

UDC 336.1

[https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2021-1\(26\)-17-29](https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2021-1(26)-17-29)

Amosov Oleg Yuriyovych,

Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of Economic Theory and Finances Department, Kharkiv Regional Institute of Public Administration National Academy of Public Administration attached to the Office of the President of Ukraine, 61075, Kharkiv, Moskovsky ave., 75, +38 (050) 237 97 25, e-mail: amosovoleg@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8718-6343>

Амосов Олег Юрійович,

доктор економічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри економічної теорії та фінансів, Харківський регіональний інститут державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України, 61000, м. Харків, Московський проспект, 75, тел.: +38 (050) 237 97 25, e-mail: amosovoleg@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8718-6343>

Amosov Oleg Yuryevich,

доктор экономических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой экономической теории и финансов, Харьковский региональный институт государственного управления Национальной академии государственного управления при Президенте Украины, 61000, г. Харьков, Московский проспект, 75, тел.: +38 (050) 237 97 25, e-mail: amosovoleg@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8718-6343>

Gavkalova Nataliia Leonidivna,

Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of Public Administration and Regional Economy Department, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, 61166, Kharkiv, Nauky ave., 9-a +38 (050) 622 61 48, e-mail: ngavl@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1208-9607>

Гавкалова Наталія Леонідівна,

доктор економічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри державного управління, публічного адміністрування та регіональної економіки, Харківський національний економічний університет ім. С. Кузнеця,



61166, г. Харьков, просп. Науки, 9а, тел.: +38 (050) 622 61 48, e-mail: ngavl@ukr.net,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1208-9607>

Гавкалова Наталья Леонидовна,

доктор экономических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой государственного управления, публичного администрирования и региональной экономики, Харьковский национальный экономический университет им. С. Кузнеця, 61166, г. Харьков, просп. Науки, 9а, тел.: +38 (050) 622 61 48, e-mail: ngavl@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1208-9607>

METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF INTERCONNECTION BETWEEN INSTITUTIONALISM AND ARCHETYPES IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Annotation. The current trends in society as a whole and in public administration under the influence of institutional factors and archetypes are identified. The course of modernization and postmodernization processes is clarified, and the evolution of scientific approaches is analyzed. It is proposed to consider postmodernization as a process ensuring evolutionary transformation from traditional to postmodern society, which is due to existing archetypes and fits into the context of institutionalism that determines the need for qualitative transformations in modern society. The influence of institutionalism on social processes in relation to social archetypes is studied: institutions are united by the fact that they arose as a result of society development and embody traditions and customs, standards of behavior and prevailing ways of people's thoughts, that is, archetypal elements. The institutions are determined in their multidimensional nature, and therefore the archetypes by their varieties are presented. It is argued that institutionalism is the scientific basis of public administration. The features of state governance and public administration are clarified and a conclusion is made on the need for social transformations to support public administration. It is determined that there are several models of interaction and social segments that create grounds for solidary and civil society, consortia, convictions and legal social state. It is noted that public administration model is based on the human model, and it is found that human behavior is based on habits and principles of behavior that have an archetypal nature and are defined as institutions. The interconnection between institutionalism and archetypes in public administration creates grounds for its effectiveness and allows considering it as a tool for society development that is able to ensure a dialogue between government, business and citizens.

Keywords: institutionalism, archetypes, modernization, public administration.

МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ АСПЕКТИ ВЗАЄМОЗВ'ЯЗКУ ІНСТИТУЦІОНАЛІЗМУ ТА АРХЕТИПКИ В ПУБЛІЧНОМУ УПРАВЛІННІ

