



UDC 330.8:339.9

**Sergii Sardak**

D.Sc. (Economics), Professor,  
Oles Honchar Dnipropetrovsk  
National University  
72 Gagarin Ave, Dnipro, 49010, Ukraine  
[dnus@ukr.net](mailto:dnus@ukr.net)  
ORCID ID:  
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4716-3355>

**Olha Bilskaya**

PhD (Economics), Associate Professor,  
Oles Honchar Dnipropetrovsk  
National University  
72 Gagarin Ave, Dnipro, 49010, Ukraine  
[lexusol@yandex.ua](mailto:lexusol@yandex.ua)  
ORCID ID:  
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7197-9330>

**Anastasia Simakhova**

PhD (Economics), Associate Professor,  
Oles Honchar Dnipropetrovsk  
National University  
72 Gagarin Ave, Dnipro, 49010, Ukraine  
[naffann@i.ua](mailto:naffann@i.ua)  
ORCID ID:  
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7553-4531>

## Potential of economy socialisation in the context of globalisation

**Abstract.** Development of the world economy bears numerous negative phenomena, and require constant need to rebalance socioeconomic interests of nations, transnational subjects, and individuals. Socialisation is an important and effective tool for balancing social and individual; however, despite socialisation is evolving rapidly, its scientific and practical potential is not duly uncovered. In the article theoretical and methodological foundations of socialisation of economy is surveyed in the context of globalisation, and etymology, explanations, scope, historical phases of development, theoretical aspects and practical forms of use, consequences and prospects are analysed.

The term «socialisation» was determined as a multidisciplinary, used in many scientific fields, increasingly involving various areas of research and is understood as inclusion, adaptation and development of human being in society.

It was determined that the economy socialisation is implemented in different fields and semantic structures, contains a large number of methodological tools, is involved at all management levels, and is primarily identified with the increasing role of social component in the life of human resources. The assumptions were made about the future transformation of this category in line with the identified predictive trends.

**Keywords:** Socialisation; Economy; Potential; State; Globalisation

**JEL Classification:** A13; F01; H00; I38; O15

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V164-01>

**Сардак С. Е.**

доктор економічних наук, доцент, професор кафедри економіки та управління національним господарством, факультет міжнародної економіки, Дніпропетровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара, Дніпро, Україна

**Бильська О. В.**

кандидат економічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри економіки та управління національним господарством, факультет міжнародної економіки, Дніпропетровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара, Дніпро, Україна

**Сімахова А. О.**

кандидат економічних наук, доцент кафедри економіки та управління національним господарством, факультет міжнародної економіки, Дніпропетровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара, Дніпро, Україна

**Потенціал соціалізації економіки в умовах глобалізації**

**Анотація.** У статті досліджено етимологію, тлумачне значення та сферу застосування соціалізації в суспільстві. Розглянуто історичні етапи розгортання, теоретичні аспекти та практичні форми соціалізації економіки. Визначено особливості застосування інструментарію соціалізації економіки на різних управлінських рівнях. Ідентифіковано позитивні та негативні наслідки соціалізації економіки. Надано прогноз розвитку потенціалу соціалізації економіки в умовах глобалізації.

**Ключові слова:** соціалізація; економіка; потенціал; держава; глобалізація.

**Сардак С. Э.**

доктор экономических наук, доцент, профессор кафедры экономики и управления национальным хозяйством, факультет международной экономики, Днепропетровский национальный университет имени Олеся Гончара, Днепр, Украина

**Бильская О. В.**

кандидат экономических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры экономики и управления национальным хозяйством, факультет международной экономики, Днепропетровский национальный университет имени Олеся Гончара, Днепр, Украина

**Симахова А. А.**

кандидат экономических наук, доцент кафедры экономики и управления национальным хозяйством, факультет международной экономики, Днепропетровский национальный университет имени Олеся Гончара, Днепр, Украина

**Потенциал социализации экономики в условиях глобализации**

**Аннотация.** В статье исследована этимология, толковые значения и сфера применения социализации в обществе. Рассмотрены исторические этапы развития, теоретические аспекты и практические формы социализации экономики. Определены особенности применения инструментария социализации экономики на различных управленческих уровнях, а также положительные и отрицательные последствия социализации экономики. Представлен прогноз развития потенциала социализации экономики в условиях глобализации.

