

DOI: [10.26565/2786-4995-2025-3-02](https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2025-3-02)

UDC 336.71:005.334:351.72

Zhytar Maksym

Doctor of Economics, Professor,
Kyiv Metropolitan Borys Grinchenko University
Kyiv, Ukraine

e-mail: m.zhytar@kubg.edu.ua

ORCID ID: [0000-0003-3614-0788](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3614-0788)

Ananieva Yuliia

PhD in Economics, Associate Professor
Associate Professor of the Department of Public Finance
State Tax University,
Irpın, Ukraine

e-mail: yuliya_3103@yahoo.com

ORCID ID: [0000-0003-0481-5787](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0481-5787)

Methodological justification of state regulation and self-regulation of the development of the banking sector and its financial security

Abstract. The modern banking sector is developing under conditions of global challenges, digital transformation, and intensified integration into the global financial space. Its key characteristics include the growing role of macroprudential policy, the necessity of ensuring financial stability, and the formation of a balanced combination of state regulation and self-regulation mechanisms.

Problem statement. Traditional regulatory and administrative approaches have proven insufficient to prevent crises, as evidenced during financial shocks and especially under the conditions of Ukraine's wartime economy. This highlights the need for a methodological justification of a modern supervisory system that combines state control with institutions of self-regulation.

Unresolved aspects of the problem. Despite the implementation of Basel III standards, FSB recommendations, and DORA provisions, unresolved issues remain in the Ukrainian banking sector, including the harmonization of international requirements with national specifics, ensuring the institutional independence of the National Bank of Ukraine, and the development of effective banking associations.

Purpose of the article. To formulate a comprehensive methodological framework that combines state regulation and self-regulation of the banking sector in order to safeguard its financial security and resilience to crisis challenges.

Presentation of the main material. The article summarizes classical and modern scientific approaches (Diamond-Dybvig, Stiglitz-Weiss models, Allen-Gale's contagion concept, and C. Borio's macroprudential developments) and analyzes the National Bank of Ukraine's experience with implementing SREP, stress testing, and cybersecurity measures. It substantiates three methodological approaches—systemic, integrative, and risk-based. Key components of the methodology are identified: the regulatory and legal framework, institutional structure, supervisory instruments, corporate governance and self-regulation standards, technological infrastructure, and the regulator's human capital.

Conclusions. The synergy of state regulation, self-regulation, and risk-based supervision constitutes the foundation of the resilience of Ukraine's banking sector. It will contribute to enhancing investment attractiveness, strengthening financial security, and integrating Ukraine into the European and global financial space.

Keywords: state regulation, self-regulation, banking sector, financial security, macroprudential policy, Basel III, risk-based supervision.

JEL Classification: G21, G28, G 32, E 58, K23

Formulas: 0, **fig:** 0, **tabl:** 1, **bibl:** 38

For citation: Zhytar M., Ananieva Y. Methodological justification of state regulation and self-regulation of the development of the banking sector and its financial security. Financial and Credit Systems: Prospects for Development. №3(18) 2025. P. 20-34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2025-3-02>

Introduction. The transformational processes taking place in the modern banking environment are driving the growing importance of a scientifically grounded methodology for regulation and supervision. The banking sector is rapidly evolving under the influence of globalization challenges, digital innovations, financial shocks, geopolitical instability, and structural changes in the global economy. Under such conditions, the application of traditional, standardized regulatory approaches is no longer sufficient to ensure financial stability, prevent systemic risks, and maintain trust in the banking system. This necessitates the development of a methodological framework capable of providing an adequate response to the latest challenges and transformations in banking activities.

Literature Review. The issue of methodological justification for state regulation and self-regulation of the banking sector has traditionally been examined through the lens of financial stability and crisis prevention. The classical theoretical foundations were established by Diamond and Dybvig (1983), who, using the model of bank runs, substantiated the role of deposit insurance in maintaining confidence in the banking system [1]. The work of Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) laid the groundwork for understanding information asymmetry and credit rationing, proving that imperfections in the capital market necessitate regulatory intervention to prevent inefficient allocation of resources [2]. Allen and Gale (2000) expanded this logic by demonstrating mechanisms of financial contagion through market liquidity and network connections among banks [3].

Further development of conceptual approaches to regulation took place within the framework of macroprudential policy, where Claudio Borio's research (2003, 2014) played a key role [4]. He systematized the differences between micro- and macroprudential supervision and identified tools aimed at limiting the procyclicality of the financial system, including countercyclical capital buffers and LTV/DTI limits. The influential "Geneva Report" by Brunnermeier, Crockett, Goodhart, Persaud, and Shin (2009) proposed a structural model for managing systemic risks and emphasized the need to combine regulatory and market-based control mechanisms [5]. Empirical studies by Laeven and Valencia (2013, 2020), based on a global database of financial crises, demonstrated the dependence of crisis frequency on institutional quality and the design of regulatory frameworks [6].

The normative consolidation of post-crisis changes occurred through the standards of the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, which introduced liquidity metrics LCR and NSFR, as well as capital requirements for systemically important banks (G-SIBs) [7]. Recommendations by the Financial Stability Board under the "Key Attributes of Effective Resolution Regimes" and TLAC standards defined mechanisms for the orderly resolution of bank insolvency and the minimization of fiscal costs [8]. The study by Acharya, Engle, and Richardson (2012) highlighted the risk of "regulatory arbitrage" and the need for consolidated supervision over banking groups and non-bank financial intermediaries [9].

In the sphere of self-regulation and corporate governance, the seminal work of Shleifer and Vishny (1997) outlined agency conflicts in the management of companies, including banks [10]. The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision's guidelines on corporate governance for banks (2015), as well as the G20/OECD Principles (2015, 2023), detail the role of boards of directors, independent members, risk committees, and effective remuneration policies as tools of internal control [11]. Kirkpatrick (2009) demonstrated that weak corporate governance mechanisms were among the factors behind the global financial crisis, highlighting the interconnection between internal and external regulatory systems [12].