Анотація. Визначено сучасні тенденції, що відбуваються в суспільстві в цілому та в публічному управлінні під впливом інституційних чинників та архетипів. Окреслено хід процесів модернізації та постмодернізації, проаналізовано еволюцію наукових підходів. Запропоновано постмодернізацію розглядати як процес, що забезпечує еволюційну трансформацію від традиційного до постмодернового суспільства, яка зумовлена існуючими архетипами та укладається в контекст інституціоналізму, що визначає необхідність якісних перетворень в сучасному суспільстві. Досліджено вплив інституціоналізму на суспільні процеси у взаємозв'язку з суспільними архетипами: інститути об'єднує те, що вони виникли в результаті розвитку суспільства і втілюють традиції та звичаї, норми поведінки і переважні напрями думок людей, тобто архетипні елементи. Визначено інститути в їх багатоаспектності, представлено, у зв'язку з цим, архетипи за їх різновидами. Аргументовано, що інституціоналізм є науковою основою публічного управління. З'ясовано особливості державного управління та публічного адміністрування, визначено необхідність щодо суспільних трансформацій у напрямі підтримки публічного управління. Визначено моделі взаємодії та соціальних сегментів, які створюють підстави для солідаристичного та громадянського суспільства, консорцій, конвіксій та правової соціальної держави. Зазначено, що модель публічного управління базується на моделі людини, та з'ясовано, що в основі поведінки людини формуються звички, принципи поведінки, які мають архетипну природу та закріплюються у вигляді інститутів. Взаємозв'язок інституціоналізму та архетипіки в публічному управлінні створюють підстави для його дієвості та дають змогу його розглядати як інструмент розвитку суспільства, здатний забезпечити діалог між владою, бізнесом та громадянином.

Ключові слова: інституціоналізм, архетипи, модернізація, публічне управління.

МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ ВЗАИМОСВЯЗИ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛИЗМА И АРХЕТИПИКИ В ПУБЛИЧНОМ УПРАВЛЕНИИ

Аннотация. Определены современные тенденции, происходящие в обществе в целом и в публичном управлении под воздействием институциональных факторов и архетипов. Очерчен ход процессов модернизации и постмодернизации, проанализирована эволюция научных подходов. Предложено постмодернизацию рассматривать как процесс, обеспечивающий эволюционную трансформацию от традиционного к постмодернистскому обществу, которая обусловлена существующими архетипами и заключается в кон-

текст институционализма, что определяет необходимость качественных преобразований в современном обществе. Исследовано влияние институционализма на общественные процессы во взаимосвязи с общественными архетипами: институты объединяет то, что они возникли в результате развития общества и воплощают традиции и обычаи, нормы поведения и преимущественные направления мыслей людей, то есть архетипные элементы. Определены институты в их многоаспектности, представлено, в связи с этим, архетипы по их разновидностям. Аргументировано, что институционализм является научной основой публичного управления. Выявлены особенности государственного управления и публичного администрирования, определена необходимость общественных трансформаций в направлении поддержки публичного управления. Определены модели взаимодействия и социальных сегментов, которые создают основания для солидаристичного и гражданского общества, консорциев, конвиксий и правового социального государства. Обозначено, что модель публичного управления базируется на модели человека, и выяснилось, что в основе поведения человека формируются привычки, принципы поведения, которые имеют архетипную природу и закрепляются в виде институтов. Взаимосвязь институционализма и архетипики в публичном управлении создают основания для его действенности и позволяют его рассматривать как инструмент развития общества, который способен обеспечить диалог между властью, бизнесом и гражданином.

Ключевые слова: институционализм, архетипы, модернизация, публичное управление.

Problem statement. In modern conditions, reform processes are taking place in Ukraine. They place a special emphasis on transforming state governance into public administration, introducing democratic governance and decentralization reform. Strategic approaches to public administration reform with hierarchical vertical of executive power and centralized decision-making procedures are burdened with inability to resolve contradictions between democratic governance, transparency of information society and inertia, and corruption that is cemented in distorted archetypes and limited cognitive capabilities of bureaucracy.

Thus, it is necessary to ensure transformation of state governance into public administration that will help to resolve contradictions and pay attention to the institutional basis of society and archetypes, which determines the relevance and timeliness of this topic during rapid and dynamic transformations, that is, today.

