

REVIEW PAPER

The Impact of Globalization on Economic Security and Innovative Public Management Tools for the Development of Strategies for Ensuring the Spheres of National Security

Kateryna Blishchuk¹, Pavlo Slisar^{2*}, Roman Pasichnyi³, Igor Britchenko⁴, Oleksandr Yurkivskyi⁵ and Olena Bobrovska⁶

¹Department of Regional and Local Development, Lviv Polytechnic National University, Stepan Bandera Str., Lviv, Ukraine

²Department of National Security and Defence Strategy, Institute of State Military Management, National Defense University of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine

³Department of Political Science and International Relations, Lviv Polytechnic National University, Stepan Bandera Str., Lviv, Ukraine

⁴Institute of Law, Economics and Administration, University of the National Education Commission, Podchorazych Str., Krakow, Poland

⁵Department of International Relations and Political Management, Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University, Chudnivska Str., Zhytomyr, Ukraine

⁶Department of Economics and Economic Security, University of Customs and Finance, Volodymyr Vernadsky Str., Dnipro, Ukraine

*Corresponding author: scientistua@ukr.net (ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8208-9499)

Received: 13-03-2024

Revised: 24-05-2024

Accepted: 04-06-2024

ABSTRACT

The article represents an attempt of comprehending modern processes and overall landscape of public management, determining the urgent necessity for innovative tools introduction. In particular, it is shown that today geoeconomics paradigm and securitization approach create extremely complex and ever changing, hardly predictable environment for public management, pushing states to apply Agile concept.

HIGHLIGHTS

- The landscape of public management today, and the choice of appropriate innovative tools, is determined by geoeconomics and securitization.

Keywords: Economic security, globalization, Public administration, innovative tools, Mechanisms of public administration, National security

Today, the expert community rightfully emphasizes the complex nature of national security problems and the need for their coordinated, systematic, scientifically based solution. However, in modern conditions, ensuring national security cannot be isolated from the totality of problems of managing society and state strategy as a whole. Issues of national defense, ensuring military and other types of security closely related to it are inextricably linked not only with economic growth and increasing the competitiveness of the economy, but also with the development of education, science and technology,

culture, healthcare, rational use of natural resources, improving the quality of life of the population, maintaining strategic stability.

The category “economics of national security” is also widespread. More recently, in a broad, humanitarian interpretation, it was used to characterize the new quality of the economy of a socially oriented state,

How to cite this article: Blishchuk, K., Slisar, P., Pasichnyi, R., Britchenko, I., Yurkivskyi, O. and Bobrovska, O. (2024). The Impact of Globalization on Economic Security and Innovative Public Management Tools for the Development of Strategies for Ensuring the Spheres of National Security. *Econ. Aff.*, 69(02): 951-958.

Source of Support: None; **Conflict of Interest:** None



capable of providing infrastructural conditions and taking responsibility as the organizer of the most complete satisfaction of the entire complex of individual, group, public, and state needs described by A. Maslow. In this capacity, it was, in fact, part of the system of categories of economic theory, especially since security problems, including problems of the military economy and the military sphere, remained beyond its consideration.

Today, the understanding of the paradigm of the economics of national security (or economic security as an integral part of national security) has changed significantly the role of external factors in ensuring this security has increased. The formation of state policy to ensure the economic security of the country is currently based on the geo-economic approach.

Modern scientists interpret geo-economics as a certain political science system of views, according to which state policy is predetermined by economic factors, operating on the geo-economic atlas of the world, the inclusion of national economies and their economic entities in the world's internationalized reproductive cores in order to participate in the formation and distribution of world income on the basis of high geo-economic technologies. Goeconomics is an integral part of the development strategy, because the guidelines for national development in the modern global world are no longer only within the national economy, they are brought to external economic boundaries (Onishchenko, 2012).

In the current year, James Lee defined goeconomics as a concept based on system analysis, economic statecraft as a concept based on foreign policy analysis, and political economy of national security as a concept based on the analysis of domestic institutions and resources in his article "*Defining Goeconomics, Economic Statecraft, and the Political Economy of National Security*" (Lee, 2024).

As Andruseac (2015) rightly points out, economic ties between nations today more than ever determine the overall nature of such interactions and establish economic security as a notion that can no longer be disregarded. The process of globalization, which modifies the worldwide environment, challenges and compels a reconsideration of economic security.