**Ключевые слова:** социализация; экономика; потенциал; государство; глобализация.

## 1. Introduction

Development of the world economy is accompanied by many negative phenomena: considerable inequalities in personal incomes, imbalance of opportunities of personal fulfilment, economic crisis etc. While the global trend sees states losing their status as the main subject in the world economic system, as transnational companies and regional megablocks assume greater importance, even in the XXI century sovereign nations still remain the main guarantor of reproduction of human resources and provision of standards of living for people. States perform their main functions for the welfare, protection and support of citizens, and create conditions for implementation of human right for decent living standards. However, in the context of globalisation it is more difficult to achieve the balance of interests between transnational players, countries and individuals. Besides, the modern reality is characterized by non-linearity of development, instability and inequality of various processes that occur within globalisation. In general, the presence of these controversial issues makes the study of the economy socialisation important, because it emerges as a tool for balancing the social and the individual.

## 2. Brief Literature Review

In general, the definition of socialisation of the economy is a traditional subject of scientific research throughout history. Theory of socialisation is long established, and contemporary understanding of need and acceptable forms of social support is introduced into major human rights international documents, such as «The Universal Declaration of Human rights» (1948), «International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights» (1966), «Declaration of Philadelphia» (1944), «Conclusions concerning social support» (adopted at the 89 session of the International Labour Conference, 2001), and others. Many scholars approached different aspects of the problem, generated models and socialisation effects, to name some of them like van Maanen & Schein (1979) [1], Kourilsky (1981) [2], Lee, Saks & Ashforth (1988) [3], Ashforth, Saks & Sluss (2007) [4] Witt (2002) [5], Owen (2008) [6], Filstad (2011) [7], Desta (2013) [8], Benner & Wang (2016) [9]. In Ukraine the issue of economy socialisation in the XXI century was studied by S. V. Mocherny (2000) [10], Y. K. Zaytsev (2002) [11], T. V. Semygina (2003) [12], L. M. Timoshenko (2005) [13], V. O. Gryshkin (2005) [14], N. M. Deeva (2006) [15], Z. I. Halushka (2009) [16], Y. V. Makogon (2009) [17], V. M. Heiets (2011) [18], S. E. Sardak (2012) [19], I. O. Irtysheva (2013) [20], O. V. Biliska (2013) [21], A. O. Simakhova (2013) [22], O. S. Vyshnevsky (2014) [23], and others.

Despite certain achievements in the study of socialisation, potential for further development of economy socialisation in the global context is still not explored enough. Most studies are focused on specific, narrow aspects of socialisation of individuals, certain groups of population, organisations, regions, etc. International academic tradition, unlike the Ukrainian one, use the term «socialisation» rarely while considering modern aspects of social development and social economy; the socialisation field in the global dimension is not clearly identified, and the prospects for its transformation are not well defined.

**3. Purpose of the article is** to study theoretical and methodological bases of the economy socialisation in the context of globalisation. For these purposes the following tasks were solved: to explore the essence and rationale of socialisation in society; to trace the historical stages of its development, theoretical aspects and practical forms of economy socialisation in modern society; to specify the application of economy socialisation instruments at different management levels; to identify positive and negative consequences of economy socialisation; to forecast development of economy socialisation in the context of globalisation.

## 4. Results

According to its etymology, the term «socialisation» is derived from West European terms «socialism» (French «socialisme», German «Sozialismus») and «social» (French «social», German «sozial»), which, in turn, are derivations from the Latin term «socialis» (public, social, collegial) [24, p. 363].

