

Olesya Datsko

postdoctoral student of National institute for Strategic Studies, Ukraine

CULTURE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC SECURITY OF UKRAINE: CHALLENGES IN XXIST CENTURY

Introduction

The term “safety culture” was first used in the analysis of the Chernobyl accident causes. Safety culture was conducted by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), when representatives of the organization recognized that the lack of safety culture has was the reason of this tragedy (Скалецкий, Бірюков, Мартюшева, Яценко, 2012, р. 3). In the report by the IAEA in 1991 the term was defined as “a set of characteristics and features of organizations and the behaviour of individuals, determining that problems such as nuclear power plants with higher priority is given attention, as determined by their value” (*Культура безопасности*, 1991, р. 1).

This report noted that the culture of safety in behavioral and structural aspects related to organizations and to individuals, and relates to the requirements resolve all security issues with appropriate perceptions and actions. Since then, the concept of safety culture began to be widely used today is relevant to many areas of human activity, although the emphasis on academics make use of this term in the technological, environmental, safety and security in the field of labour, including V. Byehun (Бегун et al., 2009), R. Durnyev (Дурнев, 2006), V. Kuznetsov (Кузнецов, 2007) and others.

Special attention is paid to safety culture today in the field of information technologies and communications. The globalization of information space is hyperintensive, thus state, regional, megaregional, supra governments don't actualized in time the principles of safe distribution, exchange, sale of information products, which in turn requires an adequate level of information culture of the users of information networks and their ethical behavior and taking into account the need to comply with safety criteria (informational, technical, economic, military, psychological, etc.).

The issue of information security is important at all levels of the hierarchy of security as makes access to the vast array of information, certain legal or ethical restrictions

on its use at the national, corporate and personal levels. Thus, the rating agency Ernst & Young's estimates in recent years the level of information security in the world (Fighting to close the gap: Global Information Security Survey, 2012) and the UN General Assembly adopted a number of policy documents on cybersecurity system forming (*Элементы для создания глобальной культуры кибербезопасности*, 2002).

The issues of national, geopolitical security cultural factors are the topics for researchers and government officials today. P.J. Katzenstein (1996) wrote about strategic meaning of the security culture for state security. J. Czaja (2008) in the work *Cultural factors of security* identifies cultural factors of national security, internal and external threats to cultural state, determining that cultural determinants is essential for the security of the state at all levels and in all areas. Also A. Lysyuk (Лысюк, 2008) studied military security, and proved that the defense strengthens of the state depend not only from logistic, organizational, information, tactics hostilities, but on the values of patriotism of most soldiers. The author states that projected in security, safety culture is coherent and stable set of ideas (value orientation) and basic ways of social actors on the forms and methods of protecting society from internal and external threats. Safety culture is formed in 3 levels of civilization, political, cultural and organizational.

Many researchers have identified an important role of culture in the process of creating wealth and in the formation of responsibility in social-economic system. At the strategic role of culture for social development indicated S. Lindsey, M. Fairbanks (1997, p. 126). They showed that the influence of culture on the formation of mental models, catalysing the process of wealth creation is dominant to progress. This cultural capital is seen not only in the obvious manifestation of music, language and traditions, but also guidelines and values related to innovation and development incentives.

R. Inglehart (2007, p. 343) wrote "... values syndrome of trust, tolerance, prosperity and participation in decision-making parameters detected survival / self-expression is especially important. Democracy cannot be solved simply introducing institutional changes or manoeuvrings through elite, but depends on the values and beliefs of ordinary citizens". It is clear that the latter are influenced by social culture as one of the determining factors of real development.

Latov (Латов, Латова, Николаева, 2005, p. 54), A. Syemuhina (2007, p. 143) confirmed the link between cultural determinants and the level of the shadow economy and corruption. In studies D. Traisman (2000, p. 402), R. Merton (1968, p. 47) also there are demonstrated a significant correlation between corruption and social diversity, ethno-linguistic division and proportion of different religious traditions among the

population. In all these studies noted that the negative effects of human activity has less to do with imperfect normative regulation of economic processes as a low level of responsibility people, first those who make management decisions, particularly in the field of public administration in the “big business” as well as consumers in the system. Also scientist wrote about importance of safety culture in organization effectiveness, its productivity and competitiveness (Sharon C., 1999, pp. 185-198 and Williams Z., Ponder N., Autry Ch., 2009).

