

суб'єктивними і об'єктивними, раціональними та ірраціональними чинниками здійснення окремими культурно-цивілізаційними світами історичних Виборів. Духовні та матеріальні цінності цивілізації розглянуті як основний зміст культури. Їх розвиток проаналізовано як показник стану культурно-цивілізаційного світу; а місце людини (насамперед, якість і тривалість життя, права і можливості творчої реалізації кожного), з одного боку, збереження і нарощування ознак цивілізованості, з іншого, – як основні критерії прогресу. У контексті рис активної меншини соціуму вивчено характеристики суб'єктності суспільних трансформацій. З цих позицій розглянуто зміст регулятивних впливів управлінської еліти, її відповідності завданням, що постають перед суспільством.

Ключові слова: ціннісно-сміслові комплекси, культура, соціогенез.

Shedyakov V. The place of culture's phenomena in processes of antroposociogenesis and social transformations realizing.

The features, capabilities and limitations of various factors sociogenesis under the pressure of traditional, modern and postmodern culture status are examined. The forming correlations between subjective and objective, rational and irrational factors of the cultural and civilizational world's historic election under the influence of the base value and meaning systems is analysed. Spiritual and material values of civilization are considered as the main content of culture. Their development is analysed as an indicator of the state of culture and civilization of the world; and man's place (especially the quality and length of life, rights and opportunities for the creative implementation of each), on the one hand, maintaining and increasing signs of civilization, on another one, – as the main criteria for progress. With regard to the features of an active minority of society studied characteristics subjectivity of social transformations. From this perspective, consider the content of the regulatory impact of the managerial elite, its adequacy to the tasks facing society.

Keywords: value-semantic systems, culture, social genesis.

Voronkova V., Maksimenyuk M., Nikitenko V.

**HUMANISTIC MANAGEMENT
IN THE CONTEXT OF PHYLOSOFIC ANTHROPOLOGY:
HUMAN DIMENSION**

The subject of research is the perception of human dimension as the anthropological aspect of humanistic management, based on the interrelations between man, government, society. The paper describes the evolution of views on man in the context of anthropological foundations of humanistic management; it is noted that the development trends of the philosophical and

anthropological knowledge of humanistic management are based on human perception in the projection of anthropological dimensions of man, which is fundamental in European philosophy. The paper analyzes the essence of human dimension as anthropological paradigm of humanistic management, in which man is not only economic, or political, but also the spiritual and cultural member of society; gives the analysis of human dimension as anthropological paradigm of European philosophy that investigates the anthropological foundations of economic, political and social spheres, interprets conditions of creating a humane society, in which the imperatives of a just society should be implemented. Characteristics and features, as well as the conditions for achieving human dimension as the anthropological foundation of European humanistic management are disclosed. The acquired knowledge can be useful for solving anthropological problems of humanistic management.

Keywords: human dimension, anthropological dimension, philosophical anthropology, humanistic management, man as the measure of all things, anthropological paradigm.

The relevance of the reception of the human dimension as an anthropological dimension of humanistic management takes place in terms of relationships "man-society" since man is central in the whole European philosophy, which demonstrates not only general-theoretical, general-philosophical, but praxiological sense as well. In the complex and contradictory development conditions of European philosophy, model of anthropocentrism, which includes features that are the foundation for analyzing the most deep and diverse relationships in the system "man-socium-nature" is formed. A model of a man in European philosophy is functional-basic and is the foundation for studying a number of universal patterns in the relationship of "man and society", "man and government", "man and management". Anthropological approach to the new format of receptions of man in the projection of anthropological dimensions of humanistic management in European Philosophy format lead to the three-level model, which is similar to a three-level model of the social world: 1) European society as a socium; 2) European society as a system-structural world; 3) European society as sociomicro- and sociomacrocism of everyday life.

