СВІТОВА ЕКОНОМІКА ТА МІЖНАРОДНІ ВІДНОСИНИ

UDC 243.65.13
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32782/2415-8801/2020-3.1

Busarieva Tetiana
Doctoral Student of the Faculty of the World Economy,
Kiev National University of Trade and Economics
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3863-4511

KNOWLEDGE RESOURCE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY OF UKRAINE

According to the International Competitiveness Rating, which is compiled annually by the IIMD, Ukraine has risen by 5 positions and ranks 54th. Our country is between Slovakia and Peru. Among the post-Soviet countries, Lithuania (29), Kazakhstan (34) and Estonia (35) occupy the highest places in the ranking. In total, the ranking includes 63 countries. The first step in 2019 was taken by Singapore, which moved from the top of the US rankings (this country is now in third place). In second place – Hong Kong. Singapore's rise to the top was due to a well-developed technological infrastructure, a skilled workforce, favorable immigration laws and effective ways to set up new businesses. Hong Kong ranked second due to good tax and business policies and business access to finance. The United States, has suffered from rising fuel prices, weaker high-tech exports and fluctuations in the dollar. The last step in the competitiveness ranking is Venezuela. Compilers draw attention to high inflation in the country, poor access to credit and a weak economy.

Keywords: *knowledge economy, globalization, development, weak national economy.*

ЗНАННЄВИЙ РЕСУРС РОЗВИТКУ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ ЕКОНОМІКИ УКРАЇНИ

Бусарєва Т.Г
Київський національний торговельно-економічний університет

Трансформація сучасного суспільства почалася з переходом найбільш розвинених країн до економіки, заснованої на знаннях, фундаментом якої є невловима цінність, що реалізується в нематеріальних активах. За розвитку суспільного виробництва знання в різних формах перетворюються в системне і безперервне явище, характерною ознакою якого виступає фіксована монополія на рентні фактори; економіка, де в загальному обсязі доходів визначальну роль починає відігравати інтелектуальна рента, що перетворюється на економіку, засновану на знаннях. У сучасних умовах використання знань як ресурсу передбачає орієнтацію передусім на ринкові механізми функціонування і формування, еквівалентності, платності та конкурентності. Одним із головних інструментів економіки знань є функціонування світового ринку знань. Із метою аналізу рушійних сил та когнітивних трансформацій необхідно визначити положення ринку знань у системі ринків. Як відомо, за економічним призначенням об'єктів ринкових відносин виділяють товарний ринок, ринок ресурсів і фінансовий. Насправді вони когерентні. І прикладом тому є ринок знань, який пронизує всю систему ринків: товарного як блага, ринку ресурсів як ресурсу та фінансового як нематеріального активу. Ринок знань – це сполучна ланка, об'єднуюча систему в єдине ціле, специфіка якого виражається в такому. Можна стверджувати, що ринок знань є сукупністю економічних відносин, які встановлюються між виробниками і продавцями знань, що формують їх пропозицію, і покупцями (споживачами) даних товарів і послуг, які формують попит на них через купівлю-продаж останніх. На сучасному етапі зростаюча неефективність сучасної економічної моделі, її неадекватність глобальним викликам, які стоять перед нашою країною, потребують розроблення нової парадигми розвитку. Тільки формування нової економіки, диверсифікованої та інноваційної, забезпечить конкурентоспроможність України на світовому ринку.

