

N. Kalyuzhna<sup>1</sup>,  
 orcid.org/0000-0003-0513-705X,  
 A. Khodzhaian<sup>2</sup>,  
 orcid.org/0000-0002-3015-1016,  
 I. Baron<sup>3</sup>,  
 orcid.org/0000-0003-4841-5152

1 – Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine, e-mail: [kalujnaya.natalya@gmail.com](mailto:kalujnaya.natalya@gmail.com)  
 2 – Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine  
 3 – State Research Institute of Informatization and Modeling of Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine

## IDENTIFICATION OF GLOBALIZATION THREATS TO THE ECONOMIC SOVEREIGNTY OF COUNTRIES WITH TRANSITION ECONOMIES

**Purpose.** To determine globalization threats to the economic sovereignty of transition economy countries based on the analysis and systematization of patterns in dynamics of subindices of the KOF Globalization Index.

**Methodology.** The methods of analysis and synthesis are used to systematize data on the structure and dynamics of the KOF Globalization Index. The method of correlation-regression analysis is used to assess statistical significance of the relation between the KOF Globalization subindices and economic development indicators of the countries of the statistical sample.

**Findings.** It is shown that wide rating opportunities to assess the level of the country's involvement in the world economic processes are created by index rating systems, one of which is the KOF Globalization Index. The dynamics and structure of de jure and de facto KOF Globalization Index are analyzed. A statistical sampling of the countries has been formed according to the criterion of the level of economic development; the value of the subindices of political and economic globalization of the KOF within the period of 2003–2017 has been analyzed. It is shown that for all groups of countries in the statistical sampling, the hypothesis of no direct statistically significant relationship between the value of the sub-index of economic globalization KOF and indicators of their economic development can be accepted. At the same time, a direct, mostly strong and statistically significant correlation between the values of the KOF subindex of political globalization and economic development indicators has been confirmed, which proves the importance of choosing a rational vector of foreign policy integration to provide economic development.

**Originality.** Confirmation of the hypothesis of no direct correlation between the level of state involvement in the world economy and the level of its economic development shows the transformation of the idea of openness of the national economy as a prerequisite for its successful development. On the contrary, it allows considering globalization as a source of additional globalization risks for the economic sovereignty of countries with weak economies.

**Practical value.** The obtained results create a basis to develop approaches for assessing vulnerability of the economic sovereignty of countries, which will take into account the determinants of economic globalization and specify the ways to minimize their destructive impact on national economic systems in neo-protectionism.

**Keywords:** *globalization, economic sovereignty, neo-protectionism, transition economy, KOF Globalization Index, indicator of economic development, foreign policy integration*

**Introduction.** Economic globalization is the objective stage of the world economy development, which is characterized by new quality of the international economic relations in terms of multiple increase in interdependence of national economies and their effect on the global processes. In the context of the intensifying integration of national economies, growing influence of transnational companies, international organizations, and financial institutions on the national economic policy as well as domination of hegemonic countries, preservation of national identity and national personality are becoming the determining challenge for the transition economy countries.

Qualitatively new level of the development of international relations, peculiar for the economic globalization, stipulates both the origin of new sources of the national economic development and advantaging from the involvement in the international differentiation of labour. At the same time, critical interdependence of countries in terms of globalization results in the worldwide intensification of political and economic inequality. Along with the origin of new possibilities for the development of national economies, globalization increases vulnerability of the economically weak states, which traditionally include the ones with transition economy, and creates additional threats for their economic sovereignty and implementation of national interests in the economic sphere. Recognition of bilateral influence of globalization processes on the noncompetitive economic systems and rapid spread of the neo-protectionism tendencies stipulate transformation of the ideas concerning the economy openness as the required prerequisite for the efficient progress.

**Literature review.** High risks caused by the globalization processes for the sovereignty of noncompetitive economies re-

quire determination of the adequate indicators of the involvement of countries in the world economic system taking into consideration their economic vulnerability. The index rating systems give ample opportunities for such an estimate; they help analyze success of political and economic integration of the countries from the viewpoint of either their current state (absolute estimate) or dynamically in time comparing to other rating participants (relative estimate). Since the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, scientists and specialized organizations have been developing actively synthetic indices of globalization, which are meant for complex estimation of multiple manifestations of that process – the A. T. Kearny/Foreign Policy Magazine's Index [1], the KOF-Index of Globalization [2], the Maastricht Globalization Index [3], the New Globalization index [4], the CSGR index of globalization (The Centre for the Study of Globalization and Regionalization's Globalization Index) [5], and others. We consider that the approaches to evaluate the consequences of the world countries' globalization using KOF methods [2] is of the considerable scientific and practical interest; the approaches sometimes result in somehow contradicting conclusions as for the effect of globalization processes on the economic growth indicators. Thus, analyzing the values of the KOF index for 123 world countries in 1970–2000, the author of the initial methodology of the KOF index calculation A. Dreher [6] states the positive effect of globalization on the economic flows; whereas, according to the scientist's opinion, political integration does not factor into the visible effect on the economic progress. While detailing the research in terms of the same period of time, N. Potrafke [7] draws conclusions on the fact that globalization stimulates economic growth of a country in general but increases inequality of wealth distribution of the country's pop-

ulation. S. Gygli, et al. [8] focus their attention on different regularities of the dynamics of the economic globalization subindex of the KOF index depending on the level of countries' economic development; the same idea is emphasized by the paper's authors as well.

Studies by the national scientists cover a later period; they differ with more differentiated approach to the evaluation of the globalization outcomes that is explained in many cases by the transformation of tendencies and dynamics of the world economic processes. Thus, analyzing the countries' rating in terms of the globalization index in 2015, S.V.Tiutiunnykova and V.V.Mykytas [9] pay attention to the fact that the developed countries-leaders of the rating with high general value of the index have medium or low rating in terms of such a component as the economic globalization subindex. In other words, high level of geopolitical importance and economic development is not accompanied necessarily by the intense involvement in the world economic processes and liberalization of the national economy. Stuchynska N. P. [10] has made similar conclusions in the context of KOF Globalization Index. She stated about the priority of the political aspect of globalization, while acknowledging the rapid growth of the economic component of the index in recent years. A. A. Khodzhaian [11] has explored strategic partnership as an effective tool of political and economic globalization. It is based on mutual foreign policy and economic support to address priority political and economic goals. Author also emphasized the fact that in the vast majority of cases of strategic partnership, Ukraine pursues political goals.

In our mind, the KOF Index of Globalization should be analyzed in the light of activation of protectionistic tendencies in the foreign trade policy of the leading world countries, which increases manifold globalization risks for economically weak countries. As a matter of fact, the countries implement certain protectionistic measures to protect national economic interests, which, in terms of the developed countries, mean not only and not so much limitation of the import access but stimulation of economic activity of the national manufacturers. It is clear that the efficiency of those measures will be justified only for the countries with stable economy and proper level of population income while the countries with low population income level will suffer from excessive openness of national markets for more competitive import. Consequently, more substantiated and clear outlining of regularities of economic and political globalization according to the KOF methodology for the countries with different level of economic development (first of all, for the ones with transition economy) is rather prospective research trend.

