

УДК 658:659.3:659.4
DOI 10.33111/sedu.2018.43.021.035

*Derevyanko Olena**

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR CORPORATE
REPUTATION MANAGEMENT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF
THE MODERN PARADIGM OF MANAGEMENT**

Abstract. The paper substantiates the main provisions of the theory of corporate reputation in the context of modern management. Therefore, in the 21st century, the place (function) of business in the system of forming a person's worldview is changing: business in the information economy from a passive recipient of a value system created by religion, family, and culture becomes one of the forces that shape the worldview of its stakeholders. Thus, a new business function is being updated — the formation of a society's value system in the context of managing the reputation of companies. Modern management of the company's reputation is developing in line with the concept of «economy of trust»; the essence of the company's reputation is stakeholder trust. Trust — the socio-psychological basis of reputation, which is the primary cause of the economic interaction of potential investors and businesses, banks and their investors, producers, and consumers, receive cost measurements and is now becoming a full-fledged economic category.

Keywords: economy of trust, stakeholders, value system, comparison of image and reputation, psychology and sociology in management.

Introduction. Intensive commercialization of scientific discoveries at the turn of the new — third — millennium has changed the global economy and the person's life. They entered the era of the sixth wave of innovation and then crossed the threshold of the fourth industrial revolution. Scientists were the first to name a new historic phase of our civilization's development «information society». Journalists and politicians followed their lead.

The information society encouraged the spread of information technologies not only connected with manufacturing processes but also with education and everyday life. This led to the emergence of human «information consciousness», of turning information into an economic resource and a source of added value and, finally, facilitated recognition of a cultural value of information as the basis of the harmonious development of the society of the future.

It is natural that the drastic changes stipulated by informatization of our life are accompanied by changes of the economic outlook, the system of values, the motives of economic behavior. In other words, the formation of a new — «information» —

* **Derevyanko Olena** — Dr. Sc. (Econ.), Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of Economics, Accounting and Finance, National University of Food Technologies, Kyiv, Ukraine, y.derevyanko@pr-service.com.ua

economy is taking place; the latter has a global character of business ties and unlike traditional methods of managing a business is based on digital management and information engineering.

Taking everything mentioned above into consideration, it is necessary to pay attention to transformation processes of managing both separate companies and their groups (the notion of «company» is further used to describe various types of company groups unless specified otherwise). In terms of a new model of integrating Ukraine into the system of international economic relations, it is necessary to have management systems on the macroeconomic level that can support their competitiveness both on home and foreign markets. In this respect there arises a question about the ability of Ukrainian owners and managers to change their managerial approaches, to redirect themselves from the permanent survival tactics or those of «taking the plum» to the strategy of ensuring long-term success in business on the basis of modern management of global quality.

In terms of methodology, the quality of managing Ukrainian companies is far below the level of global standards as it is based rather on the Ukrainian routine of a producer's behavior under conditions of short-term perspective of profit ensuring priorities (within a political cycle or a microcycle) than on the modern theoretical and methodological background of management as a science. This implies, from the point of view of the author of this study, that there are numerous managerial procedures hampering Ukrainian companies' integrating into the system of international economic affairs, namely:

- influencing a consumer with the help of intensive direct advertising to promote goods and services without taking into account specific features of separate segments' behavior;
- following a price policy based on shifting production costs, which are often unreasonably high, onto the consumer;
- promoting the goods with the help of unreasonably large-scale application of GR-technologies.

Overall, a widespread use of the above-mentioned practices testifies to a lack of strategic approach to managing Ukrainian companies.

