

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.34069/AI/2020.27.03.62>

Social responsibility in the context of global challenges: the case of Ukraine

Соціальна відповідальність у контексті глобальних викликів: випадок України

Received: January 5, 2020

Accepted: February 20, 2020

Written by:

Irina Kresina²¹⁹

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0771-9707

Natalia Shust²²⁰

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8491-160X

Hultai Mykhailo²²¹

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3521-8531

Spivak Maryna²²²

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9471-7154

Durnov Yevhen²²³

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4249-9829

Abstract

Description. The purpose of the article is to study social responsibility in the context of global challenges on the example of Ukraine. Methodology. The research methods are chosen based on the object, subject and purpose of the research. The study used general scientific and special methods of scientific knowledge. In particular, dialectical method reveals the essence and content of social responsibility. Comparative and legal method was used in the analysis of scientific categories, definitions and approaches. The method of systematic analysis was used to comprehensively summarize the features of social responsibility of a State, society and an individual. Using the normative-dogmatic method, the content of normative-legal acts, regulating the issue under consideration and scientific works of domestic and foreign scientists was analyzed. The legal modeling method was used to develop proposals for improving the regulatory framework governing the issue under consideration. As a result of the research it has been found that a new characteristic of social responsibility is its globalization, when the latter becomes planetary

Анотація

Опис. Метою статті є дослідження соціальної відповідальності у контексті глобальних викликів на прикладі України. Методологія. Методи дослідження обрані, виходячи з об'єкта, предмета та мети дослідження. У дослідженні використовувалися загальнонаукові та спеціальні методи наукового пізнання. Зокрема, діалектичний метод розкриває суть та зміст соціальної відповідальності. Порівняльно-правовий застосовувався при аналізі наукових категорій, визначень та підходів. Метод системного аналізу використовувався для комплексного узагальнення особливостей соціальної відповідальності держави, суспільства та особи. За допомогою нормативно-догматичного методу було проаналізовано зміст нормативно-правових актів та наукових праць вітчизняних та зарубіжних вчених. Метод правового моделювання був використаний для розробки пропозицій щодо вдосконалення нормативної бази, яка регулює проблему, що розглядається. У результаті проведеного дослідження встановлено, що новою характеристикою соціальної

²¹⁹ Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine, Honored Scientist and Engineer of Ukraine, Head of the Department of Legal Problems of Political Science of the V.M. Koresky Institute state and law of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine

²²⁰ Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Department of Civil Law and the Procedure of the National Aviation University, Ukraine

²²¹ Doctor of Law, Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of Constitutional Law and Human Rights of the National Academy of Internal Affairs, Ukraine

²²² Doctor of Political Science, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Public Administration and Administration of the National Academy of Internal Affairs, Ukraine

²²³ Doctor of Law, Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of the History of State and Law of the National Academy of Internal Affairs, Ukraine

in scope and requires joint consolidated action by the international community. The authors of the article have proved that the deficit of responsibility, which causes a number of serious social negative consequences, which, in turn, lead to deepening of the total crisis. Practical implementation. It is stated that the current economic theory is already considered to be archaic and far from being the best indicator for assessing the efficiency of the government and the success of the economy. It is proved that in order to determine people's quality of life, it is better to use the International Happy Planet Index, which more accurately characterizes social aspects of quality of life and social orientation of economic growth. Value / Originality. It is concluded that the formation of responsible society in Ukraine is possible only if there will be the availability of social responsibility of all subjects of social interaction. In this context, social responsibility of the State is of particular importance as a prerequisite for ensuring sustainable development based on the reconciliation of the interests of the state, the individual, society and business.

Keywords: social responsibility, global challenges, Ukraine, International Happy Planet Index, GDP, Global Agenda for the 21st Century.

Introduction

The growing uneven global development, the insecurity of the liberal world order of general equality and prosperity, climate changes, which can make the Earth unsuitable for humanity, uncontrolled technical processes, which threaten to undermine traditional structure of society should be attributed to the new realities, which require deep and collective reflection. Contradictions of the modern stage of international development, radical changes in behavior of the actors of international relations, violation of the principles and tangible destruction of collective security systems, increased nuclear danger, the large-scale challenge to the terrorism, recurrence of the Cold War force thinking, the revival of imperial ambitions, and, as a result – growth of conflict potential humanity and the global threats to international order, which are of immediate concern to humanity, international security organizations, national governments, non-governmental organizations.