**Purpose** of the paper is to identify globalization threats to the economic sovereignty of the transition economy countries basing on the analysis and systematization of regularities of the dynamics of subindices of the KOF Index of Globalization.

**Results.** The KOF Index of Globalization is made by KOF Swiss Economic Institute with the participation of Swiss Federal Institute of Technology [2]. The index is calculated for 122 world countries; first, it was published in 2002 covering the period from the year of 1970. As of today, it was last calculated in 2017.

According to the calculation methodology, globalization is considered as a process which erases national boundaries resulting in the intensified or complicated different-purpose flows (human, capital, investment, services etc.). From this viewpoint, the countries, for which the index is calculated, are estimated in terms of 24 parameters united in three groups according to the spheres of globalization effects – economic, social, and political ones. The globalization subindex is calculated for each of the mentioned spheres of effect; the subindex is determined in two aspects – de facto and de jure.

Globalization de facto is estimated by the indicators of a country's involvement in the system of world economy while globalization de jure is associated with the current national limitations for the corresponding integration processes. Thus,

trade globalization de facto as a part of economic globalization is determined on the basis of indicators of the goods and services trade intensity; trade globalization de jure is determined basing on the values of tariffs, taxes, and limitations for trade contracting. Weight of the parameters in terms of subindices may vary during different years while equal weight of the subindices themselves as a part of the total index of globalization is unchangeable (33.3 %). The total index of globalization is calculated as the average arithmetic value of the indices de jure and de facto.

The index of globalization is positioned as a combined parameter making it possible to estimate the degree of global integration of a certain country. According to the rating published in 2019 and made on the basis of statistic data as of 2017, Switzerland is the country with the highest value of the globalization index (91.1); it is followed by the Netherlands (90.71), Belgium (90.59), and Sweden (89.93). Those countries are deeply integrated in the global financial flows; their territories host powerful banking institutions and head offices of numerous transnational companies. High level of social integration of the countries measured by the subindex of social globalization is explained by their geographical location, cultural divergence, and high level of income per capita. Finally, that is Switzerland where there are headquarters of many international organizations; that stipulates its high level of political globalization.

While analyzing dynamics of the KOF Index of Globalization worldwide, we should note that beginning from 2007, deceleration of its growth rate is fixed while the period of 1990–2006 demonstrates rapid and stable increase. Moreover, beginning from 1993, there has been a tendency to exceedance of the globalization index de jure over the de facto one. That may be interpreted as the constant and systematic lifting of state restrictions and trade, financial, migration flows etc. Expanding the gap between the values of subindices of political and economic globalization beginning from 2006 is one more demonstrative tendency of the recent years. We believe that such dynamics may tell us about the activation of the manifestations of economic nationalism in the external policy of the world countries. That creates additional risks for the weak-economy countries, first of all – in the context of increasing threats for their economic sovereignty.

Let us try to confirm or contradict the dependence between the level of the country's involvement in the world economy and the level of its economic development, which will help make well-founded conclusions on the globalization-related risks for the economic sovereignty of the weak-economy countries.

Gross domestic product per capita and Human Development Index are considered to be classical indicators of the national economic development. The Human Development Index (HDI) is a complex comparative parameter of the life expectancy, literacy, education and living standards; since 1990, the index has been published in the framework of the United Nations Development Programme in annual reports on the human potential development [12]. According to the calculation methodology, the Human Development Index is defined by three indices – Life Expectancy Index (LEI), Education Index (EI), and Income Index (II).

$$\begin{cases} LEI = \frac{LE - 20}{65} \\ EI = \frac{MYS/15 + EYS/18}{2}, \\ II = \frac{\ln(GNI_{PC}) - \ln(100)}{\ln(75\,000) - \ln(100)} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where *LEI* is life expectancy, years; *MYS* is mean duration of education of the population, years; *EYS* is expected period of schooling of the population, who are still getting education,

years;  $GNI_{PC}$  is gross national income per capita in terms of the purchasing power parity, USD.

The Human Development Index is the geometric mean of the three aforementioned indices

$$HDI = \sqrt[3]{LEI \times EI \times II}. \quad (2)$$

Despite the available critical opinions and alternative approaches [13, 14], the Human Development Index is a traditional tool for both determining difference between the world countries as for their development level and estimating the efficiency of state economic policy. Those are the values of the Human Development Index that are the basis for the classification of countries as for their development level (very high, high, medium, low).

Concerning the gross national product per capita as the indicator of economic growth, its value is the criteria for the UNO to classify countries into the developed, developing, and transition ones [15]. Namely, the two specified indicators (Human Development Index and GDP per capita) may be considered as the adequate indices to measure the development level of the world countries.

Tables 1–3 demonstrate values of the subindices of economic and political globalization as well as indicators of economic development within the period of 2003–2017 for the countries of statistic sampling; the countries belong to the categories of developed, developing, and transition economy ones. The countries are sampled statistically so that they will represent to the full extent the tendencies in the dynamics of economic development indicators and provide sufficient substantiation of the conclusions concerning different nature of interaction of their values with the globalization indicators of the countries from different groups.

First of all, different regularities of ratio of the values of economic and political globalization indices for countries with different economic development level come under notice. Thus, in terms of all the developed countries of the statistic sampling (Table 1), the value of the political globalization subindex exceeds the economic globalization index by 20–25 points on average. The USA (from 25.49 points in 2017 to 29.66 points in 2003) and the Republic of Korea (from 24.25 points in 2008 to 34.61 points in 2003) demonstrate the highest gap in the context of the analyzed countries. The developing countries show even a greater gap between the values of political and economic globalization subindices (Table 2). On average, the difference between the subindices values is 30–40 points in favour of political globalization; in some cases it reaches 50–60 points. For instance, during the period of 2003–2017, the greatest gap between the values of economic and political globalization is observed for Argentina (from 39.34 points in 2004 to 60.75 points in 2012) and China (from 33.22 points in 2005 to 44.30 points in 2015). Such a situation shows that the countries with the developed or steadily developing economy are being involved actively in the global political processes by means of opening embassies and international representational offices, establishing international organizations, making agreements with international partners and so on. At the same time, a value of the economic globalization subindex is considerably lower compared to the political globalization subindex, which can be interpreted as partial preservation of formal and informal limitations for the access of external trading partners to the national markets.

It should be reminded that the level of economic globalization *de jure*, according to the calculation methodology of the KOF Index of Globalization, is measured by the level of trade taxes, customs duties, favourable rules for external trade and treatment of investment. It means that the developed countries with high values of the political globalization subindex preserve certain signs of protectionism in their trading activities; that results in rather moderate values of the economic globalization subindices compared to the political ones.