Background. In terms of the need for modernizing management of Ukrainian companies in the direction of increasing its strategic orientation and consistency, the most significant concepts are: the social systems theory [1], «7-S» theories system [2], «Z» theory [3], the concept of management by objectives [4, 5], the theory of management by results [4], the theory of «favorable opportunities» [4, 5], the concept of managing the efficiency of works [6], etc. The «social systems theory» is developed [1] on the basis of the systematic approach and the general systems theory. According to it, a company is seen as a system transforming a resource pool into results and, because of its open character, showing a tendency towards adjusting to the dynamic environment: no activity is performed apart from others, every decision carries consequences for the whole system. According to the «7-S» concept [2], there are seven basic interrelated components that form an efficient organization. They all start with the letter S: strategy, structure, system and procedures, style of management,

skills of the employees (corporate power), staff, shared values (culture). According to «Z» theory, a person is the basis of any organization; he or she paves the way of its successful functioning [3], hence there is a necessity to follow a set of certain rules when working with the staff, namely: lifelong employment, joint decision-making, personal responsibility for the results of the activities, on-going evaluation of the staff and their regular promotion, informal control on the basis of clear and formal methods, etc. The concept of management by objectives [4, 5] is based on the assumption that management starts with goal setting followed by functions defining and processes forming. The theory of «favorable opportunities» [4, 5] considers the following managerial postulates to be basic: neither resources nor results are inside business, they exist beyond it; the results are achieved due to taking favorable opportunities but not due to solving problems; economic results are the consequences of leadership but not of mere competence; everything existing becomes out-of-date very quickly; resources are usually distributed in the wrong way; the concentration of resources is the key to real economic results. The concept of managing the efficiency of works [6] is a strategic integrated approach connected with the process of forming a single vision of a company's aims and tasks so that every employee may understand and realize their role in achieving them. A sensible introduction of the mentioned above theoretical concepts by Ukrainian companies will make it possible to take management to a strategic level, to make it systematic, which will contribute to reaching European standards of management and to ensuring the long-term competitiveness of Ukrainian business.

In terms of the necessary development of the theory and methodology of science as the basis of competitiveness of Ukrainian economy, the **aim** of this research is to substantiate the theory of corporate reputation in the context of modern management.

Results. Commenting on modern changes in the global economy, the famous consulting company Reputation Institute [7] points out that if the 1990s were «the golden age of innovation» and the 2000s «the decade of risks», the 2010s represent a new competitive business medium where the company is seen as something more serious than its goods and services. Thus, there comes *the era of a reputation-based economy* where people are more interested in the company and the way it does its business than in its production.

As we can see, the very essence of the economy has changed. In the 20th century, it was defined as «the behavior under conditions of limited resources» because «unlimited» information has become the main resource and its volumes are constantly growing. It is necessary to point out that unlike modern processes the «economic theory studied general regularities of humans' behavior and the economic system on the whole during the process of producing, exchanging, distributing and consuming benefits under conditions of limited resources» (e.g. C.R. McConnell and S.L. Brue «Economics» [8]).

In its turn, informatization taking place at the moment facilitates a quick spread of scientific ideas and speeds up commercialization of R&D, that is innovative entrepreneurship is becoming more active. Information created by a human being becomes knowledge, so the term «knowledge economy» gets rooted in modern scientific lexis.

The term «knowledge economy» was introduced by the Austrian and American scientist Fritz Machlup (1962) and was applied in one of the sectors of the economy [9]. Today this term together with the term «knowledge-based economy» is used to define a type of economy where knowledge plays the key role and production of knowledge is the source of its growth. The notion of «innovation economy», «hi-tech civilization», «knowledge society», «information society» are also widely used [10]. However, informatizing socioeconomic relations has not only promoted the intermittent growth of productivity and performance of business but also caused the appearance of information weariness, information immunodeficiency, and information injury syndromes. All of these consequences of the necessity to process and digest the growing volumes of information (which unlike the classical resources of «land», «labor», and «capital» is not scarce but — vice versa — overabundant) promote the spread of the «economy of trust» concept.

The term «economy of trust» was offered by the British scientist and historian Geoffrey Hosking [11, 12, 13] who connected the development of the economy and the society on the whole with moral principles: trust promotes quick making of contacts and effective cooperation between participants of social relations. Recently Geoffrey Hosking has been paying great attention to interdisciplinary research of social capital issues and the role of the trust factor in history and modern life.

