SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION

SECTION OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SCIENCES

INSTITUTIONAL, SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND SOCIO-CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF CROSS-BORDER INTERACTIONS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF SYSTEMS THEORY

Benchak O.
Lecturer of the Department for International Studies and Social Communications,
Uzhhorod National University

Abstract

This article presents an institutional, socio-economic and socio-cultural dimensions of cross-border interactions from the perspective of systems theory. By institutional dimension we mean, first of all, interactions between such social institutions as political, economic, cultural, social. The institutional dimension of cross-border research also focuses on the functioning of specific institutions and organizations involved in the support of cross-border interactions through the concepts of institutional culture and institutional effectiveness. The socio-economic dimension of the study of cross-border interactions is closely intertwined with the socio-cultural and focuses on the differentiating and integrating functions of the border. Modern cross-border research reflects the continuity and change of scientific thought. Through the study of borders, we realize that the hegemonic dominance of any particular social theory in understanding space and its social significance is impossible. The analysis of the latest cross-border phenomena shows that his systematic understanding of borders and cross-border processes in the current conditions needs to be deepened and modified.

Keywords: borders, mobility, cross-border interactions, cross-border processes, cross-border cooperation, globalization, system methodology, system theory, actor-system dynamics, socio-economic, socio-cultural.

Sociology, on the one hand, is characterized by the interpretation of cross-border interactions through attention to the institutions within which such interactions take place, and, on the other hand, through attention to socio-economic preconditions, factors and consequences of such interactions. At the same time, the socio-cultural sphere attracts considerable attention of researchers as a special context in which cross-border interactions unfold. Sociology of cross-border processes covers the study of institutional, socio-economic and socio-cultural dimensions of cross-border interactions. By institutional dimension we mean, first of all, interactions between such social institutions as political (primarily at the state level), economic (formation of the world economy and its regional centers, activities of transnational companies, etc.), cultural (science, education, religion), social (here, new agents of international relations come to the fore - non-governmental organizations, or NGOs; many of the latter operate at the regional or even global level). The institutional dimension of cross-border research also focuses on the functioning of specific institutions and organizations involved in the support of cross-border interactions through the concepts of institutional culture and institutional effectiveness. The socio-economic dimension of the study of cross-border interactions is closely intertwined with the socio-cultural and focuses on the differentiating and integrating functions of the border. At the same time, in our opinion, it is inexpedient to single out only the border as a separate and self-sufficient object of research, and, instead, it is expedient to talk about the borders of neighboring countries, which form a special set of socio-economic, sociocultural and institutional phenomena. practices and identity structures of border residents.

Modern cross-border research reflects the continuity and change of scientific thought. Through the study of borders, we realize that the hegemonic dominance of any particular social theory in understanding space and its social significance is impossible. The study of borders has shifted from a dominant concern with formal state borders and ethnocultural interactions to the study of borders at various socio-spatial and geographical scales, from the local and municipal to the global, regional and supranational levels.

The current situation shows that the field of study of borders has opened up opportunities to justify the daily formation of borders by understanding them as a system of institutions, socio-economic and socio-cultural processes. Thus, borders are increasingly perceived as an object of social construction, which is not "given" but "created" [1], [2]. Instead of focusing entirely on physical boundaries as formal markers of territoriality, the frontier perspective inherent in the so-called spatial turn in sociology is the study of the everyday construction of boundaries between communities and groups through ideology, discourse, political institutions, attitudes, and subjectivity. The strategic use of borders, described here as "border policy", provides a frontier perspective that reflects this contemporary debate.