Culture determines the value system and provides motivation of people responsibility for its activities, thereby defining the level culture of socio-economic security as imperative and the most important humanitarian subjective factor of economic security system.

Culture of social-economic security definition

The culture of social-economic security is defined as a set of existing features, characteristics of the individuals' behavior, organizations and governments based on understanding the impact of its activities and decisions on the status and the possibility of socio-economic system security. Culture of socio-economic security point the priority of sustainable development over personal interests, understanding by people the responsibility for the results of their own activities on human security, community security, shaping the safe cultural codes of social and economic interaction, providing opportunities for sustainable socio-economic system reproduction and form the basis of development for future generations.

The culture of social- economic security is formed at the following levels:

- personal (individual as a member of society, social and economic system, as an individual socio-economic system – representatives of the management at all levels);
- organization (interpersonal contacts, related to labour policy development organizations and institutions of corporate social responsibility, etc.);
- community, commons, people (civil society, volunteering, sharing resources to supply effective common well-being);
- levels of government (from local to international).

Cultural determinants of progress susceptibility and impact of human activity on social transformation are very important. Mechanisms or institutions, offered at national or regional levels cannot provide adequate security itself. Effectiveness of its is supplied

by concrete people. The quality of decisions, implementation and efficiency of public institutions depend to the system of values and responsibilities of the people. Efficiency of economic policy realization depends not only on the elites culture of socio-economic security, but also on the level of culture and education of ordinary people to whom they are directed (public reaction and interaction), which cause trends in the development of civil society.

Justification criteria and evaluation culture of socio-economic security is challenging because it includes not only motivation, ideological values and attitudes of individuals, organizations and governments in politic of socio-economic development, participation in its implementation, but also takes into account the moral principles of their social activism and responsibility for the social and economic impact of its activities.

An indicator that culture of social and economic security isn't shaped at necessary management level in Ukraine are low indices of individual components of the Ukraine national competitiveness, which explain the low level of institutional development, inefficient use of resources and lack of activation potential of Ukraine (tab. 1).

Table 1. Culture of social-economic security indicators in The Global Competitiveness Report

Indicators	2013-2014	2014-2015
Public trust in politicians	117	96
Judicial independence	139	140
Favoritism in decisions of government officials	133	116
Transparency of government policymaking..	130	104
Ethical behavior of firms	130	98
Efficacy of corporate boards	103	86

Source: Compiled by *The Global Competitiveness Report 2013-2014* and *2014-2015*.

From the data of table 1 we can conclude that the human factor is the main reason of institutional crisis in Ukraine, because all of indicators depend on the behavioral patterns of managers who often put personal interests above the public in the management activities.

Low level of rights protection in Ukraine is being for 24 years not only because of legislation problems but due to lack of political will of the state leadership to reform it.

They didn't want to ensure the institutionalization of the constitutional system that would ensure the protection of Ukrainian people interests.

Structural reforms in Ukraine must be accompanied with macroeconomic stabilization and investment stimulating, promoting job creation, incomes and living standards increasing in a sustainable manner. If we talk about the culture of social-economic security, in the context of economic security is determining its impact on several levels.

Levels of culture of social-economic security

Culture of socio-economic security involves the interaction of a person as an object and subject of public relations socio-economic system based on values and responsibility at the following levels (fig. 1):

Figure 1. Levels of culture of socio-economic security

I	↔	I
I	↔	Other person
I	↔	Work
I	↔	Environment
I	↔	Community groups
I	↔	State
I	↔	World
I	↔	God

Most risks in the state economic security are due to underdeveloped culture of social-economic security of individuals. Lack of responsibility awareness for the results of own activity have real negative economic consequences. We will illustrate some examples to prove it.

Analysis of culture of social-economic security in Ukraine

The self-perception as values (health care, spiritual development, education, self-denial, self) at "I – I" level: a person determines for itself own hierarchy of requirements and

the sense of well-being and happiness. Spirituality, public goods creation today for the Ukrainian aren't basic value criteria of economic activity.

