АНАЛІЗ ПЕРЕДУМОВ І ЗАКОНІМІРНОСТЕЙ РОЗВИТКУ КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНОГО ВЗАЄМОЗВ'ЯЗКУ «ЕКОНОМІКА ВРАЖЕНЬ – ПРИРОДНІ АКТИВИ – ІНКЛЮЗІЯ»

Актуальність. В кризових зовнішніх умовах, зокрема в період пандемічної кризи, економіка вражень не є пріоритетним напрямом розвитку національного господарства, проте в перспективі, зокрема в поєднанні з процесами використання природних активів вона може стати лейтмотивом, що прискорює сталій та інклюзивний розвиток, зокрема в таких трансформаціях економіки, як Україна.

Мета та завдання. Мета роботи полягає в обґрунтуванні та узагальненні передумов і закономірностей розвитку концептуального взаємозв'язку між становленням економіки вражень, використанням природних активів та інклюзивним зростанням.

Результати. У статті обґрунтовано, зокрема на основі аналізу геометричної інтерпретації індексу Гувера, та узагальнено передумови та закономірності взаємозв'язаного розвитку економіки вражень і природокористування за принципами інклюзивності та сталості. Зокрема, обґрунтовано, що загальні закономірності розвитку взаємозв'язку «економіка вражень – природні активи – інклюзивність» відображаються через відповідні соціально-економічні та економіко-екологічні протиріччя та розглядаються в межах концепції сталого розвитку; досліджуваний взаємозв’язок є релевантним комплексному підходу до пошуку нових ефектів у використанні природних активів для суспільства через економічні відносини в сфері відповідно до визначених у статті специфічних положень взаємозв’язку «економіка вражень – природні активи – інклюзивність», він справедливо стимулює до економічно резонації процесів розвитку економіки країни.

Висновки. Вирішення проблемних питань, пов’язаних із досліджуваним взаємозв’язком, можливо через управління природними активами – важливої складової добробуту як інтегральної категорії: управляючи природними активами, підвищимо рівень добробуту населення; за умови імплементації в управління природними активами елементу вражень, відповідний механізм можна розглядати в межах розвитку взаємозв’язку «економіка вражень – природні активи – інклюзивність».

Ключові слова: сталий розвиток, економіка вражень, природні активи, інклюзивне зростання, пандемія COVID-19, Україна.
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ANALYSIS OF PREREQUISITES AND REGULARITIES OF THE CONCEPTUAL INTERCONNECTION DEVELOPMENT “EXPERIENCE ECONOMY – NATURAL ASSETS – INCLUSION”

Topicality. In crisis external conditions, in particular during the pandemic crisis, the experience economy is not a priority for the development of the national economy, but in the long run, in particular in combination with the use of natural assets, it can become a leitmotif that accelerates sustainable and inclusive development, especially in transition economies such as Ukraine.

Aim and tasks. The purpose of the work is to substantiate and generalize the prerequisites and patterns of development of the conceptual relationship between the formation of the experience economy, the use of natural assets and inclusive growth.
Research results. In the article the prerequisites and patterns of interconnected development of the experience economy and nature management on the principles of inclusiveness and sustainability are substantiated and summarized, in particular, on the basis of the geometric interpretation analysis of the Hoover Index. In particular, it is substantiated that the general patterns of development of the interrelationship “experience economy – natural assets – inclusiveness” are reflected through the relevant socio-economic and economic-environmental contradictions and are considered within the concept of sustainable development; the studied interconnections are relevant to a comprehensive approach to finding new effects in use of natural assets for society through economic relations in the field of impressions. In accordance with the specific provisions of the interrelationship “experience economy – natural assets – inclusiveness” defined in the article, it contributes to the creation of preconditions for transformation, and thus stimulates environmentally relevant and socially responsible changes in the country's economy.

Conclusion. Solving the problematic issues related to the studied interrelationship is possible through the management of natural assets – an important component of well-being as an integral category: managing natural assets, increase the welfare of the population; provided that the element of experience is implemented in the management of natural assets, the appropriate mechanism can be considered in the framework of the interrelationship development “experience economy – natural assets – inclusiveness”.

Keywords: sustainable development, experience economy, natural assets, inclusive growth, COVID-19 pandemic, Ukraine.