The concept of border policy raises a number of issues regarding the power relations involved in the creation of borders; this is manifested, for example, in the tension between local politics and the external demarcation of society. Representatives of the methodology of constructionism understand the issue of cross-border interactions as follows: the adjacent territories of different countries are characterized by a special borderline sociality, special characteristics of the population living there. These features are formed both in a purposeful way and "by themselves", is over long periods of time and under the influence of various factors [3]. The border can be interpreted as an institution created by society, through which people living in border regions mutually influence each other

and which influences people's self-perception (in terms of identity, values and interests). As the Ukrainian researcher S. Hobta notes: "The state border is a key social institution that sets the space for the functioning of other social institutions of society. It delineates the boundaries of the fields of power [4]." In addition to the institutional dimension, the state border is also a cultural phenomenon. How exactly is the construction of "social and cultural aspects of the state border", and can be the object of sociological research [5].

People involved in cross-border interactions are subjects of cultural change, as they exchange not only consumer goods and services, but also cognitive models and cultural practices. The integration of border regions is not only economic, but also political, social and cultural. Communities in border regions are a kind of embryo of transnational civil society. As E. Afonin notes in this regard: "At the present stage of development, civil society is losing national and territorial borders. It is becoming more global and cross-cultural [6]."

As for the debate on regionalism and the public, one of the main borderline narratives is the idea that the limitation of social space can be an additional and endogenously controlled process that creates a common notion of community [7]. On the other hand, the limitation of social space is increasingly characterized by adaptation to external pressure, producing, among other things, "post-political" re-equipment of regions, territories and public relations in order to manage the territorial contradictions of global capitalism [8]. These two generalized border setting contexts are not mutually exclusive; they coexist as elements of social construction, which relate to both individual geographical areas and functional connections, which are often less territorially fixed.

The phenomenon of globalization is characterized by many definitions that emphasize the increasingly international nature of human societies, where much attention is paid to flows, networked global infrastructure and cultural hybridization. However, from the point of view of studying borders, it is probably the understanding of globalization as interpenetration and transformation that is crucial. Interpenetration refers to the transformation of everyday life and socio-economic practice by processes that operate across national borders [9]. In addition, the transformational nature of globalization is confirmed by the processes of large-scale diffusion of social, economic and cultural practices and ideas circulating on a cross-border and global scale [10].

Importantly, for this discussion, the globalization idea of a world without borders in the sense that socio-economic, financial and, ultimately, environmental interdependence increasingly reveal the limitations of state territoriality and sovereignty and affirm the systemic nature of cross-border processes across borders [11]. The extreme idea of globalization even implies the abolition of borders in any politically and economically significant way - a scenario that is repeated in the prophecies of a future driven by global technology, cyberspace, capital flows, political convergence and interstate integration [12]. Combined with the no less extreme model of neoliberalism, in which the state will no longer have a significant regulatory role, these processes may lead to the need to revise and abolish borders.

Globalization has increased researchers' interest in the issue of borders and intensified so-called border policy for a number of reasons. Moreover, as K. Raffestin argued, political boundaries are bio-ethno-social constants that make societies possible; borders are institutions without which it would be impossible to negotiate "inside" and "outside" any socially created space [13]. There are no essential contradictions between political, social, cultural borders and globalization for the simple reason that borders perform a very fundamental social function, namely the creation of spaces in which everyday life takes place. Moreover, globalization has given impetus to the study of borders by increasing the number of potential socio-spatial contexts in which political, economic, social and cultural processes unfold.

According to K. Rumford: "The globalized world is a world of networks, flows and mobility; it is also a world of borders. It can be argued that cosmopolitanism is best understood as a world orientation that entails constant cross-border interactions (negotiations and border crossings)… Borders link the "internal mobility" of our lives both to the many communities we can choose and to the pervasive policy trends that impose their border regimes in a way that jeopardizes mobility, freedom, rights and even identity [14].

How, then, do frontier studies interact with globalization, both in concept and process? Inspired by globalization, cross-border research reflects continuity and change in scientific thought and thus makes a significant contribution to the conceptualization of social space [15]. Due to the processes of globalization, the study of borders has moved from the dominant problem with formal state borders and ethnocultural areas to the study of borders in different socio-spatial contexts and geographical scales. This led to the transition to the study of multifaceted processes of border control and their social consequences. Globalization has also contributed to the destruction of the division between individual disciplinary approaches and the creation of a methodological discipline for cross-border research. Today, cross-border research covers a wide range of disciplines: social geography, political science, sociology, anthropology, history, international law, and the humanities, including art and philosophy. It is enough to review the current collections of border research to assess their interdisciplinary focus [16].