Many statistical indicators illustrate the degradation of individual values at the basic components of the socio-economic system, especially careless attitude people to themselves as to the value. Result of consumer spending structure analysis in 2012-2013 in Ukraine demonstrate the destructive trends in the prevalence of lifestyle that contributes to the overall social degradation, and thus – reducing labour and resource potential and demographic crisis (tab. 2).

Table 2. Final consumption households expenditure for the purposes in 2012-2013 (current prices)

No	Indicators	2012		2013	
		Million UAH	%	Million UAH	%
1	Final consumption expenditure of households, total including:	986 540	100,0	1 057 781	100,0
2	Food and non-alcoholic beverages	384 212	38,9	414 536	39,2
3	Transport cost	120 863	12,3	131 016	12,4
4	Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels	119 882	12,2	118 005	11,2
5	Alcoholic beverages, tobacco and drugs	76 168	7,7	82 949	7,8
6	Clothing stores and footwear	65 293	6,6	65 282	6,2
7	Health protection	46 476	4,7	52 369	5,0
8	Furnishings, household equipment and routine maintenance of housing	40 178	4,1	44 309	4,2
9	Recreation and culture	38 126	3,9	44 455	4,2
10	Connection	23 436	2,4	26 907	2,5
11	Restaurants and hotels	24 624	2,4	25 717	2,4
12	Education	13 535	1,4	14 228	1,3
13	Other goods and services	33 747	3,4	38 008	3,6

Source: Compiled using data: Final consumption households' expenditure for the purposes (*Кінцеві споживчі витрати домашніх господарств за цілями, 2014*).

Despite the high level of poverty, there is significant increase of expenditure on alcohol, tobacco and drugs occupy the fourth position in the structure of households consumption and its share increased from 7.7% of the total household expenditures in 2012. 7.8% – in 2013. These data clearly illustrate the big social problems of Ukrainian society, which now form the risks to the economic security of the state, which only reverse the economic mechanisms impossible.

Other our researches also showed the degradation of human potential that have negative impact on economic:

- accelerated alcohol consumption by all segments of the population. Ukraine ranks 1st in the world in terms of rate of child alcoholism. Because alcoholism country annually loses more than 40 thousand people. About 10% of people who consume alcohol in Ukraine become alcoholics. Every year in Ukraine patients drug dispensaries are 600-800 thousand of alcohol depended people. In recent years, 25-30% of neonatal pathologies caused by drinking parents. Number of alcohol consumption per capita per year in Ukraine 12 litres. WHO experts indicate that in countries where this rate of over 8 litres starts falling and dying nation state (*Статистика в Україні: Католицький медіа-центр*, 2014);
- intensive drug addiction: the number of addicts in 2012 in Ukraine were about 425 thousand. Injecting drug users, whose age ranged from 15 to 64 years, which is 1.3% of the population and growth rates of their number – 8% per year (official data), according to experts the number of drug users in Ukraine is 1.5-2 million persons, annual growth of 10-11%. 70% of addicts – young people under 25 years old, female drug addiction in Ukraine in the ratio – the highest in Europe. In 2013 UN Report are showed the prevalence of injecting drug users in Ukraine at least three times higher than the world average level, ranging from 0.88% to 1.22% (the average level of 0.31%) (World Drug Report, 2014). Every tenth family in Ukraine is faced with the problem of drug addiction. And those who are caught in this addiction every year involve an even 5-6 people (but unofficial data 10-15). According to official statistics, every year from 10 to 12 thousand registered deaths due to drug use. According to experts, the rate of drug addiction in Ukraine as of 2010 amounted to 1.5-2%;
- despite the fact that according to the WHO threshold reached which form a critical threat to the existence of the state, is 7%. Drug abuse has a significant impact on negative demographic trend, growing social problems and reducing labour

and resource potential of the state (Analysis of the alcohol situation in Ukraine (*Зріз алкогольної ситуації в Україні*, 2013);

- the majority of the population is engaged in self-treating in Ukraine. From 20 billion spend for buying medications in 2012, only 4 billion were spent on drugs for the treatment of diseases that form the class of diseases in Ukraine. Misuse of pharmaceuticals increase social problems, course deaths, and the growth of state spending for help them; significant proportion of the younger generation values is a hedonistic lifestyle, unwillingness to work and high expectations about employment opportunities and wages, which causes a significant shortage of workers who want to faithfully perform its a work duties.