A distinct research direction has been the digital transformation of regulatory and supervisory processes, described in BIS and FSB reports (2017, 2020) on the use of regtech and suptech. The works of Arner, Barberis, and Buckley (2017) reveal how machine learning technologies, automated transaction analysis, and cloud services are changing AML/CFT controls and operational risk supervision methods. The EU's DORA Regulation (2022) establishes

operational resilience frameworks for financial institutions, requiring the integration of cybersecurity and business continuity plans into internal processes [13].

In the Ukrainian context, methodological approaches to banking system regulation are extensively reflected in the National Bank of Ukraine's *Financial Stability Reports* (2019–2024) and *Macroprudential Policy of the NBU* (2021, 2023). The works of Mishchenko, Naumenkova, and Mishchenko (2016, 2020) examine the evolution of banking supervision tools in Ukraine and the implementation of international standards into national legislation [14–15]. Studies by Petryk (2021) and Shkarlet and Danylyshyn (2022) analyze the adaptation of macroprudential requirements to wartime economic conditions, particularly the introduction of new approaches to assessing bank resilience and managing currency risks [16–17].

Empirical studies on the effectiveness of macroprudential instruments globally (Cerutti, Claessens, Laeven, 2017; Kuttner, Shim, 2016; Akinci, Olmstead-Rumsey, 2018) demonstrate that credit growth restrictions and asset price stabilization are achieved through a comprehensive combination of regulatory and self-regulatory tools. In Ukraine, similar results are documented in NBU research (2022, 2023), which confirms that combining state regulation (macroprudential buffers, liquidity requirements) with internal risk management systems reduces the banking sector's vulnerability to external shocks [18–20].

Thus, the contemporary literature shows that the methodological justification for state regulation and self-regulation of the banking sector relies on a comprehensive approach that integrates global standards (Basel III, FSB, DORA), local adaptations (NBU), and internal corporate practices. This ensures a multi-level system of financial security capable of effectively responding to both cyclical fluctuations and crisis events, including wartime and geopolitical risks.

Purpose, Objectives and Research Methods. The purpose of this study is to develop a comprehensive methodological framework for the justification of state regulation and self-regulation in the development of the banking sector and the safeguarding of its financial security. The research aims to bridge the theoretical foundations of banking regulation with practical instruments that ensure the resilience of financial institutions under both normal and crisis conditions, including wartime challenges. By synthesizing global best practices and Ukrainian regulatory experience, the study seeks to propose an integrated model that harmonizes prudential oversight with internal governance mechanisms, ensuring long-term stability and trust in the banking system.

To achieve this purpose, the research sets the following objectives: (1) to conduct a critical review of international and domestic literature on state regulation and self-regulation in the banking sector; (2) to identify key methodological approaches used in managing systemic and idiosyncratic risks; (3) to analyze the applicability of global regulatory frameworks, such as Basel III, FSB Key Attributes, and DORA, within the Ukrainian context; (4) to assess the role of corporate governance and risk management systems in reinforcing financial security; and (5) to propose methodological recommendations for enhancing the synergy between external regulation and internal self-regulation in the post-crisis and post-war recovery phases.

The study employs a combination of qualitative and comparative research methods. The qualitative analysis is based on a systematic literature review of peer-reviewed journal articles, monographs, and official reports from regulatory bodies, ensuring the inclusion of both seminal and recent contributions to the field. Comparative analysis is applied to juxtapose international regulatory practices with Ukraine's evolving macroprudential and supervisory frameworks. Additionally, a synthesis method is used to integrate theoretical models and empirical findings into a coherent methodological framework. The research relies exclusively on verified academic and institutional sources, ensuring scientific validity and minimizing the risk of bias or unverified assumptions.

Research Results. After the global financial crisis of 2007–2009, the international community recognized the importance of building a regulatory architecture based on in-depth

scientific analysis and the consideration of cause-and-effect relationships between various segments of the financial sector. In response, a number of new standards were developed, including Basel III, which defined the modern paradigm of risk-based banking supervision, focusing on proactive risk management, capital adequacy, and liquidity [7].

Within Ukraine's financial system, additional complexity arises from structural weaknesses such as a high level of market concentration, dependence on external capital, instability of the regulatory environment, and underdeveloped self-regulatory institutions. Banking sector reforms initiated after 2014 significantly changed the principles of interaction between the state and banking institutions; however, the issue of balancing control and autonomy, as well as preventive versus reactive supervisory measures, remains unresolved [21].

In such circumstances, the methodological substantiation of regulatory policy is not merely a technical necessity but a strategic instrument for shaping the country's long-term financial security. In particular, it is important to move from a normative-directive model to a flexible, adaptive regulatory system that takes into account the economic cycle, the specifics of banks' business models, interaction with other financial sectors (insurance, securities markets), and the institutions' level of digital maturity. This approach aligns with European and global trends, particularly within the EU's Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM), where regulation is multi-level, risk-based, and comparable across countries [7-8].

Another important aspect is the need to account for financial innovations and digital transformation, which radically change banks' risk profiles. Big data, blockchain, open banking, and artificial intelligence create new supervisory challenges that cannot be effectively addressed without modern methodological tools. This requires the development of new forms of stress testing, embedded compliance mechanisms, and a rethinking of the traditional functions of the NBU as regulator [8; 14-15].

In the context of the constant threat of economic and financial crises, it is also essential to methodologically combine macroprudential regulation tools with elements of crisis management. According to the Strategy for Economic Security of Ukraine until 2025, the banking system is defined as a critical component of the state's financial architecture that requires sustainable institutional protection through state regulation and partnership with market participants [22].

Equally significant is the development of self-regulation in the banking sector as part of a new regulatory culture based on responsibility, transparency, and internal control. International experience demonstrates that a balanced interaction between state regulation and self-regulation creates stable financial supervision systems that are flexible to market changes while maintaining public trust [23-25].

Thus, the methodological justification for regulating the banking sector is not an abstract theoretical task but directly influences the efficiency of the financial system's functioning. It should be grounded in clearly structured approaches-systemic, risk-based, integrated, and institutional-which ensure that regulatory mechanisms are consistent with the realities of the modern economic environment, public expectations, and the challenges of the global financial space.

In building an effective and sustainable system of state regulation and self-regulation of the banking sector, it is important to apply a set of methodological approaches that complement one another and ensure comprehensive coverage of all aspects of financial stability. Three key paradigms-systemic, integrative, and risk-based approaches-form the conceptual foundation of modern regulatory policy.