Accordingly, these processes, reflecting a kind of Kuhnian paradigm shift, determine the necessity to review and revise public management tools for the development of strategies for ensuring the spheres of national security, to align them with the new realities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Breslin and Nesadurai (2023) suggest a concept of economic statecraft as evolving analytical tool. The use of economic tools to achieve foreign policy goals consistent with a state's strategic goals is the essence of economic statecraft, which is a pretty straightforward idea. Baldwin (1985) first the term into popular usage about forty years ago in a book that examined historical case studies dating back to the Peloponnesian War to demonstrate the efficiency of using economic tools. He contended that these instances demonstrated how much more effective economic methods had been in persuading people to alter their behavior and take actions they otherwise would not have taken a very straightforward and traditional definition of power than the then-dominant political discourse had implied.

But in many ways, the phrase is problematic because of how straightforward this idea is (Arivazhagan *et al.* 2023). Without reference to the precise term itself, states have long employed and continue to employ the kinds of economic instruments that Baldwin characterizes as common tools of economic statecraft: the facilitation or restriction of trade, aid, and other financial flows (Avedyan *et al.* 2023). This leads one to wonder how useful the notion actually is, or, more accurately perhaps, considering the numerous conceptual tools available to examine how nations behave and interact with foreign and domestic economic players, such as economic security, commercial diplomacy, economic diplomacy, and even certain notions of soft power, how much extra value it adds.

Although the study of economic statecraft never completely disappeared, a second generation of researchers saw somewhat of a comeback in this area at the turn of the century as 'the particularly widespread use of economic tools of statecraft since the end of the cold war ... prompted rising interest in the effectiveness of these instruments' (Blanchard *et al.* 1999, p. 1). When Mastanduno (1999, p. 288) claimed that "the dividing line

between international political economy and security studies has all but disappeared”, he may have been a bit hasty or overly enthusiastic, if that is the correct term. However, the “globalization” of economic activity and the seeming decrease in the likelihood of a devastating world war following the end of the Cold War encouraged reconsideration of what security meant and what needed to be safeguarded (Cha, 2000). Considering the type and volume of international trade in products and services, the issue of how governments should try to control risks and ensure financial stability emerges.

Results

The idea of “economic statecraft” seems applicable to every case study as it emphasizes the economic instruments that governments employ to achieve many strategically connected objectives. In the fullest sense of the word, market-conforming and interventionist policies were both often used as instruments and acts in the service of economic statecraft (Gavkalova *et al.* 2022; Gaievska *et al.* 2023). Although industrial policy and developmental aims also employ these instruments, our focus on motives and objectives identified security and strategic concerns as the primary drivers of economic statecraft across all states (Byrkovych *et al.* 2023). Not only do the strategic aims of various governments differ significantly, but so do the tools available to them for achieving these goals. Therefore, it would seem reasonable to attempt to distinguish and categorize various forms of economic statecraft according to their varying capacities and goals (Deyneha *et al.* 2016). Making the distinction between acts intended to influence others and those primarily intended to safeguard and preserve the country’s economy against outside influence is a straightforward method of doing this.

It has also been suggested that China is engaging in economic statecraft by promoting Special Economic Zones abroad in order to improve trade and investment ties with other countries (Tang & Brautigam, 2012). It serves as an illustration of how to merge finance and commerce connections. Furthermore, financial flows, loans, and foreign aid are the single most prominent topic in the more recent literature on Chinese economic statecraft, even though they are likely the second most prominent subject of economic statecraft generally after sanctions across time. It should come as no

surprise that China’s financial prominence has shifted significantly in the world since the year 2000. Determining the borders between state development loans, aid, and (usually state-sponsored) foreign commercial activity is a challenging task because of the manner in which these activities are carried out and reported.

According to Dick Nanto (2011), the economy plays three overlapping roles that make it relevant to the security discussion. The primary function is to use the economy as a source of manpower, supplies, and money for military might (Gaman *et al.* 2022). The economy serves as a basis for interactions between governments and their shared or conflicting interests in the second function, which deals with the economy as a source of wealth and economic security (Kussainov *et al.* 2023). Actually, it appears that this “three-axis coordinate system” serves as a foundation for creative public management instruments that are used to create plans for guaranteeing the domains of economic security within the geoeconomic environment and national security.

