

# Theoretical Impact of Digitalization on Macroeconomic Structure: An Evaluation on Digital Currencies, Growth, and Fiscal Policies

Hamza ÖZÇİFTÇİ\* 

İstanbul Üniversitesi-Cerrahpaşa, Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksek Okulu, Emlak Yönetimi, İstanbul, Türkiye

## Article Info

Received: 06/05/2025  
Accepted: 11/08/2025  
Published: 28/06/2026

### Keywords:

Digitalization,  
Digital currency,  
Macroeconomic policy,  
Economic growth,  
Fiscal policy.

JEL Codes: E42, O33, H26

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the theoretical implications of digitalization on the macroeconomic structure through a multidimensional perspective. The rapid diffusion of digital technologies is fundamentally reshaping the operational mechanisms of economic systems, thereby challenging the traditional boundaries of monetary and fiscal policy. The paper discusses the influence of digital currencies, crypto-assets, and central bank digital currencies (CBDCs) on monetary policy, while also exploring the broader role of digitalization in fostering growth, enhancing productivity, transforming labor markets, and driving technological innovation. In addition, the study delves into issues such as the complexities of taxing the digital economy, the reconfiguration of public spending in line with digital priorities, the effects of the platform economy on employment dynamics, and the evolution of social policy frameworks. Drawing upon a systematic review of the existing literature, the analysis adopts a theoretical approach that examines the compatibility between digitalization and macroeconomic thought. Ultimately, the study argues that alongside the opportunities digitalization offers, it also poses risks including inequality, instability, and policy ineffectiveness. In this context, the need for more adaptive, inclusive, and innovation-driven macroeconomic policies becomes increasingly pressing. The paper seeks to contribute to the literature and provide actionable insights for policymakers.

## Dijitalleşmenin Makroekonomik Yapıya Teorik Etkisi: Dijital Paralar, Büyüme ve Mali Politikalar Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme

### Makale Bilgisi

Geliş Tarihi: 06/05/2025  
Kabul Tarihi: 11/08/2025  
Yayın Tarihi: 28/06/2026

### Anahtar Kelimeler:

Dijitalleşme,  
Dijital para,  
Makroekonomik politika,  
Ekonomik büyüme,  
Maliye politikası.

JEL Kodları: E42, O33, H26

### ÖZET

Bu çalışma, dijitalleşmenin makroekonomik yapı üzerindeki teorik etkilerini çok boyutlu bir yaklaşımla analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Dijital teknolojilerin hızla yaygınlaşması, ekonomik sistemlerdeki temel işleyiş mekanizmalarını köklü biçimde dönüştürmekte; bu durum, para ve maliye politikalarının geleneksel sınırlarını zorlamaktadır. Çalışmada, dijital paralar, kripto varlıklar ve merkez bankası dijital paralarının (CBDC) para politikası üzerindeki etkileri ele alınmakta; bunun yanında dijitalleşmenin büyüme, verimlilik, istihdam, üretkenlik ve teknolojik inovasyon üzerindeki rolü incelenmektedir. Ayrıca dijital ekonominin vergilendirilmesindeki zorluklar, kamu harcamalarının dijital önceliklere göre yeniden biçimlenmesi, platform ekonomisinin işgücü piyasasındaki etkileri ve sosyal politikaların dönüşümü gibi konular da kapsamlı şekilde değerlendirilmektedir. Çalışma, mevcut literatürün sistematik bir taramasına dayanan teorik bir analiz yöntemi izlemekte ve dijitalleşmenin makroekonomik teorilerle uyumunu irdelemektedir. Sonuç olarak, dijitalleşmenin yarattığı fırsatlar kadar eşitsizlik, istikrarsızlık ve politika etkisizliği gibi risklerin de dikkate alınması gerektiği belirtilmektedir. Bu bağlamda daha esnek, kapsayıcı ve yenilikçi makro politika anlayışlarına duyulan ihtiyaç artmaktadır. Çalışma, literatüre katkı sağlamayı ve politika yapıcılar için yol gösterici öneriler sunmayı hedeflemektedir.

### Bu makaleye atıfta bulunmak için:

Özçiftçi, H. (2026). Theoretical impact of digitalization on macroeconomic structure: An evaluation on digital currencies, growth, and fiscal policies. *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(1), 1-18.  
DOI: 10.51124/jneusbf.2026.130

\*Sorumlu Yazar: Hamza ÖZÇİFTÇİ, [hamza.ozciftci@iuc.edu.tr](mailto:hamza.ozciftci@iuc.edu.tr)



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

## **INTRODUCTION**

The rapid advancement of digital technologies is generating profound transformations not only at the microeconomic level but also across the macroeconomic landscape. Digitalization is reshaping a wide array of economic relations—from production processes and financial systems to labor markets and public finance—while fundamentally altering the behavior of economic agents (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014).

The emergence of digital currencies and crypto-assets, in particular, compels a reexamination of the conventional tools of central banks, the effectiveness of fiscal instruments, and the overall framework for maintaining economic stability (Bordo & Levin, 2017). Traditional macroeconomic theories have largely concentrated on how core aggregates such as output, employment, consumption, and investment are determined through the interaction of public policy and market mechanisms (Mankiw, 2016). However, the swift incorporation of digital technologies into economic systems introduces a range of new and complex variables into these processes. Developments such as blockchain-based infrastructures, crypto-asset markets, and central bank digital currencies (CBDCs) have started to erode the effectiveness of long-standing tools like monetary supply control and interest rate management, thereby exposing new vulnerabilities in financial stability (Adrian & Mancini-Griffoli, 2019).

While the literature has extensively addressed the micro-level implications of digitalization—including productivity gains, shifts in competitive dynamics, and structural changes in labor markets (Autor, 2015)—its macroeconomic ramifications remain insufficiently explored. In particular, analyses concerning digitalization's impact on economic growth, employment equilibrium, income distribution, and public finance are still scattered and lack a cohesive theoretical framework. Consequently, there is an increasing need for comprehensive and integrated assessments of digitalization's macro-level effects.

The central concern of this study lies in the inadequacy of existing macroeconomic theories to fully capture the implications of digital transformation. In response, the study aims to offer a holistic theoretical evaluation of how digital currencies and crypto-assets influence monetary and fiscal policy, and how digitalization contributes to evolving patterns of growth and employment.