The essence of the issue is also that, being formed and ingrained in the subconscious, archetypes can be either favorable or harmful to social development. The archetype can represent excessive selfishness bordering on economic egocentrism that is directed in the opposite direction from preserva-

tion of common living space, justice, working capacity, etc. All this is most harmful to economic development and its institutional support. It is manifested in destruction of real public administration aimed at modernization, namely, continuous modernization of society.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The scientists continue studying the issues of public administration and archetypes, determine the influence of archetypes on social processes and offer study of connections between institutionalism that is associated with modernization, and archetypes. Thus, among the scientists we can note E. Afonin, T. Plakhtii, A. Kolodii, T. Belska, A. Martynova and others. The issue of social transformations was studied by institutional scientists, among whom the most famous are D. Bromley, J. Commons, E. Ostrom, D. Rodrik, and others. Classic works describing modernization belong to A. Comte, H. Spencer, M. Weber, D. Durkheim, F. Tönnies and others. In most classic concepts of modernization, the emphasis is made on the formation of industrial society, and modernization is considered as a process parallel to industrialization, that is, transformation of traditional agrarian society into industrial one is viewed through the lens of transformation of the economic system, technical weapons and labor organization. Modern modernization provides for transition to neo-industrial and neo-knowledge, information and intellectual society.

Increasingly, scientists [1–4], using categories of modernization and post-modernization, draw attention away

from its content load and do not pay attention to the prevailing archetypes. The researchers often agree that there is no single approach to the perception of postmodernization, but it is directly viewed through the prism of various scenarios for the future of society and is associated with emergence of politically stable, legal democratic state with high-tech economy and developed social sphere, with archetypes associated with traditional values [5]. Therefore, we believe that postmodernization should be considered as having a significant influence on Ukraine's position in the global environment of the future.

Purpose of the article. The purpose is to substantiate the methodological aspects of interconnection between institutionalism and archetypes in public administration.

Presentation of main material. Social sciences consider postmodernization as a process, which ensures evolutionary transformation from traditional to postmodern society, that is, ensures substantiation for postmodernization by applying theories of evolution of society.

Austrian economist J. Schumpeter has formulated the theory of economic development already at the beginning of the XX century [6]. The scientist focused on the differences between economic growth and development, in fact focusing on the difference between archetypes. First of all, it involves the priority of extensive or intensive build-up of production forces, endogenous or exogenous factors of progress. He attaches the leading importance in ensuring development to the archetype of entrepreneurial initiative and competition. The issue of theoretical substan-

tiation of economic development becomes particularly relevant in the 50s of the XX century due to independence of a significant number of countries in Asia and Africa.

The theory of the big push represents the inevitability and necessity of external economic support for economic growth in developing countries. It finds a theoretical continuation in the growth model with two deficits. According to it, the lack of domestic resources makes it impossible to invest significantly in the economic development. The flows of domestic investment resources and foreign trade deficits are identified as deficits. As a result, there is dependence on external investors. The development means overcoming dependence on external sources of financing and replacing imported goods with domestic ones [7]. There is a need for an entrepreneurial archetype.

In the theory of dualistic economics, the emphasis is made not on external, but on domestic resources of development, that is, on the archetype of resource saving (economic consumption). The natural incentive for economic development is different efficiency of traditional and modern sectors of the economy, which contributes to the attractiveness for investment of the latter [8–9]. As the profitability of resources allocated to the new industrial sector of the economy is higher than in the traditional, agricultural sector of the economy (based on the conservative archetype), business entities have incentives for appropriate redistribution of these resources [10]. The theory places special emphasis on the need to form the values of new archetype inherent in post-industrial

society. At the same time, the role of public administration is growing.

In the 60s of the XX century, French scientists R. Aron and A. El-lual proposed the concept of a single industrial society, which claims that technical progress modifies not only the use of economic laws, but also their essence. Gradually, the leading role of the archetype of economic ownership is being overcome, power in society is being transferred to large corporations and the state is designed to help overcome the significant differentiation of household income [11].

The economic features of the society created after completion of industrialization are analyzed by D. Bell and L. Toffler. In particular, D. Bell identifies five features of post-industrial society: the most important decisions are made by new “Intellectual elite”, dominance among employed specialists and technicians, transition of the economy from production of goods to production of services, leading role of theoretical knowledge, focus of technical and economic environment on control over technology [10]. The technocratic archetype enters the arena.