Economic, social, political, and technical advancements in recent years have emphasized global instability (Kubiniy *et al.* 2021). The global economy become increasingly interconnected and volatile. Global interdependence increases economic vulnerability, while increased economic specialization brought about by trade (based on the “comparative advantage” principle) occasionally necessitates difficult adjustment on the part of communities and workers, which ultimately results in insecurity (Kryshtanovych *et al.* 2022). Additionally, there has been a significant rise in capital movements, which has increased volatility (Klymenko *et al.* 2016). In addition, emerging nations must contend with stronger and more erratic financial flows, which continuously undermines their ability to fend for themselves through regulations and limits. Significant market integration was observed in the banking sector, impacting national governmental decision-making authority.

Geoeconomics is both a foreign policy strategy and an analytical framework. As a foreign policy strategy, it refers to the use by states of economic means to achieve strategic goals (Kalyayev *et al.* 2019). As an analytical framework, geoeconomics

is based on the school of political realism (Isaieva *et al.* 2020). However, it goes beyond realism by focusing on the geographical features inherent in foreign policy and international relations. This means that geoeconomics deals with the economic bases of strength and power, which have a clear geographical dimension: some countries have resources that others need, and these resources are transported along strategically important “geographic” corridors (Gupta *et al.* 2021). On the other hand, geoeconomics refers to how economic instruments are applied to control and manage certain geographic areas that may be the sphere of influence of a regional or global hegemon.

Geoeconomics aims to punish and dissuade a nation’s strategic rivals while promoting and enhancing its own economic interests (Kulikov *et al.* 2022). The idea that strategic rivals seek to further their own interests at the expense of others rather than pursuing economic cooperation for mutual advantages has served as the driving force for this kind of economic statecraft. Because of this, the core elements of today’s geoeconomic competitiveness are supply chain security, technology standards, and technology transfers (Maksymenko *et al.* 2020). Nonetheless, this modifies the character of the relationship between corporations and governments. The days of governments acting in a laissez-faire manner and allowing businesses to run their operations freely are long gone. The geoeconomic climate of today encourages more frequent government intervention. Since strategic competition between states is a structural force that determines the international system, the amount of involvement is also planned to go deeper into corporate operations (Wigell *et al.* 2022).

According to Andruseac (2015), an acceptance of economic security that ignores the current level of economic globalization is out of step with modern living standards. Economic security is not limited to the regular swings in the GDP, labor force participation, productivity, and other metrics that have been top concerns for economists for many years and are currently being researched for scholarly publications in the area. In this framework, global capital flows, capital markets, and the products that these flows are aimed at are all seen to be sources of economic security (Nekhai *et al.* 2024). Through these routes, financial

institutions may become unstable, stocks may run out, inflation may spread, and currencies may be destroyed.

New definitions of economic security emerged as a result of globalization. These definitions focused on two types of flows: financial shocks, which are primarily financial in nature and can threaten political stability, undermine economic growth, and increase inequality (Davis, 2000). Illicit flows, on the other hand, are more difficult to control and can easily pass for legitimate economic transactions, such as terrorism, crime, or pollution.

DISCUSSION

Today the world is more interdependent and interconnected than at any time in history. Almost all nations depend on safe and sustainable flows of capital, goods, and services that cross the globe. Asymmetric vulnerabilities and dependencies inherited from the previous international system make economic power a powerful means of achieving strategic goals (Novak *et al.* 2022). This does not mean, however, that geoeconomics has effectively eclipsed military-based power politics or that it cannot accompany it.

Therefore, the ability to use economic leverage is an important means of power politics in the modern world, to much more extent than in the past (Levytska *et al.* 2022). As with geopolitics and military bases, the geo-dimension in geoeconomics means that the economic foundations of national power and strength must be based on geographic features. As an analytical framework, geoeconomics draws from the tradition of political realism, which emphasizes how competition for relative power influences state behavior, in particular, in public administration, since domestic management is integrated into the overall strategy of the nation-state.

Although geoeconomics has a narrower scope of interest, being limited by economic power from a geographical and strategic point of view, geoeconomics as an analytical framework overcomes certain shortcomings that characterize the mainstream theories and schools of international relations.

The old idea of economic security, which focused on economic vulnerability to other governments,

has been challenged by globalization (Omarov *et al.* 2022). In addition, because of the dangers associated with cross-border networks of non-state actors and the instability of the new global economy, globalization has led to a redefining of economic security. However, the precise nature and rigorous evaluation of the link between economic globalization and undesired political and economic effects are required (Gupta *et al.* 2024). The long-term benefits of better economic performance must be weighed against the impacts of increasing volatility brought about by globalization when making decisions concerning economic security. Institutions may help counteract economic uncertainty by offering insurance, supporting the legitimacy of policies, and assisting with environment adaptation (Karpa *et al.* 2021). Under globalization, national institutions will continue to be essential for ensuring economic security. In order to lessen the new economic insecurity, national, regional, and international organizations can work in tandem with one another (Khomiuik *et al.* 2020). New regional alternatives have developed that offer to stake out new modalities of economic stability, despite the fact that several regional organizations strayed in the aftermath of the Asian financial crisis.