Ключові слова: *економіка знань, глобалізація, розвиток, слабка національна економіка.*

Actuality of the article. The economies of developed countries are increasingly based on knowledge, innovation and new technologies, which are now considered the driving force of economic growth. In the conditions of the national economy based on knowledge, in the formation of economic and scientific and technical policy should take into account such factors as: the growing complexity of products and processes; the volume of knowledge in all areas increases; the growing importance of key competencies of enterprises that need to be coordinated, which means concentrating on activities that create greater added value; increasingly intense global competition coupled with shrinking product life cycles; increasing flexibility and mobility of employees, which entails the need to develop a conceptual framework for building an appropriate model of knowledge management.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Among authors, whose works largely represent the knowledge resource of the development of the national economy of Ukraine it is necessary to mention such as D. Bell,

T. Gryhiles, U. Dyzard, J. Martine, E. Masudu, F. Makhlup, E. Mansfield, R. Nelson, I. Nikolov, T. Stouniere, E. Toffler, J. Schumpeter, J.Ellul, A.B. And. Anchishkina, LL Veger, LM Gatovsky, LS Glyazer. Therefor there are some aspects of the specific characteristics of the formation of the intellectual aspects are still not analyzed.

The aim of the article is to analyze the ways of improvement of the development of the intellectual component in the transformation of the national economy of Ukraine.

Presentation of the main material. The economies of developed countries are increasingly based on knowledge, innovation and new technologies, which are now considered the driving force of economic growth. In the conditions of the national economy based on knowledge, in the formation of economic and scientific and technical policy should take into account such factors as: the growing complexity of products and processes; the volume of knowledge in all areas increases; the growing importance of key competencies of enterprises that need to be coordinated, which means concentrating on activities that create greater added value; increasingly intense global competition coupled with shrinking product life cycles; increasing flexibility and mobility of employees, which entails the need to develop a conceptual framework for building an appropriate model of knowledge management.

The economies of developed countries are increasingly based on knowledge, innovation and new technologies, which are now considered the driving force of economic growth. In the conditions of the national economy based on knowledge, in the formation of economic and scientific and technical policy should take into account such factors as: the growing complexity of products and processes; the volume of knowledge in all areas increases; the growing importance of key competencies of enterprises that need to be coordinated, which means concentrating on activities that create greater added value; increasingly intense global competition coupled with shrinking product life cycles; increasing flexibility and mobility of employees, which entails the need to develop a conceptual framework for building an appropriate model of knowledge management.

Obviously, the above factors must be taken into account in the formation of an effective national innovation system (NIS).

For the formation of NIS, the authors propose an analytical spatial model of the functioning of the national innovation system, which reflects the dynamics of knowledge and innovation processes. The proposed construction sequence is as follows:

I) draw up a detailed map of the knowledge infrastructure (KI), identify its main agents and indicate which categories of knowledge they operate;

II) to present the NIS model as a set of three elements - state policy, IP, institutional environment;

III) describe the relationship between the above elements using a functional approach.

Knowledge infrastructure mapping Knowledge infrastructure (KI) is defined as an institutional complex that brings together a wide range of organizations, institutions and networks that contribute to the creation and evolution of the knowledge base of a given spatial area, as well as resources and competencies needed for dynamic development. its innovative potential [1, p. 399].

Under the spatial area, we understand the level of innovation system – international, national, regional. Agents C differ in their roles and behavioral strategies, as well as in the type of knowledge produced, accumulated and transferred.

As a result of the analysis of foreign (European) experience of formation of IZ we made the following classification of agents of IZ and their specific roles are allocated:

Universities, which are the core of IZ, as they make the greatest contribution both in the field of educational services and in research and development, educating new generations of scientists, researchers, and research project leaders. At the same time, universities are a key element of the basic research infrastructure.

State research organizations operating in multi-disciplinary areas; The roles of these organizations vary from country to country, but they, together with universities, make significant contributions to scientific, technical and other research areas.

Private research organizations that are more focused on applied research. Consulting firms that play an important role in the production and dissemination of applied knowledge in technical and management areas; these firms are especially important in the transfer of new technologies, management ideas and models to production and service firms; they are in close cooperation with them in the process of creating and providing knowledge-intensive business services.

Production and service firms, whose in-house research activities, as well as personnel development programs make a huge contribution to the enrichment of technological, managerial and partly social elements of the national knowledge base.