Philosophical receptions of human dimension as an anthropological dimension of humanistic management are aimed at understanding man's place in the hierarchy of things. This problem of philosophical anthropology is defined not only systematically, but historically as well: by the first works from philosophical anthropology of Max Scheler (1874-1928) "The Place of Man in the Universe" (1928), Arnold Gehlen (1904-1976) "Man. His Nature and Place in the World" (1940). Fundamentals of philosophical anthropology were laid by L. Feyerbahom, F. Nietzsche, W. Dilthey,

E. Husserl, H. Driesch. In its formation, it has incorporated problems of the works of Uexkull, A. Portman, but was finally defined in the works of M. Scheler, H. H. Plessner, A. Gehlen, M. Buber. Philosophical anthropology identifies the sphere of the human being, human nature, human individuality, the sphere of the anthropocultural socium in whole as the object of its study.

Problems of man were interpreted by Ukrainian scientists V. Bech, Yu. Bekh, V. Shynkaruk, M. Zlotin, V. Ivanov, M. Tarasenko, V. Tabachkovskiy, H. Zaichenko, I. Bychko, V. Voronkova, M. Popovich, S. Krymskiy, V. Andruschenko, Y. Bystrytsky, S. Proleyev, M. Kultayeva, I.S tepanenko, Y. Andros, O. Kyrylyuk, V. Yatchenko, H. Shalashenko, M. Zaytsev. As a result of interpreting the anthropological studies, modern view on the human world is based on the provisions of "Renaissance Humanism", which deduces its understanding of the man and the surrounding reality from the human being itself and, through it, is based on anthropological principles of humanistic management. In our opinion, the representatives of Kyiv-anthropological school interpreted problems of man in terms of his being and ontological foundations of human existence, values and philosophical orientations. According to Ye. Andros, "Philosophical anthropology focuses on invariant (in this case universal), stable natural, anthro-cultural and personal human qualities, taken in the social and historical flow, specificity in relation to a particular era. Then – on philosophical reflection and knowledge in a certain culture and anthropological parameters of the human image in the infinity of life and self-perfection" [1, 5].

In the context of philosophical and anthropological dimensions, emphasis is shifted to human ontology, in which doctrine of the meaning of human life and the possibilities of its comprehension, in particular by examining the conflictness of human world-attitude and self-creation is central. Through the anthropological principle, an attempt to explain the man himself and the surrounding world, comprehend the man and the surrounding world, understand the man as a unique phenomenon, as the creator of history and culture is made. Fundamental questions of philosophical and anthropological discourse – the attitude of man to the world and the world to man: what is the world we live in? what is man's place in this world? What is the man himself and what is the nature of his consciousness?

The purpose of the paper is to form the theoretical bases of reception of human dimension as an anthropological dimension of humanistic management, which is important for the reflection of the human dimension of humanistic management.

This purpose is realized in the following tasks:

- to identify development trends of philosophical and anthropological knowledge relative to humanistic management, based on the human reception of the projection of the anthropological dimensions of human existence, which is fundamental in European philosophy;
- to disclose the essence of human dimension as an anthropological paradigm of humanistic management, in which man is not only an economic or political member of society, but spiritual and cultural as well;
- to give analysis of human dimension as an anthropological paradigm of European philosophy that studies the anthropological principles and imperatives of human society.

Philosophical and anthropological aspect of humanistic management is fundamental in European philosophy, so we turn to the reception of man in the projection of anthropological dimensions of human being, which are reduced to the following trends, existing in the world today.

Trend one: a) the attitude of man to the world of social life shows the attitude of man to socium and is characterized as specific self-creation of man, self-realization in this world, and in this sense - the dominance of man as "the measure of all things" (Protagoras); b) man acts not so much as the creator of society, not so much as a substance that is embodied in a society that holds to a certain extent the existence and functioning of society in this sense, so it conforms to its needs and laws, and therefore acts as a force, in some respects conformable to society; c) man acts as creator of his own sociomicrocosm of everyday life. These three trends – the attitude of man to the world of social existence – lead to forming a certain triad: 1) man within the first set of relations dominates the world; 2) within the second - conforms to it; 3) within the third – shows a peculiar synthesis – the creation of the world by man and, depending on it, conformity to it. All these three groups of interdependencies of relations appear together, concurrently and are inseparable from each other, they form a single trend, based on the law of negation. In the context of this diversity of relationships, moment of integral attitude of man to the world of his social being is formed, and this integrity is inseparable and makes the connection of all components inseparable. A man both dominates the world of his social life, and conforms to it, therefore, it is basically impossible to break this inconsistency of human relationships [2, 28].

