

UDC 330.341

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2224-6282/180-21>**Antochov Andrij**Doctor of Economics, Professor,
Yriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3887-9666>**Klevchik Leonid**PhD in Economics, Assistant Professor,
Yriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3585-544X>**Luste Olena**PhD in Economics, Assistant Professor,
Yriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3691-9038>**Антохов А.А.**доктор економічних наук, професор,
Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича**Клевчик Л.**кандидат економічних наук, асистент,
Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича**Лусте О.О.**кандидат економічних наук, асистент,
Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича

SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ORGANIZATION'S MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The article examines the problems of inertia of institutional transformations and organizational changes in domestic conditions. Sources of institutional traps are analyzed. The role of changing management models in overcoming these problems is highlighted. Special importance is attached to the creation of an organizational culture based on trust, as well as to the transfer of emphasis in management from exclusively material aspects to the formation of the intellectual capital of the enterprise. The importance of taking into account the structural components of the national economic mentality in the formation and development of social capital as a factor of organizational changes and adaptability of the personnel management system is substantiated, the peculiarities of the economic mentality as an informal institution are determined, and the prospects for further research of this issue are outlined.

Keywords: strategic management, organizational culture, self-management, economic choice, social capital.

JEL classification: D24, M11

СОЦІАЛЬНО-ПСИХОЛОГІЧНІ ЧИННИКИ ЕФЕКТИВНОСТІ СИСТЕМИ МЕНЕДЖМЕНТУ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЇ

У статті досліджуються проблеми інерційності інституційних трансформацій та організаційних змін у вітчизняних умовах. Проаналізовано джерела інституційних пасток. Висвітлено роль зміни управлінських моделей у подоланні даних проблем. Особливого значення надається створенню організаційної культури, яка базується на довірі, а також перенесенню акцентів у менеджменті із виключно матеріальних аспектів на формування інтелектуального капіталу підприємства. Обґрунтовано важливість врахування структурних компонентів менталітету у формуванні та розвитку соціального капіталу як чинника організаційних змін та адаптивності системи управління персоналом, визначено особливості господарського менталітету як неформального інституту, та окреслено перспективи подальших досліджень цієї проблематики. Авторами визначено, що невпинне зміщення акцентів від управління капіталом і технологією до управління людьми свідчить про необхідність кардинального перегляду нашого сприйняття ресурсів. Центральне місце у такому сприйнятті займає розуміння того, що своєю унікальністю роль людини різюче відрізняється від капіталу і технології. У статті визначено, що ключовий напрямок трансформації управлінських моделей у сенсі забезпечення їх адаптивності й ефективності повинен полягати у певному перенесенні акцентів із переважно матеріальних, фінансових складових організації на нематеріальні і навіть духовні й емоційні, у формуванні нової організаційної культури. Завдяки ефективно діючій організаційній культурі підприємства можуть перебудовувати свою як внутрішню, так і зовнішню політику, що допоможе їм ефективно реагувати на будь-які прояви ринкового середовища, бути лідером на ринку, мати високу конкурентоспроможність. При цьому потенціал організаційної культури визначається рівнем розвитку соціального капіталу підприємства із врахуванням неформальних норм та цінностей які значною мірою закріплені в структурі національного менталітету. Автори зазначають, що соціально орієнтована ринкова економіка потребує поєднання інтересів різних прошарків суспільства з різними потребами та ідеологічними настановами, поєднання прагнення до свободи та рівності з самореалізацією кожного індивіда. В умовах поширення процесів соціалізації економіки особливого значення на-

буває концепція соціального капіталу, в рамках якої розробляються поняття соціальних мереж, довіри, організаційної культури, приділяється увага аналізу тих етичних норм і моральних цінностей, які існують в різних групах і спільнотах.

Ключові слова: стратегічний менеджмент, організаційна культура, самоменеджмент, економічний вибір, соціальний капітал.