Problem statement and its connection with important scientific and practical tasks. In crisis external conditions, in particular during the pandemic crisis, the experience economy is not a priority for the development of the national economy, but in the long run, in particular in combination with the use of natural assets, it can become a leitmotif that accelerates sustainable and inclusive development, especially in Ukraine, which is in a protracted state of transition, complicated by geopolitical factors. Economic relations, combined with the need to take into account social, in particular socio-environmental interests, objectively contain contradictions and potential conflicts, which are particularly relevant in areas such as the experience economy. As global crises deepen, the gap between the “exclusive economic interests” and the “maximum involvement of all stakeholders” extreme points widens significantly. In the context of the coronavirus pandemic, when the spheres of life that meet the primary needs of the population are threatened, the spheres of the so-called new economy, in particular such as the experience economy aimed at meeting secondary needs and highly solvent demand, are collapsing. At the same time, an inclusive approach is important: 2021 is the year of the greatest humanitarian crisis in the 75 years of the United Nations (UN) existence, 270 million people may die of hunger: “decisions must be shared fairly as global public goods” [1]. Given this, it is important to study the interrelationship between the experience economy, the use of natural assets and inclusive growth, starting from its conceptual level.

Analysis of recent publications on the problem. Based on a study of sources relevant to the issues of the experience economy [1-3], inclusive development [4-7] and nature management at the national and international levels [8-12] (issues directly related to natural assets are revealed in the works [13-16]; disclosure of environmental conflicts content works are devoted [17-19]), in particular in the recreational and tourism sphere [20-23] as the most popular in the study of applied aspects of the experience economy in interrelation to the use of natural assets, in the article the prerequisites for the development of areas relevant to the above issues are generalized in today’s conditions of functioning of the national economy in Ukraine, adjusting to phase 4.0 and the transition to phase 5.0 of the industrial revolution.

Allocation of previously unsolved parts of the general problem. At the same time, further research is required on issues that reveal the interconnection between the experience economy and the environmental economy spheres, taking into account the need for inclusive socio-economic growth.

Formulation of research objectives (problem statement). The purpose of the work is to substantiate and generalize the prerequisites and patterns of development of the conceptual relationship between the formation of the experience economy, the use of natural assets and inclusive growth. The following tasks are set in accordance with the purpose of the work:

– determination of contextual features of the studied contradictions within the framework of the analysis of long-term forecasts of sustainable development under the condition of strengthening of the conflict of economic and ecological relations;
– substantiation of general and specific patterns of development of the conceptual interrelationship “experience economy – natural assets – inclusiveness”.

An outline of the main results and their justification. An important component in the research of the interconnection “experience economy – nature – inclusive approach” (ENI) is nature environment protection. Figure 1 shows the relationship between the level of economic development and environmental pollution (the experience economy has so far developed widely in developed economies). At the same time,
worse environmental scenarios lead to an increase in the gap between the poor and rich sections of the population (Fig. 2) and a decrease in the level of human development (due to increased disease, impoverishment, etc.) – Fig. 3. These global forecasts are relevant to the ENI issues under study: the experience economy is a sphere that is growing in developed economies; in transition economies, the market of services related to the experience economy is just being formed or is in a permanent initial state of development. Therefore, specified questions should be studied comprehensively in conjunction with the development of the entire national economy, improvement of the population welfare level, effective implementation of the Global Sustainable Development Goals, in particular regarding the betterment of the environment and the continuous enhancement of its quality.

Fig. 1. Forecast of the dynamics of air pollution in accordance with the level of economic development of countries

Source: [24]

The efforts that need to be made to reduce inequality in society in interrelation to income levels are graphically shown in Fig. 4 [25]. The so-called “Matthew effect” [26] demonstrates that countries with a high level of welfare will increase it in the future, and vice versa – countries with a low level of welfare will become even poorer (Fig. 5). In countries with extractive mechanisms of governance, this is mainly due to the fact that the basis of enrichment is real power, which directly adjusts with property and the ability to self-enrichment, including through illegal means. The Hoover Index demonstrates government intervention and the efforts of the civil society institution to equalize the opportunities of each citizen to engage in activities that will ensure personal well-being (i.e. based on an inclusive approach).

