



СЕРІЯ «ЕКОНОМІКА»

UDC 330.341

[https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-5274-2023-1\(15\)-195-206](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-5274-2023-1(15)-195-206)

Luste Olena Olehivna PhD in Economics, Assistant Professor of the Department of Economic theory, Management and Administration, Yriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Cathedral St., 2, Chernivtsi ,tel.: (095) 85-11-626, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3691-9038>

MENTAL DETERMINANTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO THE ORGANIZATIONS MANAGEMENT

Abstract. Modern development economics is characterized by increased attention to psychological determinants of economic behavior. Representatives of institutionalism and neo-institutionalism investigate the motivation of human behavior in view of the role of prevailing social norms and rules of behavior - economic mentality. The article examines the national economic mentality as an informal institution that accumulates the historical memory of the people, reflecting through the economic activity of its representatives the most important values, norms and attitudes adopted for this society and a significant element of the informal subsystem of the institutional structure of the economy. Economic mentality has certain properties characteristic of any social institution, such as historicity, structure and functionality. Economic mentality not only depends on other institutions, but can also give rise to new institutions, since its bearers constantly create new rules for regulating economic relations that correspond to the realities of the modern economy. The role of the economic mentality as a psychological determinant in the implementation of deep institutional transformations is defined, the possibilities of using the features of the national economic mentality in the process of implementing innovative approaches to the management of socio-economic systems are suggested. The author justified the importance of taking into account the structural components of the national economic mentality in the development of the system of innovative leadership and deep aspects of managerial corporate relations at the enterprise level. The perspective of further studies of economic mentality is a comprehensive approach to the analysis of its main components, promotion of its development and the use of mental characteristics of society to decide the priorities of social and economic policy, since it can also give rise to new institutions, creating new norms for the regulation of economic relations that correspond to the realities of the modern economy .





Keywords: institutions, economic mentality, economic behavior, innovative leadership, socio-economic system.

Лусте Олена Олегівна кандидат економічних наук, асистент кафедри економічної теорії, менеджменту і адміністрування, Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича, вул. Кафедральна, 2, м. Чернівці, тел.: (095) 85-11-626, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3691-9038>

МЕНТАЛЬНІ ДЕТЕРМІНАНТИ ВПРОВАДЖЕННЯ ІННОВАЦІЙНИХ ПІДХОДІВ ДО УПРАВЛІННЯ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЯМИ

Анотація. Сучасна економіка розвитку характеризується підвищеною увагою до психологічних детермінант економічної поведінки. Представники інституціоналізму та неінституціоналізму досліджують мотивацію людської поведінки з огляду на роль пануючих соціальних норм і правил поведінки – економічного менталітету. У статті розглянуто національний економічний менталітет як неформальний інститут, який акумулює в собі історичну пам'ять народу, віддзеркалюючи через господарську діяльність його представників найголовніші цінності, норми і установки, прийняті для даного суспільства та значущий елемент неформальної підсистеми інституційної структури економіки. Економічна ментальність має певні властивості, характерні для будь-якого соціального інституту, такі як історичність, структурованість і функціональність. Економічна ментальність не тільки залежить від інших інституцій, але й може породжувати нові інституції, оскільки її носії постійно створюють нові правила регулювання економічних відносин, які відповідають реаліям сучасної економіки. Визначено роль господарського менталітету як психологічної детермінанти у здійсненні глибоких інституціональних перетворень, запропоновано можливості використання особливостей національного господарського менталітету в процесі впровадження інноваційних підходів до управління соціально-економічними системами. Авторів обґрунтовано важливість врахування структурних компонентів національного господарського менталітету у розвитку системи інноваційного лідерства та глибинних аспектів управлінських корпоративних відносин на рівні підприємств. Перспективою подальших досліджень економічного менталітету є комплексний підхід до аналізу його основних компонентів, сприяння його розвитку та використання ментальних характеристик суспільства для вирішення пріоритетів соціально-економічної політики, оскільки він також може породжувати нові інститути, створюючи нові норми регулювання економічних відносин, які відповідають реаліям сучасної економіки.

Ключові слова: інституції, економічний менталітет, економічна поведінка, інноваційне лідерство, соціально-економічна система.