Formulation of the problem. The fundamental principles of strategic management, laid down half a century ago by the classic works of Harvard professors, mainly characterize the realities of a mature industrial society, while during the last decades more and more countries are making the transition to a post-industrial economy on an increasingly large scale, in which knowledge plays the role of a leading factor of production, which is global and informed. In the conditions of such dynamic transformations, there is an active search for new theoretical models that would more adequately reflect reality; accordingly, previous views are at least supplemented and adapted. This also applies to the idea of rational behavior of economic entities, and in particular to the rationality of management decision-making. First of all, this problem draws attention to the contradiction between implemented formal and historically formed informal institutions. The research of the value-orientational and mental foundations of economic and managerial activity becomes relevant, as there is a need to implement a new business culture, adequate and complementary to the modern market environment.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The study of social capital as a necessary condition for the functioning of civil society and economic development gained particular intensity in the 1990s and 2000s. In addition to the founders of this concept, R. D. Putnam, J. Coleman and F. Fukuyama, B. Asheim, N. Agapitova, D. Acemoglu, E. L. are working fruitfully in this direction. Glaser, P. Dasgupta, R.J. Degen, M. Evans, D. Karamuta, E. Migueles, A. Richard, R. Florida, F. Sabatini, et al. Among the latest Ukrainian studies, the publications of V. Geets, V. Yelagin, K. Kovyazina, O. Lazorenko, A. Maklakov, L. Shangina and others attract attention.

The purpose of the article is in determining the role of economic mentality in the process of formation and development of social capital as a factor of organizational changes and adaptability of the personnel management system.

Unsolved aspects of the problem. The analysis showed that these studies are based on institutional theory and classical economic tools, and the main methodological approaches to determining the indicators of the development of social capital are empirical and sociological, as well as the method of econometric modeling.

Presenting main material. The role of institutions in social and economic development is generally recognized, however, the processes of their conscious or spontaneous formation, implementation and changes, including at the level of an individual organization, are associated with a number of problems, the mechanisms and consequences of which are interpreted far ambiguously, and therefore require further research. In the context of the effectiveness of collective interaction and management, as well as organizational changes, the so-called "QWERTY-effects" are indicative.

QWERTY effects are a textbook example of the so-called "institutional traps". This issue has been widely

researched by such authors as Williams O., David P., North D., Polterovych V., Radaev V., Tkach A., etc., although P. David is considered the founder of considering the problem from this perspective. However, scientists usually focus on macroeconomic or sociological, cultural aspects. In our opinion, it is appropriate to evaluate the QWERTY effects in the context of the search for determinants of the effectiveness of management activities at the level of individual organizations [4].

In the English-language literature, the term "institutional trap" is used more often not as "institutional trap", but as "lock-in effect". According to D. North's interpretation, this means: "that under certain conditions the decision made is difficult to reverse, – that is, – ... the growth of changes in the technological field in a certain determined direction can lead to the victory of one technological decision over others even when the first technological direction, in the end, turns out to be less effective compared to the rejected alternative". In other words, an institutional trap is an inefficient stable norm (inefficient institution) that is self-sustaining [5].

The factor of previous experience affects both the national level and the level of functioning of individual organizations. One of the most famous examples of the dependence of economic development on a previously chosen trajectory is given by the American economist P. David. He described the "history of QWERTY" – the history of the adoption of the standard arrangement of keys on the keyboard of personal computers – with the intention of showing what circumstances led to the fact that the far from the most convenient arrangement of keys nevertheless became generally accepted [4].

Over time, competing offers appeared on the market, but QWERTY withstood the onslaught of competitors, despite the fact that tests of alternative keyboards showed an increase in typing speed of 20–40%.

Due to what circumstances did the "lock-in" of the QWERTY technology market occur? David identifies three such mechanisms:

- the effect of technical interdependence;
- economies of scale;
- irreversibility of investments.

"The history of QWERTY" illustrates the process, the starting point of which was "historical chance" (the development of the QWERTY keyboard), which determined the further development of the market, the participants of which, making spontaneous uncoordinated choices, contributed to the approval of a certain "random" pattern as a generally accepted one. Despite the fact that the agents of the modern market of computer technologies, "as it is customary to express, are absolutely free in their choices," asserts David, "their behavior, however, is determined by the events of the distant past, in which neither they nor their interests are represented were" [5].

The dependence of the institutional structure of the market on the previously chosen trajectory is caused by strong institutional and structural (organizational) inertia.

It is possible to identify three most important reasons for the institutional inertia of economic organizations:

- past investments in specific assets;
- commitment to existing structures and institutions;
- tendency to avoid risk [6]

So, the example of the QWERTY effect allows us to describe and better understand the mechanisms of fixing inefficient rules and norms, the inertia of transformation and development of systems of different levels.