Another important point is that globalization has opened up new possibilities for studying the everyday formation of borders by understanding them as institutions, processes and symbols. Going beyond purely state and territorial paradigms, the current state of the debate emphasizes that borders are institutionalized due to the existence of socio-political and cultural boundaries that occur within societies. Material borders, for example, do not arise solely as a result of war, social solidarity of the political situation, but are created and maintained by cultural, economic,

political and social actions. The restriction includes formal as well as everyday forms of border construction and is carried out through ideological, discursive and performative practices and various forms of subjectivity. In addition, everyday border policy practices create and reproduce socio-cultural boundaries. In fact, this indicates that globalization challenges traditional disciplinary boundaries and understanding of the phenomenon of borders. It is the power of globalization - real or imagined - that is the main argument for the study of borders: borders are in a constant process of confirmation, denial, transformation and reaffirmation.

As can be seen from the above, both society as a whole and cross-border interactions are mostly studied as systemic phenomena, formations and processes, and this involves adding to the methodological sources of one of the general scientific approaches, namely the systemic approach in its modern version. Almost all sociologists agree that individual social phenomena, and specific societies, and humanity as a whole are systems of varying complexity - from simple social systems to complex socio-cultural megasystems, and therefore should be studied taking into account the modern post-classical version of the systems approach. Hence the intersection of subject fields of post-non-classical sociological variations, a number of methodological turns and a systematic approach in its post-non-classical characteristics. This methodological procedure allows for a comprehensive consideration and analysis of cross-border cooperation in the context of increasing mobility of societies and their components.

Sociological studies of cross-border phenomena have become much more active in modern Ukrainian society. Some regional schools mentioned in the previous section have significant experience in the institutionalization of this sociological subdiscipline. In particular, a detailed sociological interpretation of borders and cross-border processes was given by S. Ustych, a specialist who developed theoretical problems and solved practical problems in optimizing cross-border interactions. His research position has been published in many domestic and foreign scientific and political forums and has found practical application,,,.[17], [18], [19], [20]. The system theory of borders and transboundary processes proposed by S. Ustych consists in taking into account the complex interaction of heterogeneous factors related to the crossing of the state border line. This approach makes it possible to clearly distinguish the concept of transboundary processes (transboundary flows) with other established categories that characterize borders and related phenomena [21]. To adequately reflect the essence of modern cross-border processes, should be guided by a systematic methodology, ie a set of methods, techniques or operations aimed at systematic theoretical and practical development of social reality.

According to S. Ustych, system methodology as a tool of integrative analysis is able to adequately reflect the natural, organic unity of different in nature factors that affect the borders - in particular institutional and socio-cultural. A systematic methodology that provides an analysis of both functional and dynamic characteristics of objects is able to reveal the complex mechanism of functioning and development of transboundary processes. Finally, the system methodology has a powerful apparatus of applied development and can translate the study of borders and cross-border processes from the category of mainly descriptive to practical.

Sociological analysis shows that the transformation of the nature of the latest cross-border processes under the influence of modern communication and technological innovations has led to a tendency to "blur" or even completely level the barrier function of borders. This led to the emergence of new social threats and challenges, such as "hybrid wars", the deployment of information wars, cyberattacks and others.

The peculiarities of the systematic approach in the study of cross-border cooperation are the observance of two cognitive principles: 1) the principle of genetic-functional analysis of the object; 2) the principle of unity of theoretical and methodological and empirical levels of research.

Thus, according to this approach, cross-border processes should be distinguished from interstate relations. The former are broader than the latter in their content, as they cover not only a wide range of subjective and institutional interaction across borders (which is the content of international relations), but also a significant variety of natural transboundary phenomena - flow, exchange of water and air resources, migration of animal populations (a kind of object interaction), etc. Of course, cross-border processes are richer in content and in comparison with interstate relations, the subjects of which are only state institutions.