відповідальності є її глобалізація, коли остання набуває планетарного масштабу і потребує спільних консолідованих дій міжнародної спільноти. Авторами статті доведено, що досить гостро дефіцит відповідальності, що спричиняє низку серйозних соціальних негативних наслідків, які, у свою чергу, призводять до поглиблення тотальної кризи. Практичне застосування. Констатовано, що сучасній економічній теорії показник ВВП уже вважається архаїчним і далеко не найкращим для оцінки ефективності влади та успішності економіки, особливо її соціальної та екологічної спрямованості. Доведено, що для визначення рівня якості життя людей краще послуговуватися Міжнародним індексом щастя (Happy Planet Index), який більш достовірно характеризує соціальні аспекти якості життя та соціальну спрямованість зростання економіки. Оригінальність. Зроблено висновок про те, що формування відповідального суспільства в Україні можливе лише за умов сформованості соціальної відповідальності усіх суб'єктів соціальної взаємодії. У цьому контексті особливої значущості набуває соціальна відповідальність держави як необхідна умова забезпечення сталого розвитку, що ґрунтується на узгодженні інтересів держави, людини, суспільства та бізнесу.

Ключові слова: соціальна відповідальність, глобальні виклики, Україна, Міжнародний індекс щастя, ВВП, Порядок денний на 21 століття.

Obviously, the problems identified are not only international (global) by their nature, but also take national forms, which are inextricably linked. The solution to these problems lies in the use of the experience of international unification processes, the global dissemination of the principles of democracy, the improvement of the rules of economic cooperation, the integrated awareness of responsibility by global community for the social, humanitarian and environmental security of the planet, both for the benefit of humanity as a whole and for the purpose of self-preservation and the progressive development of each nation.

The key trends and abovementioned global factors have direct and obvious impact on those processes that are taking place in Ukraine. For almost 30 years of its independent history, Ukraine continues to search for the optimal model of development, the ways of integration

on an equal basis to the world civilization processes. Unfortunately, inclusive political and economic development institutes have not yet been created in the country, its growth and investment indicators are lower than the world average, the demographic crisis continues. The State has real problems with governance, debt, social security and territorial integrity. The representatives of the Ukrainian authorities only declare the fight against corruption and currency liberalization. According to international experts and analysts, there has been a “state capture” in Ukraine – the privatization of political functions by business to such an extent that completely kills hopes for social progress.

Literature Review

A number of domestic and foreign scientists devoted their scientific works to theoretical and practical issues of social responsibility an individual, society and a State. Thus, EU Strategic Advisor, Professor Kristin Forrester, who is the head of the project on support of regional development under the name “Citizens and the State: development of partnership” and “Promotion of social enterprise”, which is carried out in Donetsk and Lugansk regions states that “the authorities and the public do not cooperate properly; there is also no close contact between ordinary Ukrainians and non-governmental organizations” (Kostiuk, 2011).

O. O. Okhrimenko and T. V. Ivanova stress, that social responsibility is of dichotomous nature, which means not only conscientious, responsible attitude of the subjects of social relations to their socially significant behavior, but also the responsibility of the State to society and individual. Therefore, the social responsibility of public entities relations and a State should be reciprocal (Okhrimenko & Ivanova, 2015).

Prof. O. A. Hrishnova (2011) argues that the formation and realization of social responsibility of all subjects of the State is a prerequisite for the development of both a social State and a developed economy and a high quality of life. Social responsibility is the awareness of the subjects of social State of the unity of social space, the conscious fulfillment of their duties.

V. I. Vartsaba (2014) pays attention to the fact that the theories and concepts of “social responsibility” in Ukraine today are studied, adapted and improved mainly in the context and from the standpoint of “corporate social responsibility”, “social responsibility of enterprises”, “corporate social responsibility”, etc. Undoubtedly, it is also a topical and

important aspect of forming a socially oriented market economy in our country.

Nevertheless, the disclosure of the social nature, the laws, the properties of such an important resource as responsibility, remains an urgent task of modern science.

Materials and Methods

Research methods are chosen based on the object, subject, and purpose of the study. The study used general scientific and special methods of legal science. In particular, dialectical method reveals the essence of social responsibility. Comparative legal was applied in the analysis of scientific categories, definitions and approaches. The method of system analysis was used for the complex generalization of peculiarities of social responsibility of a State, society and an individual. With the help of the normative-dogmatic method, the content of normative legal acts and scientific works of domestic and foreign scientists were analyzed. The legal modeling method was used to develop proposals for improving the normative framework, which regulates the problem under consideration.

Results and Discussion

The results of various sociological surveys show that the lion’s share of citizens believes that the development of the State is going the wrong way (78%). This disappointing indicator shows the disorientation of society, the inability of the political class and big business to formulate strategic goals, to communicate frankly and honestly with society.