Through this analysis, the paper seeks to fill critical conceptual gaps within the literature by developing an integrative perspective on the macroeconomic dimensions of digitalization. In doing so, it aspires to foster an original discussion on how the digital transition can be coherently embedded within macroeconomic analytical frameworks.

Ultimately, the findings are intended to offer informed guidance for policymakers in designing more adaptive, effective, and sustainable macroeconomic strategies suited to the realities of the digital age.

## **1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: DIGITALIZATION AND THE MACROECONOMIC STRUCTURE**

Understanding the political economy of digitalization requires, first and foremost, a clear delineation of its conceptual scope, constituent elements, and transformative capacity. Digital technologies have evolved beyond mere technical tools; they now function as structural agents that reshape economic relations, production processes, and policy frameworks. This transformation has positioned digitalization as a distinct focal point in macroeconomic analysis. Clarifying the conceptual framework of digitalization, juxtaposing it with traditional macroeconomic structures, and situating it within the existing literature are essential for constructing the theoretical foundation of this study.

### **1.1. Conceptualizing Digitalization**

Digitalization fundamentally refers to the conversion of information into digital formats and the subsequent processing, transmission, and utilization of this information through digital technologies (Brennen & Kreiss, 2016). This shift has significantly altered how economic actors engage in production, consumption, financing, and management, yielding profound consequences at both micro and macro levels.

Scholarly approaches to defining and framing digitalization vary. Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014) characterize it as a “second machine age” arguing that it not only transforms production processes but also disrupts decision-making structures, labor markets, and information flows. In this sense, digitalization transcends classical automation by automating cognitive tasks and enhancing data-driven decision-making capacities.

From another vantage point, Arner, Barberis, and Buckley (2017) interpret digitalization within the context of financial systems, framing it as a transformation in which digital platforms increasingly replace traditional financial intermediaries. Within this framework, digitalization—through blockchain technologies, crypto-assets, smart contracts, and financial technologies (fintech)—is restructuring financial markets and introducing novel risk configurations. More recently, decentralized finance (DeFi) applications have further radicalized this shift by removing intermediation altogether.

Over time, the scope of digitalization has expanded to encompass not only the integration of information technologies into economic processes but also the reorganization of interactions among economic agents (Goldfarb & Tucker, 2019). The rise of platform economies (e.g., Uber, Airbnb) has eroded classical employer-employee relationships and popularized flexible, project-based employment models, thus impacting employment structures and income distribution on a macroeconomic scale.

Some studies have also highlighted that digitalization’s consequences are not exclusively positive. Beyond improvements in productivity and growth, it may generate adverse macroeconomic outcomes such as inequality, unemployment, and financial fragility (Autor, 2015; Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2018). Therefore, digitalization should not be viewed solely as a driver of efficiency but also as a potential source of economic and social imbalance.

In sum, the concept of digitalization is treated in the literature not as a static phenomenon but as a dynamic and multidimensional transformation process. A systematic examination of its implications for macroeconomic structures is crucial for understanding how technology influences growth and employment, and how monetary and fiscal policy instruments should be redesigned for the digital era.

### **1.2. Traditional Macroeconomic Structure and Core Components**

Macroeconomic structure refers to the interplay among key aggregates that determine an economy’s overall functioning and the processes through which these aggregates achieve equilibrium. Core components include gross domestic product (GDP), employment rates, price levels, and trade balances (Blanchard, 2017). Conventional macroeconomic theories have developed various approaches to understanding how these elements interact and how policy tools can influence them.

Classical economic theory posits that markets tend toward equilibrium on their own, rendering state intervention largely unnecessary (Smith, 1776; Say, 1803). Say’s Law asserts that supply creates its own demand, implying that issues such as unemployment are transitory. Accordingly, classical models assign only limited roles to monetary and fiscal policy.

In contrast, Keynesian economics—emerging in response to the Great Depression—argues that markets do not always self-correct and that insufficient aggregate demand can lead to prolonged

unemployment (Keynes, 1936). The Keynesian model advocates active state intervention through fiscal policy, including government spending and tax adjustments, and highlights the macroeconomic importance of budget deficits and public debt. Monetary policy, by influencing interest rates, is also seen as vital in stimulating investment and supporting aggregate demand.

The simultaneous occurrence of inflation and unemployment in the 1970s—known as stagflation—brought Monetarist theory to the fore. Led by Milton Friedman, Monetarists emphasized the centrality of money supply in long-term economic growth and price stability (Friedman, 1968). During this period, rules-based monetary frameworks such as the Taylor Rule gained prominence, along with an emphasis on central bank independence (Taylor, 1993).

New Classical and New Keynesian theories introduced the concept of expectations into macroeconomic modeling, stressing the influence of forward-looking behavior on aggregate outcomes (Lucas, 1976; Mankiw & Romer, 1991). The time inconsistency problem, formulated by Kydland and Prescott (1977), revealed that macroeconomic policies may lose effectiveness when they lack credibility and predictability.

Traditional macroeconomic frameworks are grounded in assumptions such as the production function's reliance on physical capital and labor (Solow, 1956), the central role of money supply and interest rates in aggregate demand, and the stabilizing influence of fiscal tools. However, digitalization is disrupting these premises by altering production processes, labor market dynamics, monetary mechanisms, and the tax base. As such, reevaluating conventional macroeconomic models in light of digital transformation has become increasingly important.

### **1.3. Digitalization in the Economic Literature**

Initially, the economic literature approached digitalization predominantly from a microeconomic perspective, focusing on firm-level productivity, market structures, and consumer behavior. In recent years, however, there has been a noticeable rise in theoretical and empirical studies examining its macroeconomic implications and systemic consequences (Goldfarb & Tucker, 2019).

At the micro level, digital technologies have been shown to reduce transaction costs, enhance market efficiency, and intensify competition (Varian, 2010). They have been viewed as catalysts for innovation in traditional sectors, enablers of new business models, and mitigators of information asymmetries. Brynjolfsson and Hitt (2000) demonstrated that investments in information technologies significantly increase firms' total factor productivity, thereby exerting long-term positive effects on economic growth.

At the macro level, the implications of digitalization have increasingly been explored within the framework of endogenous growth theories. Romer's (1990) model posits that technological progress—driven by human capital accumulation and knowledge diffusion—is central to sustainable economic growth. Within this context, digitalization accelerates innovation and contributes to a reconfiguration of development dynamics.