Cooperation organizations (intermediary organizations) that promote the creation of joint ventures and alliances are an important and new element of the knowledge infrastructure. They play an important role in structuring the entire IP by building links, interdependencies between different categories of organizations and institutions in the framework of knowledge and innovation processes.

The map made contains information about the field of activity of each of the agents of the CI, its components, forms of activity and the main trends in development.

The multiplicity of agents involved in innovation and psychological processes, as well as their growing interdependence, entail the need to create new ways of interaction and coordination in order to better cope with the complexity and uncertainty that characterize hierarchical structures and market management structures. This is especially true for organizations such as networks and consortia, the effectiveness of which and the amount of value generated depends largely on the ability of their partners (as well as existing and / or potential competitors) to develop adaptive coordination mechanisms and effective sources of motivation to support cooperation and conflict avoidance. Institutions must also be involved in these mechanisms; intermediaries, government and other agencies [2, p. 91–100].

Intermediary institutes can take many forms, such as: innovation centers, international or regional scientific and technical conferences, technical communities, technology forums, university associations, research unions,

industrial and business associations, academic and industrial unions, etc.

Such institutions can be public, public-private, non-profit, private. They play the role of channels for information exchange, communication, negotiation between different categories of agents or organizations involved in the processes of knowledge generation and innovation. Thus, these institutions contain conflicts and at the same time promote the diffusion of new knowledge, ideas or models. Their activities are most important at the regional and local (municipal) spatial levels.

The second category of support institutions in IS consists of public or public-private agencies and political structures (institutions or representatives) that have a direct or indirect impact on areas such as higher education; R&D and innovation; science and technology; for industrial and regional development. They take the following forms: national and regional ministries, agencies and departments in each sector (higher education, science and technology, vocational and technical education, industrial development, etc.); public and public-private funds (at the international, national and regional levels); city and local authorities; national and regional councils (public councils, research councils, chambers of commerce and industry, etc.). These institutions and their strategies make a significant contribution to the coordination of the various CI agents and to the initiation of cooperation agreements between them, as well as provide funding, administrative and technical support for innovation.

Here are the trends that we have identified as a result of mapping the knowledge infrastructure:

Regardless of the sector of activity or the considered spatial level of psychology and innovation processes are multidimensional, complex and dynamic systems that include many interdependent agents and forms of interaction. The key agents of these systems are the organizations that form C: universities, research organizations, research laboratories of industrial firms, companies that provide knowledge-intensive services; the influence of "closing organizations" – networks of interaction, consortia, alliances, partnerships and associations – is also growing.

Strategies and goals of CI agents may differ, but it is obvious that close relationships (both formal and informal) between different types of agents are necessary for an effective innovation process, for the creation and dissemination of knowledge.

Institutional and historical environment in which innovative agents interact with each other in order to create and disseminate new knowledge and technologies, play a major role in shaping the behavior of agents in relation to the stimulation or suppression of knowledge and innovation processes.

Thus, the most important task for CI agents and policymakers is to identify and implement new coordination tools and schemes in order to overcome institutional inertia and repressive factors, to advance structured and effective mechanisms of interaction between complementary agents (especially those that form the core). C) involved in psychological and innovation processes. Thus, effective coordination is a key factor in the competitiveness of firms, sectors and regions.

In the process of researching CI agents, we came to the following conclusions about the processes of creation, accumulation and dissemination of knowledge and innovations and their institutional dynamics:

a) Knowledge, innovation, learning and competence are key factors in economic and social development; they determine economic growth and competitiveness at all spatial levels.

b) Institutions, as generally accepted collective norms of behavior and interaction, play a crucial role in the processes of creation, accumulation and dissemination of knowledge and innovation within any single geographical space. Note also the special role of cultural and ideological dimension – ideology and culture play an important role in the functioning of the national innovation system, and their elements (norms, values, patterns of behavior, etc.) are the context for change within the system itself.