In modern encyclopaedias «socialisation» is interpreted widely. Socialisation is regarded as: «1) Action - to socialize and to be socialized. 2) Process of assimilation of a certain system of knowledge, norms and values by an individual, allowing it to function as a rightful society member; includes both purposeful influence on the personality (education) and natural, spontaneous processes influencing its formation.» [25, p. 1360].

The term «socialisation» is now used in a wide range of sciences - history, psychology, pedagogy, economics, sociology, political studies, government administration (studies by van Maanen & Schein (1979) [1], Owen (2008) [6], and Desta (2013) [8]), and is often used in other sciences. For example, some scholars consider socialisation in the context of human resources management and labour relations. For instance, Lee, Saks & Ashforth (1988) [3], Ashforth, Saks & Sluss (2007) [4], C. Filstad (2011) [7] explore how work affects human resource management and the process of human socialisation. Some authors significantly narrow the potential of socialisation, and synthesize interdisciplinary areas of research. For example, Wang & Benner (2016) consider cultural socialisation of teenagers from ethnic minorities [9], and Kourilsky (1981) examines the economic component of socialisation of children depending on financial income [2].

In economics, the «socialisation» category is considered by academic economists mainly for study of economy subject coping with economic opportunities to fulfil its potential adequately (living conditions, labour relations, socio-cultural life, creativity, self-expression etc.), while the wording of this term shall be delicate. For instance, S. V. Mocherny, while using this category of economic systems, notes that socialisation of economic system is a process of gradual evolutionary filling of subsystems and elements of economic system of capitalism with socialist content, formation and development of foundations of socialism [10]. V. A. Gryshkin considers socialisation as a socio-economic category, which «... is the public attitude to preparation of a person to public activities, and lifting his life to the level of civilization standards» [14, p. 61]. N. M. Deeva determines the potential of socialisation as «... the ability of a state to ensure through public institutions such level of production, distribution, redistribution and consumption of material and spiritual wealth, which would ensure reproduction of labour ability and life of society members at the level of civilization standards both depending on and irrespective of labour contribution and other factors» [15, p. 81].

Exploring these and other explanations of socialisation by scholars, the large scope and long-term historical logic of emergence of preconditions, formation of conceptual content, and transformation of this category in publications of scientists shall be noted; we systematised it in Table 1.

Summarizing the process of introduction of «socialisation» category into science, the emergence of socialisation theory and its involvement in the context of globalisation, we shall note that theoretical aspects and practical terms of economy socialisation are mainly identified with the increasing role of the social component in human resources activity, and increase in capabilities of forming and fulfilment of human potential. They are used to address various situations:

- historical transition of countries to more developed social formations, where status of citizens, their rights, living conditions and social institutions are changing (e.g., from feudalism to capitalism, from capitalism to socialism, etc.);
- global trends and challenges with respect to social development, which are developed and mutually reinforced with each other (primarily, internationalization, homogenization, integration etc.);
- process or event producing change of individual, group, or organisational shift in consciousness, conditions, behaviour of individual or society in terms of social systems (which are interconnected with natural, biological, technological, management systems);
- activities, policies, and functions by managing subjects (managers, businessmen, local and public authorities, international organisations etc.) to regulate social relations;