Nonetheless, the literature remains divided regarding the overall desirability and distributional consequences of digitalization's effects. Acemoglu and Restrepo (2018) contend that digital technologies are reshaping labor markets in ways that deepen income inequality, particularly through the automation of low-skilled jobs. Autor (2015) likewise notes that digitalization has led to a decline in middle-skilled occupations, while employment has shifted toward both low-skill service jobs and high-skill technology roles. This trend introduces polarization within the labor force and poses risks to equitable income distribution.

There has also been growing scholarly interest in how digitalization affects monetary policy and

financial sovereignty. The widespread adoption of crypto-assets and blockchain-based payment systems has raised concerns about central banks' diminishing control over money supply (Yermack, 2015). Bordo and Levin (2017) point out that while central bank digital currencies (CBDCs) may enhance policy effectiveness, they also present potential risks to banking system stability and transmission mechanisms.

In conclusion, the literature on digitalization and its economic effects reflects two dominant currents. One emphasizes its contributions to productivity and growth, while the other highlights the associated risks—particularly structural labor market disruptions, growing inequality, and financial instability. However, systematic theoretical frameworks addressing its macroeconomic dimensions remain underdeveloped. This gap underscores the need for integrative and interdisciplinary studies that capture the complex and multifaceted impacts of digital transformation on economic systems.

## **2. DIGITAL CURRENCIES AND MACROECONOMIC POLICIES**

The emergence of digital currencies and crypto-assets presents both opportunities and significant challenges for macroeconomic policymakers. These developments possess the potential to disrupt the operational logic of traditional macroeconomic instruments, particularly monetary and fiscal policy. This section offers a systematic and theoretical analysis of how crypto-assets and central bank digital currencies (CBDCs) affect macroeconomic policy frameworks.

### **2.1. Theoretical Implications of Crypto-Assets for Monetary Policy**

Recent bibliometric studies underscore that digitalization—especially through financial technologies (fintech)—is driving deep structural changes within the financial system (Şen Küçük & Kaynar, 2023). These transformations are not limited to the provision of financial services but extend to money creation processes, payment infrastructures, and the mechanisms of financial intermediation.

As prominent manifestations of this shift, crypto-assets have emerged as alternative financial instruments with the potential to influence the effectiveness of monetary policy through multiple channels. These include challenges to money supply control, threats to financial stability, and disruptions in the transmission mechanism of monetary policy.

Conventional monetary policy operates under the assumption that central banks regulate money supply and credit creation to smooth economic fluctuations (Friedman, 1968). However, the rise of cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin—characterized by fixed issuance algorithms—has led to the partial externalization of monetary functions beyond the control of central banks. Yermack (2015) contends that Bitcoin's limited supply structure could, in theory, circumvent traditional money supply mechanisms and undermine the stabilizing role of central banks.

In scenarios of widespread crypto adoption, central banks may lose a degree of control over the aggregate money supply, thereby weakening the effectiveness of traditional policy tools. Furthermore, the decentralized architecture of crypto-assets diminishes the operational reach of instruments such as reserve requirements (Catalini & Gans, 2016).

A defining feature of crypto-assets is their pronounced price volatility, which increases the likelihood of speculative bubbles and systemic risks (Cheah & Fry, 2015). When such bubbles collapse, sudden declines in consumer and investor confidence may contract aggregate demand and heighten recession risks.

The macroeconomic repercussions of crypto-asset bubbles operate primarily through two channels: (i) direct exposure of financial institutions, leading to balance sheet vulnerabilities, and (ii) the wealth effect influencing consumption patterns. The lack of a coherent regulatory framework

exacerbates these risks, limiting central banks' capacity to intervene effectively (Arner, Barberis & Buckley, 2017).

Crypto-assets, particularly stablecoins, are constructing alternative payment systems that weaken conventional financial intermediation. As a result, the ability of central banks to transmit interest rate decisions to the real economy may be compromised (G7 Working Group on Stablecoins, 2019).

If stablecoins gain widespread usage, households and firms might increasingly transact in these units instead of local currencies, thereby reducing the responsiveness of economic agents to national monetary signals. Moreover, the lack of transparency regarding the asset portfolios backing stablecoins could amplify liquidity risks during periods of financial stress, increasing systemic fragility (Brunnermeier, James & Landau, 2019).

In summary, crypto-assets introduce new dynamics that can erode both monetary control and the broader effectiveness of policy transmission. This necessitates the development of updated and integrated policy frameworks to preserve macroeconomic stability in the digital era.

## **2.2. Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) and Monetary Policy**

Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) represent a new monetary form whereby central banks provide money in digital format directly to individuals and institutions. These digital currencies not only carry the potential to enhance the effectiveness of conventional monetary policy tools, but also possess the capacity to trigger broader structural changes in the financial system. Adrian and Mancini-Griffoli (2019) argue that CBDCs can amplify the impact of interest rate policies on households and firms, as central banks may apply interest directly via digital wallets. This capacity is particularly valuable in addressing zero lower bound (ZLB) limitation. For instance, while negative interest rate policies typically drive a shift toward cash, the dominance of digital money can discourage cash hoarding (Bindseil, 2020), thereby enabling more effective expansionary measures during periods of economic downturn.

The design of CBDCs is also crucially important for policy efficacy. The literature generally distinguishes between two main models—wholesale and retail CBDCs—each bearing distinct implications for monetary policy (Auer & Böhme, 2020). Retail CBDCs, in particular, when issued directly by central banks, may pose a threat to the deposit-taking function of commercial banks. This phenomenon, referred to as "bank disintermediation," entails a potential weakening of commercial banks' credit creation capacity (Pfister, 2020). A growing preference among individuals for CBDCs due to their perceived security may result in deposit withdrawals from commercial banks, thereby reducing available credit and negatively impacting investment and economic growth (Meaning, Dyson, Barker & Clayton, 2018).

To mitigate such risks, the literature proposes several solutions. For example, Bindseil (2020) suggests a two-tier CBDC model, that incorporates individual usage limits and tiered interest rates to safeguard the financial intermediation role of commercial banks. In addition, the use of CBDCs in international trade and cross-border payments may bring about substantial changes in the global monetary system. Should major economies such as the United States, the European Union, and China proceed with the development of their own CBDCs, the dynamics of reserve currency competition could shift dramatically (Bordo & Levin, 2017). Currencies backed by robust CBDC infrastructures may gain prominence in global trade, introducing new dynamics into the process of dollarization (Prasad, 2021). For developing countries, this transformation may pose two principal risks: (i) erosion of domestic currency usage, and (ii) loss of independent monetary control.