Trend two can be described as a trend of isolating phenomenon of man. Thus, at the first level of relations, human nature in the abstract-substantial sense is presented weakly, vaguely in the overall substantiality of man. In the second system of relations, it appears more clearly in the mass-functional existence, in its being reduced to sociality, its serving role.

However, at the third level of relations, human nature reveals most vividly, in its directly-pure form, suggesting that human nature at different levels of relations appears from different sides, which are inextricably interconnected and create the whole integrity of both exchange, and distribution of socially significant work, through the states of the loss of subjectivity, emergence of senses of independence and depression. Man relative to the world acts as a holistic and multifaceted subject, whose multidimensionality is an extremely difficult problem.

Anthropological analysis of the levels of man allows to show the complexity of this versatility, abundance of differences, even contradictions of approaches to analyzing man as a complex social being, despite the great diversity of approaches to man. Multidimensionality of man has a lot of individual dimensions since man has cosmic, physical, biological, social, psychological and cultural components. The man is a historical and creative being, who, in the process of reformative activity, transforms nature, society, himself, developing his physical and spiritual potentials. Creative, reformative human activity indicates highly-complex, multi-dimensional system. In general, multi-dimensional man is a man, who possesses the creative thinking and tries to actualize himself as a personality. Modern anthropological space on a global scale in certain tendencies becomes harmful to the personality, humanism, spiritual values, it is a narrative structure, hyperreality because it contains the same impersonal particle «man». That is why, modern man has become not the goal, but a means to achieve (by power - formal and informal - structures) any purposes (political, ideological, economic, philosophical).

Receptions of man in the projection of anthropological dimensions of human existence in European philosophy deepen relations of humanizing the surrounding world of nature and society from the standpoint of developing human needs. This means that the criterion of social progress and its ultimate goal is the human personality, the possibility and the prospect of its comprehensive development and its universalization within culture, socium and nature. Problems of modern secular humanism in fact combine these two vectors of social sciences and the humanities. It integrates political and historical aspects of the analysis, giving a truly global perspective to humanism [3, 54].

Methodological and general scientific significance of receptions of anthropological dimensions of human existence in European philosophy creates conditions for forming a new format of European philosophy, which can be defined as a system of worldviews, based on the true foundations of human freedom. Receptions of anthropological dimensions of human existence necessitate overcoming entropic processes that interpret the

conditions of creating human society, in which imperatives of human society must be implemented, and the conditions for forming a strategy of social progress must be created.

Analysis of the patterns of forming the anthropological paradigm of human dimension as the basis of European philosophy is oriented toward humanistic factor: a) increasing the level of economic development in the context of building a social-democratic state with a mixed economy; b) development of the constitutional state; c) the systematic improvement of legislation and forms of its presentation; d) formation of civil society and its institutions; e) formation and development of social responsibility in the sphere of public administration. Anthropological doctrine deduces its understanding of man and the surrounding reality from the human being and through it [6, 262].