Economic statecraft is mainly discussed in the book “*War by Other Means: Geoeconomics and Statecraft*” by Blackwill and Harris (2016), along with how it may be utilized as an effective tool to achieve geopolitical goals. The authors elucidate the ways in which developing countries are currently employing economic statecraft to advance their geopolitical goals and reduce the likelihood of military conflict.

Geo-economics has been seen by constructivists as a securitizing discourse (Oliinyk *et al.* 2021). The notion of securitization, primarily advanced by the Copenhagen School of International Relations, emphasizes how security vulnerabilities are frequently appropriated or even discursively framed as threats in order to justify the countermeasures used by public administration.

On the other hand, by focusing their research only on discourses, proponents of the constructivist approach do not attach importance to material factors that influence the world economy and international relations and are beyond the control of those who shape discourses (Kostiukevych *et al.* 2020). Moreover, constructivists usually do not say

that the alternative interpretations they put forward are, from their own constructivist point of view, either better (more correct) or worse (less correct) than the discourses that geoeconomists formulate (Litvinova *et al.* 2020). However, constructivist analytical suspicions serve an important function — highlighting the fact that geo-economics helps mask neoliberal agendas and securitization projects, and raising the question of whether such considerations should constrain the scientific agenda.

In fact, securitization today became the overall landscape of public administration, and it is not surprising taking into account the role of geoeconomics (Lola *et al.* 2022). The development of the concept of securitization was a result of the global security crisis in the 21st century. Securitization is an inevitable companion of neorealism, and geoeconomics is its tool.

Specifically, Estrella (n.d.) looks at whether the secular increase in securitization over the past several decades has an impact on the cyclical consequences of monetary policy. In particular, is the final impact on GDP different from what it would have been in the 1960s, when securitization was almost nonexistent, when the central bank implements a given monetary policy maneuver, such raising the overnight interbank rate by 50 basis points? (Mishchuk *et al.* 2020). When the focus shifted to a geoeconomic perspective, securitization began to permeate every aspect of public administration and statecraft.

Securitization has grown in popularity and is being used in a wide range of contexts, such as EU internal security cooperation. It makes it possible to track the kinds of policy tools that emerge from public concerns and comprehend how they become security-related (Panasiuk *et al.* 2020). It also problematizes the degree to which politics is subordinated to security. However, a deeper examination indicates that each author has used securitization to EU internal security policy in a very different way, particularly when it comes to the role of audiences and the kind of evidence that is presented (Balzacq, 2016). Thus, in addition to the more popular interpretation of securitization as a speaking act, there are justifications for viewing it as a particular regime of behaviors and “analytic of government”.

One of the ways to overcome both pitfalls and evident security consequences of the 'geoeconomics world' is introducing SMART management into the system of public management.

A modern system for ensuring economic security (as a component of national security) at the national level can be presented in the form of a certain algorithm for ensuring the economic security of the country, which makes it possible to monitor all negative processes in the country's economy, as well as timely prevent possible critical threats to the country's national security; the application of this algorithm in practice allows for the implementation of rational state global, regional, and domestic policies aimed at improving the coordination of the activities of state authorities, local governments, the business community and civil society institutions (Troschinsky *et al.* 2020).

With the proper application of this algorithm for ensuring economic security, operating on the basis of a geo-economic approach, there is a real opportunity to create a unified information database of indicators, threats, and threshold values for the country's national security; this, in turn, would make it possible to timely identify the main threats to national economic security and develop appropriate effective measures to eliminate them (Ortina *et al.* 2023). This creates the possibility of coordinating and methodologically guiding the activities of city and district administrations, state-owned enterprises and regional institutions, public organizations on issues of crisis management, and, accordingly, the possibility of developing uniform standards and methods of crisis management.