Thus, researchers [11] determine four stages of development of modernization school: 1) the second half of the 1950s – the first half of the 1960s – period of emergence and rapid growth of modernization studies of classic version; 2) the end of the 1960–1970s – critical period during which the modernization perspective developed under the influence of critical perception of modernization by the founders of theories of lag (dependent development), microsystem analysis (I. Wallerstein), neo-Marxism; 3) since 1980s, there has

been a post-critical period of revival of modernization studies, during which “new modernization studies” appeared (according to E. Sow) – trends of convergence of modernization schools, dependence and microsystem analysis; 4) the end of the 1980–1990s – formation of neo-modernization and post-modernization analysis largely under the influence of great transformations in the countries of Central-Eastern Europe and Eurasia. We believe that nowadays, the development of modernization school takes place within the 5th stage, which is characterized by a rapid change in the stages of growth at macro level, that is, neoindustrialization (systemic crisis is preceded by social and economic stability in most economically developed countries, and overcoming the crisis is accompanied by aggravation of contradictions in society, increase in social transformations and change in configuration of social matrices), which corresponds to postmodernization analysis in the post-crisis period. This period is associated with development of national states and is accompanied by change in the concepts of public administration, which manifested in the emergence of the following theories:

- “proper” governance;
- “democratic governance”;
- decentralization;
- “new public management”;
- “reasonable regulation”;
- “network management”, etc.

It should be noted that the issues of changes in the public administration system remained out of focus in the process of modernization and postmodernization. Moreover, public administration from time to time has

come to deep contradictions with the needs of the country’s development. The main issues cover the concentration of wealth in the hands of oligarchs; slowdown of innovations in human security; formation of “pseudo-elite” and “fictitious elite”.

The threats to the development of public administration due to the influence of various factors include: reduction of mass demand; restriction of mobility; threat of new waves of pandemic; collapse of monetary market; lack of a single national archetype.

The changes in the paradigm of public administration in modern times are due to the fact that liberal models have proved unacceptable. Moreover, the crisis proved that the refusal of states to perform their functions led to a deep social crisis. The majority of the population turned to public authorities for help. However, they were not fully prepared for this important mission. In this regard, defining the strategy of public administration reform, revising its mission and combining goals with public archetypes became one of the top priorities of the state.

In Ukraine, in order to transform state governance into public administration, several conditions must be met. First of all, it concerns the formation of institutional support for governance and reliance on traditional archetypes of a society in which there are actually several models of interaction and social segments at the same time. They include solidary society and civil society, consortia, convictions and legal social state. Such a symbiosis corresponds to such management of public affairs, which would eliminate the insolvency of each of the components. This re-

quires a symbiosis of social institutions and archetypes based on traditional, conservative narratives.

The private property and free enterprise protected by law should be considered a necessary condition for economic and social progress. However, at the center of liberal concept was the “economic man”, and the most important methodological position was individualism — analysis of actions of the isolated subject that acts rationally. However, it discredited itself with explosion of corruption.

Thus, to give complete and accurate pictures of economic development, scientists are obliged to study the most diverse aspects of human activity, in fact, everything that affects the life of society. Among the huge number of factors, it is especially necessary to highlight non-economic ones: system of law and legislation, political and social structure of society and social psychology fully reflecting the deep archetypes. This leads to informal interpretation of social processes, which is the most important feature of institutionalism. This approach of institutionalists significantly expanded the subject of social science. Since its inception, institutionalism has developed as an oppositional critical trend in science requiring reform of official science. The institutions should be considered a genetic extension of archetypes.

The proponents of the concept of institutionalism from the very beginning strongly criticized various schools. This criticism went in several directions. First of all, critical review of “economic man” model traditional for economic science, according to which a person was considered as an egoist who

acts rationally and seeks to achieve his material interest. The institutionalists considered this explanation of human behavior very narrow and widely used in their concepts the analysis of non-economic factors affecting a person. In addition, the institutionalists opposed traditional methodological individualism, when behavioral patterns were derived from the analysis of behavior of individual, sometimes even isolated, business entity. They emphasized that a person lives in society and is included in various collective organizations and institutions (trade unions, corporations, public associations, political parties, etc.). The institutionalists therefore sought to consider human activity in a social context, highlighting the collective actions of people that are often united at the subconscious level, which is important for archetypes. “...To destroy the old theory, it is not enough to destructively criticize its prerequisites or to collect new facts — a new theory must be proposed” [12] — as Mark Blaug wrote. American economist Walton Hamilton, one of the proponents of the concept of institutionalism, defined it as follows: “Institution is a verbal symbol which for want of a better describes a cluster of social usages. It connotes a way of thought or action of some prevalence and permanence, which is embedded in the habits of a group or the customs of a people... Institutions fix the confines of and impose form upon the activities of human beings. The world of use and wont, to which imperfectly we accommodate our lives, is a tangled and unbroken web of institutions”. Indeed, Hamilton (1916: 863 n.) originally coined the very term “institutional

economics". He announced its existence and defined its essential outlook at the annual meeting of the American Economic Association in December 1918 (Hamilton, 1919). Here, in fact, he appeals to traditional archetypes.