As for the countries with developing economy, we consider that low values of the economic globalization subindices confirm modern transformation of the idea concerning the national economy openness as the necessary prerequisite for its successful development. Recognition of neo-protectionism as the main tendency for the formation of external trading relations of countries in terms of globalization is becoming more and more popular [17, 18]. Moreover, from the viewpoint of recent geopolitical transformations, protectionistic tendencies in the world economy will experience growing intensification and, with a high degree of probability, transformation into the inter-state trade and economic conflicts of different intensity [19]. Nevertheless, in terms of the transition economy countries (Table 3), the ratio between the values of political and economic globalization subindices is principally different comparing to the developed and developing ones. In particular, the value of the economic globalization subindex is mostly higher than the one of the political globalization subindex (on average, by 10–15 points) or differs from it insignificantly.

Within the period of 2003–2017, the highest exceedance of the economic globalization subindex over the political one is observed for Azerbaijan (up to 10.68 points in 2003) and Armenia (up to 23.66 points in 2003). However, one should note a stable tendency to the decreasing gap between the values of the political and economic globalization subindices with the course of time. In this context, as of 2003, Ukrainian subindex of economic globalization was higher than the political one by 10.29 points; though, beginning from 2009, a reverse tendency is observed being immediately by 6.81 points lower. As for other countries, the years of 2015 (Armenia, Kyrgyzstan) and 2009 (Moldova, Tajikistan) become the watershed ones, beginning from which the political globalization subindex begins exceeding insignificantly the economic globalization subindex.

Georgia is the only transition economy country, for which the political globalization subindex exceeds the economic globalization subindex during the whole period under study. Nevertheless, the difference between the subindices values fluctuates from 3.07 points (2006) to 5.14 points (2003), being far lower than the values of the developed countries but higher than the values of the developing ones.

It should be reminded that the term “transition” (transformational) economy is traditionally used for the countries where, due to certain historical and evolution circumstances, there is the transition from the administrative-command system to the market system of accumulation, distribution, and redistribution of economic resources. Post-social countries of Central and Eastern Europe, implementing a transition model by eurointegration and being now either the EU members or having the status of EU-member candidates, are the classic example of successful transition economies.

Clear dependence between the efficiency of economic reformation and eurointegration is illustrated in paper [20] by the analysis of progress in post-social reforms as of 2014, compared to the beginning of transition period. Dynamics of EBRD transition index [21], being the index to estimate the results of transition processes, was the basis of the author’s qualitative assessment of the reformation success. Thus, from the viewpoint of reformation progress, countries-members of the UN are the most successful ones (2.5–3.5 estimate points); according to the IMF classification, the countries belong to the category of developing economies (Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, the Czech Republic). The second group in terms of the reformation success (1.8–2.5 estimate points) includes such countries-members of the UN as Croatia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Bulgaria, Romania, and Slovenia. The group also includes the countries-candidates for the UN-membership (Albania, Montenegro, Macedonia, and Serbia). The poorest estimates of the reformation success (up to 1.5 points) are demonstrated in all the countries formed on the basis of the USSR union republics (Azerbaijan, Belarus, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan) in-

Indicators of globalization and economic development of the selected developed countries

Country	Indicators	Years														
		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Australia	GDP per capita, USD thousand	27.22	32.76	36.14	37.86	45.12	49.19	45.58	56.33	66.76	68.02	64.66	61.16	51.18	51.59	54.23
	Human Development Index	0.904	0.907	0.902	0.905	0.908	0.922	0.923	0.926	0.928	0.932	0.926	0.929	0.933	0.935	0.937
	Globalization subindex	67.09	67.1	66.97	68.36	69.43	66.50	67.46	67.86	67.83	66.51	64.4	66.84	66.24	67.74	68.17
Canada	Political	88.23	87.57	87.20	87.89	88.91	88.91	89.27	89.15	89.53	90.08	89.71	89.42	89.81	89.88	90.21
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	28.2	32.07	36.31	40.44	44.59	46.66	40.83	47.51	52.14	52.57	52.34	50.25	43.28	42.31	44.41
	Human Development Index	0.882	0.887	0.892	0.895	0.891	0.893	0.893	0.895	0.899	0.906	0.910	0.914	0.917	0.920	0.921
Germany	Globalization subindex	67.92	68.4	68.07	67.91	68.25	67.37	67.61	67.54	67.15	67.36	67.20	70.20	69.77	70.50	71.71
	Political	91.50	91.58	91.92	91.71	91.77	92.09	92.25	92.09	92.25	92.01	92.06	92.11	92.47	92.36	92.41
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	30.41	34.21	34.76	36.50	41.89	45.97	41.88	41.87	46.82	44.03	46.47	47.85	40.95	42.32	43.68
Netherlands	Human Development Index	0.889	0.899	0.900	0.910	0.914	0.916	0.916	0.920	0.925	0.927	0.927	0.930	0.933	0.936	0.938
	Economic subindex	78.26	79.08	80.10	80.69	80.35	79.34	78.14	77.47	77.73	77.94	77.73	79.11	78.69	79.86	80.48
	Political	96.73	96.23	96.21	97.03	97.95	97.42	97.16	97.06	96.96	97.0	97.04	96.77	97.03	97.56	97.96
Japan	GDP per capita, USD thousand	35.31	40.00	41.64	44.49	51.31	57.19	52.03	50.43	53.58	49.50	51.59	52.24	44.32	45.21	46.82
	Human Development Index	0.883	0.886	0.891	0.897	0.904	0.906	0.906	0.911	0.922	0.921	0.924	0.925	0.927	0.929	0.932
	Globalization subindex	86.65	88.34	88.60	88.18	88.63	87.78	87.26	87.73	87.93	87.78	87.74	88.90	89.67	88.88	89.43
Korea	Political	94.48	93.70	93.11	94.21	96.41	95.71	95.31	95.19	94.77	95.31	95.48	97.03	97.53	97.27	97.33
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	33.72	36.45	35.79	34.10	34.09	37.97	39.47	43.09	46.22	46.70	38.55	36.15	32.47	37.30	40.40
	Human Development Index	0.865	0.869	0.873	0.877	0.880	0.881	0.880	0.885	0.890	0.895	0.900	0.904	0.906	0.910	0.913
Switzerland	Economic subindex	58.82	53.46	54.81	55.96	57.54	57.88	56.76	57.07	56.98	58.96	60.97	61.34	65.36	65.43	66.65
	Political	85.71	85.45	84.73	85.30	86.01	85.64	86.68	87.42	87.77	88.22	87.86	88.14	89.39	89.22	88.73
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	14.22	15.92	18.65	20.92	23.10	20.47	18.33	22.15	24.15	24.45	25.99	27.98	27.22	27.63	29.80
USA	Human Development Index	0.839	0.847	0.855	0.862	0.869	0.874	0.871	0.882	0.888	0.890	0.893	0.896	0.899	0.901	0.904
	Economic subindex	49.89	56.57	55.04	58.13	60.98	63.44	61.14	62.47	65.02	65.46	64.58	66.93	63.37	63.66	64.27
	Political	84.50	83.73	84.11	85.04	87.10	87.69	88.43	89.08	89.46	89.82	89.88	89.85	90.57	90.99	91.16
USA	GDP per capita, USD thousand	48.18	53.36	54.95	57.59	63.64	72.74	70.23	74.56	88.51	83.64	85.23	86.14	80.60	79.57	81.31
	Human Development Index	0.896	0.901	0.906	0.912	0.915	0.917	0.927	0.932	0.932	0.935	0.938	0.939	0.943	0.943	0.943
	Globalization subindex	81.95	81.13	82.77	81.83	82.45	82.13	82.13	82.73	80.48	83.51	83.96	85.70	85.77	86.97	86.79
USA	Political	93.73	93.37	93.25	93.63	93.94	94.13	94.21	94.77	94.49	95.21	95.25	95.59	95.97	96.17	96.37
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	39.59	41.83	44.21	46.35	47.95	48.30	46.90	48.30	49.25	51.38	52.70	54.50	56.08	57.29	59.40
	Human Development Index	0.889	0.892	0.896	0.899	0.902	0.907	0.908	0.911	0.914	0.916	0.914	0.915	0.917	0.919	0.919
USA	Economic subindex	63.07	65.15	64.96	66.92	68.06	65.82	63.98	64.73	65.29	65.50	65.62	66.93	66.06	67.43	68.13
	Political	92.73	92.36	92.56	93.09	93.17	93.19	92.61	92.71	93.08	93.46	93.38	93.26	93.53	93.56	93.62