On the other hand, enhanced cross-border cooperation and the development of interoperable

digital payment platforms may improve the speed and cost-efficiency of international transactions (Auer, Haene & Holden, 2021). Nevertheless, these benefits must be carefully calibrated to offset the potential threats to monetary independence and stability. In conclusion, CBDCs hold significant potential to reshape both monetary policy implementation and financial stability at national and international levels. This transformation requires central banks to formulate forward-looking, inclusive, and resilient strategies in the face of evolving domestic and global economic shocks.

### **3. THEORETICAL IMPACTS OF DIGITALIZATION ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT**

Digitalization is exerting deep and multifaceted influences on both the dynamics of economic growth and the structural composition of labor markets. Technological advances are reshaping foundational economic processes such as productivity, efficiency, and the diffusion of knowledge—factors that directly affect the sustainability of macroeconomic growth. Simultaneously, the transformation of labor markets through digital technologies is triggering profound shifts in employment structures and causing significant fluctuations in income distribution.

This section presents a systematic analysis of the theoretical implications of digitalization on growth and employment, addressing both its positive contributions and inherent limitations through an extensive review of the literature.

#### **3.1. The Role of Digitalization in Economic Growth**

The relationship between digital technologies and economic growth has long been debated within the context of technology-driven growth models. Digitalization alters the mechanisms of economic expansion by redefining knowledge production, innovation dynamics, and economies of scale. However, its effects are not uniformly positive; digitalization can accelerate or constrain growth depending on sectoral and institutional contexts, often generating asymmetrical outcomes across economies.

This subsection explores the growth-related impacts of digitalization through the lenses of endogenous growth models, the process of creative destruction, and its potential limitations.

##### **3.1.1. Digitalization within Endogenous Growth Theories**

While neoclassical growth models treat technological progress as an exogenous variable (Solow, 1956), endogenous growth theories conceptualize it as an internally driven process, emphasizing the role of intentional investment in knowledge and innovation. Romer (1990), a central proponent of endogenous growth theory, posits that technological advancement, fueled by knowledge creation, plays a decisive role in ensuring the long-term sustainability of economic growth.

In this framework, digitalization is viewed as a catalyst that directly affects endogenous growth mechanisms, particularly through the acceleration of knowledge production and diffusion. Digital technologies improve the efficiency of R&D investments and expand the stock of knowledge by lowering barriers to information access (Jones, 1995). Innovations such as the Internet, artificial intelligence, big data analytics, and the Internet of Things create positive externalities by reducing the cost of information and enhancing scale economies within the growth process.

Nonetheless, the growth-enhancing effects of digitalization are not evenly distributed. Comin and Mestieri (2018) emphasize that the diffusion of digital technologies varies significantly across advanced and developing economies, contributing to global growth disparities. Furthermore, divergences in digital skills among countries influence how effectively technological transformations unfold.

In sum, while digitalization promotes growth by accelerating knowledge flows and innovation, its impact depends heavily on national capacities in digital infrastructure and human capital.

### ***3.1.2. Creative Destruction and Innovation Dynamics***

Joseph Schumpeter's theory of creative destruction offers a powerful lens through which to examine the transformative impact of digitalization on growth. According to Schumpeter (1942), capitalist economies evolve through cycles of destruction and renewal, wherein outdated production methods and economic structures are replaced by more efficient alternatives.

Digital technologies fundamentally disrupt traditional industries, eliminate inefficient processes, and facilitate the emergence of entirely new sectors. Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014) highlight how digitalization extends beyond classical automation by enabling the automation of cognitive functions, thus accelerating the expansion of platform economies and data-driven service industries.

However, the accelerated pace of creative destruction may shorten innovation cycles, generating persistent uncertainty and volatility in investment behavior (Aghion & Howitt, 1992). Moreover, Bessen (2019) warns that digitalization could reinforce the market dominance of large firms, undermining competitive pressures and potentially stifling long-term productivity gains.

Therefore, while digitalization fosters economic transformation through accelerated creative destruction, it also introduces constraints related to market concentration and systemic instability.

### ***3.1.3. Structural Constraints on Growth***

The notion that digitalization yields unambiguously positive growth effects is increasingly contested. Andrews, Nicoletti, and Timiliotis (2018) find that rapid digital adoption by large firms has contributed to market concentration, potentially limiting aggregate productivity over time. The rise of "superstar firms" underscores the asymmetric nature of digital transformation (Autor, Dorn, Katz, Patterson & Van Reenen, 2020). Growing digital divides between nations have also been linked to widening income disparities and constraints on the growth potential of developing economies (Comin & Mestieri, 2018). The impact of digitalization on employment may indirectly restrict growth, as automation can lead to job displacement and structural imbalances (Arntz, Gregory & Zierahn, 2016). In addition, concerns about data security, cyber threats, and privacy violations pose risks to economic confidence, which may in turn hinder investment and growth (Zuboff, 2019). In conclusion, digitalization should be viewed not only as a driver of productivity and innovation but also as a process that introduces new challenges—ranging from inequality and labor displacement to cybersecurity vulnerabilities—that may constrain long-term growth trajectories.

## **3.2. Structural Shifts in Employment Driven by Digitalization**

The proliferation of digital technologies has precipitated the emergence of novel work practices and employment models. These changes have given rise to entirely new occupations and triggered substantial shifts in skill requirements and income distribution patterns.

This section analyzes the effects of digitalization on employment through the theoretical frameworks of skill-biased technological change (SBTC), employment polarization, and the rise of platform-based labor markets.

### ***3.2.1. Skill-Biased Technological Change and Labor Market Differentiation***

SBTC theory posits that technological change disproportionately benefits workers with high skill levels, while reducing demand for low- and medium-skilled labor (Autor, Katz & Krueger, 1998).

Digital technologies increase the value of cognitive skills such as analytical reasoning, creativity, and problem-solving, thereby elevating wage premiums for high-skilled workers (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014).