At the same time, in addition to above-mentioned external challenges, internal, domestic ones also exist (Panasiuk *et al.* 2021). The inadequate execution of the New Public Management model resulted in the outsourcing of public services, the indiscriminate adoption of public-private partnerships, the laxity of the State's regulatory role, and the use of high-risk financial instruments like swaps. Consequently, albeit under different conditions, a new public administration model known as Neo Weberian was embraced, particularly in continental and central Europe (Shamne *et al.* 2019). Practically speaking, the theory incorporates Weberian components that are associated with conventional administration, such as maintaining the notion of public service

and reaffirming the role of the State as a facilitator of solutions. It also reinforces the significance of Administrative Law (Yermachenko *et al.* 2023). The Neo Weberian model also incorporates elements of the New Public Management model, such as the professionalization of public management so that the manager is not just an expert in laws but is also focused on the needs of their citizens; the importance of citizens over rules and regulations; the overcoming of representative democracy through the inclusion of consultation mechanisms; and the ongoing insistence on achieving results (Rocha and Zavale, 2021).

Anyway, public management today acquires specifics of Agile management. Government agencies "need Agile to face modern challenges" (Stephens *et al.* 2022). The NAPA/PMI report, issued in the end of 2020, offers primary recommendations for how governments can incorporate Agile. This entails using Agile across all governmental levels, ranging from individual projects and programs to entire departments or even the entire government (Zilinska *et al.* 2022). According to the paper, executives in government departments and agencies should promote Agile and apply it to "as many of their activities as possible".

The problem of public administration efficiency has always existed. Today, many experts see signs that the new era following the era of modernity calls into question the compliance of the modern state with new realities. "We do not know what type of historical system will replace the currently existing one," says, for example, the famous American sociologist I. Wallerstein. "But we know for sure that the peculiar system of which we are contemporaries, a system in which states played a key role in ensuring the unlimited accumulation of capital, is no longer able to function" (Wallerstein, 2021). There are many reasons for this conclusion, rooted in the processes of globalization, post-industrialization, informatization, growing intercivilizational contradictions, loss of identity, etc.

One of the features of social systems is their constant development, and, therefore, increasing complexity (Vorobei *et al.* 2021). The meaning of the challenge faced by modern humanity is seen in the fact that the degree of diversity of social systems is inexorably increasing, leaving states with less and less maneuver to maintain their own effectiveness.

In such conditions, securitization as a paradigm and the geo-economic Agile approach seem to be truly working tools for the development of strategies for ensuring the spheres of national security.

CONCLUSION

Economic security is no longer only a matter of domestic state policy in a globalized world with a growing number of actors on the international arena (states, multinational corporations, and other international organizations), as well as a growing interdependence. In terms of political-military conflicts, economic security started to influence stability or instability to some level. Consequently, the economic aspect began to play a bigger part in political affairs, changing the focus of resolution techniques from “reactive to preventive”, which in turn affected the national security landscape and public administration vectors.