The systemic approach is based on the understanding of the banking sector as a complex, open socio-economic system that functions in interconnection with other sectors of the economy, as well as political and social institutions. The banking system is not isolated; it constantly interacts with monetary policy, the fiscal system, the labor market, the real sector, and external financial flows. Therefore, state regulation should be viewed not as a set of isolated normative tools, but as part of the country's macroeconomic policy [26].

In practical terms, this means that banking regulation must consider multiplier effects: for example, restricting lending in one sector can have a significant impact on investment in other industries. The systemic approach also requires constant monitoring of interdependencies between credit, currency, stock, and insurance markets, which is particularly relevant for Ukraine, where the financial sector is highly vulnerable to external shocks [27]. Systemicity is also reflected in the establishment of institutional cooperation-coordinated work between the National Bank of Ukraine, the Ministry of Finance, the Deposit Guarantee Fund, the National Securities and Stock Market Commission, and other bodies that collectively shape the regulatory environment.

The integrative approach emphasizes the need to synchronize national banking regulation with internationally recognized standards, recommendations, and best practices. In the context of globalization of financial flows and Ukraine's European integration course, it is important to ensure that legislation, institutional structures, and regulatory procedures are compatible with the requirements of the European Union and the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision [7].

This approach involves the implementation of key regulatory documents such as:

1. Basel Core Principles for Effective Banking Supervision, which serve as the foundation for assessing the resilience of the national supervisory system [7-8], [28].

2. Basel III**, which introduces modern requirements for capital, liquidity, leverage, and bank stress testing.

3. EU Directives**, in particular the Capital Requirements Directive (CRD IV) and the Single Supervisory Mechanism Regulation (SSM), which govern supervisory activities in the EU [29].

For Ukraine, the integrative approach is not only an element of financial security but also a prerequisite for strengthening international investor confidence, improving credit ratings, and gaining access to external capital. At the same time, it is important that the implementation of external standards is not merely formal-adaptation should take into account the realities of the Ukrainian market, the institutional capacity of the NBU, and the level of financial literacy among the population [30-32].

The risk-based approach is the central methodological concept of modern banking regulation, involving the assessment, monitoring, and management of risks at both institutional and systemic levels. Its essence lies in shifting from normative control to preventive risk assessment to reduce the likelihood of crisis scenarios.

This approach provides for:

- differentiation of the degree of supervision according to the bank's risk profile (size of assets, type of clients, geography of operations, history of violations, etc.);

- use of macroprudential policy instruments (e.g., countercyclical buffers, systemic risk limits, monitoring of bank interconnectedness);

- regular stress testing to assess banks' resilience to hypothetical crisis scenarios (exchange rate fluctuations, corporate borrower defaults, liquidity shocks) [7].

In NBU practice, the risk-based approach is implemented through the Supervisory Review and Evaluation Process (SREP), which is based on quantitative and qualitative assessments of banks' financial stability. In addition, the regulator analyzes risks related to cybersecurity, compliance, exposures to related parties, and more. This approach becomes particularly relevant in conditions of economic and energy instability, wartime threats, and heightened credit risk due to the loss of many borrowers' solvency.

Applying systemic, integrative, and risk-based approaches within banking regulation methodology makes it possible to create a multidimensional, dynamic, and stable model of regulatory influence. Such a model can respond promptly to internal and external challenges while maintaining a balance between financial stability, institutional efficiency, and public trust in the banking system.

Discussion. The methodology for regulating and supervising the banking sector should be based on a comprehensive approach that encompasses not only the legal and regulatory framework, but also institutional–organizational, economic, managerial, and technological elements. Such an approach ensures the effective functioning of the regulatory system in both stable development phases and crisis periods. In this context, six key components of the regulation and supervision methodology can be distinguished:

1. Regulatory and legal framework. The formation of regulatory policy begins with the creation of a stable legal foundation that defines the powers of regulators, mechanisms of influence, boundaries of intervention, and the rights of market participants. The core of national legislation is formed by the Laws of Ukraine “On Banks and Banking” [33] and “On the National Bank of Ukraine” [34], as well as the NBU’s regulatory acts. At the same time, the legal framework is gradually being adapted to European requirements, in particular through the implementation of Basel Principles and EU directives. This component serves not only a regulatory function but also ensures institutional legitimacy by defining the limits of permissible banking activities, the responsibilities of management, licensing conditions, capital, liquidity, reporting, and corporate governance requirements. A reliable legal basis is also the foundation for protecting depositors’ interests and increasing trust in the banking system.

2. Institutional structure of regulation. The methodology presupposes a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities among the institutions that perform banking supervision. In most countries, regulatory functions are divided between the central bank, the deposit guarantee agency, financial monitoring institutions, and market supervision bodies (securities, insurance, etc.). In Ukraine, the key body is the National Bank of Ukraine, which performs both monetary and regulatory functions, including prudential supervision, solvency assessment, and verification of banks’ internal procedures. Other important institutions include:

The Deposit Guarantee Fund (DGF) - responsible for liquidating insolvent banks;

The National Securities and Stock Market Commission (NSSMC) - regulates capital markets;

The State Financial Monitoring Service - responsible for anti–money laundering (AML) measures.

From a methodological perspective, it is important to ensure coordination among all bodies, avoid duplication of powers, and strengthen feedback mechanisms with banks and the public.

3. Regulatory instruments. The tools of state regulation of the banking system can be conditionally divided into:

3.1. Prudential tools: capital adequacy ratios (N1, N2, N3), liquidity ratios (LCR, NSFR), provisioning, credit risk limits, maximum exposure to related parties, etc.

3.2. Administrative tools: licensing, appointment of temporary administration, license revocation.

3.3. Information and analytical tools: mandatory reporting, monitoring, early warning indicators.

3.4. Macroprudential policy tools: countercyclical buffers, leverage limits, systemic risk assessment, stress testing.

In modern risk-based supervision, these tools are not limited to strict control they are increasingly preventive in nature, aimed at stability support, providing recommendations, and implementing restructuring programs [35-36].