In a transition economy, the system of basic values of society is changing: there is a reorientation from a long-term model of behavior to a short-term one. The reason for this is that in conditions of uncertainty and instability, following a long-term model causes losses, and profitable short-term intermediation deals convince economic agents to abandon a model based on long-term interests. The decline of the latter was contributed in particular by numerous unsuccessful attempts by citizens to save their savings (we mean the 90s), and financial pyramids, suspicious banks, with their dubious scams, etc. The destruction of the long-term model of behavior occurred simultaneously with the destruction of the institution of trust in the state, in the legal system, partners, and, finally, neighbors, friends, and relatives. As a result, a model takes root in society at its various levels.

One of the most important consequences of institutional traps is that while they can mitigate the negative short-term effects of too rapid institutional change, at the same time they hinder long-term economic growth.

At the same time, there are options for minimizing the inertia of transformational processes, which can have both an external and internal character, be both evolutionary and revolutionary. We consider it expedient to focus attention on intra-organizational opportunities, primarily on changing management models.

A question may arise – why new management technologies will not be hindered by the aforementioned pitfalls? It is likely that there will be obstacles, but the fact is that alternative management technologies are not ephemeral theoretical concepts – they already exist and are used in practice, and domestic managers usually do not know anything about their existence. That is, the problem is not so much that new management methods are not accepted, but that these methods are terra incognita for many managers [7].

In addition to changes in the external environment, factors caused by internal organizational changes can also become a catalyst for actions that ultimately lead to the creation of new rules. In particular, D. North emphasizes the role of knowledge development in institutional dynamics. "Systematic investment in the expansion of skills and knowledge for the purpose of economic development," he writes, "leads to the dynamic evolution of the economy, which gives rise to a certain set of institutional characteristics... Incentives built into the institutional system determine the direction of the learning process in the process of activity and development of the population knowledge that pushes decision-makers to gradually change this system" [5].

There is a correlation between the financial performance of companies and the social environment, the behavior of employees, their attitude to the matter; research projects confirm that the human factor actually has a central role in the effective operation of an organization – when

companies start practice appropriate policies regarding their personnel, their equity capital shows a clear trend of growth.

"Previously, the possession of sufficient financial capital was a significant advantage due to its inaccessibility; later, as such an advantage, technology came to the fore. These days, however, financial capital is not in short supply, and most technologies can be replicated by competitors. These resources continue to provide their owners with certain advantages, but they are no longer able to make these advantages permanent. In this decade, only people, personnel are able to maintain the competitiveness of their organizations for a long period of time" [5].

A socially oriented market economy requires a combination of the interests of different layers of society with different needs and ideological guidelines, a combination of the desire for freedom and equality with the self-realization of each individual. In the conditions of the spread of economic socialization processes, the concept of social capital acquires special importance, within which the concepts of social networks, trust, and organizational culture are developed, attention is paid to the analysis of those ethical norms and moral values that exist in various groups and communities.

Different authors at different times defined social capital as a resource that increases social efficiency or as social networks and connections between individuals based on mutual trust. F. Fukuyama gives the following definition: "Social capital is an institutional, informal norm that promotes cooperation between two or more individuals." In his opinion, social capital differs from other forms of human capital in that it is usually created and transmitted through such cultural mechanisms as religion, tradition, and mentality. At the same time, social capital includes formal institutional ties and structures, such as government, political regime, legality in society, judicial system, civil political freedoms. J. Coleman distinguishes the following forms of social capital: obligations and expectations, information channels, social norms and effective sanctions. At the same time, the importance of creating voluntary public associations, in which relations are mostly informal and based on trust, mutual support, which leads to the expansion of the network of contacts and the increase of social capital, is emphasized [3].

The economic significance of social capital lies in the fact that it reduces the costs of coordinating joint activities, replacing contracts, formal rules and bureaucratic procedures with relationships of trust, learned professional standards, and communication ethics. Social capital stimulates economic development, promoting connections between entrepreneurs, employees, facilitating access to information, improving collective decision-making and increasing the effectiveness of collective actions. At the level of society, social capital creates prerequisites for facilitating social control and transfer of social experience, solidarity of different social units through the recognition of national values.

In our opinion, those informal norms and values that mediate the process of functioning of social capital are to a large extent fixed in the structure of the national economic mentality, therefore the study of the main stages of the development of social capital and the effectiveness of the processes of socialization of the economy is possible through the prism of the mental characteristics of society.