Indicators of globalization and economic development of the selected developing countries

Country	Indicators	Years															
		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
Argentina	GDP per capita, USD thousand	3.64	4.31	5.16	5.97	7.31	9.14	8.33	10.41	12.78	13.88	14.48	13.20	14.61	12.42	13.49	
	Human Development Index	0.775	0.775	0.777	0.801	0.806	0.810	0.810	0.818	0.823	0.823	0.824	0.825	0.828	0.828	0.832	
	Globalization subindex	51.01	51.51	47.13	45.06	44.45	41.97	41.75	40.0	36.88	31.72	32.13	33.07	31.43	34.99	39.05	
Brazil	Political	91.45	90.85	90.86	91.21	91.93	91.56	91.74	92.28	92.11	92.47	92.34	92.17	92.09	91.71	91.66	
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	3.09	3.65	4.81	5.91	7.37	8.85	8.62	11.29	13.23	12.34	12.25	11.92	8.66	8.58	9.40	
	Human Development Index	0.694	0.697	0.700	0.701	0.705	0.716	0.718	0.726	0.730	0.734	0.752	0.755	0.755	0.757	0.760	
China	Economic	41.49	41.82	42.33	42.64	44.22	41.45	41.74	43.30	41.35	40.49	38.86	39.36	34.41	35.78	39.43	
	Political	74.62	75.20	76.64	76.73	77.58	78.03	78.12	78.86	79.32	79.35	79.21	79.57	74.49	79.40	79.17	
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	1.29	1.51	1.76	2.11	2.70	3.46	3.83	4.52	5.58	6.32	7.08	7.71	8.14	8.26	8.92	
Poland	Human Development Index	0.622	0.631	0.643	0.657	0.670	0.681	0.690	0.702	0.711	0.719	0.727	0.735	0.742	0.749	0.753	
	Economic	46.55	49.60	52.74	50.45	51.69	46.70	45.62	49.12	48.28	47.26	47.92	48.98	46.05	46.65	47.87	
	Political	84.57	85.77	85.96	87.72	88.48	88.83	89.06	89.29	89.51	89.43	89.66	89.30	90.35	90.54	90.61	
Romania	GDP per capita, USD thousand	5.69	6.64	7.97	8.99	11.25	13.90	11.45	12.59	13.88	13.15	13.77	14.33	12.49	12.30	12.86	
	Human Development Index	0.804	0.802	0.808	0.813	0.819	0.824	0.828	0.835	0.840	0.836	0.851	0.853	0.858	0.864	0.868	
	Globalization subindex	57.38	66.84	62.94	65.32	67.65	66.91	66.67	67.37	66.74	68.69	69.49	71.74	72.53	73.02	73.53	
Mexico	Political	92.66	92.13	92.83	93.54	93.87	94.06	94.24	91.40	91.26	91.0	91.39	91.07	91.64	91.72	91.61	
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	2.76	3.54	4.66	5.81	8.12	10.16	8.22	8.27	9.21	8.54	9.56	9.99	8.95	9.43	9.99	
	Human Development Index	0.732	0.745	0.755	0.766	0.780	0.795	0.798	0.797	0.798	0.796	0.800	0.803	0.806	0.808	0.813	
Turkey	Economic	52.29	55.87	64.11	64.02	67.33	66.40	65.21	65.36	64.97	66.24	67.79	70.44	70.74	70.42	71.03	
	Political	88.55	88.93	89.12	90.03	91.23	91.42	90.59	90.60	90.48	90.50	90.52	90.55	91.23	91.24	91.11	
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	6.81	7.27	8.08	8.91	9.50	9.89	7.93	9.19	10.12	10.13	10.65	10.84	9.45	8.69	9.10	
Czech Republic	Human Development Index	0.720	0.726	0.729	0.737	0.738	0.740	0.739	0.739	0.746	0.752	0.750	0.754	0.759	0.764	0.765	
	Economic	48.04	50.38	53.91	52.95	54.45	53.66	55.01	56.62	57.28	58.12	57.83	59.99	60.54	59.07	61.84	
	Political	75.18	74.59	74.52	75.27	76.60	76.65	77.40	77.73	78.24	78.43	78.60	78.40	88.26	88.41	88.61	
Czech Republic	GDP per capita, USD thousand	4.51	5.76	7.01	7.59	9.15	10.21	8.46	9.92	10.36	10.42	10.76	10.32	9.18	9.31	9.64	
	Human Development Index	0.679	0.685	0.691	0.702	0.709	0.714	0.721	0.743	0.759	0.765	0.781	0.792	0.800	0.800	0.805	
	Economic	49.61	50.01	50.89	51.53	52.58	54.73	55.48	53.07	53.11	53.89	52.46	56.32	54.20	53.28	55.82	
Czech Republic	Political	89.24	88.65	88.80	89.83	88.27	91.63	91.50	91.92	91.95	92.82	92.71	92.39	92.69	92.58	92.47	
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	9.74	11.66	13.33	15.18	18.39	22.76	19.74	19.78	21.73	19.73	19.91	19.76	17.56	18.32	19.00	
	Human Development Index	0.822	0.825	0.835	0.843	0.850	0.854	0.857	0.862	0.865	0.865	0.874	0.879	0.882	0.885	0.888	
Czech Republic	Economic	74.06	78.20	78.67	78.73	79.55	78.13	77.80	78.39	78.11	79.07	78.73	82.66	82.57	82.74	84.04	
	Political	86.78	86.94	87.65	88.39	89.43	89.81	88.96	88.30	88.33	88.72	88.66	89.02	89.72	90.22	90.16	

Indicators of globalization and economic development of the selected countries with transition economy