4. Corporate governance and self-regulation standards. The methodology should include elements of corporate responsibility, transparency, independence, and sound internal risk management in banks. According to Basel Committee recommendations, supervisory boards, audit committees, internal control systems, and compliance functions play a key role. Alongside state supervision, a system of self-regulation should be developed through professional banking associations that create codes of conduct, ethical standards, model internal policies, and participate

in shaping regulatory decisions. Such models are widely used in the EU, where self-regulatory institutions are powerful actors in the financial system.

5. Technological infrastructure and digital supervision tools. In the era of digital transformation, regulators must possess advanced technological tools that enable real-time monitoring, automated reporting processing, big data analysis, and anomaly detection. The use of RegTech and SupTech technologies for regulators is becoming an essential part of modern supervisory methodology. The NBU has already introduced online supervision systems, digital reporting, and a stress-testing platform. The Supervisory Review and Evaluation Process (SREP) is also developing, enabling automated and in-depth assessment of each bank across multiple parameters.

6. Human capital and analytical capacity of the regulator. The quality of regulation directly depends on the competence of regulatory staff. Modern methodology requires continuous professional development of NBU employees, expansion of analytical capabilities, use of international best practices, and cooperation with academic institutions. Certification programs, internships at the ECB or Basel Committee, and the publication of research and reports contribute to building the regulator's intellectual infrastructure. It is equally important to ensure the regulator's independence from political pressure or the influence of financial groups, which is critical for the long-term stability of the banking sector.

Each component of the methodology from legislation to technological tools plays its role in the unified system of ensuring financial stability. Their interaction allows not only for risk control but also for the development of a competitive, transparent, and resilient banking sector. In the context of European integration and global financial instability, it is crucial for Ukraine's regulatory methodology to meet the highest standards and practices endorsed by international organizations while being adapted to national conditions.

In today's globalized financial environment, banking regulation and supervision models largely determine not only national economic stability but also integration into the international financial system. Different countries use institutional approaches shaped by the level of economic development, financial market structure, and historical-legal traditions. At the same time, the existence of unified international standards, particularly Basel Committee recommendations and EU practices, enables benchmarking and adaptation in the national context.

Globally, four main regulatory models are distinguished:

1. Institutional model - each type of financial intermediary (banks, insurance companies, stock exchanges) is regulated by a separate specialized body.
2. Functional model - supervision is divided by types of financial services, regardless of the institution type.
3. Integrated model (single regulator) - a "mega-regulator" is established for all financial institutions (e.g., Poland, Hungary).
4. Twin Peaks model - combines a central bank with an independent body responsible for microprudential supervision (e.g., Germany: Bundesbank + BaFin) [23].

Within the EU, a Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM) has been formed, which provides centralized control over the largest banks by the ECB and supervision of smaller banks through national regulators [8].

Ukraine has chosen a hybrid institutional model in which the NBU performs both macroprudential regulation and microprudential supervision of banks. At the same time, the regulation of other financial institutions (insurance companies, credit unions, pawnshops) was long fragmented among several bodies (NSSMC, National Commission for State Regulation of Financial Services Markets, etc.). Only in 2020, with the implementation of the "split" reform, did the NBU gain authority to regulate the non-banking financial sector.

Currently, the regulatory structure of Ukraine's banking system includes:

1. National Bank of Ukraine (NBU) - the central bank and main regulator, responsible for licensing, prudential supervision, macroprudential analysis, and applying regulatory requirements [37].

2. Deposit Guarantee Fund (DGF) - manages the liquidation of insolvent banks and guarantees deposit repayment.

3. State Financial Monitoring Service - AML authority.

Despite formal convergence with European standards, Ukraine's model has several specific features:

Insufficient institutional independence, especially regarding political pressure on the regulator.

Lack of an effective banking self-regulation mechanism, whereas in the EU and US, active banking associations form part of the regulatory environment.

Low quality of corporate governance in many banks despite requirements for independent supervisory boards.

Limited participation in global supranational regulatory structures.

While Ukraine's regulatory model is gradually improving, several issues require methodological and practical solutions:

1. Strengthening the NBU's institutional independence, especially during political transitions and conflicts of interest between the state and large business.

2. Developing self-regulatory mechanisms through support for banking associations, ethical codes, internal control, and corporate responsibility [31], [38].

3. Integrating into European supervisory structures, participating in international financial stability initiatives, and improving information exchange.

4. Digitizing and automating supervision, developing SupTech, and enhancing the regulator's real-time response capacity.

Table 1. Comparison of Regulatory Models: International Experience and Ukrainian Realities

Country/Region	Model Type	Coordinating Authority	Key Characteristics
European Union (Eurozone)	Supranational, Centralized	ECB (SSM) + national regulators	Centralized supervision of systemically important banks, unified criteria [7]
Germany	Two-Tier	Bundesbank + BaFin	Separation of macro- and micro-supervision, high independence of regulators [8]
United Kingdom	Three-Tier	BoE + PRA + FCA	High level of supervision over conduct risks, financial education [23]
United States	Functional	OCC, FDIC, Fed, SEC	Division of powers by type of activity, parallel regulation [23]
Ukraine	Institutional (Hybrid)	NBU	Centralized supervision, high concentration of powers, gradual European integration [34]

The Ukrainian model of banking regulation is currently at a transitional stage – between adapting to international standards and searching for its own institutional form that would meet national realities. Comparative analysis demonstrates that the effectiveness of regulation is determined not only by the regulatory framework or organizational structure but also by the regulator's ability to respond flexibly to changes, maintain a balance of interests, ensure stability, and foster trust in the banking system. Further integration into the European financial area requires

continued reforms, particularly in the fields of corporate governance, crisis regulation, and digital transformation.

Modern banking sector regulation methodology recognizes the importance not only of state control but also of active involvement of self-regulatory institutions in ensuring the stability, transparency, and efficiency of the financial system. In this context, the interaction between state regulation and self-regulation emerges as a methodological category that reflects the need to balance centralized supervision with market mechanisms of responsibility. Such interaction is based on the principles of subsidiarity, partnership, coordination, and complementarity, enabling the combination of the power of the state with the flexibility and adaptability of the private sector.