Essence of human dimension as an anthropological paradigm of humanistic management focuses on the fact that man is not only an economic or political member of society, but also a sociocultural phenomenon that incorporates all the rational, cognitive-creative, cognitive-informative, which intertwine with emotional-volitional, traditionalist, national-historical, national-psychological elements. But being a reality, which takes certain place in the given space-time limits, does not make the individual historical. Democratic transformations of modern Ukrainian society determine the social formation of such values of anthropology, which are caused by specific historical circumstances. It is the question of forming such type of welfare state, which would focus on a man, his high social purpose, the orientation of the welfare state on the man, his well-being, happiness. In addition, there is no other way to make politics really humane and human, to combine it with morality and man. Philosophical anthropology covers the full range of issues that make up the essence of human problem in the coordinates of the universal laws of life and universal principles of human activity. The humanistic basis of human dimension as an anthropological paradigm of European philosophy is giving the humanistic connotation to social life, focusing on realizing human interests and values, when each man discovers the way to personal substantiality [4, 96].

Human dimension as an anthropological paradigm of European philosophy explores the anthropological bases of economic, political and social spheres; interprets the conditions of creating humane society, in which imperatives of a just society must be implemented, notions such as "humane society", "humane relationships", "humane person", "humanistic management" must be rehabilitated. In anthropological paradigm as a matrix of anthropocentrism, a total approach to the study of man as socio-

cultural being is used, the focus is placed on forming a society that is based on the ideals of justice, solidarity, social consensus, based on anthropological mode of man, i.e. forming the anthropological foundations of the welfare state, stable social development, overcoming lag of Ukraine from highly developed countries.

The object of human dimension as an anthropological paradigm of European anthropological philosophy is a set of ideas, principles, concepts of humanism that constitute a paradigm of political anthropology, accumulated by Western political and economic doctrines that ensure the regulation of relations in sociums with a focus on anthropological paradigm of culture and management. It is the anthropological paradigm as a paradigm of European philosophy that is seen as a culture, which is able to support the practical-political implementation of general democratic values, which would contribute to the development of individual completeness and integrity of the personality. It is primarily about a constitutive significance of the human personality and his experience to find new forms of social, political and religious relations, in which man is considered as the limiting form of realizing the idea of civil society, dialogue (polyphony of voices), possibility to initiate transformative processes in a changing and contradictory political life. These problems become especially relevant in view of the fact that as a result of human insecurity in conditions of crisis socium, overcoming the destruction of the personality, non-self-identity, non-integrity of the personality, dissociation of consciousness, man becomes alienated from the whole world of society, nature, himself. After all, man enters a social world not as an abstract being, but as a concrete social integrity, hence political anthropology should form an environment that would be worthy of a complete image of personality, and therefore civilized lifestyle.

Receptions of human dimension as anthropological paradigm of European philosophy are based on domestic and foreign experience in theory and practice, science, culture and education, includes the principles of humanism as a system of beliefs that define the disclosure of human capabilities as a criterion for evaluating the effectiveness of the state and maturity of social institutions, and the inherent right of everyone to free development of personality and realization of all his capabilities. Post-industrial era as the sociocultural context of modern activity paradigm creates new sociocultural trends, associated with forming a new paradigm of human dimensional foundations of management. Human dimension management is based on the following principles: 1) the principle of anthropological reduction as explanation of objective formations of politics, government and culture through their relatedness to man; 2) the principle of

authority as a holistic perception of human nature, based on created objective forms of culture; principle of anthropological interpretation of certain phenomena of human life, based on human dimension, anthropologism, humanism; 3) anthropological principles, based on "man as the measure of all things"; 4) development and the fullest use of the national cultural heritage in the multifaceted relations with other national cultures, openness to cultural interaction to ensure proper place for Ukraine in the European and global humanitarian space; 5) interaction between the state and civil society, business and government to create the necessary social and economic conditions for improving the quality of life, comprehensive harmonious development of man, protection of his rights and freedoms [5, 25-29].