Global challenges and their national manifestations complicate the lives of people in the modern world, impede the prospects for humanity, thus significantly updating the issue of social actors’ responsibility at all socio-structural levels. Max Weber (2012) defined responsibility, both individual and solidarity, as one of the important prerequisites for orderly activity in society, and irresponsibility as one of the varieties of mortal sin. It is noticeable, that the scientific work of Max Weber, which deals with the importance of responsibility / irresponsibility, received the highest rating in the ranking list of the “Book of the Twentieth Century” of the World Sociological Association among the 100 known books in the area of sociology (International Sociological Association, 2015).

All this demonstrates the fundamental importance of the concept of responsibility in

science and its exclusivity as a social phenomenon in the life of society, the state and every person.

In the late 20th – early 21st centuries, the ideas of responsibility were spread in Germany, with the establishment of Hans Jonas Center (Berlin), which was aimed “to facilitate the ability to take responsibility for the future, to foster accountability for the future and to take responsibility for the future public decisions” (Yonas, 2001). It was Hans Jonas who formulated the statement of responsibility as a basic principle that ensures the survival of all living beings in the conditions of technological reality. It should be emphasized that significant changes have taken place in the actions and awareness of the world community since the publication in 1979 of the scientific work “Principle of responsibility. In the search for ethics for technological civilization” (Das Prinzip Verantwortung. Versuch einer Ethik für die Technologische Zivilisation). The categorical imperative formulated by Hans Jonas is “humanity should exist” became a fundamental principle for the further development of all spheres of social reality (Yonas, 2001).

An important feature of modern discourse of responsibility is the propagation of the imperative of Hans Jonas: “You should act so that the consequences of your activity are not destructive for the future life on the Earth”. It is in this direction that the transformation of the responsibility of the society, detailed in the scientific work of the scientist, should be carried out:

- the problem of responsibility acquires a global scale, applies to all mankind;
- there is the “greening” social responsibility: the main focus is on responsibility for climate changes. According to the scientist, earlier the impact of people on surrounding objects had no ethical significance;
- updating responsibility for the future. In a traditional society, the results of the struggle between good and evil were considered in the short term perspective, their long-term perspective was not anticipated. In today’s context, the restricted control over the circumstances that arise from increased technogenic threats casts doubt on the possibility of effective actions that are actualized by responsibility. Conscious impotence is a tragedy of modern responsibility. Because of this, there is a disregard for responsibility (which is

poorly understood, rather unconscious by the average person) before the future (future of the children, the countries) (Yermolenko, 2007).

Thanks to the work of the prominent representatives of contemporary German philosophy Dietrich Böhler and Klaus Michael Mayer-Abich, the ideas of responsibility have become the basis for common social responsibility - law, politics, economics, ecology, pedagogic, medicine, etc. D. Böhler (2007) initiated a number of projects aimed at practical implementation of the principles of responsibility in various spheres of social life. K. M. Maier-Abikh (2004) focused his attention on the need to create the conditions for open public discourse on environmental policy issues and informed decision-making in a democratic society.

The problem of social responsibility is an object of increasing attention of domestic experts in various fields of modern social science, who considered this phenomenon in different contexts – the state of the economic sphere of society, legal and cultural responsibility, the manifestation of this phenomenon in ethics, politics, at the social level, etc. As a result, considerable experience in conceptualization, theoretical comprehension and empirical analysis of the peculiarities of responsibility formation in modern Ukrainian society has been gained. In this regard, it is worth noting the scientific achievements of some sociologists in this area – M. Shulga, O. Zlobina, O. Bezrukova and others. Given the unprecedented dynamics of social processes, the experience accumulated on the phenomenon of responsibility are often underutilized, and to some extent even outdated. This fact continues to be relevant to some scientific issues. The Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine is carrying out the research work “Forming a Responsible Society: State, Political Movements, Business” for its further development (Bevzenko, L. et al., 2019).

A relatively new feature of this phenomenon is the globalization of responsibility, i. e. when the latter takes on a planetary scale and requires joint consolidated actions by the international community. It is not about extending the discourse of responsibility beyond the borders of some individual countries, but about active responsibility, that is, real actions that testify to responsibility for the present and future of the planet.