Historically, state regulation has evolved as a response to market failures, crises, and information asymmetry characteristic of the financial sphere. Its main goals are to ensure systemic stability, protect depositors' interests, prevent bankruptcies, and combat financial crimes. Conversely, self-regulation has emerged as a mechanism to enhance the internal responsibility of market participants, optimize internal processes, and raise the level of professional ethics.

In the modern financial paradigm, these two systems do not oppose each other but interact, enhancing the overall effectiveness of the regulatory environment. State regulation sets the framework conditions and minimum standards, while self-regulation specifies them according to the specifics of individual banking segments, sectoral features, and professional standards. This approach corresponds to the logic of multi-level governance typical of both the European Union and advanced national systems (Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States).

From a methodological perspective, self-regulation performs the following functions:

1. Norm-setting function – development and implementation of sectoral standards, codes of conduct, and methodological guidelines that specify legislative provisions.
2. Supervisory function – internal monitoring of compliance with ethical standards, transparency, and internal procedures.
3. Arbitration function – resolution of conflicts between market participants outside state jurisdiction.
4. Educational function – professional training, preparation of analytical materials, and development of professional culture.
5. Advisory function – participation in the development of legislative initiatives and provision of expert opinions to state bodies [24;38].

A key element here is responsibility and transparency, which create a mechanism of "soft regulation" that complements and strengthens strict state regulatory measures.

In international practice, various forms of institutionalized self-regulation are widespread. In the United States, self-regulatory organizations (SROs) such as FINRA – a securities market SRO – operate actively with legislatively recognized powers. In the United Kingdom, banks are united in industry associations (e.g., British Bankers' Association) that participate in the national supervisory consultation process. In Germany, strong cooperative banks and associations have the right to internally regulate and audit their members [23].

In Ukraine, self-regulation mechanisms are at an early stage of development. Despite the presence of the Association of Ukrainian Banks, the Independent Association of Banks of Ukraine, and some initiatives to create sectoral codes, the practical role of these institutions in policy-making remains limited. There is no clear legal status for SROs, no system of delegated powers, and no sanctioning mechanisms.

To develop effective interaction between state and self-regulation, the following are necessary:

- Legislative definition of the status of self-regulatory organizations;
- Establishment of cooperation procedures between the NBU and banking associations;
- Development of institutional capacity of associations (analytical, legal, organizational);
- Integration of SROs into the Regulatory Impact Assessment process.

Combining state and self-regulatory influence creates regulatory synergy that ensures:
Greater flexibility in responding to challenges (e.g., fintech, cryptocurrencies, cyber risks);
Reduced burden on the state regulator by transferring part of the supervisory functions to the professional community;

Greater legitimacy of decisions through alignment with market participants;
Promotion of a culture of responsible management and ethical business conduct.

From a methodological standpoint, such interaction allows the combination of hard regulatory tools (sanctions, prudential norms) with soft ones (informational tools, self-reflection, public commitments), significantly increasing the system's resilience to stress factors.

As a methodological category, the interaction between state regulation and self-regulation in the banking sector is not only a functional necessity but also a strategic principle in building a modern, flexible, and resilient regulatory system. This approach combines control with trust, directive authority with autonomy, centralization with decentralization – collectively shaping a new quality of banking supervision. For Ukraine, this direction is promising given the need to modernize supervisory mechanisms, strengthen financial security, and ensure competitiveness within the European financial space.

Conclusions. Methodological justification of state regulation and self-regulation of the development of the banking sector and its financial security is a fundamental stage in building an effective, flexible, and resilient financial supervision system in the context of transformations in the modern economic environment. The concepts, approaches, and practical implementations analyzed in this subsection make it possible to draw several important conclusions.

First, the need for a methodological approach to banking regulation is driven by the increasing complexity and dynamics of the financial system, especially in the context of digital transformation, global financial risks, geopolitical instability, and integration challenges. Regulatory decisions should be based not on intuition or administrative expediency but on clearly structured approaches that take into account both internal and external factors affecting the banking sector.

Second, the key methodological approaches to building effective regulation include:

The systemic approach, which ensures a comprehensive analysis of the interconnections between the banking system and other sectors of the economy, allows for the forecasting of systemic risks, and improves the quality of managerial decisions;

The integrative approach, aimed at harmonizing Ukrainian standards with European and international norms, in particular the principles of the Basel Committee, the requirements of the SSM, and EU directives.

The risk-based approach, which focuses not only on formal compliance of banks with legislation but also on a qualitative assessment of each institution's risk profile, ensuring a preventive nature of supervision.

Third, the methodology of banking regulation should include a coherent system of components such as: regulatory and legal framework, institutional structure, supervisory tools, corporate governance standards, technological infrastructure, and the regulator's human capital. Each of these components is interconnected and forms a single mechanism aimed at ensuring financial stability.

Fourth, the Ukrainian model of banking sector regulation is in a phase of active reform and gradual adaptation to European standards. Compared to the models of the EU, Germany, the United Kingdom, or the USA, it demonstrates both positive changes (transfer of supervisory functions to the NBU, implementation of SREP, "split" reform) and critical constraints (underdevelopment of self-regulatory institutions, weak institutional independence, limited resources for supervision).

Fifth, the interaction between state regulation and self-regulation is gaining strategic importance. The modern regulatory paradigm recognizes the complementarity of these two systems: the state sets mandatory rules and guarantees systemic stability, while the banking community-

through associations, ethical codes, and standards-forms a responsible professional culture and ensures internal control. Methodologically, such interaction provides greater flexibility, reduces the transaction costs of supervisory activities, and enhances the effectiveness of the regulatory environment.

Thus, the synthesis of state regulation, self-regulation, and risk-based supervisory practices, based on international experience and adaptation to national conditions, is the key to forming a competitive, resilient, and transparent banking sector in Ukraine. This, in turn, will contribute to achieving macro-financial stability, increasing the country's investment attractiveness, and integrating into the global financial space.