Reception of human dimension as an anthropological paradigm of European philosophy is the basis of the anthropological paradigm of management, it is a human dimension of economics and politics, economic ethics, dialogue and tolerance as imperatives of human relations, social pragmatism and focus on the real needs of "earthly man", which provide a broad social base, possibility to survive in a crisis society. The essential feature of anthropological principles of management is that they focus on combining individual and group valuable institutions, social, national and general civilizational interests. The civilization of the XXI century with its vast technological progress and equally impressive tragedies, on one hand, has created opportunities for implementing projects of true human dimension, and on the other hand has caused deepening effect of crisis factors, which "totally" threaten humanity. As a result of these processes, mankind faces a choice, the crucial role of which belongs to human dimension and human dimensional European values. In these conditions, following anthropological standards should become the main criterion of public management. In this regard, it should be noted that in order to purposefully solve strategic programs of human development, developed by the government, they are aimed at implementing the concepts of human dimensional development. It is post-industrial era that interdetermines evolution of humanitarian sociocultural processes, allows to fix the substitution of technicist society paradigm by sociocultural development paradigm, directed to forming "symbolic man", created by the information epoch (Castells); forming post-industrial humanitarian market; inquiring for searching new meanings and forming new types of activity and professionalization systems, oriented on humanitarian production (human production).

Reception of human dimension as an anthropological paradigm of European philosophy is a new type of management activities, aimed at

achieving positive qualitative changes in all spheres of society by means of humanism, anthropocentrism, use of humanitarian resources and technologies. The human dimension is based on the concepts of communication, professional self-determination, cultural and symbolic capital, cultural policy. The human dimension is conceptualized as a sociocultural and anthropological phenomenon, introduced in the context of post-industrial scale of values, based on the activity theories of both the individual, and the government. Human centrism as type of politics is formed on the basis of the system model, which includes the evaluative, descriptive and instrumental clusters: 1) evaluative cluster includes the values of strategic thinking and cooperation, effective communication and productive reflection, responsibility and development, improving quality of life; 2) descriptive cluster is defined by objects of anthropological dimension of public management, such as symbols, institutions, communities, territories, spaces, sociocultural processes, and includes professional communities of humanitarian managers as subjects of sociocultural space; 3) instrumental cluster forms the types of resources, such as symbolic (the space of communication and language of profession), competence (communicativeness, reflexivity, creativity and projectivity) [6, 24].

The anthropological principles of human dimension of European philosophy are based on the possibility of forming the elements of universal culture, which are determined by: 1) the needs of social practice that necessitate reflection of phenomenon of humanistic management in a global transformation; 2) the need for a comprehensive understanding of the nature, meaning, functions, development areas of humanistic management in the socialization of the economy by features of humanistic management as an integrated social system, determining the place and role of the main sub-structures of humanistic management; 3) the importance of effective management of economic and social systems in transitive societies, maintaining political, social, economic and cultural stability, associated with effective mechanisms of ensuring humanistic management; 4) the need to provide all levels of management mechanism with humanistic scientific knowledge about the nature and character of the interrelation of objective conditions of ensuring human dimensional management in organizations, peculiarities of its functioning in conditions of transformation processes (transitive, transient, and modernization). The main area of anthropological development of Ukraine is the purposeful formation of a new quality of life, which consists in creating conditions for proper realization of opportunities of each person and guarantee of a decent living standard.

In modern conditions of development of the state, for elaborating and implementing human dimension as the basis of management practice, it is necessary to: 1) analyze the objective need for developing humanization of the socium as an integrated social and economic social system, in the context of which feedbacks work harmoniously; 2) identify "fundamental economic and managerial constants", which are stable basis of management system operation in the marketplace; 3) develop areas of optimizing the mechanism of effective ensurance of humanistic management to prepare absolutely new managerial elite of the XXI century; 4) develop and implement socioantropological paradigm of human dimensional European humanistic management, based on self-organizational and system processes.