The awareness of international community of this fact has become especially evident in the face of the widespread financial crisis of 2008 – 2009, which has spared no countries with the most developed economies. Even then, the incapacity of traditional political and socio-economic models (liberal politics and liberal economics) became a reality: people felt that politicians and big business left them alone with inequality, unemployment and other social risks. The issue of equality / inequality is becoming one of the most significant, including for countries with market economies. Its depth is evidenced by the data obtained in the course of Pew Research Center survey in the US and the EU in 2014: it was inequality identified by respondents as “the greatest threat to the world”. Social inequality became a key topic at the World Congress of the International Sociological Association “In the Face of Inequality” in 2014 in Yokohama. The issue was also considered on the annual conference “The Great Transformations: Political Science and the Major Issues of Our Time” of the American Political Science Association, held in 2016 in Philadelphia (Atkison, 2015).

The logical consequence of social inequality is unemployment, which was named the greatest problem by 39% of EU respondents according to Eurobarometer (Eurobarometer, 2017). The majority of those who consider unemployment to be a greatest problem are the residents of Cyprus (66%), Greece (64%) and Italy (62%). 36% of respondents named inequality and irresponsibility among the main problems of the EU (Portugal – 54%, Germany – 50%, Lithuania and Latvia – 47% (European Commission Survey, 2018). At the same time, most EU citizens continue to regard equality, social security, responsibility, the spirit of co-operation and solidarity as the main values, considering them as a “valuable legacy of the 20th century” (Ferrera, 2005).

In the context of growing conflicts between two ideas presented by the modernization of Europe – capitalism, which fosters inequality, and democracy, which fights for equality, new broad public debate on economic inequality in developed societies, on the essence of laws that can widen the gap between rich and poor, the radical methods of stopping this “infinite spiral” were started by a renowned French economist, professor at the Higher School of Social Sciences and the Paris School of Economics. His book *The Capital in the 21st Century*, 2013, was named the Book of the Year by according to Financial Times (2014), the bestseller according to the New York Times, which has already surpassed

the barrier of more than two million worldwide sales in 2015. The scientist insists on the need to deter capitalism by introducing a progressive capital tax, which will preserve competition in the economy, reduce income inequality and increase government accountability (Piketti, 2016).

The results of interviews with political leaders, corporate and union leaders of the US and Europe conducted by the Roland Berger Foundation and the Stanford Business Research Center are important for understanding the causes of rising inequality, its impact on the world order, as well as the role of responsibility of big business and government for these causes. All respondents agreed with the thesis that inequality belongs to the “natural social order of things”. However, the main concern is the fact that the enrichment of the minority generates too little rewards for the majority (Berger et al., 2010). The respondents believe the polarity in remuneration was the result of autonomy of responsibility, lack of ethics of enrichment. Therefore, the authors of the survey advise to adhere to five principles for the purpose of assertion of shared responsibility: to ensure equality of opportunity; improve social mobility; promote ethical behavior; review the practice of rewarding senior officials; balanced tax policy (Berger et al., 2010).

The World Economic Forum in Davos (January 2020), attended by more than 3,000 representatives from 117 countries, including 53 heads of States and government, over 1.6 thousand businessmen and more than 120 delegates, testified to the global level of responsibility for addressing global humanity problems from public organizations. According to WEF founder Klaus Schwab, Davos 2020’s main trend is the responsibility of business for the active contribution to the creation of more holistic and sustainable world. The Forum’s decisions, as Davos Manifesto 2020, disclose the idea of stakeholder capitalism in solving the problems of reality, including fair taxation, zero tolerance for corruption, decent pay, and respect for human rights. For the first time in the half-century of history of Davos Forum, five environmental risks were mentioned among the world’s greatest risks (climate disasters, biodiversity loss, destruction of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems). In general, the participants of the Forum outlined six key priorities for the development of the world: economy (eliminating the long-term debt burden), technology (how to avoid a global “technological war”), society (how to teach a billion people new professions and to enable them to generate their own

incomes), geopolitics (de-escalation of conflicts), industry (creating models under Industrial Revolution) and ecology (climate change risks) (Dubrovyyk-Rokhova, 2020).

The deficit of responsibility, which causes a number of serious social negative consequences, which, in their turn, lead to deepening of the total crisis, is felt in Ukrainian society. The representatives of the scientific community, expert community, non-governmental organizations, international monitoring services have repeatedly stressed this point. It is necessary to mention just a few indicators which convincingly prove this crisis state.

The experts discuss the ambitious plans of the new government of Ukraine to increase GDP by 40% over the next five years (2020 – 2024). After a record GDP growth under President L. Kuchma, such successes have not been observed for 15 years.