According to S. Ustych, the system methodology, in particular the level understanding of the social system, also allows to clearly grade and typologize cross-border processes. In the system of transboundary phenomena, according to the criteria of depth of coverage of the territory by transboundary action and its spatial volumes (scales), four levels should be distinguished: micro, meso, macro and interlevel. The micro level of cross-border processes is related to the crossing of the state border (organized or spontaneously, legally or illegally) by specific entities (representatives of authorities, public organizations, groups or individuals), or trade, natural phenomena at the local level. The meso-level consists of cross-border phenomena that extend to the regions (for example, cooperation of regional government agencies and territorial communities, trade, natural processes, etc.). The macro level corresponds to cross-border processes that cover the entire territory of the state (for example, interstate relations, international relations of national actors, interstate trade, etc.). The inter-level of cross-border phenomena is related to the crossing of the borders of several or even many states. In general, in the opinion of S. Ustych, the volume of cross-border phenomena at the level can be considered identical to transnational, globalization processes [21].

Finally, S. Ustych considers it necessary to identify the systemic essence of transboundary phenomena by a separate concept - "transboundary system of society". He defines this concept as a self-organized set of components of objective and subjective origin, which interact with each other in connection with the special spatial demarcations (borders) established by states. The horizontal section of the cross-border system is the main component series, which includes cross-border needs and interests, subjects of cross-border activity, this activity itself, its objects and means, as well as cross-border relations. The vertical section of the vehicle is formed by its main subsystems: technical-production, economic, political and spiritual-specialized. According to the scope of cross-border processes, cross-border systems can also act at four main levels: micro (local), meso (regional), macro (national) and inter- (transnational, global).

As in the study of any social process, in the analysis of borders and cross-border interactions it is very important to provide not only reflex but also predictive function of cognition, is to reflect not only the current state of the object, but also to predict future trends. On the same basis, you should optimize the management of this object.

One of the most effective modern methods of solving this "dual" problem is the modeling of cross-border interactions. The most important theoretical and cognitive function of social modeling, as we know, is the image of a holistic picture of the systemic diversity of society.

The concept of "model" in science is usually understood as a material or conceptual system that: a) in one form or another reflects, reproduces some essential properties and relations of the original; b) in the exact sense replaces this original, as well as; c) simultaneously with the study of the original gives new information about it.

As you know, the concept of the model arose in the XIX century. in the natural sciences, more precisely, in mathematical research on the consistency of geometry. Over time, the concept of CS began to be widely used in social cognition. Today, modeling is an effective means of learning about social reality, an integral part of systems research. "Building models that reflect the properties of the object of study and, accordingly, its purpose - is one of the principles of a systems approach."

In modern literature, the concept of "modeling" is distinguished in a broad, general-cognitive and in a narrow, special sense. In a broad sense, "modeling" means any cognitive process that results in concepts, categories, laws, and so on. "To know an object," I. Novik believes, "means to model it." Modeling in this sense encompasses knowledge in latitude, but does not exhaust it in depth. As for the narrow understanding of modeling, it means "... a specific way of cognition in which one system (object of study) is reproduced in another (model) [22]".

The epistemological basis of modeling in the narrow sense (namely, it is of interest to us) is related to the theory of similarity. According to it, the similarity of the original object and its analogue-model is isomorphic (complete correspondence of their structures) and homomorphic (partial similarity of structures). There are also subject and sign modeling. The first is carried out on a material model, and in the process of the second schemes, drawings, formulas, logical-mathematical symbols, etc. are used.

The simulation can also be based on an indirect or direct description of the system - the original. Indirect description in modeling involves abstraction from the nature and complexity of the object of study. Its main task is to develop a mathematical formula that includes the known (what is), the unknown (what needs to be found), mathematical description, constraints [23]. In direct description, which is called imitation, in the modeling with the help of formalized and informal means reproduces the component composition, structure, functional parameters of the original system.