The negative economic consequences of this situation are obvious today, when in some economic sectors is emerging deficit of healthy and qualified workers. In construction, street trade, agriculture industry is extremely difficult to find workers who do not abuse alcohol, and accordingly, it is difficult to ensure the quality of work displayed on the negative trends of the labour market, reducing the competitiveness of products and businesses and economic development of regions of the state as a whole. The spread of bad habits cause general social degradation, reducing requirements people to themselves, need for self-development, affecting the intellectual capacity and the demographic crisis.

Destructive trends will be most felt in the future due to increased morbidity, disability acceleration of certain social groups, increasing social problems and significant reduction in labour and resource potential of the entire country.

Another problem caused by insufficient levels culture of socio-economic security is the lack of leadership's proper responses to these challenges. The results of the nationwide survey of Ukrainian NGO leaders about lobbying for legislative regulation in Ukraine, the most probable explanation of the adequate response absence is that in Ukraine business interests actively lobbied government officials, who are often indirect owner, managers do not fully understand of danger situation and possible negative consequences (*Результати всеукраїнського опитування лідерів громадських організацій щодо законодавчого врегулювання лобіювання в Україні*, 2012).

For example, the results of our studies showed that in recent years almost quarter of all advertising in Ukraine – is advertising of alcohol or tobacco. Such super active sales promotion makes the spread of alcoholism and smoking, which promotes social problems and therefore increase state spending foe help them, and the other - reduces the productivity of the economy.

Systematic scientifically based research of these phenomena impact on the labour potential and the level of economic security of Ukraine wasn't conduct State has not yet conducted as unaccounted these risks when the state regional policy.

Other aspect of low level of social-economic security is so-called "poverty culture". "Reconciliation" of people to the poverty is one of the manifestations of insufficient culture of social and economic security, and so we can talk about the wide spread of the so-called culture of poverty in Ukraine.

The definition of the term "culture of poverty" was offered by O. Lewis (1975), defining it as a poor condition, which is characterized not only by material poverty but also social, cultural and psychological limitations. People who has such style of life, do not seek to overcome it, and therefore do not want to "stop being poor". They did not seem to somehow change their lives, but when it comes to real effort to persistent aspirations, mostly retreating.

Followers of the concept of poverty culture showed that environment of poor is characterized by a particular culture, which is based on humility, inability to build their future and fatalism. In the process of primary socialization, these values are passed from one generation to another, leading to the "inheritance" of poverty. People are getting used to their poverty, perceive it as the norm. Even the associated psychological characteristics of man – passivity, dependence, helplessness, social timidity, simplicity – the environment is perceived as normal and even a virtue.

V. Vasyutynskyy emphasizes that the culture of poverty today massively embraced the Ukrainian villages, where not only the economic crisis, but primarily psychological (rural youth sees an attractive future, don't want to seek profession, frivolous attitude towards their health, prone to depression, major efforts spending on survival, and at worst - escapes from reality uninteresting in alcohol or drugs) deepens the economic crisis in the country as a whole (Кириченко, 2014). In Ukraine many people desire to receive state social assistance instead of real employment gained distribution. This causes excessive growth and social orientation of public spending at the same time without creating real economic basis of – involving labour of the working population and create added value.

Soviet stereotypes, that the state will take care about the man, regardless of whether it will make some effort of self-care resulted in the majority of Ukrainian exit from the crisis now see only one way: the state or someone will give them sustenance. But these people do not seek to create conditions where they can earn that causes systemic indifference I passivity of the productive forces.

Other levels of social interaction as a negative trend today affect public deformations and distortions. Thus, at the level of “I – Social group” and “I – State” emerging awareness of their role in the development of socio-economic system as an active participant, member of civil society, the person responsible for the consequences of their actions to the public and society, nature.