It follows from this definition that institutions are a wide range of phenomena of social life, which can be both formal and informal in nature and relate to both economic and non-economic aspects of human life. The concept of "institution" can include: state and legal system, private property and money, family and church, industrial corporations, trade unions and so on. All these institutions are united by the fact that they arose as a result of society development and embody traditions and customs, standards of behavior and prevailing ways of people's thoughts. The institutions organize people's lives and impose restrictions on them, and person is included in the system of institutions and obeys it. Here we find the basis of public administration, which combines two components. First, public administration is based on public power, which is mainly the result of interaction of informal institutions. Second, public administration involves formalizing interaction through democratic decision-making procedures and enshrining them in regulations.

Returning to institutionalism, we note that first, institutionalism is characterized by the so-called interdisciplinary approach, desire to integrate social sciences — sociology, social psychology, law, history. In other words, institutionalism is not a pure economic theory, but studies conducted at the intersection of different sciences. Sec-

ond, representatives of institutionalism were mostly skeptical about abstract theoretical models and use of mathematical methods in economic analysis. They advocated the widespread use of empirical data, factual and statistical material. Third, institutionalism introduces into scientific theory the idea of variability of social life and its development, the idea of gradual evolution of social and economic institutions. Public administration in this context creates a triangle with institutions and state.

It is necessary to highlight the main methodological principles of institutionalism that are common to all proponents of this direction. The first principle is the principle of holism or interdisciplinary approach related to the object of study by institutions, structural and functional aspects of economic system as part of social mechanism. This issue involves expanding the boundaries of economic analysis by introducing elements of other social disciplines — sociology, political science, psychology, law, ethics, etc.

The second methodological principle proclaimed by institutionalists is the principle of historicism that is expressed in the desire to identify the driving forces and factors of development, main trends of social evolution, as well as to substantiate the purposeful influence on the prospects of social development.

Considering the ways of formation and evolution of various social institutions, T. Veblen, first of all, formulates a kind of human model, which is fundamentally different from "economic man" model, which prevailed in economics at the time [13]. The human

behavior is based on some innate instincts, as well as natural archetypes. There are several main archetypes: parental, that is, the instinct of family preservation and self-preservation, the instinct of skill, which is “a tendency or inclination to effective actions”, the instinct of empty curiosity, the instinct of envious comparison and the instinct of competition.

Thus, the central point of the institutional concept is the dichotomy of public administration and archetypes.

The institutional and historical method is manifested in the application in public administration of evolutionary approach based on the study of origin and development of public institutions. The evolution of governance of society is a process of natural selection of institutions that change under the influence, first of all, of social and psychological factors. Public interests and power are at the top.

Public power is the ability of person, social group, institution or organization to exercise their will through certain means. The nature of public power is often determined through the concept of will, that is, through the action of subjects, bearers of political will who seek to master reality, subjugate objective existence and actively form the life of society.

An important role is played by the public leader — an authoritative member of society, whose special influence allows him to play a significant role in social processes. Public leader is a person who is able to influence others to integrate joint activities aimed at meeting the interests of the community and who focuses on the prevailing archetypes.

This or that social institution separately performs a certain function, but due to the synergistic effect, it acquires new properties, such as integrity, balance, distribution of spheres and methods of activity, unity of approaches to solving issues of a certain level, formation and application of rules, standards and new values. The governance of society still creates an archetetic foundation. Thus, through a system of social relations — tangle of roles and social statuses — people’s behavior is realized and maintained in certain social norms, that is, people reproduce typical patterns, embodying them in public administration.