The works by Stephen Cowe Jr. [14, 15] are dedicated to communication aspects of forming trust in an economy, developing and spreading the concept of «the economy of trust» on the level of companies and other organizations. He draws our attention to the economic characteristics of trust as a «pragmatic, material and valid asset» [15] that can be and must be formed by managerial means. The researcher pays attention to the existing unfulfilled potential of business processes effectiveness within the framework of employing the principles of trust by those who take part in decision making on the company's development (beneficiaries, top managers). He justifies and explains the mechanism of «trust waves»: from ethic relations in a team, in an office to the relations between a company and its stakeholders. Stephen Cowe supports «social ecology» and substantiates the concept of trust as the basis of all communications, relations, and connections in the business medium; he stresses that the main weapon to win the competition in the 21st century is the speed of counteragents' cooperation where the main role is played by the trust. (Correspondingly, a low level of trust generates extra transactional expenses and results in lagging behind competitors). The result of forming the necessary level of trust in the company is a multiplicative reduction of marketing expenses as «consumers themselves become its main promoters, sales managers and marketing consultants» [15].

In late summer of 2012, famous consulting companies and rating agencies made poor forecasts of the global economic development (e.g., see Finch Ratings' forecast (<http://www.fitchratings.com>)). They said credibility gap, the result of a discrepancy between the words and actions of one or the two parties in communication [16], was among the reasons of worsening the crisis. Namely, Bain&Company claims: financial institutions of Germany are faced with the gravest credibility gap after WWII [17]. Trust as the driver of cooperation between a business and its potential investors, be-

tween banks and their depositors, between producers and their consumers acquires cost dimensions and is now becoming a full-fledged economic category, according to the author of this study. Geoffrey Hosking [13] believes trust is Adam Smith's «invisible hand» that regulates market relations. It is necessary to point out that excessive unreasonable trust, namely in a risky investment, can become a cause of a macroeconomic crisis. Geoffrey Hosking pays attention to the issue of spreading unreliable information [12].

Thus, information society produces information whose volumes are going to grow further and more and more resources will be necessary to process it, on the one hand. On the other hand, a great amount of information does not necessarily mean that it is absolutely reliable because deception and fraud as a moral atavism have not fallen off the edge of the earth at all. They have become global and acquired new forms with the development of information technologies. Under these conditions, the economy based exclusively on «extracting» knowledge or exclusively on trust is doomed to be inefficient.

Correspondingly, developing and ensuring efficient economy based on establishing and supporting cooperation between the participants of economic processes (producers, consumers, suppliers of resources, the state, etc.) faces the problem of excessive information as such and at the same time of lack of its authenticity. It makes getting some idea about an economic counteragent and their goods and services really difficult (and sometimes impossible). The number of comments on the counteragent can be a degree of objectivity, in its turn. Yet, it is necessary to take into account the character of the sources that provide this information which, in the end, becomes public opinion and corresponds to the categories of «reputation», «image», «authority» in its contents.

The problem of analyzing various aspects of a company's reputation, image, brand was studied in the works by G. Dowling [18], Ch. Fombrun [19], V. Shepel [20], T. Guseva [21], G. Pocheptsov [22], A. Panasiuk [23], K. Buksha [24] and others.

To manage reputation efficiently, it is necessary to have a modern theory and methodology that also demand the system of scientific categories to be modified in conformity with the latest tendencies of economic development. The latter is impossible without establishing categorial correlations between the notions that are used as synonyms of reputation in some studies.

It is necessary to point out that the very problem of studying reputation came to economics from an adjacent sphere of the humanities: psychology, sociology, and philosophy as well as from practical political activities. The Egyptian pharaoh Ramses II used to apply the system of reputation management events to form target public opinion of the outcome of the battle with Hittites at Kadesh. And Niccolo Machiavelli in his books «The Prince» and «Discourses of the First Decade of Titus Livius» systematized and characterized the logic of forging and supporting the reputation of public persons including its manipulative aspects [25]. Over 300 years ago, John Locke in his «Essay Concerning Human Understanding» formulated the law of public opinion stressing the importance of reputation in everyday life. «When men unite into political societies they hand over to the public the decisions about how

their force is to be used, so that they can't employ it against any fellow-citizens further than the law of the country directs, but they hang onto the power of approving or disapproving of the actions of members of their society; and by this approval and dislike they establish amongst themselves what they call virtue and vice» [26]. The connection with the problem of forging a reputation and seeking its value bases in particular, ways of information influence aimed at a person or a society as a bearer of a system of values are now traced in such sciences and concepts as analytical philosophy, structuralism, hermeneutics, psycholinguistics, empirical and theoretical sociology, macrosociology. Taking this into consideration the author of this study analyzes the management of companies' reputation from the standpoint of economics — within the framework of modern paradigm of business management as well as its connection with modern concepts of psychology, sociology, and philosophy.