c) The importance of spatial factors is great, especially in the long run the creation, accumulation and dissemination of knowledge and innovation. Structural relationships and dynamic coordination mechanisms that function between different spatial levels play a crucial role in innovation and knowledge processes.

d) Regardless of industry, research and knowledge, geographical location, there is no single organizational and behavioral model, universal dynamics or trajectory of development that could ensure the effectiveness of the processes of creation, accumulation and dissemination of innovations and knowledge.

e) All agents, organizations and institutions involved in innovation and psychological processes are the driving forces and sources and consumers of the innovation system. This means that there can be no "main player" in an innovation system, which means that it is necessary to carefully study each agent, his strategy and patterns of behavior – to make a map of.

f) Of great importance is the institutional nature, specific strategies and time frame of each CI agent. Innovative and psychological processes require temporary compatibility of all agents, otherwise there are conflicts and difficulties in coordinating processes. To solve these problems, intermediary organizations are needed – government agencies, professional associations, whose role is important at all spatial levels.

g) Structural relationships between all agents are necessary. There are no agents that exist autonomously. At the theoretical level, the recognition of this fact is necessary for the transition from a static, private, mono disciplinary approach to a dynamic, systemic and multidisciplinary approach in the analysis of the innovation system. From a practical point of view, the recognition of this fact entails an increase in the role of intermediary institutions, their role becomes crucial.

h) Innovation system and CI systems cannot be self-organizing and self-regulating. There are no perfect market mechanisms and procedures that allow agents to effectively coordinate their activities. We believe that in the face of uncertainty and imperfection of information, there is a need for flexible and decentralized collective institutional forms of coordination and cooperation, regardless of industry, research or space. Mechanisms are also needed to motivate agents to create and disseminate knowledge, as well as mechanisms to involve the private sector in innovation.

i) Improving the political and legal environment is important at all levels: international, national, regional. Among the factors that play an important role in knowledge

and innovation processes, we note the following: ways of allocating funds for R&D, tax legislation, higher education, research priorities, the status of the researcher, the conditions for creating spin-off companies. In parallel with science and technology policy, regulators must strike a balance between basic and applied research, between public and private interests, long-term and short-term goals, and national and regional (local) interests. All the above provisions show the multidimensional and complex nature of innovation processes and processes of creation / accumulation / dissemination of knowledge. It seems that the degree of interaction between spatial / institutional factors explain the differences between innovative percent is dumplings in certain sectors and regions.

From our study we can conclude that in general the dynamics of innovation and knowledge processes, as well as forms of interaction between agents of the IS have a systemic nature, which repeats to some extent the complex multidimensional nature of the economic and social system.

I. Construction of an analytical model of NIS

The need to create an analytical institutional-spatial model that describes innovation and psychological processes is due to the following factors:

a) a large number of types of agents, organizations and institutions involved in psychological and innovation processes; diversity of their missions, goals and strategies and patterns of behavior;

b) strong interdependence, different ways of interaction that form the relationship between agents;

c) the role of historical, cultural and social dynamics in the formation of the institutional and spatial environment in which the agents of knowledge and innovation processes operate (dependence on the path traveled).

The proposed analytical model could serve as a tool for studying the NIS, identifying its missing elements and weaknesses, as well as to find ways to improve it.

The analytical spatial model developed by us reflects the institutional components (and their dynamic relationships) necessary for the analysis of the structure, functioning and evolution of the innovation system. It shows the dynamic relationships between different spatial levels that structure innovation and psychological processes. Finally, we combine institutional and spatial dynamics in order to reconstruct the systemic nature of the dynamics of knowledge and innovation and to show that CI agents and their interactions play a decisive role in it.