Formulation of the problem. At the current stage, most of the socio-economic problems in Ukraine are primarily related to the state of institutional crisis, which is characterized by social disorder, a lack of skills for coexistence and interaction of different social groups within the new economic order. In view of this, an important task in the implementation of innovative approaches to the modernization of the national economy is the search for a balance of basic and complementary institutions in all spheres of economy. The improvement of the institutional environment should include the construction and introduction of effective institutions in the socio-economic sphere, aimed not only at achieving economic, but also social efficiency. In our opinion, this process actualizes the role of the economic mentality of the nation as the main informal institution, since it is it that accumulates the historical memory of the people to the greatest extent, reflecting through the economic activity of its representatives the most important values, norms and attitudes adopted for this society.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The question of mental determinants of the economic behavior of individuals was at one time interested in representatives of many directions of economic thought, in particular A. Smith, D. Ricardo, D. Mill, I. Bentham, A. Marshall, K. Menger, V. Pareto, J. Keynes, T. Veblen, D. Commons, R. Coase, H. Becker, M. Friedman, D. Buchanan. In the works of G. Komykh, T. Gaidai, O. Bondarenko, A. Hrytsenko, G. Pylypenko, the issue of the national economic mentality, its main characteristics and factors of formation, mechanisms, but the problem of its influence on the nature of modernization transformations in the transformational economy on our the view is not sufficiently opened.

The purpose of the article -determination of the role of economic mentality in the process of development and reform of the management system of organizations.

Presentation of the main research material. Economic mentality is a platform for building institutions. Economic mentality must be considered as a significant element of the informal subsystem of the institutional structure of the economy. Together with other informal institutions, the economic mentality determines the institutional environment, and in the historical time period is the basis for the formation of a subsystem of formal institutions.

An important prerequisite for studying the influence of economic mentality on the implementation of innovative approaches in the management of socio-economic systems is the definition of the general mechanism of action of psychological and socio-economic factors. I. V. Andreeva offers a generalized matrix, which presents the zonal nature of the interaction of socio-psychological and socio-economic factors. The content and result of their interaction are determined by the intensity of influence of each of them. Depending on the balance of forces, qualitatively different zones of intensity of interaction appear:



1. The zone of polarized interaction is characterized simultaneously by the maximum intensity of both socio-economic and socio-psychological factors. The result of such interaction can be presented in several forms:

a) accumulation or integration of the effects of high intensity socio-psychological and socio-economic phenomena, thus the forces of influence of various factors add up or multiply;

b) mutual neutralization: at the maximum intensity of socio-psychological and socio-economic factors, none of them determines the behavior of the individual and the group, because they neutralize each other [1].

2. The zone of strict economic determination of the behavior of the individual and the group is characterized by the maximum intensity of the influence of economic factors that determine behavior, and the minimum intensity of the influence of social and psychological factors.

3. The zone of unexpressed interaction is characterized by an equally weak influence of socio-economic and socio-psychological phenomena, and the behavior of the individual and the group is completely determined by other factors. At the same time, it is assumed that the initial factors can potentially influence the behavior of the individual, but do not influence due to adverse conditions.

4. The zone of strict socio-psychological determination of individual and group behavior is characterized by high intensity of influence of socio-psychological factors that determine economic behavior, and minimal socio-economic ones.

5. The zone of parity interaction is characterized by approximately equal influence of socio-economic and psychological factors in medium intensity zones. The result of such interaction is, as a rule, unstable economic behavior. The process of parity interaction is unstable, and the adoption of one of the behavioral options occurs in two main forms:

a) there is a predominant influence of one of the factors, either socio-psychological or socio-economic;

b) behavior is determined by some additional conditions, accidents, various circumstances [2].

It is worth noting that in modern conditions, enterprises and firms are the source of the formation and development of such features of the national economic mentality, which will contribute to the implementation of innovative leadership in the management of the socio-economic system, since it is at enterprises that the principles of mutual coordination of activities, the formation of labor discipline, the peculiarities of relations between by the boss and subordinates, responsibility for their actions and performance results, as well as many other principles of management that are adequate to the modern requirements of the market environment. At enterprises, methods of collective solution of production and management tasks are established, positive production and management experience is accumulated, as well as cost reduction due to the accumulation of such experience.



In the process of development and operation of the enterprise, there is a repeated repetition of individual operations related to the production and sale of products, with reproductive processes, on the basis of which the own stable stereotypes and models of behavior characteristic of this enterprise are formed, which relate to the technology of production, management and determine the reaction of the enterprise in general, to the change of external factors and internal factors. This, in turn, has a significant impact on the transformation and development of the main features of the economic mentality.