The mechanism of coordination of the main functions of social capital and features of economic mentality is presented in the table. 1. The micro level of reproduction of social capital is determined by the activities of people within institutional units (individual firm, public organization, etc.). From an economic point of view, the social capital of a firm affects the growth of business efficiency by reducing transaction costs that arise when searching for information; conducting negotiations and concluding contracts; implementation of monitoring and warning of market threats; replacing the atmosphere of competition with relations of cooperation.

The accumulation of social capital at the meso level (relationships within institutional sectors, between institutional units) determines the stability of the entire socio-economic system. Social capital at the meso level is manifested in relations between economic agents of the region, associations of industry trade unions, etc.

Macro-level social capital (relationships between institutional sectors) manifests itself in ensuring trust and cooperation across markets and the economic system as a whole. The structural form of social capital at the macro level is social associations – political parties, social movements, professional unions, creative unions and other organizations, which are characterized by the presence of a consciously built system of intra-organizational relations, which testify to the active interaction of various social systems within the general social space.

In our opinion, it is the values embedded in the structure of economic mentality that are the basis for the formation of social capital, determining its quality and dynamics of development. The economic mentality contributes to the socialization of the individual, support, transformation of the stock of social stereotypes, ways of their actualization, legitimization. An individual adopts the value orientations of his group and begins to consciously reproduce them in the process of economic activity. The social capital of the enterprise is a consequence of the socialization of each employee in the conditions of collective work.

Socialization of employees takes place through the assimilation of behavioral patterns, psychological mechanisms, social norms and values, which are necessary for successful interaction with other team members. It covers all processes of approaching the values of corporate culture, communications and training,

The economic mentality, materializing in the process of production activity, is capable of influencing the process of motivation for effective work and self-organization, speeding up or inhibiting it. A critical analysis of the economic mentality is needed, first of all, to find ways to qualitatively update its components in accordance with the requirements of the market economy. A valuable reference point of the economic mentality should be directing the consciousness of employees to the development of their competitiveness in work, which creates grounds for the development of competitiveness and real independence of the economy.

Currently, it is generally recognized that the economic mentality is one of the most important factors affecting the forms, functions and structure of management. The organization, being a social system, possesses all the characteristics of the society in which it functions. People working in the organization reflect all the features of the national culture and mentality. In this regard, the expressed desire for collectivism or individualism, the predominance of diligence or laziness, frugality or extravagance determine the forms and methods of management, permeate the behavior and actions of managers. Thus, the correspondence between management and mentality smoothes the contradiction between the managed and the managers, helps to overcome crisis situations.

In different countries with different national cultures, certain models of enterprise management have developed. Reforming industrial enterprises is impossible without a scientific search for institutional forms capable of connecting socio-cultural mental features of people with their role functions in the modern production and economic process. On the basis of economic mentality,

Table 1

The mechanism of influence of economic mentality at different levels of functioning of social capital

Functions of social capital	The influence of economic mentality on the realization of the functions of social capital
Social capital due to the increase of trust between the participants of the agreement allows to reduce the transaction costs associated with formal coordination mechanisms	Business mentality accumulates previous experience of the mechanisms of realization of economic interests, learned models of interaction with partners, competitors, and the state. Therefore, the formation of trust and a tendency to establish informal ties in business, which make it possible to overcome obstacles related to bureaucratic rules, directly depends on whether the values of equality, tolerance, and the desire for cooperation are enshrined in the structure of the economic mentality.
Social capital accumulated at the level of the firm makes it possible to facilitate and improve the process of making managerial decisions	Innovativeness, responsibility, the desire for self-realization, as features of the economic mentality, can contribute to the formation of social capital at the firm level by increasing the motivation of employees, the prevalence of non-material incentives, and the active involvement of personnel in solving important tactical and strategic steps in the development of the organization.
Social capital contributes to the increase of trust in state institutions, the consolidation of society, the growth of social stability, and the acceleration of economic development	The formation of trust in government institutions is based on such features of the economic mentality as respect for the law, established formal norms and restrictions, the prevalence of cooperation strategies, partnership in business and government relations, and active citizenship.
Social capital makes it possible to reduce social vulnerability and receive the necessary support in a crisis situation	Enshrining the values of collectivism, tolerance, and trust in the structure of the economic mentality can significantly reduce the negative consequences of crisis situations and obtain significant benefits from concluding long-term agreements