At present, the potential of the two factors that at the time ensured the success, i. e. the mobilization of existing production capacities and the implementation of effective economic reforms, has been largely exhausted. The growth points declared by the current government (the legalization of gambling; mass privatization; the opening of the land market; preferential mortgage lending; the IT sector and foreign investment) are weakly correlated with GDP volumes and dynamics. These growth points are mostly virtual and unable to provide such a forecast. For example, Ukraine is in the third group of the second tier of the least attractive countries to foreign investment. Ukraine's share in world investment is declining every year and in 2017 it was already less than 0.1 (Haidutskyi, 2019).

The fact that Ukraine has many problems with the socially equitable distribution of GDP among citizens is also principally important. Thus, according to Tom Pickett, the wages of the 50% of the poorest of overall lifehood structure were: in the Scandinavian countries – 35%, in the EU – 30%, in the US – 25%, and in Ukraine – only 15%. Instead, the wages of 10% of the richest in the Scandinavian countries were – 20%, in the EU – 25%, in the US – 35%, and in Ukraine – up to 39%. The indicators of social and property inequality have not improved in Ukraine since 2007. Besides, the authorities deliberately liberalized the income of certain high-paying categories in 2014 – 2019 (Haidutskyi, 2019).

It should be noted that in modern economic theory the GDP indicator is already considered

archaic and far from being the best for assessing the efficiency of government and the success of the economy, especially its social and environmental orientation, in modern economic theory. In 2006, the New Economics Foundation proposed to use the International Happy Planet Index, based on a 10-point representative survey, and including six indicators (income level; life expectancy; level of social support; personal freedom; attitudes toward corruption; goodwill and generosity). One can discuss the extent to which the index truly reflects the sense of happiness, but it is obvious that it more accurately describes the social aspects of quality of life and the social orientation of economic growth than that of GDP.

In accordance with a resolution of the UN General Assembly (2011), the Happy Planet Index was proposed to be used by the Member States to develop national effective policies. The meeting of the high-level group with the agenda “Happiness and well-being: defining a new economic paradigm” was held at the UN in 2012. It is symbolic that the meeting was chaired by the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Bhutan, the first and so far the only country in the world, which officially adopted the Happy National Index instead of GDP. The main text for the meeting was the First World Happiness Report. Since then, the annual format of such UN-sponsored meetings has become traditional (Cherevatskyi, 2019). It is quite disturbing in this context that this Index has steadily worsened in Ukraine over the last 20 years: the country came down to 133rd place in 2015 – 2018 from the 91st in 2000 – 2004 among 156 represented countries (Haidutskyi, 2019).

The key factor is the environmental factor when calculating the Happy Planet Index. It is paradoxical, but the countries with the highest quality of life leave the deepest ecological footprint. According to the Global Footprint Network, Qatar, is a leader in adverse environmental impact; at the same time it has ranked first in DALY – disability-adjusted life expectancy (15,000 lost years per 100,000 inhabitants of the country). Opposing to Qatar is the Central African Republic – 91,000 years per 100,000 inhabitants, Ukraine – almost 46 thousand, Russia – 45 thousand, Poland – slightly less than 34 thousand years, while according to Environmental Impact Assessment our country ranks 87 among 187 countries (Cherevatskyi, 2019).

Obvious demographic crisis, the shortage of labor (18% of the working population work abroad), significant debt obligations, growing

overall wage arrears, low purchasing power of the population, etc. should be added to these critically disappointing socio-economic indicators of the national development of Ukraine. All these social, economic, environmental problems are testimony to the crisis of responsibility and the consequence of the irresponsibility of different actors – citizens, politicians, state and public figures, civil servants, business owners and so on.

At the same time, the formation of responsible society in Ukraine is possible only if there will be the availability of social responsibility of all subjects of social interaction. In this context, social responsibility of the State is of particular importance as a prerequisite for ensuring sustainable development based on the reconciliation of the interests of the state, the individual, society and business.

Ukraine, according to Art. 1 of the Constitution (the Constitution of Ukraine of June 28, 1996), is a social State, but, as V. Babkin (1998) correctly pointed out, there is a lack of development of the concept of the social State, awareness of the importance of humanization of society, provision of the human dimension of politics and law.

The realization of social responsibility of the State depends on the quality and efficiency of public administration, whose improvement process should be continuous. According to the experts of the Resuscitation Package of Reforms (RPR), the adopted Strategy of Public Administration Reform for 2016 – 2020 has been implemented by only 47% as of March 31, 2018, and there are no preconditions for its timely implementation (Soroka, 2018).

The results of monitoring of social changes, which is conducted annually by the Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine, provide complete answer to the question of the level of quality and efficiency of public administration, as well as the social responsibility of the State. Thus, among the greatest and most urgent threats to the population, prevention of which is the sole responsibility and function of public authorities, respondents most often cite the rise in prices (74.3%), unemployment (57.8%), non-payment of salaries, pensions, etc. (57, 0%), increase in crime (43,4%), attack of an external enemy on Ukraine (36,9%) (Vorona & Shulha, 2018).