The origin of the term «reputation» (Lat. *reputatio* — reasoning, reflecting) takes us back to the times when it characterized the virtues of a person. Yet in the 19th century, it was actively used in relation to companies. We believe that the process of «providing» business with reputation was a logical consequence of industrial enterprises growth, separating them from one particular owner because of the spread of shareholding pattern of ownership. Thus not a private person, a businessman, but a legal body, an enterprise, was gradually becoming the main business unit of an economy. Today the reputation of an enterprise (company) is a notion which is much wider than the reputation of a separate individual: the owner, an employee, any of its stakeholders (a stakeholder is a person with an interest or concern in something). Of course, an individual's reputation, in particular of «a decision-maker» remains one of the key factors of forging corporate reputation, the factor whose significance grows within the framework of information society and the economy of trust. At the same time, it is not equal to the latter like it was in the pre-industrial days.

I consider it necessary to stress a certain closeness of the notions of «image» and «reputation» of a company. According to Graham Dowling, the author of «Creating Corporate Reputations», an image is a set of target groups' feelings about the company while reputations are «valuable characteristics and thoughts caused by the corporate image and the complex of actions and decisions of the company available for observation» [18]. While supporting Graham Dowling's position the author of this study mediates the process of transforming the image into the reputation with the system of the society's values on the whole and the definite audience, in particular, the audience that is the target acceptor of information about the company. In other words, the image is particular superficial associations in a person's mind which are foregrounded by an experience of practical cooperation (experimental check) and which transform (otherwise do not transform) into reputation. On the whole, Graham Dowling [18] singles out three bases for a cooperation of stakeholders and a company: reputation, image, and vagueness (table 1). At the same time reputation is the most perfect basis for this kind of cooperation.

The mentioned processes have led to changing the place (functions) of business in the system of forming a person's outlook on life: from a passive recipient of the system of values created by the religion, the family, the cultural traditions into an active

power guided forming the outlook of a modern person. A bright example of the business performing the value-making outlook function is the emergence of the well-known phenomenon of «consumer economy». Innovations embodied in companies' goods change not only the daily life but the outlook of a modern person. Correspondingly, new — global — values are not an «independent system of assessment» described by Graham Dowling [18] passing through which the image becomes «good» or «bad» reputation. That is, according to the author of this study, forging the system of values is also an element of the process of developing stakeholders' trust in the company. This does not separate the guided stage of forming a corporate image from the partially unguided stage of forming corporate reputation; vice versa, it merges them into a single process.

Table 1

**THE BASES FOR COOPERATION OF STAKEHOLDERS
AND THEIR COMPANY: REPUTATION, IMAGE, AND VAGUENESS**

The bases for cooperation of stakeholders and their company	Stakeholders' treatment of the company / their actions	
	aspect of treatment	practical aspect
Reputation	Advice	«I'll advise turning to you»
	Statement	«I'll turn to you first of all»
	Experiment	«Show me your potential»
Image	Devotion	«I'll turn to you»
	Popularity	«I know who you are»
	Good acquaintance	«I see you very often»
	Memory	«I remember this company»
	Awareness	«I saw the name before»
Vagueness	Confusion	«I seem to have seen the name»
	Unawareness	«I've never heard of you»

Compiled on the basis of [18].