Source: compiled by the authors

such components of organizational culture as values and norms of behavior, communication system, relations between units and employees within the team, work ethics, motivation system, system of decision-making and control over their implementation, attitude to innovations, reaction to changes, positioning are formed organizations in the external environment, international relations and intercultural perception, etc. A qualitative change in individual social capital leads to an increase in the quality of working life at the enterprise. First of all, this is due to the fact that human development is impossible without the process of humanizing work, which involves a complex of organizational, technical and socio-economic measures to change working conditions and the production environment. On the other hand, as a result of the change in the economic mentality, the development of individual and personal characteristics of the employee, his attitude to work, his position in the organization, the conditions of personal and professional advancement, which is considered an important indicator of the quality of working life at the enterprise, changes. which provides for a complex of organizational, technical and socio-economic measures to change working conditions and the production environment.

The success of socialization processes in modern conditions depends on the quality of social capital and the efficiency of its functioning at all levels of management. At the same time, the national economic mentality has a significant influence on the quality and development of social capital, since it is values, traditions, models of economic behavior that are the basis for the formation of social capital, ensuring effective cooperation between various market participants.

That is, the economic mentality is an important institutional factor of socio-economic development, which: 1) determines the dynamics of the development of the institutional environment due to the influence on the effectiveness of the interaction of formal and informal

institutions, ensuring that they fulfill complementary functions; 2) mediates the process of institutionalization of historically determined values, stereotypes and models of economic behavior into a system of formal norms and rules; 3) ensures adaptability and dynamism of the institutional structure under the influence of other socio-economic factors, promotes the formation and development of new institutions; 4) determines the national specificity of socialization processes.

Conclusions. A favorable prerequisite for the implementation of new management technologies, in particular in the field of HRM, is, as paradoxical as it sounds, a situation of economic decline, when a significant number of organizations are in a crisis or pre-crisis state, and therefore the choice of a new scenario of functioning does not require giving up already existing advantages and assets. The constant shift of emphasis from capital and technology management to people management indicates the need for a radical revision of our perception of resources. The central place in this perception is the understanding that, due to its uniqueness, the role of man is strikingly different from capital and technology.

The key direction of the transformation of management models in the sense of ensuring their adaptability and efficiency should be a certain transfer of emphasis from mainly material, financial components of the organization to immaterial and even spiritual and emotional ones, in the formation of a new organizational culture. Thanks to an effectively functioning organizational culture, enterprises can rebuild both their internal and external policies, which will help them respond effectively to any manifestations of the market environment, be a market leader, and have high competitiveness. At the same time, the potential of organizational culture is determined by the level of development of the social capital of the enterprise, taking into account informal norms and values that are largely fixed in the structure of the national economic mentality.

References:

1. Azar, O. H. (2016). Relative Thinking Theory. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, no. 36(1), pp. 1–14.
2. Bondarenko, O. (2007). The economic mentality of Ukraine: the current state and prospects for further development. *The Political Herald*, no. 27, pp. 69–79.
3. Coleman, J. (2000). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *Social Capital: a Multifaceted Perspective*. Washington, DC: World Bank, p. 320.
4. David, P. (1985). Clio and the Economics of QWERTY. *American Economic Review*, no. 75, pp. 332–337.
5. Davis, L., North, D. (1971). *Institutional Change and American Economic Growth*. Cambridge: University Press, p. 284.
6. Earl, P. (2015). Behavioural Economics and the Economics of Regulation. Briefing Paper for the New Zealand Ministry of Economic Development, p. 276.
7. Harrison L. (2000). *Culture matters: How values shape human progress*, New York: Basic Books, p. 432.
8. Huselid, M. (1995). The impact of HRM practices on turnover, productivity and corporate performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, no. 38, pp. 640–645.
9. Korzhenko, V., Pisarenko, J. (2009). Influence of national culture on the formation of management models: methods of cross-cultural management. *Actual problems of public administration*, no. 1 (35), pp. 16–26.
10. Kubiniy H. (2019) Mentality as a factor of economic development in the conditions of post-modern economy. *Business strategy: futurological challenges*, Kyiv, 495 p.
11. Pishchik V., Belousova A. (2020). Methodology of project management and type of economic mentality of managers of x and y generations. *E3S Web Conf.* Volume, 175. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202017513012>.