According to the 2017 monitoring data, most of the respondents attribute responsibility to the President, the Government and the Verkhovna Rada (74.3%), politicians (51.5%), oligarchs (42.2%), judges (20.8%) for the deterioration of the situation in the country. It is interesting that,

despite the war being launched by Russia in the territory of Ukraine, only 27.8% of those polled believe that the deterioration of the situation in Ukraine is influenced by the leadership of the Russian Federation (Vorona & Shulha, 2017).

The logical consequence of the State's denial of its responsibility is the refusal of citizens to trust the ineffective subjects of public administration responsibility, who have abandoned their direct duties (functions). Thus, according to the social monitoring data of 2018, the respondents "do not trust at all" or "mostly do not trust" the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (77.1%), the government (76.0%), the President (72.9%), the courts (70.5%), prosecutors (67.0%), police (62.2%), local authorities (55.6%) (Vorona & Shulha, 2018).

Equally important in the theoretical and practical sense is the responsibility of the State for the formation and creation of the necessary conditions for the introduction of social responsibility of an individual, society as a whole, in particular, those social institutions, which have a direct impact on the human consciousness, its values, needs and interests. After all, the formation of the traits of a socially responsible person with high moral qualities, with the desire to respect social norms and the realization of recognized values in society is perhaps the most difficult and most necessary in the formation of social responsibility in the system of social relations.

In the context of the above, in our opinion, the theoretical generalizations and critical evaluations of the Ukrainian realities by Mykola Shulha (2019) are important. Considering the category "responsibility" as a social quality, whose presence is expected throughout society, in all its spheres, in all its institutions, at all its levels, that is, in all perceived and conscious social space, the scientist introduces the concept of "socially responsible society". In his view it is a society, in which there is an extensive, dense network of horizontal and vertical conscious societies, controlled and regulated responsible relationships, as well as adequate social institutes. The latter are "indispensable conditions of such qualities of society as its integrity and constancy".

Analyzing the current state of relations in different sectors of Ukrainian society, M. Shulha (2018) emphasizes on the critically high level and threatening scale of imbalance of these relations, which "have accumulated a huge potential of imbalance in recent decades in all spheres of Ukrainian society". Therefore, social

disparities, according to the scientist, “undermine the foundations of all spheres of society and threaten its very existence”.

The social imbalance arises from the inability of State authorities, the current regime to ensure the coordinated interaction of social actors and social institutions, to create conditions for the coordinated work of economic and political actors, for the comprehensive manifestation of cultural and spiritual potential of the society. The consequences of social imbalance are obvious failures of social relations in society as a whole, in certain areas, dysfunction of social institutions, inconsistency of manifestations of basic social values, norms and rules, increase of social tensions, mass anomie and social irresponsibility (immaturity).

It is the responsibility of individual and group actors for the state of affairs in society that is a phenomenon, which supports the integrity of society and holds it in a social oriented balance. Unfortunately, this factor is quite weighted in Ukrainian realities; thus, 54% of those polled (regardless of age category) have renounced any responsibility for the state of affairs in Ukraine; 53.2% – for who is the President of Ukraine; 52.4% – for who is a People’s Deputy (Vorona & Shulha, 2018).

In terms of civilizational choices the Ukrainian society is quite differentiated, if not split. Thus, in 2018, the proportion of those who believed that they were the closest to the traditions, values and behavior of citizens of Western Europe was 35.2% of the respondents. Instead, 40.4% of the population is closest to the traditions, values and behaviors of citizens of Eastern Slavic countries. At the same time, 24.3% of the respondents could not decide on this issue (Shulha, 2018).

In the absence of proper compatibility of the phenomena of social consciousness, common spiritual, cultural, value orientations, it is difficult to form basic value consensus, the consent of the elites on the most important issues of functioning and development of society. Unfortunately, this problem has existed in Ukrainian society since the declaration of independence of the State. And the fact that a strategy for its development, recognized by both elites and other social groups, has not yet been developed is one of the consequences of the absence of such consensus.

It is extremely important to diagnose the state of social relations in a timely manner, to prevent social imbalance and its consequences, and in particular the state of social responsibility and its

role in social processes good governance of social processes.