Consider in order each of the elements of the system. Institutional dynamics. At any spatial level, the institutional dynamics that structure psychological and innovation processes can be represented as a result of the interaction of three main elements:

1) the nature and direction of state policy, time frame and degree of influence on the main agents involved in innovation and psychological processes, models of their interaction;

2) knowledge infrastructure, its agents, as well as supporting their institutions, their micro; and meso-economic strategies and models of interaction within the considered innovative knowledge space;

3) the institutional environment of innovation, which characterizes the economic and social system of the country (region). It includes all stable structures: historically formed models of behavior, legal framework (laws, norms, rules, forms of contracts, protection of intellectual property, etc.); political and power structures; economic, social and cultural conditions; historically formed the role of the public sector in higher education and research.

Dynamic relationships between system components. At each spatial level, the three elements of the system are dynamically interconnected as follows:

1) at a given time t the institutional environment affects the behavior of agents and their forms of interaction, as well as the content and direction of science; technical policy of the state, which, in turn, determines the micro; and macroeconomic strategies and tactics for coordinating knowledge and innovation processes;

2) in the process of carrying out their activities, decision-making, interaction, agents and their supporting institutions, as well as public authorities make adjustments to the existing institutional environment. This means that the institutional environment in which CI agents operate sometimes plays a deterrent role. Innovative and psychological processes generate a flow of opportunities and motivating factors to change the whole system (at the micro, meso, and macro levels) and initiate new forms of thinking, models of interaction and coordination.

In other words, the innovation process is the result of intensive interactions between various factors and therefore significantly depends on intra-firm transactions and the firm's relationship with the institutional environment [3].

The institutional environment, on the one hand, creates conditions for building the interaction of companies with other factors in the search for information, technology, knowledge, experience and other resources; changing over time, determines the behavior of innovative firms, creating socio-cultural preconditions, institutional and regulatory structures that influence the decision-making process.

On the other hand, the institutional environment itself is a "hostage" to the factors of innovation and may change under the influence of different "interest groups" (eg, unions, associations and various associations). It can be assumed that the more formalized the relations within such groups, the stronger their impact on the institutional environment.

Spatial dynamics. In our proposed analytical model there are spatial interactions, forming an innovative and knowledge system.

The study concludes that although the role of national factors (institutional, economic or social) is currently dominant in structuring the innovation and knowledge systems of different countries and regions, there is a clear tendency to increase the transparency of national borders, increasing the influence of transnational companies. On the other hand, strategies for organizing innovation in the regions are becoming more effective and dynamic.

Thus, there is a new spatial reconfiguration of innovation and knowledge processes. This reconfiguration leads to a strengthening of the relationship between innovative agents based on territorial proximity and complementarity.

Institutions and space: a dynamic relationship. Institutional and spatial dynamics that shape national and regional innovation processes are closely interrelated. They can be illustrated by the example of the European Union [3, p. 54–67].

First, the policy that has led to the construction of a single EU space over the last four decades has transformed a large amount of national competences at the EU level,

which is especially important for policy-making for large R&D projects, harmonization of patent legislation, and unification of basic institutional rules. industries (pharmaceutical, food, agricultural, etc.), as well as in domains such as competition policy, environmental protection, quality control, health and safety, higher education and academic mobility. There is also a tendency to harmonize and unify the electricity and gas industries, railways, the system of degrees in universities, there are prerequisites for the formation of a single European research space. The processes of harmonization and unification have played an important role in changing the spatial organization of the processes of creation, accumulation and dissemination of knowledge and innovation.

Second, most European countries have expanded the process of decentralization of their political and administrative structures, transferring more power and responsibility to regional and local authorities in economic and social matters (employment, industrial restructuring, etc.), as well as in higher education and R & D.

Finally, the processes of globalization, rapid technological change, the growing complexity of innovation processes have contributed to increased technological and geographical interdependence and enhanced strategic complementarity between different types of innovative agents.

Now innovative agents in the process of cooperation create scientific, technological and industrial coalitions and networks that require the development of new models of cooperation and coordination at different spatial levels.

