0.1	0.4

Note. For the 12-item index, the data presented account for persons that did not make their choice or did not give answer, as well as the cases when the research was not performed; this brings down the percentage of persons identified as “materialists” or “post-materialists”. But in this case the importance is to be given not to absolute percentage indicators of groups but to their interrelation.

Source: World Values Surveys Databank [16].

** The methodology of these indices is explained in [3].*

It is highly important in this context to see how globalized value orientations exert influence on traditional value profiles: whether this impact has a *gradual* and discreet modifying and modernizing effect on the structure of traditional values, or conversely, it leads to *aggressive destruction* and *replacement* of traditional values by externally induced value orientations.

In the former case, we shall have conditions for modernization being created through an extension of the value horizon up to the level of the global self-identification of a person and of a national community.

In the other case, as the experience of many less developed countries testifies, the attempts to transplant, via the channels of globalization, the postmodern cultural and value foundations of the North American civilization community are likely to give birth to grave destructive processes, and in many cases it really happens. This destructiveness is caused, first of all, by a rather rapid ruination of the environment of genuine national cultural specificity. Under certain conditions, it is fraught with complete assimilation by globalized values of the values originating from the national culture and authentic experience of internal self-development. In addition, this problem is exacerbated by the asymmetric perception of different components of global (in this context, Euro-Atlantic) values by non-western civilization entities. That is to say, *elements of the cult of prestigious consumption penetrate into these communities much easier than the civilized ethics of social relations. And various aspects of the freedom of personal choice are accepted much more eagerly than the principles of social responsibility.*

Many components of the western value system, after having immersed into a foreign cultural environment, go through major mutations that have a cardinal impact on their contents. As a result of it, we may receive permissiveness instead of freedom, free criminal activities combined with all-pervading corruption – instead of free enterprise, and the arbitrary government bureaucracy slightly covered by pseudo-democratic procedures – instead of genuine democracy. This phenomenon is preconditioned by the peculiar feature that the globalization of values is much ahead in ruining old and inherited value foundations in comparison

with the creation of new and higher (in the civilization dimension) forms of social consciousness reflecting the conditions of human existence in the 21st century.

Consequently, such social modernization that is externally induced by globalization may turn to be a *pseudo-modernization*, which is a process concealing actual degradation. And this is, in turn, paves the way to a spontaneous substitution of the ruined social constructs with value formats that revive, under the cover of modernity, the primitive worldview of the past centuries prior to the epoch of Modern; thus in fact it may bring about a sort of *demodernization*. This type of social value evolution may be recognized as a paradox of the pro-western neoliberal globalization format.

Clearly, the dominating neoliberal globalization, which in its cultural dimension has become a synonym of westernization, needs an alternative in the form of such alternative format of the process, which would *combine the benefits of unimpeded efficient economic interaction with opportunities of harmonized national cultural self-development*. In such conditions, the formation of global values is to rely exclusively on the processes of interaction (but in no case on assimilation) of the cultures of various peoples and nations in their common search of responses to key challenges for the contemporary world development.

Value shifts in the Ukrainian society under the impact of global processes

The considerable influence of global challenges on the formation of value orientations in Ukraine has been determined by the specific condition that the country gained its state independence in the period when neoliberal globalization was at its peak. Under these circumstances, the revival of national consciousness and the formation of intranational symbols and meanings of life have been determined, from the outset, by a prominent contribution of the components of global influence, this peculiarity clearly reflected in a predominantly global self-identification of a significant share of the population.

Thus, the cross-country studies of value systems performed within the *World Values Survey/European Values Survey* in 1999–2002 indicated that both in

Ukraine (likewise in Russia) a very significant number of people used to identify oneself primarily as *a world citizen*: in Ukraine their share made up 14.7 percent [4]. In total, the share of those who saw themselves as citizens of the world reached 57.7 percent, as reported by the 2005-08 survey. Although this indicator testifies to the widespread global self-identification, it is, nonetheless, essentially lower if compared with the world average for 57 nations – 77.9 percent [16]. The latter provides grounds for the conclusion that the Ukrainian society is heterogeneous in the aspect of globalization's influence on social values.

On the one hand, the extremely problematic character of internal social and economic transformations in Ukraine squeezed out of the country a sizeable amount of workers that were forced to search for sources of earnings abroad, while many of those who remained to work in the country were engaged in the areas linked with export, the latter could not but support the proliferation of global worldview. On the other hand, the instantaneous collapse of the system of Soviet-era institutions and the prolonged formation of new national institutions of the Ukrainian society launched the process of substitution of the lacking nationwide rules and regulative norms by more local forms, with family-type connections playing the leading part among them.

The combination of these two trends gave birth in Ukraine to an explicit phenomenon of *glocalization*⁵ of value orientations. This phenomenon potentially contains prerequisites both for modernization and demodernization of the society. The value ambivalence of the Ukrainian society is manifested in the observed aspiration of Ukraine's integration into global and European economic structures happening alongside with the attempts to preserve rather archaic approaches in the organization of internal life, which actually impede the introduction of instruments that might foster the country's adaptation to the conditions of the globalizing world.