The study conducted by the Institute of Economics of NAS of Ukraine could be an example of such scientific diagnostics. Based on the results of the expert survey, a high level of influence of underdeveloped social responsibility on the level of corruption (73.6%), development of human potential (61.4%), fulfillment of international commitments on sustainable development (59.5%), competitiveness (52.5%) and external investor requirements for corporate culture development (48.1%) were determined. The most important obstacles to social responsibility are the domination of personal interests and lobbying of interests of business structures in the system of State and regional government (73.4%), low level of spiritual and moral culture of the ruling elite (63.3%), lack of formation and realization of the principles of social State (46.2%) (Novikova, Deich & Pankova, 2013).

Based on the analysis of the obtained data, the researchers have justified substantiated the factors of formation of social responsibility, determined the severity and importance of the obstacles to establishment of social responsibility, revealed the origins and levers of influence of an individual, society, business, state on the social responsibility. Systematization of the directions of introduction and development of social responsibility in the system of public administration is of particular importance is of particular importance.

A number of international events related to the development and implementation of comprehensive programs of the Sustainable Development Society were evidence of planet-level responsibility for solving the global problems of human development and its effective implementation.

The international act that formulates the concept of sustainable development is a Global Agenda for the 21st Century, adopted by the UN at the International Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. It states, in particular, that sustainable development is an “Integration Strategy for economic, social and environmental goals”. At the same time, the responsibility for the implementation of this program lies with the national Governments, with the requirement of “developing national sustainable development strategies and pursuing appropriate policies”, and “international cooperation should facilitate and complement these national efforts” (All-Ukrainian public

organization “Ukraine. Agenda for the 21st Century”, 2000).

In response to this international act, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine presented in 2017 the National Report on Sustainable Development Goals, which offers a comprehensive vision for guidelines for achieving sustainable development goals by 2030, which were approved in 2015 by the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit. The report presents the results of the adaptation of 17 global Sustainable Development Goals, taking into account the specificities of national development: poverty alleviation; overcoming hunger; development of agriculture; good health and well-being; quality education; gender equality; clean water and proper sanitation; affordable and clean energy; decent work and economic growth; industry, innovation and infrastructure; reducing inequality; sustainable development of cities and communities; responsibility for consumption and production; mitigating the effects of climate change; conservation of marine resources; protection and restoration of land ecosystems; peace, justice and strong institutions; partnership for sustainable development.

The aim of the National Sustainable Development Strategy is to ensure a higher standard and quality of life for the population of Ukraine, to create favorable conditions for the activity of present and future generations, to introduce a new model of economic growth and to stop degradation of natural ecosystems. One of the guiding principles of the strategy is the responsibility of all actors involved in its implementation (Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine, 2017).

Conclusion

Social responsibility is a social phenomenon, which is the voluntary and deliberate execution, use and observance of prescriptions, social norms by the subjects of social relations, and in case of their violation – the application of punitive sanctions provided by these norms, against the perpetrator. Social responsibility is aimed at regularization, harmonization of social relations and ensuring their progressive and stable development.

External factors of securing the development of a social, democratic state are of particular importance in the context of globalization. The State influences various aspects of economic life, applying both administrative-legal and purely economic levers of influence by implementing internal and external economic policies. It is the

State itself that is responsible for fulfilling the obligations arising from international treaties and agreements. It is endowed with full legal capacity as a subject of international relations and, accordingly, international economic law.

Thus, the responsibility of politicians, businessmen, industrialists, civil servants, ordinary citizens, collective social responsibility for the fate of the country is an important factor for ensuring the stability and self-sustainability of society. Socially responsible behavior of the main subjects of society is a guarantee of sustainable economic and social development, improvement of quality of life and strengthening of industrial relations. The main ideas of the concept of sustainable development should be implemented through the adoption of the relevant strategies of social responsibility by the parties to economic relations. This approach will integrate the best practices of combining private and public interests into competitive decision-making. Responsible actions of the actors of socio-political space are the prerequisite for the formation of the responsible society and consolidation of the Ukrainian nation. Therefore, the disclosure of the social nature, the laws, the properties of such an important resource as responsibility, remains an urgent task of modern science.