The enterprise, by its main purpose, is a production institute, but it is capable of generating new social and economic norms, values, and attitudes that can contribute to overcoming the contradictions between the leading features of the national economic mentality and modernization processes in the modern market environment. Therefore, in our opinion, an important stage in the process of reforming the institutional environment of the domestic economy is the process of cultivating qualitatively new features of the economic mentality precisely at the level of enterprises.

In our opinion, the generalized algorithm for the development of innovative leadership based on the formation of positive features of the economic mentality looks as follows:

At the first stage, it is necessary to identify the corporate elite, designed to form a system of economic values adequate to the requirements of the modern market. At the same time, the subject of management of the process of formation of economic mentality should belong to such an elite. When selecting and forming the corporate elite, managers must take into account that the tasks of the corporate elite are the introduction and support of the following features of the business mentality:

- 1) the priority of the goals of corporate humanism, which is manifested in the exceptional value of each individual as the owner of unique intellectual capital;
- 2) extended reproduction of the latest creative knowledge and generation of new ideas;
- 3) the value of positioning the organization as the main producer of new knowledge;
- 4) the unconditional value of the "power of authority" and not the "authority of authority" in the system of management and new organizational and economic relations; recognition of the priority of network forms of activity over vertical interaction.

The problem of finding and forming the corporate elite as a source of creating or changing the value system in the structure of the economic mentality is an extremely difficult task, since the subject of the formation of the corporate elite will support those features of the economic mentality that will correspond primarily to its economic values, motives and interests [3].

The problem lies in the identification of already active corporate elites, in a clear understanding of who and what they are for the enterprise, from the point of



view of realizing the interests of creative development. If the existing elites begin to inhibit innovative actions, to cultivate outdated features of the economic mentality, then overcoming such resistance is much more difficult than forming a new management top at a newly created enterprise. Thus, the creation of a management apparatus that would stimulate the development of progressive features of the economic mentality requires significant investment and responsibility on the part of management.

At the second stage, within the framework of the new value system, a corporate educational process should be organized with the aim of forming a desire for creativity and innovation in staff and managers.

The main task on the part of managers is to explain new mental values adequate to modern market requirements, as well as to form and develop intra-firm forms of continuous learning, using external conditions and factors that contribute to the creation and spread of new stereotypes of economic behavior [4]. To do this, the owners and managers of the enterprise must turn the organization into a self-learning structure that has a variety of forms and methods of advanced reproduction of individual and corporate innovative knowledge. Forms of extended reproduction of the latest knowledge as a form of education and promotion of the development of progressive features of the economic mentality can be:

- 1) various discussions on issues of innovation and real problems arising in the process of innovation activity;
- 2) intercompany and intracompany fairs of new knowledge;
- 3) formation of targeted creative microgroups that create innovative products at a certain stage of the reproduction process;
- 4) creation of own research laboratories and training centers for targeted personnel retraining;
- 5) external internships of future managers, as well as the involvement of new employees with a high level of intellectual capital in the organization, etc.

At enterprises, it is necessary to create a local system of management of innovative processes, which is characterized by the following features:

- 1) integration of expert, communication, training, implementation procedures;
- 2) management of all stages of the life cycle of innovative projects;
- 3) structural and branch diversification of projects focused on regional needs;
- 4) targeted personnel training;
- 5) availability of effective feedback from the consumer market [5].

In practical terms, it is expedient to monitor the process of forming a desire for creativity and innovation in the staff and the results achieved by each employee and especially the line manager. The value of this monitoring lies in the fact that each business entity will be able to determine its own innovation rating and identify directions for its improvement.

At the third stage, a new system of conscious stereotypes of perception and understanding of economic reality, progressive features of economic mentality is



created. However, at this stage, a contradiction may arise, which is manifested in the interaction of old and new, formed stereotypes of economic thinking and behavior.

The measures that meet the requirements of the innovative development of the enterprise and ensure the continuity of the formation of a creative business mentality should include the following:

1) the creation of a corporate knowledge base, supplemented by new creative ideas of the staff, should become customary and mandatory;

2) the availability of directions for creative and innovative development within the general strategy of the organization's economic development for each employee, group of workers;

3) stimulating the search for extraordinary ideas and innovations in solving tactical and strategic tasks of the enterprise;

4) the main feature of the business mentality should be the desire of the organization and each member of the staff to constantly surpass themselves, and not to beat competitors solely based on profitability indicators [6].