Country	Indicators	Years														
		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Azerbaijan	GDP per capita, USD thousand	0.86	1.01	1.53	2.41	3.75	5.21	4.93	5.84	7.10	7.47	7.93	8.05	5.73	3.75	4.02
	Human Development Index	0.667	0.674	0.681	0.707	0.712	0.721	0.734	0.732	0.731	0.736	0.741	0.746	0.749	0.749	0.752
	Globalization subindex	59.6	60.82	62.11	60.07	60.77	61.65	59.61	58.94	60.40	64.26	62.70	65.81	66.0	70.71	70.92
Armenia	Political	48.92	49.44	50.68	52.31	55.34	56.57	57.33	59.03	60.19	61.6	62.62	62.03	64.11	64.34	64.74
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	0.92	1.18	1.62	2.12	3.07	3.91	2.91	3.12	3.42	3.57	3.73	3.88	3.52	3.59	3.73
	Human Development Index	0.672	0.681	0.694	0.708	0.724	0.727	0.724	0.729	0.733	0.737	0.743	0.746	0.748	0.751	0.758
Kyrgyzstan	Globalization subindex	67.02	67.89	66.40	65.68	64.16	62.98	66.92	68.82	69.77	69.14	69.18	70.61	67.73	68.51	69.41
	Political	43.36	43.73	45.72	49.13	53.08	53.49	54.27	54.13	54.76	66.38	66.21	66.07	70.21	70.54	70.57
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	0.37	0.43	0.47	0.54	0.71	0.95	0.86	0.87	1.11	1.16	1.26	1.26	1.11	0.95	1.01
Moldova	Human Development Index	0.611	0.615	0.616	0.621	0.628	0.631	0.635	0.636	0.639	0.649	0.658	0.663	0.666	0.669	0.671
	Economic	56.24	58.91	57.69	59.29	59.70	62.64	62.49	65.21	63.9	59.09	61.36	63.31	60.88	62.13	62.04
	Political	53.16	53.79	56.08	57.57	58.91	59.44	59.60	59.42	59.34	61.04	61.09	61.76	62.82	63.26	63.55
Georgia	GDP per capita, USD thousand	0.54	0.72	0.83	0.94	1.22	1.69	1.52	1.63	1.97	2.04	2.24	2.24	1.82	0.54	0.72
	Human Development Index	0.641	0.651	0.658	0.667	0.672	0.677	0.673	0.681	0.687	0.693	0.702	0.705	0.703	0.705	0.709
	Globalization subindex	64.0	64.24	64.81	66.30	67.76	67.28	64.40	62.90	63.65	62.90	63.72	66.33	66.69	66.05	65.29
Tajikistan	Political	57.39	58.33	60.30	63.84	65.88	66.36	66.72	67.02	67.11	68.43	68.36	68.67	70.39	70.94	71.16
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	0.92	1.20	1.52	1.86	2.47	3.15	2.69	2.95	3.71	4.13	4.26	4.42	3.75	3.90	4.25
	Human Development Index	0.688	0.695	0.705	0.712	0.724	0.723	0.727	0.732	0.738	0.749	0.756	0.764	0.771	0.776	0.783
Ukraine	Globalization subindex	51.47	52.72	53.55	56.49	56.25	56.85	56.74	57.45	58.02	58.33	58.64	59.09	58.96	59.08	59.36
	Political	56.61	57.48	58.51	59.56	60.44	61.22	61.78	62.26	62.43	62.92	63.13	63.70	63.72	63.95	64.15
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	0.23	0.30	0.33	0.39	0.51	0.69	0.66	0.74	0.83	0.95	1.04	1.11	0.92	0.76	0.977
Ukraine	Human Development Index	0.571	0.582	0.590	0.596	0.602	0.616	0.619	0.630	0.634	0.639	0.643	0.642	0.642	0.647	0.651
	Economic	47.12	46.14	51.30	50.84	53.14	54.15	46.49	48.45	48.14	50.57	46.39	45.81	43.22	44.01	43.93
	Political	36.83	36.77	38.60	39.35	40.54	51.95	53.30	55.19	55.10	56.08	56.44	56.71	48.48	48.90	49.28
Ukraine	GDP per capita, USD thousand	1.09	1.42	1.90	2.40	3.21	4.09	2.65	2.98	3.58	3.87	3.96	3.09	2.12	2.05	2.24
	Human Development Index	0.699	0.706	0.715	0.722	0.729	0.733	0.727	0.732	0.737	0.742	0.744	0.747	0.742	0.746	0.747
	Globalization subindex	47.12	46.14	51.30	50.84	53.14	54.15	46.49	48.45	48.14	50.57	46.39	45.81	43.22	44.01	43.93
Ukraine	Political	36.83	36.77	38.60	39.35	40.54	51.95	53.30	55.19	55.10	56.08	56.44	56.71	48.48	48.90	49.28
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	1.09	1.42	1.90	2.40	3.21	4.09	2.65	2.98	3.58	3.87	3.96	3.09	2.12	2.05	2.24
	Human Development Index	0.699	0.706	0.715	0.722	0.729	0.733	0.727	0.732	0.737	0.742	0.744	0.747	0.742	0.746	0.747
Ukraine	Economic	47.12	46.14	51.30	50.84	53.14	54.15	46.49	48.45	48.14	50.57	46.39	45.81	43.22	44.01	43.93
	Political	36.83	36.77	38.60	39.35	40.54	51.95	53.30	55.19	55.10	56.08	56.44	56.71	48.48	48.90	49.28
	GDP per capita, USD thousand	1.09	1.42	1.90	2.40	3.21	4.09	2.65	2.98	3.58	3.87	3.96	3.09	2.12	2.05	2.24
Ukraine	Human Development Index	0.699	0.706	0.715	0.722	0.729	0.733	0.727	0.732	0.737	0.742	0.744	0.747	0.742	0.746	0.747
	Economic	47.12	46.14	51.30	50.84	53.14	54.15	46.49	48.45	48.14	50.57	46.39	45.81	43.22	44.01	43.93
	Political	36.83	36.77	38.60	39.35	40.54	51.95	53.30	55.19	55.10	56.08	56.44	56.71	48.48	48.90	49.28

cluding the ones declaring pro-European vector of development (Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia).

As we can see, the highest transition values are observed in the countries-members of the UN, which combine successful market reforms and active eurointegration. Such results show the importance of rational external political integration in the provision of national economic development since traditional concept of transition from the administrative-command system to the market one is implemented by maximum liberalization of national economy in general and external trade in particular, being the causes of additional threats for economic sovereignty. Those threats may be minimized in case of joining to efficient political and economic union at the expense of external political, organizational, financial support, and so on, which we can observe in terms of the experience of European integration of the social-camp countries. Besides, it should be reminded that scientists are more and more doubting as for the importance of economic openness in the provision of national economic development under conditions of neo-protectionism. Such a conclusion is indirectly proved by considerable prevailing of the values of political globalization subindices over the values of economic globalization subindices for the developing European countries (Table 2). At the same time, these are the countries with the most vulnerable transition economy where the economic globalization subindex is most-

ly higher than the political globalization subindex (Table 3). In addition to the inefficient approaches to the economic reform and nonavailability of favourable institutional medium, liberalization of the access to national markets decreases manifold the possible globalization risks for those countries.