Acemoglu and Restrepo (2019) extend this framework by emphasizing task-biased effects, arguing that digitalization affects labor not only based on skill level but also by automating specific occupational tasks.

Overall, the labor market transformations induced by digitalization are heterogeneous across sectors and occupations, generating new dimensions of inequality within the employment structure.

### **3.2.2. *Employment Polarization and Income Inequality***

Goos and Manning (2007) identify employment polarization as a defining consequence of digitalization, whereby the share of middle-skill jobs declines while both low- and high-skill occupations increase. Autor (2015) reinforces this view, noting that the automation of routine tasks has eroded the economic position of the middle class.

This polarization carries broader socio-political consequences. The IMF (2017) has linked rising income inequality to diminished social mobility and adverse effects on long-term growth potential.

Thus, employment polarization driven by digitalization has deep economic and societal repercussions, intensifying the need for targeted education and training policies.

### **3.2.3. *New Employment Models, Flexible Work, and the Platform Economy***

Digitalization has facilitated the rise of flexible, project-based, and independent work arrangements, epitomized by the gig and platform economies (De Stefano, 2016). According to OECD (2019), approximately 10% of the workforce in many advanced economies is engaged in gig-based employment.

Platforms such as Uber, Upwork, and Fiverr have increased access to work and enhanced labor flexibility, but they have also introduced new risks—such as employment precarity, inadequate social protection, and income volatility (Berg et al., 2018).

Moreover, the market dominance of large digital platforms raises concerns about monopolistic behavior, which may undermine economic dynamism and exacerbate income disparities over the long term (Kenney & Zysman, 2016).

In sum, while digitalization introduces promising avenues for increased efficiency and labor market flexibility, it also necessitates the redesign of social protection systems to safeguard equity and economic resilience.

## **4. THE IMPACT OF DIGITALIZATION ON FISCAL POLICY**

The influence of digitalization extends beyond production systems and labor markets, increasingly shaping how governments design and implement fiscal policy. The expansion of digital technologies is transforming various fiscal dimensions—ranging from tax collection mechanisms and public expenditure frameworks to budgetary balances and social transfer systems. This section offers a comprehensive theoretical analysis of digitalization's implications for fiscal governance, focusing on taxation challenges within the digital economy, shifts in revenue and expenditure structures, and the evolving priorities of fiscal policy.

#### **4.1. Taxation in the Digital Economy: Challenges and Opportunities**

The rapid growth of the digital economy presents substantial difficulties for traditional tax systems. The ability of multinational tech firms to deliver digital products and services without a physical presence has resulted in base erosion and an uptick in profit-shifting activities (OECD, 2020). A core challenge lies in determining tax jurisdiction over activities that transcend national borders—a situation that disproportionately affects the tax bases and public revenues of developing economies (Zucman, 2014).

In response, policy initiatives such as the OECD’s “Tax Challenges Arising from Digitalisation” and the European Union’s proposed Digital Services Tax (DST) seek to restore fairness in digital taxation. However, these efforts face complications due to the need for multilateral alignment and the potential for geopolitical frictions (Beer, de Mooij & Liu, 2020).

Conversely, digitalization offers new tools to enhance tax administration. Innovations such as e-invoicing systems, digital payment records, and big data analytics improve compliance and curb informal economic activity. Some countries have already adopted AI-powered tax monitoring and blockchain-based systems to detect and prevent tax evasion (OECD, 2022).

In short, while the taxation of digital activities involves intricate legal, political, and technical challenges, digital oversight tools and international cooperation provide feasible pathways toward effective solutions.

#### **4.2. The Role of Digitalization in Public Expenditure**

Digital technologies are reshaping the delivery of public services in profound ways. E-government platforms, AI-assisted administrative tools, and data analytics are enabling governments to provide services more efficiently, transparently, and cost-effectively (Margetts & Dunleavy, 2013). As a result, core services such as healthcare, education, and social protection have become more personalized and performance-driven, improving the allocation and management of public resources. For example, the use of big data in healthcare facilitates early diagnosis and reduces treatment costs (OECD, 2019).

Digital twin technologies also enhance infrastructure planning and oversight, allowing public investments to be monitored and evaluated with greater precision (Kitchin, 2020). Furthermore, digitalization supports performance-based budgeting by offering tools to assess the effectiveness of spending programs.

Nevertheless, the digitalization of public expenditure brings several direct and indirect risks. First, the initial capital costs of building digital infrastructure can be substantial. Second, unequal access to digital services may exacerbate regional disparities, particularly in low-income or rural areas. Third, cybersecurity vulnerabilities introduce new fiscal risks, threatening the continuity and reliability of public service provision (Anderson, 2016).

Therefore, the effects of digitalization on public spending must be assessed not only in terms of efficiency gains but also with regard to inclusivity, resilience, and long-term fiscal sustainability.

#### **4.3. Emerging Directions in Fiscal Policy under Digital Transformation**

The digital transformation is reshaping the goals and instruments of fiscal policy. Whereas traditional fiscal systems are grounded in taxing and spending based on physical production and consumption, value creation in the digital economy often stems from intangible processes and data flows (Cockfield, 2006).

This shift is steering fiscal policy in three key directions:

First, tax policy must be reformed to capture digital activities more effectively. The OECD and G20 are developing frameworks to tax digital services, improve global tax coordination, and prevent profit shifting. Countries such as France, India, and the United Kingdom have introduced DST regimes to more equitably tax income generated through platform-based economic activities.

Second, public expenditure is increasingly being reoriented toward digital infrastructure, digital literacy programs, and cybersecurity investments. To remain competitive in the digital economy, governments must take on more proactive and strategic roles in public investment.

Third, fiscal policy must be recalibrated to address income inequality exacerbated by digitalization. Progressive tax reforms, social protection schemes for digital workers, and education spending aimed at easing digital transitions are essential (Atkinson, 2015). In particular, the exclusion of gig workers and platform laborers from conventional welfare systems calls for a reimagining of fiscal policy's social inclusion function (ILO, 2021).

In conclusion, the implications of digitalization for fiscal policy extend beyond regulatory adaptations. They call for a more holistic approach that prioritizes equity, inclusiveness, and long-term economic sustainability within fiscal governance.