Tab. 1: Historical periods of economy socialisation

No.	Period	Characteristics	Scientific publications
1.	Prior to the first third of the XIX century	Conceptual formulation, paradigm formation, and historical transformation of social rights and guarantees, economy and governmental administration. Elaborating theoretical and practical preconditions to introduce scientific notions for spreading of social components in production and economic relations.	Works of theologians, philosophers, economists, politicians. Most notable authors: J. Bentham, A. Comte, C. Fourier, J. Locke, R. Owen, Ricardo, W. Petty, A. Saint-Simon, A. Smith.
2.	1834- 1848	Emergence of the term «socialism» and its use in scientific research.	Pierre Henri Leroux and J. S. Mill.
3.	Mid to late XIX century	Emergence of theoretical basis for transformation of class society and improvement of living conditions of mass population. Emergence of sociology.	O. Bismarck, E. Durkheim, F. Engels, I. Franko, H. Gossen, K. Marx, P. Proudhon, G. Tarde, M. Tugan-Baranovsky.
4.	End of XIX century	Emergence of the term «socialisation» and laying the foundations of socialisation theory.	F.H. Giddings, R. Hilferding, J. Hobson, S. Webb, B. Webb.
5.	Early XX century	Implementation of socializing measures in industries and public relations. Establishment of social policy as an object of scientific research.	E. Böhm von Bawerk, H. Fayol, C. Fourier, A. Hamilton, J. Jay, D. Locke, D. Madison, C. Menger, V. Pareto, F. Taylor, M. Weber, F. Wieser.
6.	1917-1991	Construction, transformation and destruction of socialist formation. Socialisation of capitalist formation. Growth of social component, and strengthening of social functions of states. Conceptualization of different models of social policy. Increase in numbers of studies of socialisation in different age groups and spheres of life. Development of models of socialisation for national economies.	M. Allais, K. Arrow, G. Becker, W. Beveridge, O. Bohdanov, S. Bulhakov, A. Crosland, L. Erhard, G. Esping-Andersen, J. Hayes, J. A. Hobson, J. Keynes, Y. Kronrod, K. Landauer, V. Lenin, A. Marshall, R. Mishra, M. Moiseev, G. Myrdal, T. Parsons, A. Pigou, V. Riazanov, E. Schein, J. Schumpeter, T. Schultz, R. Titmus, J. Van Maanen, V. Vernadsky, F. Williams, Y. Yaremenko, T. Zaslavskaya.
7.	Late XX century	Bridging theory of social economy with the context of globalisation. Development of theory of social protection.	L. I. Abalkin, L. Balcerowicz, J. M. Buchanan, B. Dikon, M. Friedman, J. Galbraith, F. Hayek, S. Hoffman, P. Mocherny, V. Navarro, A. Novikova, S. Onishchuk, V. Riazanov, A. Saint-Simon, V. Shcherbina.
8.	Early XXI century	Conceptualization of economy socialisation potential. Building research schools of economy socialisation in wake of ensuring of positive socioeconomic dynamics amid global transformations. Research of the global socioeconomic policy.	O. I. Amosha, V. V. Antropov, G. I. Bashnyanin, O. O. Beliaev, O. V. Biltska, N. M. Deeva, M. S. Doronina, A. Galchinsky, V. O. Gryshkin, V. M. Heiets, I. O. Irtysheva, O. F. Ivashyna, O. V. Kakhovska, A. M. Kolot, B. V. Kulchitsky, E. M. Libanova, Y. V. Makogon, T. V. Orekhova, S. E. Sardak, T. V. Semigina, S. V. Sidenko, A. O. Simakhova, O. I. Soskin, L. M. Tymoshenko, O. S. Vyshnevsky, Y. K. Zaytsev.

Source: Compiled by the authors based on [10-12; 14; 23; 26]

- actions, thoughts, communications of individuals for self-development and rational adaptation to the environment (housing, environment, labour relations, law, society, etc.);
- measure of values of socialisation, integrity, solidarity, justice, respect, protection, etc.;
- direction of research, theory, academic discipline to determine theoretical and methodological foundations of economy socialisation.