To have more detailed analysis of interconnection between the level of a country's integration in the political and economic system and level of its economic development, assess the density and statistic importance of the connection between the values of subindices of economic ( $Y_1$ ) and political ( $Y_2$ ) globalization as part of the KOF Index of Globalization and indicators of their economic development: GDP per capita ( $X_1$ ) and Human Development Index ( $X_2$ ).

Table 4 represents the results of calculation of the linear coefficient of correlation  $r_{xy}$  (Pearson's coefficient) and estimation of statistic importance of correlation for the countries with developed, developing, and transition economy respectively. Boundary value of t-test, defined according to the Student's table and corresponding to the number of degrees of freedom  $((15 - 13) = 8)$  and significance level  $\alpha = 0.1$ , is 1.771.

The force of correlation relationship is defined according to the standard value range, i. e.:  $0 < r_{xy} < 0.3$  is very weak correlation relationship;  $0.3 < r_{xy} < 0.5$  is weak relationship;  $0.5 < r_{xy} < 0.7$  is medium relationship;  $0.7 < r_{xy} < 0.9$  is strong relationship; and  $0.9 < r_{xy} < 1.0$  is very strong relationship.

Table 4

Results of the estimation of correlation relation of the globalization subindices with the indicators of economic development of the selected countries

Country	Force and significance of the correlation relation	Correlation relation of the globalization subindices with the indicators of economic development			
		Subindex of economic globalization KOF ( $Y_1$ )		Subindex of political globalization KOF ( $Y_2$ )	
		GDP per capita, USD thousand ( $X_1$ )	Human Development Index ( $X_2$ )	GDP per capita, USD thousand ( $X_1$ )	Human Development Index ( $X_2$ )
<b>Countries with developed economy</b>					
Australia	$r_{xy}$	-0.2831086	-0.2279437	0.8038899	0.9324032
	t-test	-1.06431	-0.84408	4.87319	9.301724
	Correlation force	Very weak reverse	Very weak reverse	Strong direct	Very strong direct
	Significance	No	No	Yes	Yes
Canada	$r_{xy}$	-0.0846782	0.7022821	0.5623361	0.7836279
	t-test	-0.30641	3.556846	2.451941	4.548087
	Correlation force	Very weak reverse	Strong direct	Strong direct	Strong direct
	Significance	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Germany	$r_{xy}$	-0.2267465	-0.0399023	0.4746367	0.5645708
	t-test	-0.83941	-0.14398	1.944288	2.466231
	Relationship force	Very weak reverse	Very weak reverse	Weak direct	Medium direct
	Significance	No	No	Yes	Yes
Netherlands	$r_{xy}$	-0.0109406	0.5123206	0.3394257	0.7925674
	t-test	-0.03945	2.15092	1.301057	4.686317
	Correlation force	Very weak reverse	Medium direct	Weak direct	Strong direct
	Significance	No	Yes	No	Yes
Japan	$r_{xy}$	-0.0774172	0.8756481	0.3159571	0.9216262
	t-test	-0.27997	6.537314	1.200708	8.562621
	Correlation force	Very weak reverse	Strong direct	Weak direct	Very strong direct
	Significance	No	Yes	No	Yes
Korea	$r_{xy}$	0.8326324	0.9037175	0.8749975	0.9661327
	t-test	5.420653	7.610784	6.516565	13.49932
	Correlation force	Strong direct	Very strong direct	Strong direct	Very strong direct
	Significance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Country	Force and significance of the correlation relation	Correlation relation of the globalization subindices with the indicators of economic development			
		Subindex of economic globalization KOF ( $Y_1$ )		Subindex of political globalization KOF ( $Y_2$ )	
		GDP per capita, USD thousand ( $X_1$ )	Human Development Index ( $X_2$ )	GDP per capita, USD thousand ( $X_1$ )	Human Development Index ( $X_2$ )
Switzerland	$r_{xy}$	0.4960291	0.7124434	0.7996288	0.9212161
	t-test	2.05971	3.6606	4.801213	8.537413
	Correlation force	Weak direct	Strong direct	Strong direct	Very strong direct
	Significance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
USA	$r_{xy}$	0.6779483	0.4599769	0.8675016	0.7790183
	t-test	3.325188	1.867792	6.287908	4.479722
	Correlation force	Medium direct	Weak direct	Strong direct	Strong direct
	Significance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Countries with developing economy</b>					
Argentina	$r_{xy}$	-0.9657299	-0.4282503	0.799629	0.7843829
	t-test	-13.4155	-7.61737	4.801216	4.559468
	Correlation force	Very strong reverse	Weak reverse	Strong direct	Strong direct
	Significance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Brazil	$r_{xy}$	-0.2366012	-0.7689867	0.8027818	0.551868
	t-test	-0.87801	-4.3372	4.854271	2.386033
	Correlation force	Very weak reverse	Strong reverse	Strong direct	Medium direct
	Significance	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
China	$r_{xy}$	-0.4494041	-0.4282503	0.8687651	0.9434788
	t-test	-1.81383	-1.70869	6.325168	10.2638
	Correlation force	Weak reverse	Weak reverse	Strong direct	Very strong direct
	Significance	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Poland	$r_{xy}$	0.7179033	0.860855	0.3519309	0.5768947
	t-test	3.718256	6.099744	-1.35563	-2.54649
	Correlation force	Strong direct	Strong direct	Weak direct	Medium direct
	Significance	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Romania	$r_{xy}$	0.8833304	0.8999367	0.9169866	0.8896219
	t-test	6.794427	7.441779	8.288023	7.023414
	Correlation force	Strong direct	Strong direct	Very strong direct	Strong direct
	Significance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mexico	$r_{xy}$	0.6824576	0.6467241	0.2092484	0.8641256
	t-test	3.366468	10.5993	0.771536	6.190734
	Correlation force	Medium direct	Medium direct	Weak direct	Strong direct
	Significance	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Turkey	$r_{xy}$	0.5442858	0.6869726	0.76011	0.8699415
	t-test	4.018141	3.40852	4.217665	6.360311
	Correlation force	Medium direct	Medium direct	Strong direct	Strong direct
	Significance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Czech Republic	$r_{xy}$	0.7769325	0.8096539	0.7098249	0.8204933
	t-test	1.467275	4.973948	3.633432	5.175017
	Correlation force	Strong direct	Strong direct	Strong direct	Strong direct
	Significance	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Countries with transition economy</b>					
Azerbaijan	$r_{xy}$	0.1720599	0.5892391	0.7630726	0.9670733
	t-test	0.629763	2.629505	4.256913	13.70082
	Correlation force	Very weak direct	Medium direct	Strong direct	Very strong direct
	Significance	No	Yes	Yes	Yes