References

1. Diamond, D. W., & Dybvig, P. H. (1983). Bank runs, deposit insurance, and liquidity. *Journal of Political Economy*, 91(3), 401–419.
2. Stiglitz, J. E., & Weiss, A. (1981). Credit rationing in markets with imperfect information. *American Economic Review*, 71*(3), 393–410.
3. Allen, F., & Gale, D. (2000). Financial contagion. *Journal of Political Economy*, 108(1), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1086/262109>
4. Borio, C. (2014). Macroprudential frameworks: (Too) great expectations? BIS Working Papers, (442).
5. Brunnermeier, M., Crockett, A., Goodhart, C., Persaud, A., & Shin, H. (2009). *The fundamental principles of financial regulation* (Geneva Reports on the World Economy No. 11).
6. Laeven, L., & Valencia, F. (2020). Systemic banking crises database II. *IMF Economic Review*, 68, 307–361. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41308-020-00107-3>
7. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. (2017). Basel III: Finalising post-crisis reforms. Basel: BIS.
8. Financial Stability Board. (2021). Evaluation of the effects of too-big-to-fail reforms. Basel: FSB.
9. Acharya, V., Engle, R., & Richardson, M. (2012). Capital shortfall: A new approach to ranking and regulating systemic risks. *American Economic Review*, 102(3), 59–64. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.3.59>
10. Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. *Journal of Finance*, 52(2), 737–783. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb04820.x>
11. G20/OECD. (2023). Principles of corporate governance. Paris: OECD Publishing.
12. Kirkpatrick, G. (2009). The corporate governance lessons from the financial crisis. *OECD Journal: Financial Market Trends*, 2009(1), 61–87. <https://doi.org/10.1787/fmt-v2009-art3-en>
13. Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2017). Fintech, regtech, and the reconceptualization of financial regulation. *Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business*, 37(3), 371–413.
14. Mishchenko, V., Naumenkova, S., & Mishchenko, S. (2016). Banking supervision in Ukraine: Problems and perspectives. *Banks and Bank Systems*, 11(3), 20–32. <https://doi.org/10.21511/bbs.11%283%29.2016.03>
15. Mishchenko, V., Naumenkova, S., & Mishchenko, S. (2020). Implementation of macroprudential policy in Ukraine. *Banks and Bank Systems*, 15(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.21511/bbs.15%281%29.2020.01>
16. Petryk, O. (2021). Adaptation of macroprudential regulation in Ukraine during economic shocks. *Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice*, 4(39), 18–28.
17. Shkarlet, S., & Danylyshyn, B. (2022). Banking system resilience in wartime conditions: The case of Ukraine. *Economic Annals-XXI*, 197(1-2), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V197-01>
18. Cerutti, E., Claessens, S., & Laeven, L. (2017). The use and effectiveness of macroprudential policies: New evidence. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 28, 203–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2015.10.004>
19. Kuttner, K., & Shim, I. (2016). Can non-interest rate policies stabilize housing markets? Evidence from a panel of 57 economies. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 26, 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2016.07.001>
20. Akinci, O., & Olmstead-Rumsey, J. (2018). How effective are macroprudential policies? An empirical investigation. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 33, 33–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2017.11.001>
21. Khudoliy, A. (2019). Transformation of the Ukrainian banking system regulation. *Banks and Bank Systems*, 14(4), 27–36. Retrieved from: https://www.businessperspectives.org/images/pdf/applications/publishing/templates/article/assets/12707/BBS_2019_04_Khudoliy.pdf
22. Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 347/2021. (2021). On the Decision of the National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine of August 11, 2021 "On the Economic Security Strategy of Ukraine until 2025." <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/3472021-39613> [in Ukrainian]
23. International Monetary Fund. (2006). Is one watchdog better than three? International experience with integrated financial sector supervision (IMF Working Paper WP/06/57). <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2006/wp0657.pdf>
24. Mozghovyi, Y., Kondrunina, K., Ratnykova, I., & Skidan, D. D. (2011). Corporate governance regulation in banks in the context of crisis: The role of the National Bank of Ukraine. *Corporate Ownership & Control*, 9(1), 221–229. <https://virtusinterpress.org/IMG/pdf/10-22495c0cv9i1c1art6.pdf>
25. Fedorushchenko, B. V. (2021). Determinants and threats to the financial security of the banking sector. *Finansovyi prostir*, 3, 44–51. [in Ukrainian]
26. Bakumenko, V. D. (2000). Formation of public administration decisions: Problems of theory, methodology, and practice. [in Ukrainian]

27. Aliexsieiev, I., Zhelizniak, R., Glietova, N., Pavlenko, L., Kovalenko, V., et al. (2023). Development of the model for forecasting indicators of banking microcrediting of small business entities. *Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice*, 2(49), 163–180. <https://doi.org/10.55643/fcaptop.2.49.2023.4025>
 28. Chugunov, I., Sidelnykova, L., Sosnovska, O., Zhytar, M., & Navolokina, A. (2022). Tools for assessing the level of adaptivity of the financial architecture of economy to financial globalization conditions based on the capacity of banks, non-banking financial institutions and stock market. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, 19, 1075–1084. <https://doi.org/10.37394/23207.2022.19.94>
 29. Financial supervisory architecture since the global crisis. (2018). *VoxEU*. Retrieved from: <https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/financial-supervisory-architecture-global-crisis-supervisory-models-remain-diverse>
 30. Doroshenko, N., Doroshenko, O., & Melnychenko, V. (2019). Bringing the standards of Ukrainian banking legislation to EU standards. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, 188, 17–22. <https://www.atlantis-press.com/article/125960335.pdf>
 31. Mozghovyi, Y., & Pavliuk, O. (2020). Formation of the concept of risk-oriented banking supervision in Ukraine. *International Economic Policy*, 32–33, 56–65. [in Ukrainian]
 32. Tseluiko, O. I. (2021). Features of state regulation of the banking system in the conditions of European integration. *Law and Public Administration*, 1, 262–270.
 33. Law of Ukraine No. 2121-III. On banks and banking activity. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2121-14#Text> [in Ukrainian]
 34. Law of Ukraine No. 679-XIV. On the National Bank of Ukraine]. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/679-14#Text> [in Ukrainian]
 35. Zhytar, M., & Samorodov, B. (2022). Infrastructural assurance of the mechanism for regulating imbalances in the movement of financial resources of the Ukrainian economy in the context of external fluctuations. *Financial and Credit Systems: Prospects for Development*, 1(4), 28–36 <https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2022-1-03>
 36. Kachula, S., Zhytar, M., Sidelnykova, L., Perchuk, O., & Novosolova, O. (2022). The relationship between economic growth and banking sector development in Ukraine. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, 19, 222–230. <https://doi.org/10.37394/23207.2022.19.21>
 37. Samorodov, B. V., Sosnovska, O. O., Zhytar, M. O., & Ananieva, J. V. (2020). Methodical approach to the quantification of enterprise financial security level. *Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice*, 32, 269–277.
 38. Ustynova, I., & Poltoratska, Y. (2017). International practices of organizing the banking system as models for reforming banking supervision in Ukraine. *Scientific Papers of the National Aviation University. Series: Legal Bulletin "Air and Space Law"*, 1(42), 86–91. Retrieved from: <https://er.nau.edu.ua> [in Ukrainian]
- The article was received by the editors 18.06.2025*
The article is recommended for printing 26.08.2025