The role of social component in the human living conditions, and enhancement of capabilities to fulfil human potential is increasing in every economy sector (production, exchange, distribution and consumption) through different means: patterns, hypotheses, laws, functions, methods, principles, measures, mechanisms, institutions, standards, guarantees, legal framework, etc. Amid globalisation the economy socialisation is spread across all five management levels of socioeconomic systems (individual level, micro-, meso-, and macro-level, global level) [19]. Multilevel actualisation of socialisation potential is particularly visible in the following sectors:

- individual level (individual, family, individual group environment): increase of personal potential, human socialisation, socially responsible behaviour, self-employment, self-development, self-government, privatization of natural resources, socialisation of youth, gender socialisation, socialisation of orphans, parenting, socialisation of disabled persons and orphans;
- micro-level (nanoenvironment, submicroenvironment, organisation environment, environment of direct exposure of organisation): satisfaction of social needs at the workplace, improved working conditions, environmental policies, relations with labour unions, corporate motivation programs, social responsibility and support, tools socialisation, labour relations socialisation, ownership socialisation, formation of social corporate standards;
- meso-level (mesoenvironment - industries, markets, regions): community control of resources and power, social priorities, information policy of local governments, formation of associative structures and unions, socialisation of markets, socialisation of local budgets, socialisation of regions and territories;
- macro-level (macroenvironment - national economy): socialisation of processes of production, distribution and consumption

of wealth, social state programs, state regulation of social relations, state social standards and guarantees, support of education and science;

- global level (subcontinental environment, continental environment, megaenvironment, metaenvironment, cosmoenvironment): international organisations social support, economic assistance from international organisations and global foundations, international treaties, conventions, declarations, minimum standards etc.

In the era of globalisation the most important events linked to the unlocking of the socialisation potential in the economy is ongoing at the macro environment. Socialisation process is following and depend on quantitative and qualitative indexes of the development of human capital of states, as they remain the key institutions to provide living conditions and reproduction for their citizens. For example, if the population size is taken as the main quantitative indicator [27], and the human development conditions are taken as a qualitative indicator [28], we can provide reasonable set of groupings for countries and territories [29] (see Table 2).

By using this approach, we could carry out an adequate comparison of the socioeconomic environment in the countries and its relation to the state of human development. Such systematisation is a key to use of the international experience while approaching regional and national issues, to determine the directions of strategic development, to introduce universal solutions for the socialisation of human resources in any given national economy, and to find optimal forms of international cooperation and integration.

But it shall be noted that under globalisation implementation of the economy socialisation bears positive and negative consequences [20; 14]. The positive consequences of economy socialisation are: improving of lives of people in socialized (economically developed) countries, innovation of economic sphere and social sector of national economies, improvement of public health, reduction of mortality, healthy lifestyle promotion, increase of education level, opportunities for self-development and fulfilment of human potential. The negative outcomes of economy socialisation are: leveling of diversity of human characters, deprivation of dynamism and demands of human efforts and desires,



Tab. 2: Grouping of countries and territories on the basis of the qualitative and quantitative indices of human resources in 2015

