Oliinyk Kyrylo
Postgraduate Student,
Mariupol State University

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36059/978-966-397-498-9-34

DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF DIGITAL INEQUALITY AND DIGITAL EXCLUSION: FEATURES OF DEVELOPING DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION STRATEGIES

As part of the Going Digital project, the OECD proposed a toolkit for the development and implementation of digital policy in seven areas: infrastructure, use of ICT, innovation, jobs, social and digital inclusion, trust, and market openness in the digital business environment [1]. As a result, the national digital transformation strategy can be supplemented and specified by strategies, programs, and roadmaps in the areas of the digital economy, broadband, digital security and privacy, innovation, digital skills, and jobs. Digital transformation breaks traditional structures and fundamentally changes social institutions, structures, relationships, and roles. This occurs at several levels at once: (1) operational (by adopting and implementing digital tools to simplify processes and reduce iterations); (2) organizational (by transforming existing services, offering new services, and abandoning unnecessary practices); (3) economic (changing roles and value chains in business ecosystems); (4) social (changes in social structures and public decision-making processes (labor market, family, political participation)).

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) defines digital inequality as "the gap between individuals, households, businesses and geographical areas at different socio-economic levels in terms of their ability to access information and information and communication technologies, and in their ability to use the Internet for various activities" [1]. The key characteristics of the

digital divide and its opposite, digital inclusion, are connectivity, capability, content, confidence and continuity, which are known in academic literature as the "5 C" model. Overcoming digital exclusion requires a comprehensive management approach that involves structured partnerships, effective coordination between different policy sectors that influence digital transformation, and the adoption of policy measures at different levels (international, local communities, regions, countries) [2; 3]. Digital inclusion policy includes a set of measures, initiatives, and strategies used to overcome the mechanisms of social and digital exclusion in order to ensure the full participation of individuals in the life of the network society.

C The semantic connotations of digital inequality and digital exclusion are different. Unlike digital inequality, which records differences in digital skills, practices of using web technologies and the advantages that arise on their basis, exclusion indicates a disadvantageous social position in the continuum of digital inequality. As a result, gradations of inequality cover the entire spectrum of positions between complete exclusion and complete inclusion, producing various levels of digital inclusion / exclusion. At the macro level, digital exclusion means a lack of access to resources for integration into the network society due to structural limitations. In this context, the term "discrimination" becomes relevant for understanding exclusion. At the micro level, the specifics of the life situation of bearers of digital exclusion are revealed, described as digital deprivation.

Relative objective digital exclusion (deprivation) reflects the results of comparing the skills, motivation, online dividends of individuals with the volumes of digital resources of other groups. Objective digital inequality results in relative subjective digital deprivation, when, during self-assessment and comparison with reference groups actively mastering ICT, individuals consider themselves disadvantaged, feel their "online isolation", the lack of opportunities available to other members of society, recognize the benefits of possessing digital resources, the injustice of inequality and strive to overcome the situation. E. Helsper explains how social and digital inclusion mutually influence each other through their

inherent online and offline fields of social, economic, cultural, personal resources [4]. The fields of offline resources of social inclusion determine the relevant fields of online resources of digital inclusion and vice versa. E. Helsper established two types of cause-and-effect relationships: from offline fields of social inclusion to online fields of e-inclusion, conditioned by access (to infrastructure and equipment), skills, motivation to use ICT; from digital fields to offline fields, determined by the parameters of using digital resources (relevance, sustainability, autonomy). A negative trend of digital transformation is uncompromising aggressive digitalization, which results in the loss of rights of citizens who do not participate in the so-called "digital" relations [5; 6].

The development of the state digital ecosystem can completely or partially displace traditional non-digital methods of participation in political life or significantly complicate their use. The objectives of digitalization are to speed up, simplify and reduce the cost of processes. At the same time, the widespread transition to "digital" without maintaining an analog alternative directly contradicts these objectives, since the "digital segregation" it generates leads to difficulties in obtaining relevant services for certain categories of citizens. The conducted analysis allowed us to establish that "digital exclusion" is understood as a specific feature of certain groups of the population, characterized by a reduced level of their access to technology (the elderly, people with serious illnesses, the poor, migrants). Digital discrimination implies the infringement of the rights and opportunities of these categories of citizens, due to their limited ability to use electronic services. Digital social capital is a combination of "connection capital," i.e. capital that is formed when an individual socializes with people who are similar to him, for example, in age or religion, and "gap-bridging capital." Bridging gaps means that an individual can establish connections and solidarity with people who are not like him. These two types of social capital, when combined, reinforce each other and create opportunities for digital interaction in the digital community.

References:

1. Going Digital integrated policy framework (2020) OECD Digital Economy Papers, no. 292. OECD Publishing, Paris. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/dc930adc-en

2. Reznikova N. V., Shlapak A. V., Ivashchenko O. A. (2023) Vid promyslovykh ekosystem do ekosystem tsyfrovoi ekonomiky: novi biznes-modeli i modeli konkurentsii v umovakh didzhytalizatsii mizhnarodnoi torhivli tovaramy i posluhamy [From industrial ecosystems to digital economy ecosystems: new business models and competition models in the context of digitalization of international trade in goods and services]. *Herald of Khmelnytskyi National University. Economic Sciences*, no. 2(316), pp. 332–340. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31891/2307-5740-2023-316-2-52

3. Reznikova N. V., Bulatova O. V., Shlapak A. V., Ivashchenko O. A. (2023) Innovatsii yak draiver tsyfrovoi transformatsii svitovoi ekonomiky v umovakh tekhnohlobalizmu: vplyv novykh biznes-modelei na rozvytok mizhnarodnoi torhivli tovaramy i posluhamy [Innovation as a driver of the digital transformation of the world economy in the context of technoglobalism: the impact of new business models on the development of international trade in goods and services]. I*nvestytsii: praktyka ta dosvid – Investments: Practice and Experience*, no. 12, pp. 6–12. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6814.2023.12.5

4. Helsper E. J. (2012) A corresponding fields model for the links between social and digital exclusion. *Communication Theory*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 403–426.

5. Bulatova O. V., Reznikova N. V., Ivashchenko O. A. (2023) Tsyfrovy rozryv chy tsyfrova nerivnist? Novi vymiry hlobalnykh asymetrii sotsialno-ekonomichnoho rozvytku i mizhnarodnoi torhivli v umovakh tekhnohlobalizmu [Digital divide or digital inequality? New dimensions of global asymmetries of socio-economic development and international trade in the context of technoglobalism]. *Visnyk Mariupolskoho derzhavnoho universytetu. Seriia: Ekonomika – Bulletin of Mariupol State University. Series: Economics*, no. 25, pp. 45–57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.34079/2226-2822-2023-13-25-45-57

6. Reznikova N., Panchenko V., Karp V., Grod M., Stakhurska S. (2024) The relationship between the green and digital economy in the concept of sustainable development. *Economic Affairs*, vol. 69 (Special Issue), pp. 389–399. DOI: https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.1.2024.41