At the fourth stage, new conscious stereotypes of the understanding of economic reality gradually become familiar and replace the negative features of the economic mentality.

However, the problem is that the new features of the economic mentality will come into conflict with the former stereotypes and models of economic behavior, which can lead to a crisis within the organization. The main task is to ensure the gradual introduction of new conscious stereotypes of economic behavior and the corresponding features of the economic mentality, while interacting with traditional values. As the experience of science-intensive enterprises in the transition period shows, the desired and expected effects of replacing old mental stereotypes with new ones appear only if you act systematically and purposefully.

The formation of positive features of the economic mentality is directly related to the demonstration of real successes and prospects of a new mental model, for this purpose, proven examples of the activities of advanced domestic and foreign enterprises can be widely used. The task of the management apparatus at this stage is to minimize existing outdated mental stereotypes and replace them with a system of new vital socio-economic values and attitudes.

It is possible to offer an approximate list of forms of concrete activity of the organization, which ensure the displacement or desired modification of outdated features of the economic mentality:

1) demonstration and analysis of practical activities of the best organizations with real achievements in innovative activities; the specified demonstration is intended, first of all, for persons who make management decisions;

2) organization of internal company cases (cases, samples, examples) characterizing the advantages of progressive forms and ways of perceiving and understanding new information; at the same time, real economic losses from the





functioning of traditional features of the economic mentality, which prevent the penetration of new information into the enterprise, are calculated;

3) modeling of forms and methods of organizational behavior, which are significantly different from traditional forms and show new opportunities for all personnel of the enterprise [7].

At the fifth stage, a modified economic mentality is approved, samples and examples of innovative behavior of personnel and managers are established, which strive not only to maximize profit, but also to ensure the creative development of personnel and the organization as a whole.

The economic mentality formed in the process of changes is manifested in the economic behavior of managers and staff, which corresponds to the latest trends in market development. External indicators and manifestations of progressive features of economic mentality can be:

1. A quantitative indicator of the involvement of all staff members in various types and forms of retraining and advanced training (internships, corporate conferences and seminars, video conferences with related enterprises, advanced forms of self-education, etc.). However, it is not about traditional personnel training mechanisms, but about the creation of a system of continuous corporate education, anticipating the growth of the intellectual level of employees. In this case, the coefficient of continuous training of personnel should be close to unity, which would indicate a hundred percent coverage of personnel in various forms of economic training. The specified coefficient does not always directly characterize the degree of staff coverage by such forms of training that are directly related to the current goals of the organization. At the same time, it is irrational to engage in arbitrary staff training [8].

2. Quantitative indicator of creative groups and subgroups operating within specific target corporate projects. The difference between these groups and subgroups from the above-mentioned forms of continuous training of personnel is that the creation of knowledge takes place in a previously actualized direction. If in the first case, new knowledge becomes an asset of the subject's intellectual potential and is more informational in nature, then in this case, knowledge first becomes a creative driving force, intellectual capital. In the innovation economy and in the activity of an innovation-oriented organization, the number of network creative groups or the number of participants in any joint group is an absolutely necessary factor in the sustainable dynamics of economic growth.

3. The number of employees who are creators of the organization's economic culture. Such employees create informal norms and rules that are not subject to the official structures of corporate power. It is this part of the organization's creative staff that determines the internal logic and direction of the entire structure, creates the company's economic history, its corporate culture, image and reputation.

Until now, when exploring and revealing the deep aspects of managerial corporate relations, experts often focused attention around various economic



interests within organizations, while little attention was paid to the fact that the contradictions that arose and repeated were often of a mental nature. Thus, it can be asserted that the traditionally known intra-company socio-economic contradictions are to a significant extent a manifestation of inconsistencies in the structure of the economic mentality.

It is possible to distinguish three variants of the organizational and management style of the functioning of the enterprise, which are the basis for the creation of a holistic economic mentality:

1. The management "vertical" model, where the top manager or owner-manager is the only person who makes decisions, that is, the authority of the authorities prevails.

2. The management "horizontal" model is network management, where the authority of the most creatively prepared leaders and creative groups that perform specific tasks to adjust the overall corporate strategy reigns supreme.

3. "Mixed" model of management relations, which provides the most effective combination of the authority of the authorities and the executive responsibility of the staff [9].