REFERENCES

- Arivazhagan, D. *et al.* 2023. An Assessment of Challenges of Digitalization of Agrarian Sector. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems. 621 LNNS, 48–57.
- Avedyan, L. *et al.* 2023. The effectiveness of the development of territories in the state regional system politicians. *Financial and Credit Activity Problems of Theory and Practice*, 4(51): 333–344.
- Breslin, S., and Nesadurai, H. 2023. Economic statecraft, geoeconomics and regional political economies. *The Pacific Rev.*, 36(5): 927-948.
- Cha, V. 2000. Globalization and the study of international security. *J. of Peace Res.*, 37(3): 391-403.
- Davis, N. 2000. Securitisation: A Public Policy Tool?, New Zealand Treasury Working Paper, No. 00/08, *New Zealand Government*, The Treasury, Wellington.
- Gavkalova, N.L. *et al.* 2022. Functioning of United Territorial Communities and Identification of Main Problems of Organizational Support of Local Budget Management. *Financial and Credit Activity Problems of Theory and Practice*, 2(43): 107–117.
- Gupta, M. *et al.* 2021. Application of Fuzzy Logic Data Analysis Method for Business Development. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, 194 LNNS. 75–93.
- Gupta, S.K. *et al.* 2024. An Application of Structure Equation Modelling in Determinants of Customer-Based Brand Equity (CBBE) in the Banking Area. In: Khouru, R.E., Nasrallah, N. (eds) *Intelligent Systems, Business, and Innovation Research*. Studies in Systems, Decision and Control, vol 489. Springer, Cham.
- Isaieva, N. *et al.* 2020. Categorization of personality traumatic experience in chinese womens diary narrative: The frame-scenario model. *Psycholinguistic*, 28(2): 56–81.
- Kahler, M. 2004. Economic security in an era of globalization: definition and provision. *The Pacific Rev.*, 17(4): 485-502.
- Kalyayev, A. *et al.* 2019. Global Security Governance: Conceptual Approaches and Practical Imperatives, Proceedings of the 33rd International Business Information Management Association Conference, IBIMA2019: Education Excellence and Innovation Management through Vision 2020, 10-11 April, Spain, Granada, 4484-4495.
- Karpa, M. *et al.* 2021. Entrepreneurship education of the formation of the e-commerce managers professional qualities. *Int. J. Entrepreneurship*, 25(7).
- Kondur, A. *et al.* 2024. Economic and environmental component in the field of sustainable development management. *Quality*, 25(201): 7–14.
- Khomiuk, N. *et al.* 2020. Planning of socioeconomic development of the territories (experience of European Union). *Int. J. Management (IJM)*, 11(4): 638-646.
- Klymenko, V.V. *et al.* 2016. Regional aspects of middle class development in Ukraine. *Actual Prob. of Econ.*, 4(178): 178–188.
- Kostiukevych, R. *et al.* 2020. The impact of European integration processes on the investment potential and institutional maturity of rural communities. *Economics and Sociology*, 13(3): 46-63.
- Kryshtanovych, M. *et al.* 2022. Problems of European integration in the construction of EU security policy in the context of counter-terrorism. *Int. J. Safety and Security Engineering*, 12(4): 501-506.
- Kubiniy, N. *et al.* 2021. Modeling the process of forming the safety potential of engineering enterprises. *Int. J. Safety and Security Engineering*, 11(3): 223-230.
- Lee, J. 2024. Defining Geoeconomics, Economic Statecraft, and the Political Economy of National Security. In Vinod K. Aggarwal, and Tai Ming Cheung (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Geoeconomics and Economic Statecraft* (online edn, Oxford Academic, 22 Feb.). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197673546.013.3>
- Litvinova, I. *et al.* 2020. The negative impact of corruption on the economic security of states. *Int. J. Manage (IJM)*, 11(5): 1058-1071.
- Lola, Y. *et al.* 2022. Innovative Development of Renewable Energy During the Crisis Period and its Impact on the Environment. *Virtual Econ.*, 5(1): 65-77.
- Maksymenko, T. *et al.* 2020. Adaptive management of entrepreneurship model as a component of enterprise resource planning. *Academy of Entrepreneurship J.*, 26(3): 1-8.
- Novak, A. *et al.* 2022. Financial and Economic Security in the Field of Financial Markets at the Stage of European Integration. *Int. J. Professional Business. Rev.*, 7(5): e0835.
- Oliinyk, O. *et al.* 2021. The impact of migration of highly skilled workers on the country’s competitiveness and economic growth. *Montenegrin Journal of Econ.*, 17(3): 7-19.
- Omarov, A. *et al.* 2022. Features of creative burnout among educational workers in public administration system. *Creativity Studies*, 15 (1): 116-129.

- Panasiuk, O. *et al.* 2021. Virtual Laboratories for Engineering Education. 11th International Conference on Advanced Computer Information Technologies, ATIT 2021 – Proceedings, pp. 637–641.
- Rocha, J.A.O. and Zavale, G.J.B. 2021. Innovation and Change in Public Administration. *Open J. Social Sciences*, **9**: 285-297.
- Shamne, A. *et al.* 2019. Psychosemantic peculiarities of promotional videos perception. *Psycholinguistics*, **25**(1): 384-408.
- Stephens, M., Awamleh, R. and Salem F. 2022. Agile government: Emerging perspectives in public management.
- Troschinsky, V. *et al.* 2020. International experience of public administration in the area of national security. *J. Legal, Ethical and Regulatory. Issues*, **23**(3).
- Vorobei, O. *et al.* 2021. Metaphorical Conceptualization of WAR in Chinese Sports Discourse. *Psycholinguistics*, **29**(2): 25–45.
- Wallerstein, I. 2021. The global lest: Yesterday, today, tomorrow. Routledge.
- Wigell, M. *et al.* 2022. Navigating geoeconomic risks. *FIIA Report*, November, 71.
- Zilinska, A. *et al.* 2022. Efficiency in the Context of Ensuring Sustainable Territorial Development. *Financial and Credit Activity Problems of Theory and Practice*, **4**(45): 234–243.