References

- All-Ukrainian Public Organization “Ukraine. Agenda for the 21st Century” (2000). Program of Action “Agenda for the 21st Century”. Kyiv: Intelsphere.
- Atkison, A. B. (2015). *Inequality: What Can You Done?* London, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Babkin V. D. (1998). The welfare state and the protection of human rights. *Constitutional state*, 9, 3 – 11.
- Berger, R. et al. (2010). *The Inequality Puzzle: European and US Leaders Discuss Rising Income Inequality*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 10.1007/978-3-642-15804-9_1
- Bevzenko, L. et al. (2019). Formation of a responsible society: opportunities, restrictions, prospects. *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing*, 2, 5 – 6.
- Böhler, Dietrich (2007). The idea and obligatory responsibility for the future. *Philosophical thought*, 1, 117 – 134.
- Cherevatskyi, Danylo (2019). Quality of life: the phenomenon of the peninsula. *The mirror of the week*, 48 (444). Available from <http://www.nas.gov.ua/UA/Messages/Pages/Vie>

- w.aspx?MessageID=5856 (accessed: 11.02.2020).
- Dubrovyk-Rokhova, A. (2020). A new manifestation of saving the world. Day, 7 – 8. Available from <https://day.kyiv.ua/uk/article/ekonomika/novy-manifest-poryatunku-svitu> (accessed: 11.02.2020).
- Eurobarometer 2017 Survey. Available from <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/priorities/eurobarometer-2017> (accessed: 11.03.2020).
- European commission 2018 Survey. Available from <https://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/survey/getsurveydetail/instruments/standard/surveyky/2215> (accessed: 11.02.2020).
- Ferrera M. (2005). *The Boundaries of Welfare. European Integration and the New Spatial Politics of Social Protection*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haidutskyi, Pavlo (2019). GDP growth by 40%: how to make impossible things possible? *The mirror of the week*, 35 (431). Available from https://dt.ua/macrolevel/zrostannya-vvp-na-40-yak-nemozhlive-zrobiti-mozhlyvim-323782_.html (accessed: 5.02.2020).
- Hrishnova, O. A. (2011). Social responsibility. *Ukrainian path to the European social State. Social and labor relations: theory and practice*, 2, 5 – 12.
- International Sociological Association (ISA) (2015). *Books of the 20th Century*. Available from https://www.isa-sociology.org/books/vt/bkv_000.html (accessed: 11.03.2020).
- Kostiuk, Bohdana (2011). *Business and Community Social Responsibility: British Experience for Ukraine* <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/2313721.html>
- Law of Ukraine. (1996). *The Constitution of Ukraine of June 28, 1996 no. 254k/96-VR*. Available from http://search.ligazakon.ua/l_doc2.nsf/link1/Z960254K.html (accessed: 11.02.2020).
- Maier-Abikh, K. M. (2004). *Uprising to protect the nature. From environment to community*. Kyiv: Libra.
- Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine (2017). *Sustainable Development Goals: Ukraine. The National Report 2017*. Available from http://www.un.org.ua/images/SDGs_NationalReportUA_Web_1.pdf (accessed: 11.02.2020).
- Novikova, O. F., Deich, M. E., Pankova, A. V. (2013). *The diagnosis of the state and prospects of development of social responsibility in Ukraine (expert assessments): monograph*. Donetsk: Institute of Economy of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Okhrimenko O.O. & Ivanova T.V. (2015). *Social responsibility: a handbook*. Kyiv: National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”.
- Pickett, Tom (2016). *Capital in the 21st Century*. Kyiv: Our Format.
- Shulga, M. (2018). The signs of social unbalance (Postscript). *Ukrainian Society: Monitoring Social Change. Issue 5 (19)*. Kyiv: Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Shulga, Mykola (2019). What is a socially responsible society? *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing*, 2 (April-June), 6 – 10.
- Soroka, S. (2018). Public administration reform – to pass the “point of no return” before the elections. *The mirror of the week*, 47. Available from <https://rpr.org.ua/news/reformaderzhavnoho-upravlinnya-projty-tochku-nepovernennya-do-vyboriv-serhij-soroka/> (accessed: 11.03.2020).
- Vartsaba, V. I. (2014). The role of the state in ensuring the social responsibility of business. In Hrynychutskyi, V. I., ed. *Transformational processes of the economic system in the face of modern challenges: a monograph*. Ternopil: Krok, pp. 157 – 162.
- Vorona, V. M. & Shulha, M. O., eds. (2017). *Ukrainian Society: Monitoring Social Change (2017). Volume 4 (18)*. Kyiv: Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Vorona, V. M. & Shulha, M. O., eds. (2018). *Ukrainian Society: Monitoring Social Change. Volume 5 (19)*. Kyiv: Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Weber M. (2012). *Economy and Society: Essays on the Sociology of Understanding*. Kiev: Universe.
- Yermolenko, A. M. (2007). To philosophize with discourse. *Dietrich Böhler’s Practical Philosophy and Berlin’s Ethics of Discourse. Philosophical thought*, 1, 107 – 116.
- Yonas, G. (2001). *The principle of responsibility. In search of ethics for technological civilization*. Kiev: Libra.