As indicated in the Human Development Report (2008) “we have recognize that in Ukraine defining the human needs are not the responsibility of the State; rather it is the responsibility of the people themselves... This reflects the persistent Soviet expectations what the government will take care about of most people’s needs. As a result, solving local issues, citizens rarely showed a sense of community, especially when resources for human development were limited”.

The experts of UNDP in Ukraine in 2012 conducted a survey: that sought to identify what needs to be changed to improve the quality of life in Ukraine? Discovered this study contradiction showed that experts believe that the main factor should be a change in attitude, mentality, because the people themselves are driver of improvement. Average Ukrainian indicated that the quality of life in Ukraine depends on changes in public administration.

The results of surveys of the Razumkov Centre in 2012, respondents recognized the main cause of socio-economic and political problems in Ukraine – the high level of corruption (31.3% of respondents), the prevalence of state leaders in the personal interests above the public (18.2%), ignoring the Constitution and government representatives laws of Ukraine (14.4%), ineffective governance through its leadership incompetence (13.3%). The main reasons of socio-economic problems lie not only in the plane of economic mechanisms and instruments as in the cultural plane. The propensity for corruption prevailing public interest over personal, law-abiding are factors determined values and responsibilities of people, and so are the cultural determinants.

Main risks to economic development of Ukraine because of low level of social-economic security

The main risks to the economic security of Ukraine system associated with misunderstanding needs, no real steps towards the formation of humanitarian imperatives of economic security:

- lack of strategic goals and mechanisms of economic development achieve at the state level, regions and communities;

- orientation of social and economic policy development on satisfaction the needs of managers (officials), but not the people and communities;
- marginality of cultural priorities, not systematic understanding of the culture role of the government;
- separate formation of economic, social, humanitarian, environmental policy, and therefore lack a systematic approach to the implementation of policies and programs of economic development;
- low leadership responsibility for made decisions at various levels of governance and lack of effective public mechanisms of influence to these decisions of officials and monitoring their implementation;
- low real education, public initiative to introduce instruments of civil control and lobbying of public interests (undeveloped civil society);
- high degree of society cultural degradation and no state response to such threats, which leads to risks of reduction of human potential.

Conclusions

In the present situation, taking into account the formation system of values of Ukrainian society, we can conclude that:

1. Population itself will not be able in a short time to form a proper level of safety culture in all spheres of life, including social and economic.
2. It is necessary to ensure the formulation of goals of the state in the short-term and strategic, using axiological approach in which the main value of the state is a human visitor and priority of economic activity – human development and quality of life (development of living standards for different categories of the population).
3. Must be reconcile social, economic, humanitarian, environmental policy which should reflect the complex sequenced priorities in the political agenda.
4. Should be mandatory comprehensive strategic educational and promotional programs that would cover all areas of human activity and population oriented on the socialization and the formation of the high-level value criteria, cultural codes of social interaction and responsibility of all members of society (the development of high culture and spirituality).

Thus, the study of humanities determinants, settling humanitarian imperatives of economic development and economic security system with the formation of appropriate

mechanisms for achieving them is one of the major task of Ukrainian economics. Specification of cultural socio-economic security criteria , methods to achieve them is necessarily part of the state economic policy.