Extremely important in modeling is simplification, ie a certain "coarsening" of social reality, abstraction from certain specific characteristics of the system in order to identify its most common, essential features. Recognized authority in systems theory and cybernetics, R. Ashbee emphasized: "Systems theory should be based on methods of simplification and, in fact, be a science of simplification [24]."

From the point of view of the purpose of our research, it seems important to distinguish two types of modeling, namely: qualitative (essential-semantic) and formal-quantitative. The system methodology, which provides interdisciplinary research, has a separate, applied, closely related to management, computer science and modeling level. This is the level of system analysis. As you know, systems analysis first appeared in the work of RAND Corporation in 1948 to perform the tasks of military management. The abbreviation RAND is an abbreviation of "Research and Development". The result of these studies was the creation of the first method of system analysis of PATTERN and other methods that are widely used in the United States by government agencies and large industrial corporations for forecasting and management.

The formation of systems analysis as an independent methodology dates back to the early 60's of last century. It was during this period that the first developments made according to the rules of applied system methodology appeared. They were largely based on a well-developed and widely used mathematical theory of operations research, but also had their own specifics [25]. The first attempts to use systems analysis were generally successful, and in the following decades it became widespread in various fields of cognitive and practical activities.

In the special literature you can find a lot of systems analysis. Most authors, however, tend to understand it as a set of theoretical and methodological tools for research, system design and control systems that include the human (purposeful) factor.

One of the essential features of systems analysis is its focus on concrete-cognitive and concrete-practical embodiment of the unity of objective and subjective in society.

This feature of the system analysis is "continuation", application at the level of social specificity of the methodological principle of unity of social subjects, activity, relations. System analysis seeks to find such methodological tools that would allow to "combine", "connect" factors of different quality - subject, subject-substrate, subject-spiritual. This determines the relationship of different types of social exchange: matter, energy, information.

Another important feature of systems analysis is its focus on research, design and practical use of artificial systems. This is a significant difference from the principle of systematics, systemic approach, theory of social system, focused on the "simple" reflection of the systemic, mostly natural and historical quality of society. At all stages of the study of social systems and their management in one form or another there is a problem of decision-making. Therefore, the development of methodological settings for finding, comparing and selecting alternative solutions is an essential feature of systems analysis.

In the works of researchers you can find many different theoretical and methodological schemes of decision making. According to the author, the model proposed by V. Gorelova and E. Melnikova deserves attention. All stages of the procedure of search, comparison, selection and decision-making (eleven such stages) are characterized in it with sufficient clarity and consistency.

Here's what this model looks like:

1. Analysis (statement) of the problem and definition of its essence, exact formulation, analysis of the logical structure of the problem (assessment of the previous state and forecast), selection of external relations, assessment of the fundamental solvability of the problem.

2. Definition, construction of the system: definition of the purpose and tasks, formulation of the position of the observer, definition of system objects, definition of subsystems, definition of the external environment.

3. Analysis of the structure of the system: definition of levels of hierarchy, aspects of process consideration, definition and specification of subsystems, specification of processes and functions.

4. Formulation of the general purpose and criterion of the system: definition of the purpose of systems of the highest order, the purpose and restrictions of external environment, formulation of the general purpose, definition of criterion, decomposition of the purpose and criteria of subsystems.

5. Decomposition of the purpose, definition of need for resources and processes: formulation of the purpose of the highest order, the purpose of current processes and the purpose of development.

6. Assessment of resources: assessment of existing technologies and capacities, the current state, resources, interaction with other systems, social factors.

7. Forecast and analysis of future conditions: analysis of sustainable trends in the problem, forecast development and changes in the environment, forecast the emergence of new factors affecting the system;

analysis of future resources, analysis of possible changes in goals and criteria.

8. Evaluation of the purpose and means: definition of estimations on criteria, an estimation of interdependence of the purpose, an estimation of relative importance of the purpose.