Country	Force and significance of the correlation relation	Correlation relation of the globalization subindices with the indicators of economic development			
		Subindex of economic globalization KOF ( $Y_1$ )		Subindex of political globalization KOF ( $Y_2$ )	
		GDP per capita, USD thousand ( $X_1$ )	Human Development Index ( $X_2$ )	GDP per capita, USD thousand ( $X_1$ )	Human Development Index ( $X_2$ )
Armenia	$r_{xy}$	0.2445842	0.3928244	0.8248809	0.9265385
	t-test	0.909484	1.540156	5.261128	8.880072
	Correlation force	Very weak direct	Medium direct	Strong direct	Very strong direct
	Significance	No	No	Yes	Yes
Kyrgyzstan	$r_{xy}$	0.6628267	0.5286422	0.849931	0.9423179
	t-test	3.191697	2.24546	5.816104	10.15052
	Correlation force	Medium direct	Medium direct	Strong direct	Very strong direct
	Significance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Moldova	$r_{xy}$	-0.1413868	0.1302292	0.5724241	0.9548181
	t-test	-0.51495	0.473581	1.932613	11.58396
	Correlation force	Very weak reverse	Very weak direct	Medium direct	Very strong direct
	Significance	No	No	Yes	Yes
Georgia	$r_{xy}$	0.9474687	0.9223471	0.9647491	0.9540499
	t-test	10.68051	8.607389	13.21744	11.47974
	Correlation force	Very high direct	Very high direct	Very strong direct	Very strong direct
	Significance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tajikistan	$r_{xy}$	-0.3782743	-0.4371768	0.8846979	0.8407164
	t-test	-1.47337	-1.75262	6.842696	5.598121
	Correlation force	Weak reverse	Weak reverse	Strong direct	Strong direct
	Significance	No	No	Yes	Yes
Ukraine	$r_{xy}$	0.436858	-0.2797626	0.7404894	0.795039
	t-test	1.75104	-1.05065	3.972623	4.725934
	Correlation force	Weak direct	Very weak reverse	Strong direct	Strong direct
	Significance	No	No	Yes	Yes

As we can see from Table 4, most cases demonstrate strong or very strong statistically significant direct correlation relationship between the indicated subindices of the political globalization KOF and indicators of economic development of the developed countries. On the other hand, one cannot consider that the available dense positive correlation relationship between the values of the economic globalization subindex KOF and the same indicators is confirmed. On the contrary, for the majority of the developed countries of the statistic sampling the relationship has turned to be weak and statistically insignificant.

Similarly, one cannot confirm the significant direct correlation relationship between the level of economic globalization and economic development for the developing countries of the statistic sampling; in case of some countries, it is even of reverse direction. An interesting exception here is the case of European countries (Poland, Romania, the Czech Republic), for which that relationship has turned to be strong or very strong, with high value of statistic significance. Such a result proves once more the earlier hypothesis concerning the interdependent successful political (in this case, European) integration and positive dynamics of the European growth indices. As for the correlation between the level of political globalization, in terms of the developing countries (as well as for the developed ones), the values of direct dependence have turned to be rather high and statistically significant.

Finally, analysis of the interrelation between the level of economic globalization and indicators of the development of transition economy countries shows the nonavailability of a

single direction of correlation as well as low and often statistically insignificant values of its density (except for Georgia). Such results show the nonavailability of direct correlation dependence between the economic globalization, whose level in transition economy countries is mainly high (Table 4), and the level of their development. At the same time, correlation between the political globalization level, similar to other groups of countries, has appeared to be direct strong (or very strong) and statistically significant without any exceptions.

**Conclusions.** Thus, the hypothesis that there is no direct statistically significant correlation between the values of the subindex of economic globalization KOF and indicators of their economic growth can be considered as confirmed for all the groups of countries. At the same time, direct correlation between the values of the subindex of political globalization KOF and indicators of economic growth has turned to be rather strong and statistically significant in most cases. Such results confirm the statements formulated during the research, i.e.: significance of the selection of rational vector of political integration in the provision of national economic development and nonavailability of direct interrelation between the efficiency of national economy and its openness measured by the economic globalization subindex KOF. On the contrary, relying on the expansion of protectionistic tendencies in the external trade policy of the world countries, states with the excessively open economy will face additional risks of economic globalization, which will appear to be the most notable for the countries with weak transition economy. That will inevitably result in the weakening economic sovereignty of such countries due to the increased dependence on

more influential actors of the world policy and threaten their economic safety. That is why the elaboration of moderate and selective mechanisms to involve economically weak countries in the economic globalization processes is gaining its topicality. On the one hand, that will provide economically weak countries with the implementation of competitive advantages in the system of international labour division; on the other hand, that will prevent a national economy from the excessive influence of the world decision-making centers. That problem is possible to be solved by developing approaches to estimate national economic safety, which will take into consideration the economic globalization determinants and specify the directions for minimization of their destructive effect on national economic systems under conditions of neo-protectionism.

#### References.

1. Amburn, B. (2009). *How the Index is Calculated*. Retrieved from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/29/how-the-index-is-calculated/>.
2. *KOF Globalisation Index* (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://kof.ethz.ch/en/forecasts-and-indicators/indicators/kof-globalisation-index.html>.
3. Figge, L., & Martens, P. (2014). *Globalisation Continues: The Maastricht Globalisation Index Revisited and Updated*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2014.887389>.
4. Huh, H.-S., & Park, C.-Y. (2019). A New Index of Globalization: Measuring Impacts of Integration on Economic Growth and Income Inequality. *ADB Economics Working Paper Series*, 587. <https://doi.org/10.22617/WPS190245-2>.
5. *The CSGR Globalisation Index* (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/pais/research/researchcentres/csgr/index>.
6. Dreher, A. (n.d.). *Does globalization affect growth? Evidence from a new index of globalization* Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00036840500392078?scroll=top&needAccess=true>.
7. Potrafke, N. (2015). The Evidence on Globalization. *The World Economy*, 38(3), 509-552. <https://doi.org/10.1111/twec.12174>.
8. Gygli, S., Haelg, F., Potrafke, N., & Sturm, J.-E. (2019). The KOF Globalisation Index – Revisited. *Review of International Organizations*, 14(3), 543-574. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-019-09344-2>.
9. Tiutiunnykova, S. V., & Mykytas, V. V. (2016). Economic sovereignty in the conditions of globalization: maintenance and features of modification. *Efektivna ekonomika*, (5). Retrieved from <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=4947>.
10. Stuchynska, N. P. (2017). Level of globalization: quantitative grounds of quality transformations. *Investytsiyi: praktyka ta dosvid*, (10), 100-105.
11. Khodzhaian, A. A. (2017). Strategic partnership as a form of innerstate cooperation. *Scientific bulletin of Polissia*, 3(11), 1, 48-53. [https://doi.org/10.25140/2410-9576-2017-1-3\(11\)-48-53](https://doi.org/10.25140/2410-9576-2017-1-3(11)-48-53).
12. Human Development Reports. United Nations Development Program (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://hdr.undp.org/en>.
13. Caplan, B. (2009). Against the Human Development Index. Retrieved from [https://www.econlib.org/archives/2009/05/against\\_the\\_hum.html](https://www.econlib.org/archives/2009/05/against_the_hum.html).
14. Hou, J., Walsh, P., & Zhang, J. (2015). The dynamics of Human Development Index. *The Social Science Journal*, 52(3), 331-347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2014.07.003>.
15. World Economic Situation and Prospects 2019 (n.d.). Retrieved from [https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/WESP2019\\_BOOK\\$web.pdf](https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/WESP2019_BOOK$web.pdf).
16. International Monetary Fund (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.imf.org/external/index.htm>.
17. Demir, M. A., & Sepili, A. (2017). The Effects of Protectionist Policies on International Trade. *People: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 136-158. <https://doi.org/10.20319/pi-jss.2017.32.136158>.