## **5. DIGITALIZATION AND MACROECONOMIC RISKS: THEORETICAL DISCUSSIONS**

While digitalization offers significant opportunities in terms of economic growth, productivity, and innovation capacity, it simultaneously gives rise to new types of risks at the macroeconomic level. Elements such as the excessive volatility of crypto asset markets, the regulatory challenges posed by decentralized finance (DeFi) systems, the diminishing effectiveness of conventional monetary policy instruments, and the deepening of income inequality through the digital divide represent substantial threats to economic stability. This section theoretically examines the impact of digitalization on the macroeconomic risk profile under three principal dimensions: risks to financial stability, risks to monetary policy independence, and potential inequality risks related to income distribution.

### **5.1. Financial Stability Risk**

One of the most visible implications of digitalization for the financial system lies in the systemic vulnerabilities introduced by crypto assets and DeFi platforms. Unlike traditional financial markets, these systems operate independently of centralized regulators and are inherently prone to extreme volatility. Such characteristics foster the formation of speculative bubbles and increase the likelihood of erratic investor behavior and contagion effects across the system (Cheah & Fry, 2015).

With rapid advancements in digital infrastructure, public governance and fiscal institutions now face novel threats related to cybersecurity, data integrity, and the operational reliability of digital systems. Consequently, the indirect economic implications of information security and digital warfare must also be acknowledged in macroeconomic assessments (Bayrakcı & Koçman, 2023).

The historical price fluctuations of crypto assets such as Bitcoin have undermined consumer trust and exposed institutional balance sheets to pronounced fragility (Baur, Hong & Lee, 2018). DeFi platforms now facilitate lending, insurance, and investment services via blockchain-based networks, yet their unregulated nature allows latent risks to accumulate unnoticed. The collapse of TerraUSD in 2022 and the ensuing panic surrounding Luna illustrated how illusory assurances can trigger cascading system failures (Shin, 2022).

Smart contract vulnerabilities, shallow market liquidity, and the absence of investor protections

further jeopardize the integrity of digital financial ecosystems. The interlinked architecture of DeFi compounds these risks by increasing the likelihood of chain reactions, where minor shocks can escalate into systemic crises (Gudgeon et al., 2020).

Overall, while digital finance enables innovation and expansion, its inherent regulatory gaps intensify fragilities. Thus, safeguarding financial stability requires not only vigilance over market dynamics but also the development of holistic and adaptive supervisory frameworks tailored to emerging digital asset classes.

## **5.2. Risk to Monetary Policy Autonomy**

Digitalization introduces structural dynamics that may erode the capacity of central banks to steer economic activity through conventional monetary policy tools. Historical precedents—such as the constrained autonomy of post-colonial currencies like the CFA franc—highlight how external dependencies can undermine monetary sovereignty and impose long-term fiscal burdens. In this context, the digital era compels monetary authorities to reconceptualize their domain of influence (Badet, 2021).

Traditionally, central banks influence macroeconomic outcomes by adjusting the money supply and interest rates (Goodhart, 1988). However, the growing adoption of digital assets, particularly stablecoins, threatens to disrupt this transmission mechanism directly. As households and firms increasingly conduct transactions using stablecoins, demand for the local currency may decline, thereby weakening the central bank's ability to modulate aggregate demand through rate adjustments (Brunnermeier, James & Landau, 2019).

Moreover, the proliferation of cross-border digital payment systems accelerates capital mobility and complicates the balancing act between exchange rate policy and monetary independence (Bordo & Levin, 2017). Facebook's now-defunct Libra (later Diem) project exemplified these concerns, prompting alarm among global financial authorities about potential encroachments on sovereign monetary spaces.

In response, many central banks have initiated the development of central bank digital currencies (CBDCs), signaling a proactive approach to maintaining relevance in an evolving financial landscape (BIS, 2021). While digitalization poses challenges to policy autonomy, it concurrently offers instruments—like CBDCs—that can restore or even enhance the effectiveness of monetary governance. Accordingly, resisting digital transformation is less viable than strategically embracing it through responsive and flexible policy architectures.

## **5.3. Income Distribution and the Digital Divide**

Although digitalization holds the promise of democratizing access to information, it also bears the potential to exacerbate existing socio-economic disparities. As high-paying occupations increasingly require advanced digital competencies, unequal access to such skills risks transforming the digital divide into a widening income divide (Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2018).

Structural constraints often hinder access to digital technologies for low-income groups and rural populations. Even when access is granted, the ability to meaningfully engage with digital tools remains uneven—an issue described in the literature as the "second-level digital divide" (van Dijk, 2006).

Simultaneously, the ascent of the platform economy has heightened income insecurity, fostering a large segment of digitally employed individuals who operate outside the bounds of traditional welfare systems (Berg et al., 2018). The spread of such precarious employment models calls for a fundamental reconfiguration of social protection and income support policies.

Without deliberate policy interventions, the digital economy may deepen inequality rather than

mitigate it. As such, ensuring equitable access to digital opportunities requires comprehensive reforms centered on three pillars: digital skill development, income security, and universal access. These measures are critical to embedding social inclusion within the digital transition and to counterbalancing its potential regressive effects.

## CONCLUSION

This study has sought to examine the multifaceted and transformative effects of digitalization on the macroeconomic structure through a theoretical lens. The analyses presented demonstrate that digitalization is not merely a mechanism for enhancing productivity and efficiency, but also a phenomenon that introduces novel risks to fundamental macroeconomic balances, including financial stability, the effectiveness of monetary policy, and income distribution. In this sense, digitalization emerges as a dual-faceted force—offering structural opportunities while simultaneously deepening systemic vulnerabilities.

In the first section, the relationship between digitalization and economic growth was analyzed within the frameworks of endogenous growth theory and Schumpeterian creative destruction. The findings highlight that while digitalization strengthens the potential for economic expansion by accelerating knowledge production and innovation, it may also constrain this potential through market concentration and the monopolization of technological capacity.

The second section examined the structural transformations induced by digital technologies in the labor market. Framed through the concepts of skill-biased technological change (SBTC) and employment polarization, the analysis reveals a growing demand for high-skilled labor alongside the contraction of low- and medium-skilled employment. Additionally, the rise of the platform economy has given rise to novel forms of social risk, including job insecurity and income volatility.

In the third section, the implications of digitalization for fiscal policy were evaluated. The analysis addressed the challenges posed by digital taxation, the changing composition of public expenditures, and the necessity for fiscal frameworks to adapt to the digital transition.