Grouping of countries by Human Development Index	Grouping of countries by population						
	Group I Huge (more than 1 billion)	Group II Very large (100 mln - 1 billion )	Group III Large (50-100 mln)	Group IV Medium (20-50 mln)	Group V Small (10-20 mln)	Group VI Very small (1-10 mln)	Group VII Tiny (less than 1 mln)
Group I Countries with very high level of human development (HDI from 0.944 to 0/802)	-	USA, Japan	Germany, France, United Kingdom, Italy, Republic of Korea	Spain, Argentina, Poland, Canada, Saudi Arabia, Australia	Chile, Netherlands, Greece, Belgium, Portugal, Czech Republic	Hungary, Sweden, Austria, United Arab Emirates, Switzerland, Israel, Qatar, Hong Kong, Denmark, Slovakia, Finland, Norway, Singapore, Ireland, New Zealand, Croatia, Kuwait, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovenia, Estonia, Bahrain, Cyprus	Montenegro, Luxembourg, Brunei, Malta, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Andorra
Group II Countries with high level of human development (HDI from 0.798 to 0.702)	China	Brazil, Russian Federatio, Mexico	Iran, Turkey, Thailand	Colombia, Ukraine, Algeria, Venezuela, Peru, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Romania	Kazakhstan, Ecuador, Cuba, Tunisia, Dominican Republic	Serbia, Belarus, Azerbaijan, Jordan, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Georgia, Lebanon, Panama, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Uruguay, Albania, Armenia, Jamaica, Mongolia, Oman, Macedonia, Mauritius Libya, Trinidad and Tobago,	Fiji, Bahamas, Belize, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Barbados, Tonga, Grenada, Maldives, Antigua and Barbuda, Suriname, Samoa, Seychelles, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, Palau
Group III Countries with medium level of human development (HDI from 0.698 to 0.555)	India	Indonesia, Bangladesh, Philippines	Vietnam, Egypt, South Africa	Iraq, Morocco, Uzbekistan, Ghana, Syrian Arab Republic	Guatemala, Cambodia, Zambia, Bolivia	Honduras, Tajikistan, Paraguay, Laos, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Botswana, State of Palestine, Congo, Moldova, Namibia, Gabon, Timor-Leste	Guyana, Bhutan, Equatorial Guinea, Cabo Verde, Vanuatu, Micronesia, Kiribati, Sao Tome and Principe
Group IV Countries with low level of human development (HDI from 0.548 to 0.348)	-	Pakistan, Nigeria	Ethiopia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Myanmar, Tanzania	Sudan, Kenya, Uganda, Afghanistan, Nepal, Yemen, Mozambique, Madagascar, Côte d'Ivoire, Cameroon	Angola, Burkina Faso, Niger, Mali, Malawi, Senegal, Zimbabwe, Chad, South Sudan, Benin, Rwanda, Burundi, Guinea, Haiti,	Papua New Guinea, Togo, Sierra Leone, Eritrea, Central African Republic, Liberia, Mauritania, Lesotho, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Swaziland	Djibouti, Comoros, Solomon Islands
Group V Unaccounted countries and territories (HDI not identified)	-	-	-	North Korea	Somalia	Puerto Rico	Reunion (ter. France), Macau, Western Sahara, Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Polynesia, New Caledonia, French Guiana, Mayotte, Netherlands Antilles, Guam (ter. USA), Bermuda, Channel Islands, the Virgin Islands, Aruba, Isle of Man, American Samoa, Northern Mariana Cayman Islands, Islands, Greenland, Marshall Islands, Faroe Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands, Monaco, San Marino, Gibraltar, British Virgin Islands, Cook Islands, Anguilla, Wallis and Futuna, Nauru, Montserrat, Saint Pierre and Mi Elon, Tuvalu, Saint Helena, Tokelau, Niue, the Falkland Islands, Holy See

Source: Formed by the authors based on [27-28]

diffusion of externalities from immigration processes to socially oriented countries, disapproval by population of changes in the social security, aging of population in socialized countries, etc.

Considering the logic of development of economy socialisation under globalisation, we identified five predictive trends.

*First*, globalisation limits the development of economy socialisation due to polarisation of society and concentration of capital, and energize socialisation by equalising incomes and standards of living of population in all countries and territories, due to complexity and enhancement of social character of production and information of society.

*Second*, measures for economy socialisation taken in the countries are directly proportional to the state of development of economic environment and will be less dependent on sociocultural, political, legal, religious, natural and other factors.

*Third*, due to the human factor the economy socialisation potential identified in theoretical developments of scientists and slogans of international organisations (provision with economic opportunity of productive life for all people, providing equitable access to resources and creation of conditions of

decent life) will not be implemented fully even in the long term and will require further development of adaptive forms of implementation.

*Fourth*, key factor which will for a long time slow the development of economy socialisation is the lack of scientifically based and socially acceptable mechanisms for finding a rational correlation between expenses for needs of citizens and responsible for disability of human resources.