18. Park, S.-C. (2018). U.S. Protectionism and Trade Imbalance between the U.S. and Northeast Asian Countries. *International Organizations Research Journal*, 13(2), 76-100. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1996-7845-2018-02-05>.
19. Kalyuzhna, N. (2019). Interstate trade conflicts as impersonation of neo-protectionism policy. *Problems of Systemic Approach in the Economy*, 1(69), Part I, 30-35. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2520-2200/2019-1-5>.
20. Seliutina, A. (2019). The modern concept of transition and financial markets: the experience of European countries. *Ekonomika ta derzhava*, (9), 103-108. <https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6806.2019.9.103>.
21. *European Bank for Reconstruction and Development* (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.ebrd.com/home>.

## Ідентифікація глобалізаційних загроз економічному суверенітету країн із транзитивною економікою

Н. Г. Калюжна<sup>1</sup>, А. О. Ходжаян<sup>2</sup>, І. Г. Барон<sup>3</sup>

1 – Київський національний торговельно-економічний університет, м. Київ, Україна, e-mail: [kaluynaya.natalya@gmail.com](mailto:kaluynaya.natalya@gmail.com)

2 – Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, м. Київ, Україна

3 – Державний науково-дослідний інститут інформатики та моделювання економіки, м. Київ, Україна

**Мета.** Ідентифікація глобалізаційних загроз економічному суверенітету країн із транзитивною економікою на підставі аналізування й систематизації закономірностей динаміки субіндексів КОФ-індексу глобалізації.

**Методика.** Методи аналізу й синтезу використані для систематизації даних щодо структури й динаміки КОФ-індексу глобалізації. Метод кореляційно-регресійного аналізу використано для оцінювання статистичної значущості зв'язку між значеннями субіндексів економічної й політичної глобалізації у складі КОФ-індексу та індикаторами економічного розвитку країн статистичної вибірки.

**Результати.** Показано, що широкі можливості для оцінювання рівня залученості країни до світогосподарських процесів створюють індексні рейтингові системи, однією з яких є КОФ-індекс глобалізації. Проаналізована динаміка та структура КОФ-індексу глобалізації de jure та de facto. Сформована статистична вибірка країн за критерієм рівня економічного розвитку та проаналізовано значення субіндексів політичної та економічної глобалізації КОФ протягом 2003–2017 рр. Показано, що для всіх груп країн статистичної вибірки підтверджується гіпотеза про відсутність прямого статистично значущого взаємозв'язку між значенням субіндексу економічної глобалізації КОФ та індикаторами їх економічного розвитку. Водночас, підтверджена пряма, переважно сильна та статистично значуща кореляція між значеннями субіндексу політичної глобалізації КОФ та індикаторами економічного розвитку, що підтверджує важливість вибору раціонального вектору зовнішньополітичної інтеграції в забезпеченні економічного розвитку країни.

**Наукова новизна.** Підтвердження гіпотези щодо відсутності прямої статистичної залежності між рівнем залучення держави до світової економіки та рівнем її економічного розвитку засвідчує трансформацію уявлення про відкритість національної економіки як передумову її успішного розвитку й навпаки, дозволяє розглядати надмірну відкритість як джерело додаткових глобалізаційних ризиків для економічного суверенітету країн зі слабкою економікою.

**Практична значимість.** Отримані результати створюють підґрунтя для вироблення підходів до оцінювання

вразливості економічного суверенітету країн, що враховуватимуть детермінанти економічної глобалізації й визначатимуть напрями мінімізації їх деструктивного впливу на національні економічні системи в умовах неопротекціонізму.

**Ключові слова:** глобалізація, економічний суверенітет, неопротекціонізм, транзитивна економіка, КОФ-індекс, індикатор економічного розвитку, зовнішньополітична інтеграція

## Идентификация глобализационных угроз экономическому суверенитету стран с транзитивной экономикой

*Н. Г. Калюжная<sup>1</sup>, А. А. Ходжаян<sup>2</sup>, И. Г. Барон<sup>3</sup>*

1 — Киевский национальный торгово-экономический университет, г. Киев, Украина, e-mail: [kalujnaya.natalya@gmail.com](mailto:kalujnaya.natalya@gmail.com)

2 — Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко, г. Киев, Украина

3 — Государственный научно-исследовательский институт информатизации и моделирования экономики, г. Киев, Украина

**Цель.** Идентификация глобализационных угроз экономическому суверенитету стран с транзитивной экономикой на основании анализа и систематизации закономерностей динамики субиндексов КОФ-индекса глобализации.

**Методика.** Методы анализа и синтеза использованы для систематизации данных о структуре и динамике КОФ-индекса глобализации. Метод корреляционно-регрессионного анализа использован для оценки статистической значимости связи между значениями субиндексов экономической и политической глобализации в составе КОФ-индекса и индикаторами экономического развития стран статистической выборки.

**Результаты.** Показано, что широкие возможности для оценки уровня вовлеченности страны в мирохозяйственные процессы создают индексные рейтинговые системы,

одной из которых является КОФ-индекс глобализации. Проанализирована динамика и структура КОФ-индекса глобализации de jure и de facto. Сформирована статистическая выборка стран по критерию уровня экономического развития и проанализировано значение субиндексов политической и экономической глобализации КОФ в течение 2003–2017 гг. Показано, что для всех групп стран статистической выборки подтверждается гипотеза об отсутствии прямой статистически значимой взаимосвязи между значением субиндекса экономической глобализации КОФ и индикаторами их экономического развития. В то же время, подтверждена прямая, преимущественно сильная и статистически значимая корреляция между значениями субиндекса политической глобализации КОФ и индикаторами экономического развития, что подтверждает важность выбора рационального вектора внешнеполитической интеграции в обеспечении экономического развития страны.

**Научная новизна.** Подтверждение гипотезы об отсутствии прямой статистической зависимости между уровнем вовлеченности государства в мировую экономику и уровнем ее экономического развития свидетельствует о трансформации представления об открытости национальной экономики как предпосылке ее успешного развития и наоборот, позволяет рассматривать чрезмерную открытость как источник дополнительных глобализационных рисков для экономического суверенитета стран со слабой экономикой.

**Практическая значимость.** Полученные результаты создают основу для разработки подходов к оценке уязвимости экономического суверенитета стран, которые будут учитывать детерминанты экономической глобализации и определять направления минимизации их деструктивного влияния на национальные экономические системы в условиях неопротекционизма.

**Ключевые слова:** глобализация, экономический суверенитет, неопротекционизм, транзитивная экономика, КОФ-индекс, индикатор экономического развития, внешнеполитическая интеграция

*Recommended for publication by A. I. Ihnatiuk, Doctor of Economic Sciences. The manuscript was submitted 30.06.20.*