Turning to the history of forming the basic categories it is necessary to emphasize that in comparison to «reputation» «image» is a new term that started to be applied to companies in the second half of the 19th century. The image got the definition of «an artificial portrait formed in public or individual consciousness by the media mass communication and psychological influence that can combine both the real qualities of an object and those that do not exist» [27]. It is the very possibility to use non-existing qualities of a company to create its image that became a pretext to contrast it with the reputation as «a complex of target audiences' evaluative ideas about the company that was formed on the basis of objective parameters» [28]. Leaving the investigation of the epistemological notion of «objectiveness» as such beyond this study, it is still necessary to point out that the aim of creating both a positive image

and a reputation is forging a trust in the company. The ethical category of «trust» gets its cost dimension when realized in the acts of buying the production of a company that a consumer trusts, granting a loan to a company that a bank trusts, choosing a company that an applicant trusts to be employed by, etc.

It is possible to make the following conclusion on the basis of everything mentioned above: trust in a company is the essence of both its reputations and its image. As some extra arguments, I would like to offer opinions of sociologists and psychologists. Thus, the expert in sociology and imagology V. Shepel considers the image to be «individual looks or a halo created by mass media, by social groups or personally» [20]. The psychological dictionary edited by A. Petrovsky and M. Yaroshevsky defines the image as «a stereotypical picture of a particular object existing in the mass consciousness» [30]. The image as a form, or the appearance of its bearer, needs to be filled with contents: particular actions and deeds that, according to some sociologists [31], determine the reputation. The reputation is an image of a person, their personality on the whole and all of this is the integrity of form (image, appearance) and contents (behavior, actions, etc.). We believe that only the integrity of form and contents, their compatibility create the «natural» image of a company forging the well-grounded trust of its stakeholders.

By selecting and forming the strategies of reputation management to be discussed further the company's management is seeking an applied solution to the philosophical problem of the primacy (priority) of the form or the contents.

It is reasonable to go into the opinions of psychologists of the image as a special instrument for stimulating the necessary human deeds by influencing the subconsciousness. In particular, this can be found in the works by A. Panasiuk [23], A. Bodalev [32]. The process of perception or «rationalization» (Lat. ratio — mind) of the company's image is not necessary for forging trust in it: the image can arouse admiration, love or other emotions that will lead to the fact of stakeholders' supporting the company's development by buying its production, investing in its shares, etc. A. Bodalev illustrates his opinion about the importance of a person's acts on the basis of the subconscious with the following data, «when choosing the voter's hand that is crossing something out or underlining something on a ballot is determined by the information in the person's subconsciousness by 70–80 % and only by 20–30 % by the information that the voter is aware of» [32]. A. Panasiuk defines the process of «creating a particular opinion of something as «the influence of not that much on people's consciousness as on their subconsciousness» [23]. The spread of management practices by influencing the person's subconsciousness seems to us to be connected not only with the development of psychological techniques of this kind of influence but with the very essence of the information society of the 21st century — information overloading and lack of time to digest it while it is necessary to react to changes in no time. However, the influence on both the person's consciousness and subconsciousness is considered by us to be only the means or instruments of forging the trust in the company; the latter, as was mentioned above, is the aim of reputation management and means stakeholders' readiness to support the development of the company (for example, by buying its production).

The traditional understanding of reputation in the works by Ukrainian authors differs from modern international studies by much greater attention to the psychological essence of this category. Taking the fact into consideration the means of forging reputation are often identified with the instruments of information and psychological influence on the society. It is indicative that Ukrainian scientists' works on reputation can often be read in editions aimed at PR experts [33, 34, 35]. The latter has become a reason for the altered understanding of reputation management as an exclusive function of PR, the false identification of reputation management only with PR technologies.

Summing up the opinions of numerous scientists the author of this study tends to the statement that the company's reputation has the features of an economic category (managing contacts with key stakeholders, managing information and knowledge, the factor of increasing business activities, the factor of developing the company) as well as belongs to the category of cost (ensuring profitability and cost-effectiveness, assets capitalization). It is the cost essence of corporate reputation that foreign scientists draw our attention to.

Conclusions:

1. The place (functions) of business in the system of forming a person's outlook on life changes in the 21st century: from a passive recipient of the system of values created by the religion, the family, the culture business changes into one of the powers guidedly forming the outlook of its stakeholders in the information economy. Thus a new function of business — forming a system of social values within the context of reputation management — is updated.