9. Formulation of alternatives for solving the problem and selection of options: evaluation of alternatives by criteria, comparison and selection of options.

10. Construction of a comprehensive solution program: formulation of project and program activities, prioritization of goals and means to achieve them, distribution of areas of activity, distribution of areas of competence, development of action plan in terms of resource and time constraints, distribution of responsibilities for organizations, managers and executors .

11. Designing the organization to achieve the goal: the purpose of the organization, the purpose of the functions of the organization, the design of the organizational structure, information flows, modes of operation, material and moral incentives [26].

Conclusions. Hence such a characteristic feature of systems analysis as the unity of formalized and informal principles. Reflecting on the formalized components of system analysis, we mean the social knowledge expressed in special signs (symbols), which through the detection and fixation of the form of the system reveals and clarifies its (system) content.

The historical trend of formalization is the increase of cognitive capabilities, "coverage" and expression of special sign languages of the growing amount of social information. At the same time, it is obvious that despite its possibilities, formalization cannot remove the general cognitive contradiction of the relationship between content and form, in which the first is never exhausted by the second (in this case, formalization) to the end. The persistence of this contradiction is due to many circumstances, in particular: 1) the qualitative uniqueness of social systems, which is manifested in the fact that information about some of their components (eg subjective plan, such as experience, intuition of subjects) is very difficult or completely not amenable to formalized (especially quantitative, mathematical) analysis; 2) continuous structural changes in the content of the system, as a result of which research tasks related to formalization are continuously updated; 3) the limited capabilities of the formalization apparatus itself, which, despite constant progress, is far from omnipotent and in many respects remains imperfect.

In general, the author shares the research approach of S. Ustych. However, the analysis of the latest cross-border phenomena shows that his systematic understanding of borders and cross-border processes in the current conditions needs to be deepened and modified. In the context of the development of the general theoretical component of modern sociological knowledge, as researchers note, we can consider the concept of S. Ustych intermediate (liminal) between the system-mechanistic picture of the world, on the one

hand, and system-physical and system-cybernetic pictures of the world today [27]. The provisions of his concept correlate well with the current state of development of general sociological theorizing in Ukrainian sociology and the need for a better understanding of cross-border processes in the Ukrainian border, as this area of sociological knowledge is still underdeveloped in Ukraine. At the same time, there is a need to expand the conceptual concepts of the systemic nature of cross-border interaction, cooperation and mobility. Below we will name the ways of such modification of the system methodology of studying transboundary phenomena proposed by S. Ustych.

First, from among the whole set of various transboundary phenomena, it is expedient to single out those that are part of the subject of sociological research and thus to speak exclusively of transboundary interactions. Secondly, at one time there was a spatial turn in the social sciences, which was a progressive achievement, but today there is a need to reconsider the topic of spatial rootedness of social phenomena. Cross-border interactions can bring together geographically distant individuals, groups and communities and generally take place in a virtual communications space. Third, in addition to distinguishing between micro-meso, macro and intra-level cross-border interactions, it is advisable to talk about different dimensions of the relevant phenomena - in particular, the institutional-organizational and subjective dimensions. The first deals with the functioning of formal bureaucratic rules, such as border crossing rules, visa and migration regimes. The second deals with relatively informal interactions between individuals, groups, and communities. Both the first and the second occur according to formal-legal, on the one hand, and socio-cultural, on the other hand, factors.

References

1. Van Houtum, Henk & van Naerssen, Ton. (2002). Bordering, Ordering and Othering. Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie. 93. 125-136. 10.1111/1467-9663.00189.

2. Jessica Becker (2018) Speaking to The Wall: Reconceptualizing the US–Mexico Border "Wall" from the Perspective of a Realist and Constructivist Theoretical Framework in International Relations, Journal of Borderlands Studies, DOI: 10.1080/08865655.2018.1482775

3. Gupta, A./Ferguson, J. (1996): Discipline and Practice: "The Field" as Site, Method, and Location in Anthropology. In: Gupta, A./Ferguson, J. (eds.): Anthropological Locations. Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science. Berkeley/ Los Angeles/ London: University of California Press, pp. 1-46.