In our opinion, the most adequate model for ensuring the innovative development of the enterprise is the third model, according to which an optimal combination of all existing and operating within the enterprise mental characteristics of employees (managers and ordinary personnel) is ensured. Corporate economic mentality here acts as a combination of new forms and ways of perceiving and understanding all economic phenomena and events that occur both inside and outside the enterprise. The goal of forming such a mixed mentality is to provide greater power of the organization by mobilizing the best mental traits of each individual. It should be noted that this type of business mentality is formed around the mental characteristics of top management. This circumstance is a condition for renewing the enterprise,

In addition to top managers, the formation of an economic mentality takes place on the basis of the characteristics of the most creative part of line-functional managers and employees. The source of innovative business mentality can be innovative network subgroups and teams that perform non-standard economic tasks and create intellectual assets of the enterprise. Practice shows that the greatest success is achieved by those enterprises where an ideology and an atmosphere of respectful attitude towards innovative employees are formed. The ability to create such an atmosphere is one of the most important tasks of modern government.

Summing up, it is worth noting that the models proposed above emphasize the importance of taking into account the economic mentality of personnel in solving the following important tasks in the field of implementing innovative leadership in organizations:

1. It is important to know the individual mental characteristics of all employees in order to form appropriate organizational values. To solve this task,



future employees should be selected not only with regard to professional suitability, but also taking into account their ideological beliefs, stereotypes of economic behavior, views on certain processes taking place in the socio-economic environment. This will make it possible to successfully anticipate and resolve existing and emerging mental contradictions that may arise within the organization.

2. It is important to understand what economic mentality is as a systemic socio-economic phenomenon and how to form it from available mental resources. It is necessary to analyze the mental characteristics of the organization's personnel, highlighting the most promising and progressive features of the economic mentality and specific carriers in the form of individuals and microsocial groups. Next, the most important thing is to ensure the spread of these traits among other employees and microgroups. The result will be an economic mentality of better quality that will meet the requirements of innovative economic development. It is obvious that in order to successfully solve this task, the subject of management must be the bearer of modern economic values and attitudes.

3. The management apparatus of the organization must skillfully develop the general mental model, accordingly changing its structure, as well as the conditions and parameters of functioning. For this, it is necessary, first of all, to identify creative elites among the personnel, which are necessary for the development of economic mentality, since it is the representatives of modern creative elites who act as carriers of socio-economic innovations and new quality of production activity.

Conclusions. Therefore, in the process of stimulating and developing progressive features of the national economic mentality, enterprises and organizations play an important role, since it is at the level of the labor force that it is possible to create and spread new social and economic norms, values, and attitudes that meet the requirements of the modern market environment. The proposed algorithm of management activity is based primarily on the assumption that the management and owners of enterprises should become carriers of progressive economic values and an example of the implementation of effective strategies of economic behavior. An important task of the managerial elite should be the comprehensive development of the creative potential of employees and involvement in the development of strategic tasks of the company's activities, because in the structure of the national economic mentality, aspirations for innovation and effectiveness are not sufficiently expressed. Instead, effective leadership within organizations will minimize the contradiction between the mental characteristics of employees and modern management methods.

References:

1. Bondarenko, O. (2007). Ekonomichna mentalnist Ukrayini: suchasnij stan ta perspektivi podalshogo rozvitku [The economic mentality of Ukraine: the current state and prospects for further development]. *The Political Herald*, 27, 69–79 [in Ukrainian]
2. Gaidai, T. (2006). Instituciyi yak instrument institucijnogo analizu [Institution as an instrument for institutional economic analysis]. *Economic Theory*, 2, 53–64.