*Fifth*, the scope of scientific, methodological and practical developments in the field of socialisation will be enhanced in sociohumanistic and natural sciences, and will be formed as a separate branch of knowledge or science over time.

**5. Conclusions**

Based on study of etymology, explanations and scope of «socialisation» in society we claim that this category has gained its conceptual content as inclusion, adaptation and development of human being into society. Considering the historical stages of development, theoretical aspects and practical forms of «economy socialisation», this term lacks single definition; it is used in various fields and semantic structures, contains a large number of methodological tools, is implemented at all management levels, and

is mainly identified with the forms and terms of provision of economy subjects with economic opportunities to fulfil their potential adequately. Considering actual examples of fulfilment of «economy socialisation potential», and the fact of existence of positive and negative consequences, we can

make assumptions about further transformation of this category in line with global trends. Therefore, a promising direction for further research in this area is the formalization of mechanisms for implementation of positivist socializing measures considering the global context.

## References

1. Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in organizational behaviour*, 1, 209-264. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.475.8533>
2. Kourilsky, M. (1981). Economic socialization of Children: Attitude toward the distribution of rewards. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 115(1), 45-57. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1981.9711986>
3. Ashforth, B. E., Saks, A. M., & Lee, R. T. (1988). Socialization and newcomer adjustment: the role of organizational context. *Human Relations*, 51(7), 897-926. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679805100703>
4. Ashforth, B. E., Sluss, D. M., & Saks, A. M. (2007). Socialization tactics, proactive behaviour, and newcomer learning: Integrating socialization models. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(3), 447-462. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.02.001>
5. Witt, U. (2002). Germany's «Social Market Economy». Between Social Ethos and Rent Seeking. *The Independent Review*, 6(3), 365-375. Retrieved from [http://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir\\_06\\_3\\_witt.pdf](http://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir_06_3_witt.pdf)
6. Owen, D. (2008). *Political Socialization in the Twenty-first Century: Recommendations for Researchers*. Retrieved from [http://www.civiced.org/pdfs/GermanAmericanConf2009/DianaOwen\\_2009.pdf](http://www.civiced.org/pdfs/GermanAmericanConf2009/DianaOwen_2009.pdf)
7. Filstad, C. (2011). Organizational commitment through organizational socialization tactics. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 23(6), 376-390. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/13665621111154395>
8. Desta, A. (2013). Political Socialization in the Era of Globalisation in Ethiopian Schools. *European Journal of Academic Research*, 4(1), 201-212.
9. Wang, Y., & Benner, A. D. (2016). Cultural socialization across contexts: family-peer congruence and adolescent well-being. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(3), 594-611. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0426-1>
10. Mocherny, S. (2000). *Socialization of economic systems*. Kyiv: Publishing Centre Academy (in Ukr.).
11. Zaytsev, Y. K. (2002). *Socialization of Ukrainian economy and systematic transformation of society: methodology and practice*. Kyiv: KNEU (in Ukr.).
12. Semiygina, T. (2003). *Social policy in a global dimension*. Kyiv: Pulsary (in Ukr.).
13. Tymoshenko, L. M. (Ed.) (2005). *Investments and investment in the socialization of the economy of Ukraine: theory, methodology, perspective*. Dnipropetrovsk: Porohy (in Ukr.).
14. Gryshkin, V. O. (2005). *Socialisation of economy of Ukraine: theory, methodology, prospects*. Dnipropetrovsk: Porohy (in Ukr.).
15. Deeva, N. M. (2006). *Potential of Socialization and its Regulation in the Economy: Theory, Methodology, Prospects*. Dnipropetrovsk: ART-PRES (in Ukr.).
16. Halushka, Z. I. (2009). *Socialisation of transformation economy: characteristics, problems and priorities*. Chernivtsi: Chernivtsi national university (in Ukr.).