References

- Czaja J. (2008), *Kulturowe czynniki bezpieczeństwa*, Kraków, Krakowska Szkoła Wyższa im. A.F. Modrzewskiego
- Fairbanks M., Lindsay S. (1997), *Plowing the Sea – Nurturing the Hidden Sources of Advantage in Developing Nations*, Harvard, Harvard Business School Press
- Fighting to close the gap: Global Information Security Survey. Insights on governance, risk and compliance* (2012), Ernst & Young's
- Global competitiveness report* (2014-2015), <http://www.weforum.org> [20.01.2015]
- Inglehart R., Welzel Ch. (2007), *Modernization, cultural change and democracy: the human development sequence*, New York, Cambridge University Press
- Katzenstein P.J. (1996), *The culture of national security: norms and identity in world politics*, New York, Columbia University Press
- Lewis O. (1975), *Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty*, New York, Basic Books
- Merton R. (1968), *Social Theory and Social Structure*, New York, Free Press
- Semukhina O. (2007), *Russian cultural factors related to perceived criminal procedure fairness: the juxtaposition of policy and practice*, Orlando, Fall Term
- Sharon C. (1999) *Perceptions of organizational safety: implications for the development of safety culture*, "Journal of Organizational Behavior" Vol. 20, Iss. 2
- Treisman D. (2000), *The causes of corruption: a cross-national study*, "Journal of Public Economics", № 76
- World Drug Report – 2014*, UN Office On Drugs And Crime, Vienna, http://www.unodc.org/documents/wdr2014/World_Drug_Report_2014_web.pdf [20.01.2015]
- Williams Z., Ponder N., Autry Ch. (2009), *Supply chain security culture: measure development and validation*, "The International Journal of Logistics Management", Vol. 20, Iss. 2
- Дурнев Р.А. (2006), *Культура безопасности жизнедеятельности: дефиниция и уровни формирования*, "Социологические исследования", Вып. 12
- Зрів'язаної ситуації в Україні* (2013), UNADO, <http://aiwa.dn.ua/hypn/Files/alcohol-situation-2013.pdf> [19.01.2015]

- Кириченко І. (2014), *Сучасне село: “невидимі” люди в ослабленому середовищі: інтерв’ю з Вадимом Васютинським*, “Дзеркало тижня”, 14 лютого, <http://gazeta.dt.ua/socium/suchasne-selo-nevidimi-lyudi-v-oslablenomu-seredovischi-.html> [19.01.2015]
- Кінцеві споживчі витрати домашніх господарств за цілями* (2014), “Державна служба статистики України”, http://ukrstat.org/uk/operativ/operativ2014/vvp/kkv_vvp/kkv_vvp_u/ksv_dg0214_u_n.htm [28.12.2014]
- Кузнецов В.Н. (2007), *Социология безопасности*, Москва, МГУ
- Культура безопасности* (1991), МАГАТЭ, Вена, 1991 STI/PUB/882 ISBN 92-0-423291-1 (Серия изданий по безопасности, No75-INSAG-4)
- Бегун В.В., Бегун С.В., Широков С.В., Казачков І.В., Литвинов В.В., Письменный Є.М. (2009) *Культура безпеки на ядерних об’єктах України*, Київ, ДП НАЕК «Енергоатом»
- Латов Ю., Латова Н, Николаева С. (2005), *Повседневная теневая экономика и национальная экономическая ментальность в современной России. Взаимосвязь индексов Г. Хофстеда и индикаторов теневой экономической деятельности*, Директмедиа Паблишинг
- Лысюк А.И. (2008), *Культура безопасности: содержание и структура*, “Інформаційні технології у сфері безпеки та оборони” №1 (1)
- Скалецький Ю.М., Бірюков Д.С., Мартюшева О.О., Яценко Л.Д. (2012), *Проблеми впровадження культури безпеки в Україні: аналітична доповідь*, Київ, НІСД
- Результати всеукраїнського опитування лідерів громадських організацій щодо законодавчого врегулювання лобіювання в Україні* (2012), http://www.lobbying.com.ua/lobby_results.doc [28.12.2014]
- Статистика в Україні: Католицький медіа-центр* (2014), http://www.catholic-media.org/ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=11183:2014-09-0411-14-02&catid=76:2014-04-12-21-30-56&Itemid=100081/dopysy/dopysy/036102/ [15.01.2015]
- Элементы для создания глобальной культуры кибербезопасности: Резолюция Генеральной Ассамблеи ООН A/RES/57/239 от 20.12.2002* (2002), http://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/conventions/elements.shtml [15.01.2015]

Olesya Datsko

**Culture of socio-economic security of Ukraine:
Challenges in XXIst Century**

Abstract

There is argued, that the culture of social-economic security has impact on the socio-economic development of state. It is formed at several levels of human interaction: with oneself, other people, work, environment, community groups, state, world, God. There is proved that low level of culture of socio-economic security of Ukraine's population, especially state leaders has a destructive effect on the economic development, labour potential, and increasing level of corruption. The necessity to develop a culture of social-economic security in the state economic policy is proved.

Keywords: *culture of social-economic security, development, values, Ukraine*

E-mail to the Author: olesya.datsko@gmail.com