In democratic societies, social institutions operate on the principles of stable system of social values, have their roots in archetypes often enshrined in constitutions, which define the powers of the main institutions of political system of society, institutions of social control and management.

There are still discussions among scientists about definition of the concept of “social institution” [14]. Undoubtedly, in the institute of public administration, such concepts as law, contract and expediency are value categories, but in the modern era they are not a sufficiently strong support for stability and welfare of society. That is due to the appeal of political technologists to archetypes.

The dictionary of public administration defines political values as “guidelines and regulators of political consciousness, political relations and political practice. In general, political values have a double existential foundation: on the one hand, they are developed in the historical experience of

people, and on the other – they are embodied and manifested both in non-subject states of political reality (political phenomena, structures, processes) and in its subject forms (political orientations, identification, practices). In a broad sense, political values can be substantive (power, security, democracy, justice, etc.)” [14].

Thus, the contradictions between public administration and state governance are strategically related to their different roles in public processes. Due to interconnection between institutionalism and archetypes, public administration becomes effective, is considered as a tool ensuring society development, and the formation of public institutions that appeal to archetypes can resolve various contradictions and ensure a dialogue between government, business and citizens who have the right to exercise public power.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. At the beginning of the XX century, a direction of scientific research called “institutionalism” was formed, the proponents of which criticized the methodological foundations of neoclassical theory. The proponents of institutionalism considered various institutions to be the main object of their analysis, by which they understood a wide range of phenomena of social life, which embodied traditions and customs, standards of behavior and prevailing ways of people’s thoughts. The institutionalism has become the scientific basis of public administration. The institutionalism with existing archetypes becomes the basis for development of public administration in the context of modernization and postmodernization.

The proponents of this research are united by common research approaches: interdisciplinary approach, negative attitude to abstract methods of analysis, idea of gradual evolution of social institutions, recognition of the need for public administration as a tool for development within the dialogue between government, business and society, and emphasis on the archetypal basis of public power. These institutions are an invariant of the strategic development of public administration by means of a symbiosis of institutionalism and archetypes.

The prospects for further research are to study the strategic directions of public administration reform in Ukraine, namely, reform of the institute of public service and local self-government, taking into account the influence of public archetypes.

REFERENCES

1. Bell D. (1973). *The coming of post-industrial society: A venture of social forecasting*. N.Y.: Basic Books.
2. Berlie Jean A., ed. *Islam in China, Hui and Uyghurs: between modernization and sinicization* (Bangkok, White Lotus Press, 2004)
3. Blokland Hans, and Nancy Smyth Van Weesepe, eds (2006). *Modernization and Its Political Consequences: Weber, Mannheim, and Schumpeter*.
4. Chin Carol C. (2011). *Modernity and National Identity in the United States and East Asia, 1895–1919* (Kent State University Press;160
5. Afonin E. & Plakhtiy T. (2019). Arkhetypika i publichne upravlinnya: stratehiyi staloho rozvytku v umovakh tsyvilizatsiynykh zrushen [Archetype and public administration: strate-