Human dimension as humanistic principle of management is aimed at forming human dimensional European humanistic management as a management paradigm of the XXI century, which is a multiparadigm sphere of knowledge, based on several independent paradigms that are determined by the following factors: 1) practical: humanistic management is a practical field of activity that is related to solving practical problems, arising in different spheres of society; 2) institutional: humanistic management is a set of institutions that conduct humanistic management activity; 3) activity: humanistic management is the activity, related to the state management; 4) regulatory and legal: humanistic management serves as a legal and regulatory system that governs the state management; 5) scientific: humanistic management is an area of scientific knowledge, which is implemented in the state activity; 6) system: humanistic management should be formed as a system that requires a system regulation and self-regulation; 7) instrumental: humanistic management is a set of instruments for state management and influence on society; 8) innovative: humanistic management serves as an important mechanism for implementing innovations and renewing all spheres of society; 9) liberal: humanistic management is a way of regulating the relations between subjects of politics, government, management, centered around the "man as the measure of all things".

1. To fulfill all tasks of concept of human dimension as the anthropological basis of humanistic management, it is necessary to form the elite of humanitarian managers, exercise social and humanitarian policy by forming the key objectives of humanitarian management activity in human dimensional direction: a) notional (semiotic); b) personal growth and activity self-determination (anthropological); c) spatial; d) strategic thinking and political action.

2. Promote development of human dimensional outlook of humanitarian managers and development of human dimensional technologies, which are a

set of scientifically grounded methods and special techniques of indirect impact on society through the management of social human behavior.

3. Promote modernization of human dimensional European space of Ukraine, which requires: establishing a modern human dimensional culture of public management; full integration of Ukraine into the information space; strengthening the Ukraine's presence in the global humanitarian space.

Human dimension comes from the fact that reserves of humanistic development of economics, politics and culture are to be found in man himself, the development of his consciousness and spiritual capital. Without the development of anthropological capital, further development and improvement of society become impossible. The most important resource of human dimension appears intensification of anthropological capital and human existence. Anthropological principles of human dimension are terms of saving human, natural, social and political resources. In its substantive characteristics, concept of human dimension includes theoretical and conceptual grounding of "typical" tasks of humanization of politics, economy, ecology, social policy, science, education and culture.

The acquired knowledge may be useful for solving anthropological problems of humanistic management.

Л И Т Е Р А Т У Р А

1. *Бех В. П.* Философия социального мира: гносеологический анализ. – Запорожье : Тандем-У, 1999. – 284 с.
2. *Бех Ю. В.* Філософія управління соціальними системами: монографія. – К. : Вид-во НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 2012. – 623 с.
3. *Воронкова В. Г.* Філософія гуманістичного менеджменту (соціально-антропологічні виміри) : Монографія [Текст]. – Запоріжжя : РВВ ЗДІА, 2008. – 254 с.
4. *Кастельс М.* Информационная эпоха : экономика, общество, культура / [пер. с англ. О.И. Шкаратана]. – М. : ГУ ВШЭ, 2000. – 607 с.
5. *Лазаревич А. А.* Становление информационного общества : коммуникационно-эпистемологические и культурно-цивилизационные основания [Текст] : монография / науч. ред. И.Я. Левяш. – Минск : Беларуская навука, 2015. – 537 с.
6. *Соснін О. В.* Інформаційна безпека: нові виміри загроз, пов'язаних з інформаційно-комунікаційною сферою / О.В. Соснін, О.П. Дзьобань // Гуманітарний вісник Запорізької державної інженерної академії : [зб.наук.пр.]. – Запоріжжя : Вид-во ЗДІА, 2015. – № 61. – С.24-34.

Воронкова В., Максименюк М., Нікітенко В. Гуманістичний менеджмент в контексті філософської антропології: людський вимір.

Предметом дослідження є аналіз людського виміру як антропологічного напрямку гуманістичного менеджменту, що формується на основі взаємовідносин між людиною, урядом, суспільством. У статті описується еволюція поглядів на людину у контексті антропологічних засад гуманістичного менеджменту; відзначено, що тенденції розвитку філософського та антропологічного знання гуманістичного менеджменту базуються на основі людського чинника. В основі гуманістичного менеджменту антропологічні виміри людини, яка відіграє важливу роль у європейській філософії. У статті проаналізовано сутність людського виміру як антропологічної парадигми гуманістичного менеджменту, в якому людина є не тільки економічною або політичною, але духовною та культурною константою суспільства; дається аналіз людського виміру як антропологічної парадигми європейської філософії, в основі якої антропологічні основи економічної, політичної і соціальної сфери, умови створення гуманного суспільства. Представлено характеристики та функції, а також умови досягнення людського виміру як антропологічної основи європейських цінностей гуманістичного менеджменту. Отримані знання можуть бути корисними для вирішення проблем антропологічних засад гуманістичного менеджменту.