The fourth section focused on the emerging macroeconomic risk profile associated with digitalization, categorized into three key domains: threats to financial stability, the erosion of monetary policy autonomy, and the exacerbation of income inequality through digital divides.

Based on these theoretical findings, the following key policy recommendations are proposed for policymakers:

### Policy Recommendations

#### Adaptive Monetary Policy Strategies

Given the diminishing efficacy of conventional monetary tools in the digital era, central banks must develop more agile and technologically aligned policy instruments. Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) hold promise for enhancing the direct transmission of monetary policy.

#### *International Digital Tax Reform*

To address issues such as tax base erosion and profit shifting in the digital economy, new-generation tax systems should be established through international coordination. The OECD's global minimum corporate tax proposal and the EU's Digital Services Tax initiative represent significant strides in this direction.

#### *Inclusive Digital Employment Policies*

To mitigate the polarizing effects of digitalization on the labor market, policy efforts should

prioritize digital skill-building programs, lifelong learning initiatives, and the integration of flexible employment arrangements into formal social protection systems.

#### *Investments in Digital Infrastructure and Cybersecurity*

To ensure the continuity of digital public services and the resilience of the digital economy, governments must incorporate cybersecurity systems and digital infrastructure investments into long-term development strategies.

This study offers a theoretical framework; however, further empirical research is essential to deepen our understanding of digitalization's macroeconomic consequences. Such research should prioritize the following areas:

#### *Empirical Country- and Sector-Level Analyses*

Quantitative studies focusing on the specific effects of digitalization on growth, employment, and fiscal policy across different nations and sectors are necessary.

#### *Microdata-Based Investigations*

Special attention should be paid to sectors that are directly influenced by digital transformation, such as services, finance, and high-tech industries.

#### *In-Depth Research on Inequality Dynamics*

Analyses focusing on regional and class-based dimensions of the digital divide will be crucial for the formulation of effective and inclusive social policy responses.

In conclusion, the macroeconomic implications of digitalization cannot be fully captured through the lenses of existing economic paradigms alone. This transformation demands the development of new conceptual models, interdisciplinary perspectives, and forward-looking policy frameworks. To maximize the benefits of digitalization while minimizing its attendant risks, a comprehensive, flexible, and inclusive model of macroeconomic governance must be adopted—one that is attuned to the demands and realities of the digital age.

### **Ethical Declaration**

There is no ethical declaration for this study.

### **Ethics Committee Approval**

Ethics committee approval is not required for this study.

### **Funding**

The study received no financial support.

### **Conflict of Interest**

There is no conflict of interest arising from the study for the authors or third parties.

## REFERENCE

- Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2018). *Artificial intelligence, automation, and work* (NBER Working Paper No. 24196). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w24196>
- Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2019). The wrong kind of AI? Artificial intelligence and the future of labor demand. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 13(1), 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsz022>
- Adrian, T., & Mancini-Griffoli, T. (2019). *The rise of digital money* (IMF FinTech Notes No. 2019/001). International Monetary Fund. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/Fintech-Notes/Issues/2019/07/12/The-Rise-of-Digital-Money-47097>
- Aghion, P., & Howitt, P. (1992). A model of growth through creative destruction. *Econometrica*, 60(2), 323–351. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2951599>
- Anderson, R. (2016). *Security engineering: A guide to building dependable distributed systems* (3rd ed.). Wiley.
- Andrews, D., Nicoletti, G., & Timiliotis, C. (2018). *Digital technology diffusion: A matter of capabilities, incentives or both?* (OECD Economics Department Working Papers No. 1476). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/7c542c16-en>
- Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2017). FinTech and RegTech: Impact on regulators and banks. *Journal of Banking Regulation*, 19, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41261-017-0038-6>
- Arntz, M., Gregory, T., & Zierahn, U. (2016). *The risk of automation for jobs in OECD countries: A comparative analysis* (OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers No. 189). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jlz9h56dvq7-en>
- Atkinson, A. B. (2015). *Inequality: What can be done?* Harvard University Press.
- Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 29(3), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.3.3>
- Autor, D. H., Dorn, D., Katz, L. F., Patterson, C., & Van Reenen, J. (2020). The fall of the labor share and the rise of superstar firms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(2), 645–709. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjaa004>
- Autor, D. H., Katz, L. F., & Krueger, A. B. (1998). Computing inequality: Have computers changed the labor market? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113(4), 1169–1213. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355398555874>
- Auer, R., & Böhme, R. (2020). The technology of retail central bank digital currency. *BIS Quarterly Review*, March 2020. [https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r\\_qt2003j.pdf](https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_qt2003j.pdf)
- Auer, R., Haene, P., & Holden, H. (2021). *Multilateral interoperability and digital currencies* (BIS Bulletin No. 41). Bank for International Settlements. <https://www.bis.org/publ/bisbull41.pdf>
- Badet, J. (2021). Sömürge para sisteminin ekonomik etkileri: CFA Fransı ve Afrika ülkeleri üzerine bir inceleme. *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(1), 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.51124/jneusbf.2021.10>
- Bayrakçı, E. & Koçman, M. A. (2023). Bilgi Güvenliği Ve Elektronik Harp, *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(Özel Sayı), 184-206.
- Baur, D. G., Hong, K., & Lee, A. D. (2018). Bitcoin: Medium of exchange or speculative assets? *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 54, 177–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intfin.2017.12.004>
- Beer, S., de Mooij, R., & Liu, L. (2020). International corporate tax avoidance: A review of the channels, magnitudes, and blind spots. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 34(3), 660–688. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12305>