4. Хобта С. В. Кордон України як соціологічна проблема: суб'єкти, інтереси, інституціоналізація / С. В. Хобта // Вісник Луганського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Соціологічні науки. - 2012. - № 23. - С. 41–58. - Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/vluc_2012_23_5. C. 41

5. Усенко О. Державний кордон як соціальний інститут та соціокультурний конструкт: перспективи соціологічного аналізу. Грані. 2015: С. 79-83.

6. Афонін Е. А. Глобальне громадянське суспільство як феномен сучасного глобального світу / Е. А. Афонін, Т. В. Бєльська // Вісник Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України. - 2013. - № 4. - С. 9-17. - Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Vnadu_2013_4_4 c. 11.

7. Scott, J. W. (ed.) (2006) EU Enlargement, Region-building and Shifting Borders of Inclusion and Exclusion, Aldershot: Ashgate.

8. Allen, John/Cochrane, Allan (2007): "Beyond the Territorial Fix: Regional Assemblages, Politics and Power", in: Regional Studies 41/9,1161-1175

9. Cochrane, A., & Pain, K. (2000). A Globalizing Society? In D. Held (Ed.), A Globalizing World? Culture, Economic, Politics. London and New York: Routledge.

10. Held, D. (2000). Regulating Globalization? The Reinvention of Politics. International Sociology, 15(2), 394–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002015

11. Has Globalization Created a Borderless World? Janet Ceglowski

12. Scholte, Jan Aart (1997) "Global capitalism and the state", International Affairs, 73(3): 427-452

13. Francisco R. Klauser: Thinking through territoriality: introducing Claude Raffestin to Anglophone sociospatial theory, In: Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 30 (1), 2012, pp. 106 – 120.

14. Rumford, Chris. (2006). Theorizing Borders. European Journal of Social Theory - EUR J SOC THEORY. 9. 155-169. 10.1177/1368431006063330.

15. Scott, J. W.: Bordering, Border Politics and Cross-Border Cooperation in Europe. In: Celata, F. – Coletti, R. (ed.): Neighbourhood Policy and the Construction of the European External Borders. SPRINGER, GeoJournal Librar 2015, pp. 27 – 44.

16. Laine, Jussi & Brambilla, Chiara & Scott, James & Bocchi, Gianluca. (2015). Introduction: Thinking, Mapping, Acting and Living Borders under Contemporary Globalisation. Brambilla, C., J. Laine, J. W. Scott & G. Bocchi (2015). Introduction: Thinking, Mapping, Acting and Living Borders under Contemporary Globalisation In: Brambilla, C., J. Laine, J. W. Scott & G. Bocchi, eds. Borderscaping: Imaginations and Practices of Border Making, 1-9. Ashgate, London. (8) (PDF) Introduction: Thinking, Mapping, Acting and Living Borders under Contemporary Globalisation. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311425887_Introduction_Thinking_Mapping_Acting_and_Living_Borders_under_Contemporary_Globalisation [accessed Mar 14 2020].

17. Serhii Ustych. Systems theory of borders and transborder processes. – Saarbrücken: Scholars' Press. – 2015. – 492 P.

18. Ustych S. Analysis and conclusions for the Ukraine-EU borders/ SerhiiUstych// Ex borea lux? Learning from the Finnish and Norwegian Experience of Cross-border Cooperation with Eastern Neighbours.—Prague: ISD,2012.—P.74-81.

19. Ustych S. The typology, indexation and monitoring of modern trans-border processes//Transborder economies– new challenges of regional development in democratic world. Editors: MarekCierpal-Wolan, Jozef Olenski, Waclaw Wierzbieniec.—Jaro-slaw:PWSTE,2013.—P.42-52.

20. Ustych S. The Indexation and Monitoring of the Modern Transborder Processes//Journal of Mathematics and System Science. USA—2013.—№3.—P.592-596.