⁵ The glocalization phenomenon, i.e. the combination of the globalizing trend with the simultaneous tendency towards proliferation of local organization, was analyzed in [17–18].

The action of the mutually contradictory orientations results in a rather inconsistent policy of socio-economic transformations, within which the impact of globalizing factors and available global challenges is *asymmetric*. This means that different elements of globalization and different components of the complex of global challenges are being comprehended and reflected in the structure of dominating values rather *unequally and inconsistently*.

1. Globalization's impact on value orientations in the Ukrainian society has been spreading most easily in the area of *motivations and symbols of material consumption*. The country's population for a prolonged period had been facing the shortage of goods and the absence of market choice, with evident lagging behind the most developed nations by the level of consumption, and that is why the opening of the economy in 1990s and the powerful demonstrative effect of foreign markets gave birth to a rapid adoption of new representations about the sense of life. At that, among economically the most active segment of the population one could witness a considerable rise of the status of the values of comfortable life and satisfaction, which gave a powerful impetus to consumer requirements to the range and quality of goods and services. The values of public recognition and personal self-respect also have begun to take a materialized shape and have been associated much more with the possession and consumption of prestigious products (as a rule, produced under famous worldwide brands) and property objects, including those located abroad. Non-economic values began to shift to the background, as they had been largely discredited by their association with the former ideologized concepts of the collapsed Soviet Union.

The mentioned value change was most evident among the strata that were capable of receiving ultrahigh incomes due to possession of a specific status (usually monopolistic) in the system of movement and distribution of scarce public resources. The representatives of these circles ("New Ukrainians") became the specimen of the elite "Euroconsumption" model – by and large wasteful and vain, and diverting public resources from the objectives to find efficient responses to real challenges of the contemporary world.

2. Another powerful channel through which globalization and global challenges influence the value structure of the Ukrainian society is represented by the *radical growth of the signs of governance inefficiency under the conditions of open economy and its high dependence on foreign resources* (energy carriers, raw materials, foreign investments and loans). Together with other negative consequences, it caused an abrupt falling of confidence in the absolute majority of state institutions. In these circumstances, the merits of economic freedom, which is defined as a basis for a market economy, were discredited in Ukraine among broad public and produced the tendency towards the revival of various methods of state control in their hypertrophied and explicitly distorted shape. Being rather restricted in its facilities to actually attain correct proportions in the economic and social structures, this control became the nutrient for the flourishing Ukraine's bureaucracy with its impressive, even by world standards, corruptive practices. Simultaneously, the functions of strategic development planning were drastically curtailed, and the government has plunged itself almost exclusively in current balancing and filling the gaps. Such attitude slowed down very significantly targeted progressive structural reforms and weakened considerably Ukraine's positions measured by global competitiveness indicators, thus having intensified ever more the country's dependence on external factors. The vicious circle has been thus closed.

3. Neoliberal globalizing processes became a potent factor to *aggravate social inequality in Ukraine*. Although this effect of globalization is well-known in many countries of the world, in Ukraine it revealed itself during an extremely short historic period and, what is especially important, its real scale has been cynically concealed. All this could not but impact most negatively the evolution of public morals and was another factor to decrease public confidence in almost all state institutions.

Such state of affairs was not the least in the consequences of Ukraine's sheer inability to conform to the global principles regarding the rule of law and transparency of financial deals, the regulation of financial markets and

international financial transactions, and the norms of business ethics that account for corporate social responsibility. This situation is corresponding to the general public attitude in the issues of unacceptability of bribery or tax evasion⁶.

4. The intensified large-scale global challenges and the increased instability of socio-economic development under the present conditions of global transformations, which are coupled with the specific factors of instability caused by the problematic course of Ukrainian social and economic transformations, determine the *considerable activation of the safety value orientation*, both in its local family and social (national state) dimensions. In this respect, we can speak about partial inversion of the evolution following the *Maslow's model* defining the hierarchy of human needs, because the latter envisages a gradual transition from dominating safety needs to post-material needs of love/belonging, esteem and self actualization.

For Ukraine this problem has been intensified by its combination, on the one hand, with the large-scale need of external energy supplies, and on the other hand, with the geopolitical competition of superpowers and regional unions to gain geopolitical control over Ukraine. This causes for Ukraine an *exclusively prominent role of the value of national security*.

5. Globalization is intrinsically linked with the global information and communication revolution and the ICT-based development of *transnational network structures*, both professional and civil. These developments give rise to a sophisticated process of personal self-identification within the socium, because *the focus of its preferences and loyalties is likely to shift from the identification oneself with the local community of the place of residence or the country where one lives – to the belonging to a network*. The latter is especially crucial for the so called creative professions providing opportunities for international career growth.

⁶ If the average indicators for 57 nations analyzed within the World Values Survey showed that accepting a bribe and cheating on taxes were considered as never justifiable by 71.1 and 61.3 percent of population, respectively, in Ukraine these figures made only 56.0 and 39.3 percent [16].