The ideas presented in Figures 1-5, as well as in previous studies [28] are the basis for determining the contextual features of contradictions in the field of environmental and economic relations: the probability of transforming potential natural resource conflicts into active ones heightens with increasing distance between the extreme points of the continuum “economy – nature management”, namely: “experience economy – inclusive nature management”. The context of these contradictions is as follows:

– in their objective essence, which is determined as a result of the experience of cognition of social and natural phenomena as the basis of social development;
– environment and economy as a whole at the same time in their interaction appear in the form of contradictions between the interests of participants in environmental and economic activities;
– from a managerial point of view, these contradictions can be the object of targeted influence.
Fig. 2. Forecast of the dynamics of economic inequality according to the main environmental scenarios

Source: [24]

Fig. 3. Forecast of the dynamics of the global human development index according to the main environmental scenarios

Source: [24]
Given the above, the general provisions of ENI are as follows:

– regularities of ENI development are reflected through the corresponding socio-economic and economic-environmental contradictions;
– ENI are considered within the concept of sustainable development, in particular the green economy;
– ENI is based on the theoretical foundations of the new institutional economy and the so-called new economy [29; 30] (along with other new directions, for example, creative economy);
– ENI is related to behavioral economics, which induces to the importance of applying socio-psychological along with economic research methods of ENI;
– ENI as a kind of the experience economy emerged evolutionarily, this was facilitated by development of information technology and civil society;
– ENI is an important component of the transition from the traditional to the new, namely the creative, digital economy, etc.;
– there is a direct connection (which mediates the objective function of ENI, aimed at continuous maximization of positive feelings and emotions of the individual as an integral part of a satisfactory state of health) with the welfare economy (welfare is considered in a broad sense, suggesting the multifaceted nature of the category of “health”, which includes, along with physical and psycho-emotional, also the financial component, as well as the interrelationship with the quality of natural environment. Accordingly, it is important to take into account not only the level of morbidity, but also, above all, human longevity);
– ENI is a tool to increase the competitiveness of producer – the user of natural assets: to gain additional competitive advantage within the sale of environmentally relevant products and services, it must focus on emotions, feelings, memories and other experiences of consumer and in particular, its environmental needs;
– within the study of the needs hierarchy ENI is aimed at meeting them from a comprehensive perspective: impressions, experiences, emotions and feelings of the individual belong to both primary (physiological) and secondary (complex psycho-emotional, including aesthetic) needs; inclusiveness herewith involves as well consideration of the intermediate level of meeting social needs;

Fig. 4. The Hoover Index

Source: [25]
– currently the state is not able to support the sphere of the experience economy and in particular ENI, given the difficult socio-economic conditions, primarily related to the negative effects of the pandemic crisis, so it is necessary to develop market relations in the field of ENI, especially within the framework of recreational nature management and sustainable tourism, in combination with regulatory instruments such as the luxury tax;

– in a country with a transition economy and incomplete state of social reforms, insufficiently active civil society, within ENI it is necessary to begin with the small and most necessary for citizens, namely social inclusion and gradually move to an inclusive economy and in particular ENI;

– the most common form of ENI organization in the world is natural amusement parks;

– ENI is the object of research at different interrelated hierarchical levels: individual, microeconomic, municipal, national;

– ENI as a component of the experience economy is a mean of reducing inequality in society: in order to increase social status, the economically vulnerable part of the population, as well as the population with below average income in the country, with the help of new technical means tries to copy the fashion trends of affluent life. High-income population is constantly introducing new fashion to the impressions to remain unique in their social status. In other words, the impressions in their complexity and accessibility are what distinguishes the rich from the poor in modern society, and therefore ENI aims to equalize this situation;

– in a broad sense, inclusiveness is considered not only in social or economic terms, in particular on the promotion of equal opportunities in the areas of consumption and production, but also in governance: we are talking about the so-called inclusive management, involving all stakeholders, specifically in the field of ENI;

– ENI is not a separate branch / sector of the economy, but a comprehensive approach to finding new effects in the use of natural assets for society through economic relations in the field of experience. ENI involves obtaining effects at different levels, as well as in the context of the application of a cross-sectoral project approach, for example in the field of rural green tourism;
ENI is a way to attract additional investment in the spheres of hospitality and nature management. The specific provisions of ENI are as follows:

- ENI helps to create the preconditions for transformations: institutions – extractive to inclusive; services – to experience; the experience economy – to the next stage, namely the so-called “transformational economy”. Accordingly, ENI encourages environmentally relevant and socially responsible changes;
- ENI applies to all spheres and sectors characterized by economic, social and nature-environmental factors; subject to availability within their functioning and, accordingly, the production of products and services, the so-called “wow effect”;
- the contradictory content of ENI (primarily due to the opposition of simultaneous maximization of economic and social goals, in relation to the environmental factor) requires for its analysis the use of the "game against nature" model, which takes into account two-factor, in particular socio-economic and socio-environmental strategies of sustainable development, as well as the criterion of gross value added – those sectors that according to the Classification of economic activities are related to nature management and the experience economy;
- in Ukraine currently the market of impressions, if it exists, then in the form of fragmented market relations, the totality of which does not yet claim to be permanent;
- usually only positive impressions are considered, aimed at improving the level of well-being of the individual. At the same time, from a broad point of view, impressions, experiences, feelings, emotions can be negative, which can also be used as a basis for making improvements within ENI;
- ENI includes mass and individual services, with mass services being personalized;
- ENI is a certain way of moving away from reality: consumers are in some ways actors, not just consumers; the process of consuming impressions is a “scene” with feelings, emotions and impressions. Given this, ENI is a tool for raising environmental awareness and culture;
- according to the “health-income” matrix, individuals' needs for impressions and feelings are directly related to their state of health, and access to meet these needs is directly related to their level of solvency. Respectively, ENI is directed to promote an improvement of population health level and expanding access to opportunities of gaining experience, in particular through the use of natural assets;
- opposite ways of conducting research within ENI are the so-called “imposed” inclusion and citizen science;
- the paradox of ENI is that impressions are the most expensive compared to goods and services, as it is assumed that the cost of their creation is high; at the same time inclusive development in its initial social sense, aimed at low-income populations;
- ENI in the framework of sustainable development is a study of the SDG on extremums, and at the same time a “soft” transformation of socio-economic relations of Ukraine without excessive control over the implementation of the SDG 2030;
- in the conditions of pandemic and post-pandemic periods the urgency of the experience economy interests in a country with a transitional economy is a specific issue. Situationally relevant is the view on the prospects and potential of ENI development. Relevant interests consist in readiness to change in the future: how much and how quickly the nature of socio-economic relations may change. Therefore, it is more correct to talk not about impressions, but about the prerequisites for impressions;
- ENI is implemented through ecosystem services: a “director” is nature itself, the economic entity is primarily a logistician. Both flows should be taken into account: nature (raw materials) – product – service – experience; ecosystem – ecosystem service – experience;
- conditions of artificial isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic increase the demand for “impressions”, which directs it towards the expansion of spheres and sectors that can sell products and services with the presence of “wow-effect”. At the same time, there is a growing need for security and comfort. That is, there is a transformation of the experience economy, namely in the direction of the economy of comfort and the economy of security;
- interconnection between the experience economy, nature management and inclusive growth is taken place through innovation. Due to the inclusiveness the impression gradually loses its significance, but thanks to innovation, the impression “returns” to the consumer in a new format;
- the scarcity of natural resources makes them closer to the impression: the scarcer the natural resource or part of the ecosystem, the greater the demand for them, particularly in the context of obtaining a “wow effect";
– impressions that become artificially inclusive cease to be impressions and that cause corresponding changes / transformations. Thus, the concept of ENI is the concept of accelerating transformations (transformational economics [31] is the next stage after the experience economy);
– it is impossible to make all natural attractions inclusive: for example, glamping is even etymologically exclusive;
– solving problematic issues related to ENI is possible through the management of natural assets - an important component of well-being as an integral category: managing natural assets, increase the welfare of the population; if the element of experience is implemented in the management of natural assets, then the mechanism of natural assets management can be considered as a mechanism for the development of ENI.

**Conclusions and prospects of further research.** In the article the prerequisites and patterns of interconnected development of the experience economy and nature management on the principles of inclusiveness and sustainability are substantiated and summarized, in particular, on the basis of the geometric interpretation analysis of the Hoover Index. It is substantiated that the general patterns of development of the interrelationship “experience economy – natural assets – inclusiveness” are reflected through the relevant socio-economic and economic-environmental contradictions and are considered within the concept of sustainable development, in particular the green economy; the interrelationship under study does not relate to a particular sphere or sector of the economy, but is relevant to a comprehensive approach to finding new effects in use of natural assets for society through economic relations in the field of experience, and involves obtaining effects at different levels, as well as in the context of the application of a cross-sectoral project approach. In accordance with the specific provisions of the interrelationship “experience economy – natural assets – inclusiveness” defined in the article, it contributes to the creation of preconditions for transformation: institutions – extractive to inclusive; services – to experience; stage of formation and functioning of the experience economy – to the next stage, namely transformational economy, and thus stimulates environmentally relevant and socially responsible changes in the country’s economy. Solving the problematic issues related to the studied interrelationship is possible through the management of natural assets – an important component of well-being as an integral category: managing natural assets we increase the welfare of the population; provided that the element of impressions is implemented in the management of natural assets, the appropriate mechanism can be considered in the framework of the interrelationship development “experience economy – natural assets – inclusiveness”.

Further research is related to determining the specifics of natural asset management in transition economies.
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