II. Research of institutional dynamics with the help of functional approach and identification of the most significant functions

A functional approach was used to study institutional dynamics. R. Galli and M. Tubal began to work in this direction; their ideas were continued in the works of A. Johnson and S. Jacobson, N. Zavlin and others. The primary function of the innovation system is to promote the development and dissemination of innovation. It is often called the goal of the innovation system.

The novelty of the works of the above authors is that they reflected on the various subfunctions of the innovation system necessary for its development and for the development of emerging technologies. In this paper, we will call these subfunctions "system functions" [4, p. 45–49].

S. Jacobson and A. Johnson developed a concept in which the function of the system is defined as the promotion of a component or series of components of the system as a whole. They argue that the NIS can be described and analyzed in terms of its "functional pattern", which shows how these functions are performed.

The functions of the system relate to the nature and interaction between the components of the innovation system, ie between participants (eg, companies and other organizations), associations and institutions, or specific to one particular NIS, or common to several different systems.

The author proposes to consider the following functions: F1 – business; F2 – knowledge creation (learning); F3 – dissemination of knowledge through interaction networks; F4 – research management, formation of expectations; F5 – market formation; F6 – resource mobilization; F7 – lobbying / resistance, resistance, change. As a result of the study we made the following conclusions:

Entrepreneurial activity (1st function) was the main indicator of the progress of the innovation system.

First, we saw that this is a good indicator of the spread of technology. Second, the activity of entrepreneurs has been a central function that connects other system functions and, thus, increases the efficiency of emerging cycles. We have often observed that the process of knowledge creation was followed by entrepreneurial actions, which, in turn, initiated many other system functions.

Knowledge creation (2nd function) also proved to be an important factor in all cases. Often the development of knowledge preceded entrepreneurial activity or evolved in parallel with it. Thus, entrepreneurs only invested in new technology trajectories, while the minimum knowledge base already existed. If they did invest in the projects, many of the technological problems they faced were solved through additional R&D efforts.

It turned out to be more difficult to directly trace the role of knowledge dissemination (3rd function). We were able to assess the events in which the dissemination of knowledge was most likely, such as seminars, conferences and scientific and technical presentations. However, the main dissemination of knowledge occurs in the process of bilateral relations and can not be reflected in the literature. It seems to us that by interviewing the participants of the innovation system you can get a better idea of the performance of this function.

Research management (4th function) proved to be an important systemic function. We observed that strict management motivated entrepreneurs to enter a new technological market, directly affected the amount of resources invested in the development of knowledge. At the same time, the lack of leadership led to the reluctance of entrepreneurs to invest. The change in positive and negative management affected the growth or decline of entrepreneurial activity. In addition, much of the frustration of entrepreneurs in emerging innovation systems has been due to the rapid change in leadership style; much less affected, for example, the availability of capital.

Market formation (5th function) in most cases was at the bottom of the list of functions that contribute to the growth of the innovation system. Very often it is used last, after which the formation of the system is significantly accelerated.

Resource mobilization (6th function) was present in every studied innovation system.

Finally, lobbying (function 7) proved to be the most important factor. This is a vital function that helps institutions adapt to the needs of participants in the innovation system. We observed that the absence of this system function was often an indicator of a poorly functioning innovation system, as well as the weak participation of institutions in meeting the needs of the emerging system [5, p. 48–56].

With a more specific consideration of the dynamics of efficient cycles, it becomes obvious that some system functions play a particularly important role. The growth of entrepreneurial activity (1st function) is observed when such systemic functions as research management (4th function) and market formation (5th function) are well performed.

In some cases, positive leadership (4th function) leads to increased pre-entrepreneurial activity (1st function), but

the breakthrough does not occur until a market is formed (5th function), which provides entrepreneurs and investors with a stable, long-term perspective.

Conclusion. Clear leadership and successful market formation, in turn, is influenced by the fact that entrepreneurs receive certain powers. A vital factor here is a well-organized group of entrepreneurs who are able to shape expectations about new technology, successfully influence the government and adapt institutional conditions so that they better meet their needs.