17. Makogon, Y., Orekhova, T., Khadzhynov, I., & Koshelenko, V. (2009). Globalisation and socialisation of economic development: experience for Ukraine. *International Conference «Economics and Management-2009». Collection of the scientific works*, 307-314 (in Ukr.).
18. Heiets, V. M. (2011). The institutions of socialization in Ukraine and the EU: trends and key differences. *Ukrainskyi sotsium (Ukrainian Society)*, 2, 7-34 (in Ukr.).
19. Sardak, S. E. (2012). *Management-regulation aspects of human resources development in globalisation context*. Dnipropetrovsk: DNU (in Ukr.).
20. Irtysheva, I., Stroyko, T., & Krupitsa, I. (2013). Formation of institutional changes management system under the conditions of socialization of national economy. *Visnyk Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho ahrarnoho universytetu. Ekonomichni nauky (Herald of Kharkov National Agrarian University. Economics)*, 6, 3-9.
21. Bilskaya, O. V. (2013). Innovative imperatives of socialisation of the economy. *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats Khmelnytskoho kooperatyvnoho torhovelno-ekonomichnoho institutu (Collection of the Research Papers of Khmelnytsky Cooperative Trade and Economic Institute)*, 6, 34-42 (in Ukr.).
22. Simakhova, A. O. (2013). Perspectives of strengthening of the influence of the innovation and investment sphere on the social and economic dynamics of Ukraine. *Ekonomika. Finansy. Pravo (Economy. Finances. Law)*, 3, 21-22 (in Ukr.).
23. Vyshnevskyy, O. S. (2014). The social orientation of the production: the role of Ukraine in the process of socialization of the economy and the direction of structural changes. *Ekonomika promyslovosti (Economy of Industry)*, 2, 68-77 (in Russ.).
24. Melnychuk, O. S. (Ed.) (2006). *Dictionary of Ukrainian language*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukr.).
25. Busel, V. T. (Ed.) (2007). *Large dictionary of modern Ukrainian language*. Kyiv: VTF Perun (in Ukr.).
26. Soskin, O. I. (2012). Model of national capitalism: sustainability and adaptability to any challenges (Austrian case). *Aktualni problemy ekonomiki (Actual Problems of Economics)*, 132(6), 16-29 (in Ukr.).
27. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2015). *World Population Prospects. Total Population - Both Sexes*. Retrieved from <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/Download/Standard/Population>
28. United Nations Development Programme (2016). *Human Development Report 2015*. Durham: PBM Graphics. Retrieved from [http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr15\\_standalone\\_overview\\_ru.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr15_standalone_overview_ru.pdf)
29. Sardak, S. E. (2012). The grouping of countries by qualitative and quantitative indicators of human resource development as the basis for global economic cooperation. *Aktualni problemy mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn (Current Issues of International Relations)*, 111(II), 101-111 (in Ukr.).
30. Francis, J. E., & Davis, T. (2014). Exploring children's socialization to three dimensions of sustainability. *Young Consumers*, 15(2), 125-137. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-06-2013-00373>
31. Scherpereel, J. A., & Zierler, M. C. (2011). Barriers to socialization: Turkey and regional international organizations. *Journal of European Integration*, 33(1), 19-36. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2010.526710>
32. Lee, H.-W. (2013). Locus of control, socialization, and organizational identification. *Management Decision*, 51(5), 1047-1055. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-11-2012-0814>

Received 24.10.2016  
Revised 20.04.2017

## ORCID and Scopus author profiles

Elsevier's Scopus is the world's largest abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed literature and it features smart tools to track, analyze and visualize research.

When you've published an article in any peer-reviewed journal, you automatically have a Scopus profile.

It is a good idea to check and update your profile containing the right publications.

ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID) seeks to remedy the systemic name ambiguity problems seen in scholarly research by assigning unique identifiers linkable to an individual's research output.

You can now update both your Scopus and your ORCID at [orcid.scopusfeedback.com](http://orcid.scopusfeedback.com).

Please follow the easy steps online.

by Elsevier