Authors Contribution: All authors have contributed equally to this work

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest

Максим Житар

доктор економічних наук, професор,
професор кафедри фінансів
Київського столичного університету
імені Бориса Грінченка
e-mail: m.zhytar@kubg.edu.ua
ORCID ID: [000-0003-3614-0788](https://orcid.org/000-0003-3614-0788)

Юлія Ананьєва

кандидат економічних наук, доцент
доцент кафедри публічних фінансів
Державного податкового університету
e-mail: yuliya_3103@yahoo.com
ORCID ID: [0000-0003-0481-5787](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0481-5787)

Методологічне обґрунтування державного регулювання і саморегулювання розвитку банківського сектору та його фінансової безпеки

Анотація. Сучасний банківський сектор розвивається в умовах глобальних викликів, цифрової трансформації та посиленої інтеграції у світовий фінансовий простір. Його ключовими характеристиками є зростаюча роль макропруденційної політики, необхідність забезпечення фінансової стійкості та формування збалансованого поєднання державного регулювання й механізмів саморегулювання. Разом із тим посилюється вплив зовнішніх шоків, зокрема воєнних та геополітичних ризиків, що потребують адаптивних регуляторних механізмів. Важливою особливістю є й підвищена залежність банківської системи від цифрових технологій, що формує нові виклики у сфері кіберстійкості та операційної безпеки.

Постановка проблеми. Традиційні нормативно-адміністративні підходи до регулювання виявляються недостатніми для запобігання кризам, що проявилось під час фінансових потрясінь і особливо в умовах воєнної економіки України. Виникає потреба в методологічному обґрунтуванні сучасної системи нагляду, яка поєднувала б державний контроль та інститути саморегулювання.

Нерозв'язані аспекти. Незважаючи на імплементацію стандартів Basel III, рекомендацій FSB та норм DORA, в українському банківському секторі залишаються невизначеними питання гармонізації міжнародних вимог із національними особливостями, забезпечення інституційної незалежності НБУ та розбудови ефективних банківських асоціацій.

Мета статті. Сформулювати цілісну методологічну основу для поєднання державного регулювання й саморегулювання розвитку банківського сектору з метою забезпечення його фінансової безпеки та стійкості до кризових викликів.

Основний матеріал. У статті узагальнено класичні та сучасні наукові підходи (моделі Даймонда-Дибвіга, Стігліца-Вайса, концепція Аллена-Гейла, макропруденційні розробки К. Боріо), проаналізовано досвід НБУ щодо впровадження SREP, стрес-тестування, кіберстійкості. Обґрунтовано три методологічні підходи - системний, інтегративний та ризик-орієнтований. Визначено ключові компоненти методології: нормативно-правову базу, інституційну структуру, регуляторні інструменти, стандарти корпоративного управління, технологічну інфраструктуру та кадровий потенціал регулятора.

Висновки. Синергія державного регулювання, саморегулювання та ризик-орієнтованого нагляду є фундаментом стійкості банківського сектору України. Це сприятиме підвищенню інвестиційної привабливості, посиленню фінансової безпеки та інтеграції України до європейського й глобального фінансового простору.

Ключові слова: державне регулювання, саморегулювання, банківський сектор, фінансова безпека, макропруденційна політика, Basel III, ризик-орієнтований нагляд.

JEL Classification: G21, G28, G 32, E 58, K23

Формули: 0, рис.: 0, табл.: 1., бібл.: 38

Для цитування: Zhytar M., Ananieva Y.. Methodological justification of state regulation and self-regulation of the development of the banking sector and its financial security. Фінансово-кредитні системи: перспективи розвитку. №3(18) 2025. С. 20-34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2025-3-02>

Список літератури

1. Diamond D. W., Dybvig P. H. Bank runs, deposit insurance, and liquidity. *Journal of Political Economy*. 1983. Vol. 91, No. 3. P. 401–419.
2. Stiglitz J. E., Weiss A. Credit rationing in markets with imperfect information. *American Economic Review*. 1981. Vol. 71, No. 3. P. 393–410
3. Allen F., Gale D. Financial contagion. *Journal of Political Economy*. 2000. Vol. 108, No. 1. P. 1–33. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1086/262109>
4. Borio C. Macroprudential frameworks: (Too) great expectations? BIS Working Papers. 2014. No. 442