2. Modern reputation management of a company develops in line with «the economy of trust» concept. It is necessary to stress a sizable contribution of the American researcher Stephen Cowe Jr. to creating a methodological basis, developing and spreading the concept of «the economy of trust» on the level of companies and other organizations. The scientist supports the idea of the existence of the unfulfilled potential of business processes effectiveness within the framework of employing the principles of trust by companies' management, he justifies and explains the mechanism of «trust waves» and supports the «social ecology» grounds substantiating the concept of trust as the basis of all communications, relations and connections in the business sphere. The result of forming the necessary level of trust is a multiplicative reduction of marketing expenses as «consumers themselves become its main promoters, sales managers and marketing consultants».

3. To manage reputation efficiently, it is necessary to have a modern theory and methodology that in their turn demand the system of scientific categories to be modified in conformity with the latest tendencies of economic development. That is impossible without establishing categorial correlations between the notions that are used as synonyms of reputation in some studies. The essence of a company's reputation is the trust of the concerned parties. It means stakeholders' readiness to support the development of the company (by buying its products, making an investment, etc.). Thus, the arrangement of categorial terminology undertaken by the author improves the consistency of companies' reputation management theory.

4. The company's reputation has features of an economic category (marketing instruments, managing information, and knowledge, the factor of developing the company, its business activities) and a category of cost (ensuring profitability and cost-effectiveness, assets capitalization). It is the cost essence of the company's reputation that foreign scientists draw our attention to.

References

1. Ansoff, H. Igor. *Strategic Management*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
2. Peters, T. J. *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from Americas Best-run Companies*. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
3. Ouchi, W.H. *Teoria Z. Como as Empresas Podem Enfrentar O Desafio Japones*. Sao Paulo: Fundo Educativo Brasileiro, 1982.
4. Drucker, Peter F. *Managing for Results: Economic Tasks and Risk-taking Decisions*. New York: HarperBusiness, 1993.
5. Drucker, Peter Ferdinand. *The Practice of Management*. Amsterdam: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2007.
6. Armstrong, Michael, and Angela Baron. *Managing Performance: Performance Management in Action*. Front Cover.. CIPD Publishing, 2005.
7. «Reputation Leaders Network.» Reputation Institute. Accessed December 03, 2018. <http://www.reputationinstitute.com/research/Reputation-Leaders-Study>.
8. McConnell, C. R., and S. L. Brue. *Economics: Principles, Problems, And Policies*. New York: McGraw- Hill/Irwin, 2005.
9. Machlup, Fritz. *The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972.
10. Makarov, V.L. «Jekonomika znanij: uroki dlja Rossii.» [Knowledge Economy: Lessons for Russia]. *Vestnik Rossijskoj Akademii nauk* 73, no. 5 (2003): 450. <http://vivovoco.astronet.ru/VV/JOURNAL/VRAN/SESSION/VRAN5.HTM>. [in Russian].
11. Hosking, Geoffrey. «Trust And Distrust: A Suitable Theme For Historians?» *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 16 (2006): 95-115. DOI:10.1017/s0080440106000429.
12. Hosking, Geoffrey A. *Trust: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
13. Hosking, Geoffrey. *Trust: Money, Markets and Society*. Erscheinungsort Nicht Ermitelbar: Seagull Books, 2010.
14. Covey, Stephen M. R., Greg Link, and Rebecca R. Merrill. *Smart Trust: The Defining Skill That Transforms Managers into Leaders*. New York: Free Press, 2013.
15. Covey, Stephen M. R., and Rebecca R. Merrill. *The Speed of Trust: The One Thing That Changes Everything*. New York: Free Press, 2008.
16. Jekonomicheskij slovar. Slovari i jenciklopedii na Akademike. [Economic Dictionary. Dictionaries and Encyclopedias on Academica]. https://dic.academic.ru/contents/nsf/econ_dict/ (accessed November 03, 2018). [in Russian].
17. «Banki Germanii perezvivajut samyj glubokij krizis doverija za ves' poslevoennyj pe-riod» [German banks are experiencing the deepest crisis of confidence in the entire postwar period]. Bain & Company. Finmarket.ru. August 10, 2012. <http://www.finmarket.ru/news/3013413> (accessed November 03, 2018). [in Russian].
18. Dowling, Grahame. *Creating Corporate Reputations Identity, Image, and Performance*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2009.
19. Fombrun, Charles J., Leonard J. Ponzi, and William Newburry. «Stakeholder Tracking and Analysis: The RepTrak® System for Measuring Corporate Reputation.» *Corporate Reputation Review* 18, no. 1 (2015): 3-24. DOI:10.1057/crr.2014.21.