In Ukraine, the named evolution is promoted by the peculiar feature that the socio-economic transformations happening during the period of over two decades decreased substantially the role of research-intensive activities and relatively limited the attention paid to the development of genuine art under the aggressive expansion of the primitive mass culture. The values of intellect and aesthetics are evidently suffering losses in their competition with the aspirations of exclusively material wellbeing. This situation makes many science workers and artists, and lately university graduates as well, to search outside the country their opportunities to employ their talents – and the proliferation of networks substantially facilitates this task.

Research conclusions

1. Global economic processes and associated global changes exert an extraordinary powerful influence on value systems, which implies not only the commenced formation of a set of global (universal) values but also a substantial modification and renovation of value systems existing within nation states. However, under the domination of the neoliberal form of globalization this impact appears to be controversial and ambiguous with regard to development and modernization processes.

2. The cultural value impact of globalizing processes has manifested itself during the last three decades primarily as the process of westernization and the expansion of the western value orientations to non-western countries. In many cases, it caused adverse value mutations in recipient nations, and the destruction of traditional foundations for regulation of the social functioning, with an evident lack of adequate formation of a new value basis for development and modernization. This peculiarity was caused not merely by the problem that a value matrix, which was shaped in other cultural and historical contexts, might not be vital in a qualitatively different cultural environment, but also by the circumstance that the “value donor” countries have attained, in principle, higher stages of civilized development in comparison with the recipient nations.

3. The development of transforming processes that have cardinally intensified at the outset of the 21st century and especially following the 2008-09 global crisis, and the launched transition of the world system to a qualitatively new model of organization and development determine a profound reconstruction of the system of values dominating in the world, embracing advanced nations, developing countries and emerging market economies. Such value evolution is to avoid artificial transplantation of value principles from one civilization community to other, but arise out of growing interaction along key directions of the search for responses to global challenges. It is the framework of these joint activities where common and universally meaningful value references are likely to take shape against the background of preserved opportunities for genuine national development.

4. Up to now, Ukraine has failed to adequately fit in the global system and create satisfactory instruments to protect its development against potent global challenges. The country's value foundations have suffered noticeable deformations caused by globalization, while a number of potentially beneficial global trends (ecological orientation, social responsibility of corporations, standards for the financial sector and taxation, and others) have not yet spread due influence on Ukraine. Both these circumstances significantly complicate the development and modernization of the country, and they evidently require substantial changes in the development policy for the future.

References

1. Schwartz, Shalom H. Are There Universal Aspects in the Structure and Contents of Human Values? // Journal of Social Issues. – Vol. 50, No. 4, 1994. – P. 19-45.
2. Global Values website – <http://www.globalvalues.org/values.htm>.

3. Inglehart, R. *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
4. World Values Survey/European Values Survey (WVS'EVS). *The Values Surveys 1981–2004* [Electronic resource]. – Available at: <http://www.wvsevsdb.com/wvs/WVSanalyzeQuestion.jsp>.
5. Ritzer G. *The McDonaldization of Society. An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. – Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1993.
6. Ritzer G. *The McDonaldization Thesis: Explorations and Extensions*. – London: Sage, 1998.
7. Ritzer G. *Sovremennyye sotsiologicheskiye teorii*, 5th ed. – S.-Petersburg: Izdat. dom “Piter”, 2002. – Part IV [in Russian].
8. *Identichnosti i tsennosti v epokhu globalizatsii*, ed. Yu.N.Pakhomov and Yu.V.Pavlenko. – Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 2013 [in Russian].
9. World Economic Forum. *Global Risks 2011, Sixth Edition. Executive Summary* [Electronic resource]. – Available at: <http://www.weforum.org/issues/global-risks>.
10. World Economic Forum. *Global Risks 2013, Eighth Edition*. – P. 10 [Electronic resource]. – Available at: <http://www.weforum.org/issues/global-risks>.
11. Pew Research Center. *Climate Change and Financial Instability Seen as Top Global Threats*. June 24, 2013 [Electronic resource]. – Available at: www.pewglobal.org.
12. Yakovets Yu.V. *Global'nyye ekonomicheskiye transformatsii XXI veka*. – Moscow: Ekonomika, 2011 [in Russian].
13. Naím M. *Illicit: How Smugglers, Traffickers, and Copycats Are Highjacking the Global Economy*. New York: Doubleday, 2005.

14. UN General Assembly. Outcome of the Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and Its Impact on Development. Doc. A/RES/63/303, 13 July 2009.
15. The Evolution of Global Values by American Environics. April 2006 [Electronic resource]. – Available at: http://www.americanenvironics.com/PDF/Evolution_of_Global_Values_AE.pdf.
16. World Values Surveys Databank [Electronic resource]. – Available at: <http://www.wvsevsdb.com/wvs/WVSanalyze.jsp>.
17. Robertson, R. Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture. – London: Sage, 1992.
18. Kuvaldin V. Global'nost: novoye izmereniye chelovecheskoho bytiya // Gorbachev M.S. i dr. Grani globalizatsii: Trudnyye voprosy sovremennoho razvitiya. – Moskva: Alpina Publisher, 2003. – S. 31–98 [in Russian].