- Berg, J., Furrer, M., Harmon, E., Rani, U., & Silberman, M. S. (2018). *Digital labour platforms and the future of work: Towards decent work in the online world*. International Labour Office. [https://www.ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS\\_645337/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS_645337/lang--en/index.htm)
- Bindseil, U. (2020). *Tiered CBDC and the financial system* (ECB Working Paper Series No. 2351). European Central Bank. <https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/scpwps/ecb.wp2351~d36d0c4b25.en.pdf>
- Blanchard, O. (2017). *Macroeconomics* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Bordo, M. D., & Levin, A. T. (2017). *Central bank digital currency and the future of monetary policy* (NBER Working Paper No. 23711). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w23711>
- Brennen, S., & Kreiss, D. (2016). Digitalization and digitization. *Culture Digitally*. <https://culturedigitally.org/2014/09/digitalization-and-digitization/>
- Brunnermeier, M. K., James, H., & Landau, J. P. (2019). *The digitalization of money* (NBER Working Paper No. 26300). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w26300>
- Brynjolfsson, E., & Hitt, L. M. (2000). Beyond computation: Information technology, organizational transformation and business performance. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(4), 23–48. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.14.4.23>
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Catalini, C., & Gans, J. S. (2016). *Some simple economics of the blockchain* (MIT Sloan Research Paper No. 5191-16). Massachusetts Institute of Technology. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2874598>
- Cheah, E. T., & Fry, J. (2015). Speculative bubbles in Bitcoin markets? An empirical investigation into the fundamental value of Bitcoin. *Economics Letters*, 130, 32–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2015.02.029>
- Cockfield, A. J. (2006). The rise of the OECD as informal “World Tax Organization” through national responses to e-commerce tax challenges. *Yale Journal of Law and Technology*, 8(1), 136–187. [https://digitalcommons.schulichlaw.dal.ca/scholarly\\_works/95/](https://digitalcommons.schulichlaw.dal.ca/scholarly_works/95/)
- Comin, D., & Mestieri, M. (2018). If technology has arrived everywhere, why has income diverged? *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 10(3), 137–178. <https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.20150103>
- De Stefano, V. (2016). The rise of the “just-in-time workforce”: On-demand work, crowd work, and labor protection in the “gig-economy”. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, 37(3), 471–504. <https://cllpj.law.illinois.edu/archive/>
- Friedman, M. (1968). The role of monetary policy. *American Economic Review*, 58(1), 1–17.
- G7 Working Group on Stablecoins. (2019). *Investigating the impact of global stablecoins*. Bank for International Settlements. <https://www.bis.org/cpmi/publ/d187.pdf>
- Goldfarb, A., & Tucker, C. (2019). Digital economics. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57(1), 3–43. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20171452>
- Goodhart, C. A. E. (1988). *The evolution of central banks*. MIT Press.
- Goos, M., & Manning, A. (2007). Lousy and lovely jobs: The rising polarization of work in Britain. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89(1), 118–133. <https://doi.org/10.1162/rest.89.1.118>
- Gudgeon, L., Perez, D., Harz, D., Livshits, B., & Gervais, A. (2020). The decentralized financial crisis: Attacking DeFi. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2002.08099. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08099>
- International Labour Organization (ILO). (2021). *World social protection report 2020–22: Social protection at the crossroads*. [https://www.ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS\\_817572/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS_817572/lang--en/index.htm)

- International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2017). *Fiscal monitor: Tackling inequality*. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/FM/Issues/2017/10/05/fiscal-monitor-october-2017>
- Jones, C. I. (1995). R&D-based models of economic growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 103(4), 759–784. <https://doi.org/10.1086/262002>
- Kenney, M., & Zysman, J. (2016). The rise of the platform economy. *Issues in Science and Technology*, 32(3), 61–69. <https://issues.org/the-rise-of-the-platform-economy/>
- Keynes, J. M. (1936). *The general theory of employment, interest and money*. Macmillan.
- Kitchin, R. (2020). The real-time city? Big data and smart urbanism. *GeoJournal*, 79, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-013-9516-8>
- Kydland, F. E., & Prescott, E. C. (1977). Rules rather than discretion: The inconsistency of optimal plans. *Journal of Political Economy*, 85(3), 473–492. <https://doi.org/10.1086/260580>
- Lucas, R. E. (1976). Econometric policy evaluation: A critique. *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, 1, 19–46. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2231\(76\)80003-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2231(76)80003-6)
- Mankiw, N. G. (2016). *Principles of macroeconomics* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Mankiw, N. G., & Romer, D. (1991). *New Keynesian economics* (Vols. 1–2). MIT Press.
- Meaning, J., Dyson, B., Barker, J., & Clayton, E. (2018). *Broadening narrow money: Monetary policy with a central bank digital currency* (Bank of England Staff Working Paper No. 724). Bank of England. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3180720>
- OECD. (2019). *Going digital: Shaping policies, improving lives*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264312012-en>
- OECD. (2020). *Tax challenges arising from digitalisation – Report on Pillar One Blueprint*. OECD/G20 Inclusive Framework on BEPS. <https://doi.org/10.1787/beba0634-en>
- OECD. (2022). *Tax administration 2022: Comparative information on OECD and other advanced and emerging economies*. <https://www.oecd.org/tax/forum-on-tax-administration/publications-and-products/tax-administration-series.htm>
- Pfister, C. (2020). Central bank digital currency: Financial system implications and control. *Revue d'Économie Financière*, 138, 65–84.
- Prasad, E. (2021). *The future of money: How the digital revolution is transforming currencies and finance*. Harvard University Press.
- Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous technological change. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), S71–S102. <https://doi.org/10.1086/261725>
- Say, J. B. (1803). *A treatise on political economy* (C. R. Prinsep, Trans., 1821). Sherwood, Neely & Jones.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. Harper & Brothers.
- Shin, L. (2022). *The cryptopians: Idealism, greed, lies, and the making of the first big cryptocurrency craze*. PublicAffairs.
- Smith, A. (1776). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. W. Strahan and T. Cadell.
- Solow, R. M. (1956). A contribution to the theory of economic growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 70(1), 65–94. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1884513>
- Şen Küçük, G., & Kaynar, Z. (2023). Finansal teknoloji literatürü üzerine bibliyometrik bir analiz. *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(2), 119–131. <https://doi.org/10.51124/jneusb.2023.59>

- Taylor, J. B. (1993). Discretion versus policy rules in practice. *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, 39, 195–214.
- van Dijk, J. (2006). Digital divide research, achievements and shortcomings. *Poetics*, 34(4–5), 221–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2006.05.004>
- Varian, H. R. (2010). Computer mediated transactions. *American Economic Review*, 100(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.2.1>
- Yermack, D. (2015). Is Bitcoin a real currency? An economic appraisal. In D. Lee (Ed.), *Handbook of digital currency: Bitcoin, innovation, financial instruments, and big data* (pp. 31–43). Academic Press.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.
- Zucman, G. (2014). Tax evasion on offshore profits and wealth. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 28(4), 121–148. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.28.4.121>