Thus, the authors propose an analytical model of the national innovation system, which consists of three spatial levels and takes into account the dynamics of innovation and knowledge processes occurring in it. Evaluation of the dynamic interaction between the elements of the system is carried out using a functional approach.

References:

1. Iliashenko S.N., Shipulina Yu.S. (2018) Intellectualnyi capital i korporativnaya kultura v innovationnom obshestve: aspetku na urovne regiona [The intellectual capital and corporate culture in innovative society: aspects at the level of the region]. Donetsk : Yugo-vostok, 399 p.

2. Halligan B., Shah Dh. (2019) Marketing v internete: kak privlech google, socialnue seti i blogerov [Inbound Marketing: Get Found Using Google, Social Media, and Blogs]. Moscow: Dialektika, pp. 91–100.

3. Ansoff I. (2018) Strategicheskyi management.[Strategic management]. L.I. Evenko (Ed.). Moscow: Ekonomika, pp. 54–67.

4. Iliashenko S.N. (2019) Primenenie metodov i instrumentov marketinha v upravlenii znaniiami [Application of methods and instruments of marketing in management of knowledge]. *Marketinh i menedzhment innovatsii – Marketing and Management of Innovations,* no. 2, pp. 45–49. (in Russian)

5. Melnik L.H., Iliashenko S.N., Kasianenko V.A. (2018). Ekonomika informatsii i informatsionnye sistemy predpriiatiia [Economics of information and information systems of enterprise]. Sumy: Universitetskaia kniha, pp. 48–56. (in Russian)

6. Shevchuk O.A. (2017) Znaniya – kak osnovnoi strategicheskyi resurse predpriyatiya. [Knowledge – as the main strategic resource of the enterprise]. Moscow, no. 2/2(10), pp. 46–49.

7. Rudenko M.V. (2018) Management znaniyi kak konkurentno priemushestvo predpriyatiya [Management of knowledge as a competitive advantage of the enterprise]. Economy and State. New York, no. 4, pp. 74–78. (in Russian)

8. Vovk Yu.Ya. (2019) Proses upravleniya znaniyami predpriyatiya I ego characteristic. [The process of enterprise knowledge management and its features]. Kiev, no. 23.17, pp. 343–352.

9. Turnip D.O. (2018) Formirovanie sistemu adnibistrirovaniya znaniyami pr

edpritatiya. [Formation of system administration knowledge enterprise]. Kharkiv: Ed. KhNEU, no. 22 (119), pp. 37–39.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Ильяшенко С.Н. Интеллектуальный капитал и корпоративная культура в инновационном обществе: аспекты на уровне региона. Донецк : Юго-восток, 2018. С. 399.

2. Халлиган Б. Маркетинг в Интернете: как привлечь клиентов с помощью Google, социальных сетей и блогов. Москва : Диалектика, 2019. С. 91–100.

3. Ансофф И. Стратегическое управление. Киев : Экономика, 2018. С. 54–67.

4. Ильяшенко С.Н. Применение методов и инструментов маркетинга в управлении знаниями. *Маркетинг и менеджмент инноваций.* 2019. № 2. С. 45–49.

5. Мельник Л.Г. Экономика информации и информационные системы предприятия. Сумы : Университетская книга, 2018. С. 48–56.

6. Shevchuk O.A. (2017) Knowledge – as the main strategic resource of the enterprise. *Technological audit and production reserves,* no. 2/2 (10), pp. 46–49.

7. Rudenko M.V. (2018) Management of knowledge as a competitive advantage of the enterprise. *Economy and State?* no. 4. pp. 74–78.

8. Vovk Yu.Ya. The process of enterprise knowledge management and its features. Kyiv, 2019. Vol. 23.17. Pp. 343–352.

9. Turnip D.O. (2018) Formation of system administration knowledge enterprise. *Development Management,* no. 22 (119), pp. 37–39.

E-mail: sutner@ukr.net