Ключові слова: людський вимір, антропологічні засади, філософська антропологія, гуманістичний менеджмент, людина як міра всіх речей, антропологічна парадигма.

Воронкова В., Максименюк М., Никитенко В. Гуманистический менеджмент в контексте философской антропологии: человеческое измерение.

Предметом исследования является анализ человеческого измерения как антропологического направления гуманистического менеджмента, формируется на основе взаимоотношений между человеком, правительством, обществом. В статье описывается эволюция взглядов на человека в контексте антропологические основ гуманистического менеджмента; отмечено, что тенденции развития философского и антропологического знания гуманистического менеджмента базируются на основе человеческого фактора. В основе гуманистического менеджмента антропологични измерения человека, играет важную роль в европейской философии. В статье проанализированы сущность человеческого измерения как антропологической парадигмы гуманистического менеджмента, в котором человек является не только экономической или политической, но духовной и культурной константой общества; даётся анализ человеческого измерения как антропологической парадигмы европейской философии, в основе которой антропологические основы экономической, политической и социальной сферы, условия создания гуманного общества. Представлены характеристики и функции, а также условия достижения человеческого измерения как антропологической основы европейских ценностей гуманистического

менеджмента. Полученные знания могут быть полезными для решения проблем антропологических основ гуманистического менеджмента.

Ключевые слова: человеческое измерение, антропологические основы, философская антропология, гуманистический менеджмент, человек как мера всех вещей, антропологическая парадигма.

Бех Ю.

СТАН ПРОБЛЕМИ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ РОЛІ ІНТЕЛЕКТУАЛЬНОГО КАПІТАЛУ У КОНКУРЕНТОСПРОМОЖНОСТІ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЇ

В статті розкрито ступінь розробки проблеми дослідження ролі інтелектуального капіталу у конкурентоспроможності організації. Представлено базові поняття, що складають проблемне поле дослідження та їх зміст. Проаналізовано сукупність праць вітчизняних та іноземних науковців, що розкривають стан проблеми дослідження. Виявлено підходи щодо побудови систем управління знаннями. Обґрунтовано підвищення ролі інтелектуальних здібностей людини щодо формування конкурентних переваг організації.

Ключові слова: конкурентна боротьба, конкурентний потенціал, конкурентоспроможність організації, управління знаннями, інтелектуальні ресурси, інтелектуальний капітал.

Визначальним процесом третього тисячоліття є глобалізація. Глобалізаційні процеси підсилюють конкурентну боротьбу, причинами якої виступають поява нових конкурентів на ринках. Конкуренція є важливою передумовою для функціонування і повного розкриття потенціалу ринкових відносин. Конкурентоспроможність організації в значній мірі залежить від такої характеристики працівників організації, як здатність швидко адаптуватися до нових умов виробництва, яка обумовлена наявністю у працівників організації професійно-кваліфікаційного потенціалу і знань, що за певних умов надасть можливість сформувавши інтелектуальний капітал організації.

Вважається, що термін «інтелектуальний капітал» уперше було використано Дж. Гелбрейтом який у 1969 р. вживає даний термін у листі до М. Калецькі у значенні інтелектуальної діяльності. Проте ще у 1829 р. Ш. Фур'є у своїй праці «Новий господарський соціетарний світ» до основних чинників виробництва, окрім праці й матеріально-речовинного капіталу, додав ще один вагомий нематеріальний чинник – талант, який, по суті, є інтелектуальним активом. Пізніше могутнім