3. Halushka Z., Luste O. (2017). Gospodarskij mentalitet ta nacionalni osoblivosti procesiv socializaciyi ekonomiki [Economic mentality and national features of economic socialization processes]. Chernivtsi: Chernivtsi National University, 264 [in Ukrainian]
4. Korzhenko, V., Pisarenko, J. (2009). Vpliv nacionalnoyi kulturi na formuvannya modeli upravlinnya: metodiki kros-kulturnogo menedzhmentu [Influence of national culture on the formation of management models: methods of cross-cultural management]. *Actual problems of public administration*, 1 (35), 16–26 [in Ukrainian]
5. David, P.A. (1985). Clio and the Economics of QWERTY. *American Economic Review*, 75, 332–337.
6. Coleman, J.S. (2000). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *Social Capital: a Multifaceted Perspective*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
7. Gritsenko, O. (2005). Mentalitet yak kategoriya institucionalnoyi teorii [Mentality as an institutional theory category]. *Economic Theory*, 1, 35–51 [in Ukrainian]
8. Galan, N. (2005). Innovacijna dinamika globalnoyi ekonomiki [Innovation dynamics of global economics]. *Economic space*, 1, 69–76. [in Ukrainian]
9. Biermann P., Welsch H. (2021) *An anatomy of East German unhappiness: The role of circumstances and mentality, 1990–2018* *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, Volume 181, 1-18
10. Davis, L., North, D. (1971). *Institutional Change and American Economic Growth*. Cambridge: University Press.
11. Azar, O.H. (2016). Relative Thinking Theory. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36(1), pp. 1-14.
12. Bendix, J. (2018) *West German Industrialists and the Making of the Economic Miracle: A History of Mentality and Recovery*. *Politics and Society*, 36, 104-107.
13. Earl, P. (2015). *Behavioural Economics and the Economics of Regulation*. *Briefing Paper for the New Zealand Ministry of Economic Development*
14. Harrison L. (2000). *Culture matters: How values shape human progress*, New York: Basic Books, 431.
15. Inglehart, R. (2000). Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values. *American Sociological Review*, 65, 19–51.
16. Kubiniy H. (2019). Mentalnist yak faktor ekonomichnoho rozvitku v umovah ekonomiki postmodernu [Mentality as a factor of economic development in the conditions of post-modern economy]. *Business strategy: futurological challenges*, Kyiv, 495 c. [in Ukrainian]
17. Schwartz, S. (2008). *Multimethod Probes of Basic Human Values*, Publ. House SU HSE, 226.
18. Teraji, S. (2017). Morale and the Evolution of Norms, *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36(1), 48-57.

Література:

1. Бондаренко О. В. Економічна ментальність України: сучасний стан та перспективи подальшого розвитку. *Політологічний вісник*. 2007. Вип. 27. С. 69-79.
2. Гайдай Т. Інституції як інструмент інституційного аналізу. *Економічна теорія*, 2006, №2. С. 53–64.
3. Галушка З. І., Лусте О. О. Господарський менталітет та національні особливості процесів соціалізації економіки : монографія. Чернівці : Чернівецький національний університет, 2017. 264 с.
4. Корженко В. В., Писаренко Ж. А. Вплив національної культури на формування моделі управління: методики крос-культурного менеджменту. *Актуальні проблеми державного управління*. 2009. № 1. С. 16–26.
5. David, P.A. (1985). Clio and the Economics of QWERTY. *American Economic Review*, 75, 332–337.



6. Coleman, J.S. (2000). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. Social Capital: a Multifaceted Perspective. Washington, DC: World Bank.
7. Гриценко О. А. Менталітет як категорія інституціональної теорії. *Економічна теорія*, 2005. № 1. С. 35-51.
8. Галан Н. Інноваційна динаміка глобальної економіки. *Економічний простір*, 2005. № 1, с. 69–76.
9. Biermann P., Welsch H. (2021) *An anatomy of East German unhappiness: The role of circumstances and mentality, 1990–2018*. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, Volume 181, 1-18.
10. Azar, O.H. (2016). Relative Thinking Theory. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36(1), pp. 1-14.
11. Bendix, J. (2018) West German Industrialists and the Making of the Economic Miracle: A History of Mentality and Recovery. *Politics and Society*, 36, 104-107.
12. Davis, L., North, D. (1971). Institutional Change and American Economic Growth. Cambridge: University Press.
13. Earl, P. (2015). Behavioural Economics and the Economics of Regulation. *Briefing Paper for the New Zealand Ministry of Economic Development*
14. Harrison L. (2000). *Culture matters: How values shape human progress*, New York: Basic Books, 431 p.
15. Inglehart, R. (2000). Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values. *American Sociological Review*, 65, 19–51.
16. Schwartz, S. (2008). *Multimethod Probes of Basic Human Values*, Publ. House SU HSE, 226.
17. Teraji, S. (2017). Morale and the Evolution of Norms, *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36(1), 48-57.
18. Кубиній Н. Ментальність як фактор економічного розвитку в умовах економіки постмодерну. 2019, Бізнес-стратегія: футурологічні виклики: К., 495 с.