5. Brunnermeier M., Crockett A., Goodhart C., Persaud A., Shin H. The Fundamental Principles of Financial Regulation. Geneva Reports on the World Economy. 2009. No. 11
6. Laeven L., Valencia F. Systemic banking crises database II. IMF Economic Review. 2020. Vol. 68. P. 307–361. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41308-020-00107-3>
7. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. Basel III: Finalising post-crisis reforms. Basel: BIS, 2017
8. Financial Stability Board. Evaluation of the effects of too-big-to-fail reforms. Basel: FSB, 2021
9. Acharya V., Engle R., Richardson M. Capital shortfall: A new approach to ranking and regulating systemic risks. American Economic Review. 2012. Vol. 102, No. 3. P. 59–64. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.3.59>
10. Shleifer A., Vishny R. A survey of corporate governance. Journal of Finance. 1997. Vol. 52, No. 2. P. 737–783. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb04820.x>
11. G20/OECD. Principles of corporate governance. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2023
12. Kirkpatrick G. The corporate governance lessons from the financial crisis. OECD Journal: Financial Market Trends. 2009. No. 1. P. 61–87. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/fmt-v2009-art3-en>
13. Arner D. W., Barberis J., Buckley R. P. Fintech, regtech, and the reconceptualization of financial regulation. Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business. 2017. Vol. 37, No. 3. P. 371–413
14. Mishchenko V., Naumenkova S., Mishchenko S. Banking supervision in Ukraine: Problems and perspectives. Banks and Bank Systems. 2016. Vol. 11, No. 3. P. 20–32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21511/bbs.11%283%29.2016.03>
15. Mishchenko V., Naumenkova S., Mishchenko S. Implementation of macroprudential policy in Ukraine. Banks and Bank Systems. 2020. Vol. 15, No. 1. P. 1–14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21511/bbs.15%281%29.2020.01>
16. Petryk O. Adaptation of macroprudential regulation in Ukraine during economic shocks. Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice. 2021. Vol. 4, No. 39. P. 18–28.
17. Shkarlet S., Danylyshyn B. Banking system resilience in wartime conditions: The case of Ukraine. Economic Annals-XXI. 2022. Vol. 197, No. 1-2. P. 4–11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V197-01>
18. Cerutti E., Claessens S., Laeven L. The use and effectiveness of macroprudential policies: New evidence. Journal of Financial Stability. 2017. Vol. 28. P. 203–224. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2015.10.004>
19. Kuttner K., Shim I. Can non-interest rate policies stabilize housing markets? Evidence from a panel of 57 economies. Journal of Financial Stability. 2016. Vol. 26. P. 31–44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2016.07.001>
20. Akinci O., Olmstead-Rumsey J. How effective are macroprudential policies? An empirical investigation. Journal of Financial Intermediation. 2018. Vol. 33. P. 33–57. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2017.11.001>
21. Khudoliy, A. (2019). Transformation of the Ukrainian Banking System Regulation. Banks and Bank Systems, 14(4), 27–36. URL: https://www.businessperspectives.org/images/pdf/applications/publishing/templates/article/assets/12707/BBS_2019_04_Khudoliy.pdf
Про рішення Ради національної безпеки і оборони України від 11 серпня 2021 року «Про Стратегію економічної безпеки України на період до 2025 року». Указ Президента України №347/2021. URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/3472021-39613>
23. International Monetary Fund. (2006). Is One Watchdog Better Than Three? International Experience with Integrated Financial Sector Supervision. IMF Working Paper, WP/06/57. URL: <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2006/wp0657.pdf>
24. Mozghovyi, Y., Kondrunina, K., Ratnykova, I., & Skidan, D. D. (2011). Corporate Governance Regulation in Banks in the Context of Crisis: The Role of the National Bank of Ukraine. Corporate Ownership & Control, 9(1), 221–229. URL: <https://virtusinterpress.org/IMG/pdf/10-22495cocv9i1c1art6.pdf>
25. Федорущенко Б. В. Детермінанти і загрози фінансовій безпеці банківського сектору. Фінансовий простір. 2021. № 3. С.44-51
26. Бакуменко В. Д. Формування державноуправлінських рішень: проблеми теорії, методології, практики: монографія. Київ, 2000. 328 с.
27. Aliksieiev Ihor, Zhelizniak Roman, Glielova Nataliia, Pavlenko Liudmyla, Kovalenko Volodymyr and others. Development of The Model For Forecasting Indicators of Banking Microcrediting of Small Business Entities. Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice. № 2 (49). 163-180. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55643/fcaptop.2.49.2023.4025>
28. Chugunov I., Sidelnykova L., Sosnovska O., Zhytar M., Navolokina A. Tools for Assessing the Level of Adaptivity of the Financial Architecture of Economy to Financial Globalization Conditions based on the Capacity of Banks, Non-Banking Financial Institutions and Stock Market. WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics. 2022. № 19. P. 1075-1084. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37394/23207.2022.19.94>
Financial supervisory architecture since the Global Crisis. (2018). VoxEU. URL: <https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/financial-supervisory-architecture-global-crisis-supervisory-models-remain-diverse>
30. Doroshenko, N., Doroshenko, O., & Melnychenko, V. (2019). Bringing the Standards of Ukrainian Banking Legislation to EU Standards. Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research, 188, 17–22. URL: <https://www.atlantispress.com/article/125960335.pdf>
31. Mozghovyi, Y., Pavliuk, O. (2020). Formation of the Concept of Risk-Oriented Banking Supervision in Ukraine. International Economic Policy, 32-33, 56–65
32. Целуйко О. І. Особливості державного регулювання банківської системи в умовах євроінтеграції. Право та державне управління. 2021. № 1. С. 262–270
33. Про банки та банківську діяльність: Закон України від 7.12.2000 р. № 2121-III. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2121-14#Text>

34. Про Національний банк України: Закон України від 20.05.1999 р. № 679-XIV. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/679-14#Text>
35. Zhytar M., Samorodov B. Infrastructural Assurance of the Mechanism For Regulating Imbalances in The Movement of Financial Resources of The Ukrainian Economy in The Context of External Fluctuations. Financial and credit systems: prospects for development. 2022. № 1(4). P.28-36 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2022-1-03>
36. Kachula S., Zhytar M., Sidelnykova L., Perchuk O., Novosolova O. The Relationship between Economic Growth and Banking Sector Development in Ukraine. WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics. 2022. № 19. P. 222-230. DOI: 10.37394/23207.2022.19.21
37. Samorodov B.V., Sosnovska O.O., Zhytar M.O., Ananieva J.V. Methodical approach to the Quantification of Enterprise Financial Security Level. Financial and credit activity: problems of theory and practice, 2020. № 32. P. 269-277
38. Устинова І., Полторацька Ю. Міжнародні практики організації банківської системи як моделі для реформування банківського нагляду в Україні. Наукові праці Національного авіаційного університету. Серія: Юридичний вісник «Повітряне і космічне право». Київ : НАУ, 2017. № 1(42). С. 86–91 URL: <https://er.nau.edu.ua>
Стаття надійшла до редакції 18.06.2025
Статтю рекомендовано до друку 26.08.2025

Внесок авторів: всі автори зробили рівний внесок у цю роботу

Конфлікт інтересів: автори повідомляють про відсутність конфлікту інтересів