21. Ustych S. I. (2014) Methodology of systematic research of cross-border processes and its social implementation: monograph. Uzhhorod: Polygraph Center "Lira". 352 p.

22. Новик И. Б. О моделировании сложных систем (философский очерк) / Новик И. Б. – М. : Мысль, 1965. – 335 с.

23. Buchanan A., Moore M. States, Nations and Borders. The Etics of Making Boundaries Buchanan A., Moore M. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 226 p.

24. W. Ross Ashby 1946. "The behavioural properties of systems in equilibrium". In: Amer. J. Psychol. 59, 682–686.

25. Ларычев О. И. Системный анализ и принятие решений //Диалектика и системный анализ. - М., 1986.

26. Горелова Г. Л., Мельникова Е. И. Основы прогнозирования систем / Горелова Г. Л., Мельникова Е. И. М.: Наука, 1986. с.32-33

27. Chernysh N.Y. Ukrainian sociology in search of a general theory in terms of interdisciplinarity. Ukrainian society. 2019. № 2. P. 9-34, p. 28

ECONOMIC MACRODEPARTMENTS IN THE STRUCTURE OF UKRAINIAN CLASSICAL UNIVERSITIES

Chornyi O.
Ph.D. in Philosophy of Education,
Associate Professor of the Management and Administration Department,
Vinnytsia Finance and Economics University

Abstract

Ukrainian higher education system is complex, extensive and branched. Unlike industry-specific universities, classical universities occupy a special place because their development and functioning are elitist and multidisciplinary. Among the various disciplinary faculties of Ukrainian classical universities, faculties of economics play an important role, as high-quality professionals in the fields of economics, finance, marketing, entrepreneurship and management are trained there. Analysis of the economic departments number and economic educational activities at these faculties is an important component of Ukrainian economic science and education overall characteristics.

Keywords: classical university, economic department, economics, interdisciplinarity, Ukraine.

Introduction. Ukraine has a well-developed network of university education. In total, we have selected 38 classical universities from the "2019 Consolidated Ranking of Ukrainian HEI" (Consolidated Ranking of Ukrainian HEI, 2019). Most universities are state-owned, but some are privately owned. The 13 classical universities are included in the list of the 50 best universities in Ukraine. The 25 universities are among the 100 best universities in Ukraine. However, before we begin to analyze the functioning of economic knowledge in classical Ukrainian universities, we will focus on the specifics of the classical universities functioning.

Literature overview. Research on the universities' activities is an important component of effective management and improvement of their activities. The economic faculties in the structure of classical universities are an important element of contemporary education. Research can concern both the historical perspective (Mason and Lamont, 1982) and the study of this phenomenon within a national education system (Mixon and Upadhyaya, 2016). Today, this is associated with an important confrontation concerning the superiority of economics and (Fourcade, Ollion, Algan, 2015) intersection between economics and interdisciplinarity (Neves, 2017). However, we would like to mention that the interdisciplinarity is a trend, which affects the following: the promotion of interdisciplinarity in higher education (Tarrant and Thiele, 2017), the interdisciplinary future of a university (Irani, 2018) and the interdisciplinary work of young researchers (Bridle, Vrieling, Cardillo, Araya and Hinojosa L, 2013). In view of this, we would like to explore various aspects related to the functioning of economic faculties in the structure of Ukrainian classical universities.

Results. A classical university occupies a special place among Ukrainian universities. Classical state-owned universities are usually older than branch (industry-specific) universities. This means that the academic culture within them has been developed over a long period. Education in the "old" Ukrainian classical universities is elitist. It is the activity of the "old" classical universities that concerns the notion of the "academism spirit ". As a rule, such a clear academic culture is associated with a high-quality training in various fields.

The structure of a classical university, in comparison with industry-specific universities, is complex and diversified. In the structure of a classical university on a par with historical, legal and philosophical faculties one can find medical, geographical and economic macrodepartments (compared to the size of colleges within American universities). Each faculty specializes