- gies of sustainable development in the conditions of civilizational shifts]. *Ukrayins'kyi sotsium – Ukrainian sociology*, 2 (69), 142–151.
6. Schumpeter J. *A Theory of Economic Development* (Social Science Classics Series Book 46) [Print Replica] Kindle Edition by Joseph A Schumpeter (Author) Format: Kindle Edition, 320.
 7. (2008). *Mizhnarodna ekonomika: svitova ekonomika ta mizhnarodni ekonomichni vidnosyny. Modul' 1. Svitova systema hospodaryuvannya*. [International economy: world economy and international economic relations. Module 1. World economic system]. Kyiv: Professional [in Ukrainian].
 8. Amosov O. Yu., Gavkalova N. L. & Markova N. S. (2009). *Naukovyy dosvid O. H. Lieberman ta kapitalizatsiya znan': suchasni realiyi* [Scientific experience of OG Lieberman and capitalization of knowledge: modern realities]. Kharkiv: FOP Liburkina LM; "INZHEK" [in Ukrainian].
 9. Amosov O. Yu. & Gavkalova N. L. (2012). *Modernizatsiya v Ukrayini: shlyakh v maybutny* [Modernization in Ukraine: the way to the future]. *Stratehiya rozvytku Ukrayiny. Ekonomika, sotsiologiya, pravo – Strategy of development of Ukraine. Economics, sociology, law*, 4(1), 16–21.
 10. Kireeva A. (2006). *Vekhi ekonomicheskoy mysli. Mezhdunarodnaya ekonomika* [Milestones of Economic Thought. International Economics]. (Vols. 6). Moscow: TEIS [in Russian].
 11. Gontareva I. V. (2011). *Otsinyuvannya systemnoyi efektyvnosti funktsionuvannya i rozvytku promyslovykh pidpryyemstv* [Assessment of the systemic efficiency of functions and development of industrial enterprises] Kharkiv: "INZHEK" [in Ukrainian].
 12. Blaug M. (1997). *Economic theory in retrospect* (5th ed.). Cambridge New York: Cambridge University Press.
 13. Thorstein Veblen. *The Theory of the Leisure Class. Social Stratification. Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective*, third edit., Ed.by David B. Grusky, Westview Press, 862–870
 14. Surmin Yu. P., Bakumenko V. D., Mikhnenko A. M. and others (2010). *Entsyklopedychnyy slovnyk z derzhavnoho upravlinnya* [Encyclopedic dictionary of public administration]. Kyiv: NADU [in Ukrainian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Bell D. (1973). *The coming of post-industrial society: A venture of social forecasting*. N.Y.: Basic Books.
2. *Berlie Jean A.*, ed. *Islam in China, Hui and Uyghurs: between modernization and sinicization* (Bangkok, White Lotus Press, 2004)
3. *Blokland Hans, and Nancy Smyth Van Weesepe, eds* (2006). *Modernization and Its Political Consequences: Weber, Mannheim, and Schumpeter*.
4. *Chin Carol C.* (2011). *Modernity and National Identity in the United States and East Asia, 1895–1919* (Kent State University Press; 160.
5. *Афонін Е.* Архетипіка і публічне управління: стратегії сталого розвитку в умовах цивілізаційних зрушень / Е. Афонін, Т. Плахтій // Український соціум. 2019. № 2 (69). С. 142–151.
6. *Schumpeter J.* *A Theory of Economic Development* (Social Science Classics Series Book 46) [Print Replica] Kindle Edition by Joseph A Schumpeter (Author) Format: Kindle Edition. 320 p.
7. *Міжнародна економіка: світова економіка та міжнародні економічні відносини. Модуль 1. Світова система господарювання: навч.-практ. посібник.* К.: "Вид. дім "Професіонал", 2008. 386 с.

8. *Амосов О. Ю.* Науковий досвід О. Г. Лібермана та капіталізація знань: сучасні реалії / О. Ю. Амосов, Н. Л. Гавкалова, Н. С. Маркова // Ліберманівські читання – 2009. Економічна спадщина та сучасні проблеми. Монографія / За заг. ред. В. С. Пономаренка, М. О. Кизима, О. Г. Зими. Харків : ФОП Лібуркіна Л. М.; ВД “ІНЖЕК”, 2009. 296 с.
9. *Амосов О. Ю., Гавкалова Н. Л.* Модернізація в Україні: шлях в майбутнє // Стратегія розвитку України. Економіка, соціологія, право. Вип. 4. Т. 1. 2012. С. 16–21.
10. Вехи экономической мысли. Т. 6. Международная экономика / Под общ. ред. А. Киреева. М.: ТЕИС, 2006. 720 с.
11. *Гонтарева І. В.* Оцінювання системної ефективності функціонування і розвитку промислових підприємств: монографія. Харків: ВД “ІНЖЕК”, 2011. 480 с.
12. *Blaug M.* (1997). Economic theory in retrospect (5th ed.). Cambridge New York: Cambridge University Press.
13. *Thorstein Veblen.* The Theory of the Leisure Class // Social Stratification. Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective, 3rd edit., Ed. by David B. Grusky, Westview Press. P. 862–870.
14. Енциклопедичний словник з державного управління / уклад. : Ю. П. Сурмін, В. Д. Бакуменко, А. М. Михненко та ін. ; за ред. Ю. В. Ковбасюка, В. П. Трощинського, Ю. П. Сурміна. К. : НАДУ, 2010. 820 с.