20. Shepel', V.M. *Imidzhelogija. Kak nravit'sja ljudjam*. [Imageology. How do people like]. M.: Narodnoe obrazovanie, 2002. [in Russian].
21. Guseva, Tat'jana. «Kak zashhitit' chest', dostoinstvo i delovuju reputaciju?» [Kak zashhitit' chest', dostoinstvo i delovuju reputaciju?]. *Jurist v Kaliningrade* Tat'jana Guseva. March 01, 2018. Accessed November 03, 2018. <https://pravoznai.ru/dlja-fizicheskikh-lic/kak-zashhitit-chest-dostoinstvo-i-delovuju-reputaciju/>. [in Russian].
22. Pochepcov, G. *Imidzhelogija: teorija i praktika*. [Imageology: Theory and Practice]. Kiev: Refl-buk Vakler, 2006. [in Russian].
23. Panasuk, A.Ju. *Formirovanie imidzha: strategija, psihotehnologii, psihotehniki*. [Image formation: strategy, psychotechnology, psychotechnics]. M.: Omega-L, 2007. [in Russian].
24. Buksha, K.S. *Upravlenie delovoj reputaciej. Rossijskaja i zarubezhnaja PR-praktika*. [Reputation management. Russian and foreign PR practice]. M.: OOO «I.D. Vil'jams», 2007. [in Russian].
25. Machiavelli, Niccolò, Giuliano Procacci, and Sergio Bertelli. *Il Principe E Discorsi: Sopra La Prima Deca Di Tito Livio*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 1984.
26. Locke, John, and P. H. Nidditch. *An Essay concerning Human Understanding*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011.
27. «Imidzh.» [Image]. Wikipedia. September 29, 2018., 2018. <https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Имидж> (Accessed November 03). [in Russian].
28. «Reputacija.» [Reputatuion]. Wikipedia. September 04, 2018. <http://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Репутация> (Accessed November 03, 2018). [in Russian].
29. Shepel' V.M. *Imidzhelogija. Kak nravit'sja ljudjam*. [Imageology. How do people like]. M. : Narodnoe obrazovanie, 2002. [in Russian].
30. *Kratkij psihologicheskij slovar'*. [A brief philosophical dictionary]. obshh. red. A.V. Petrovskogo i M.G. Jaroshevskogo ; red.-sost. L.A. Karpenko. [2-e izd., rasshir., ispr. i dop.] Rostov n/D.: «FENIKS», 1998. [in Russian].
31. Kondrat'ev, M.Ju. *Social'naja psihologija : slovar'*. [Social Philology: Dictionary]. M.: 2006. [in Russian].
32. «Kommunikativnaja funkcija podsoznanija.» [Communicative function of the subconscious]. *Psihologija.NJeS*. May 26, 2017. Accessed November 03, 2018. <http://vocabulary.ru/termin/kommunikativnaja-funcija-podsoznanija.html>. [in Russian].
33. Bogdanov, E. and V. Zazykin. *Psihologicheskie osnovy «Pablik rilejshnz»* [Psychological basis of «Public Relations»]. SPb.: Piter, 2004. [in Russian].
34. Korolko, V.H. *Pablik rileishnz. Naukovi osnovy, metodyka, praktyka*. [Public relations. Scientific fundamentals, methodology, practice]. K. : Vydavnychi dim «Skarby», 2001. [in Ukrainian].
35. Pochepcov, G.G. *Pablik rilejshnz dlja professionalov*. [Public relations for professionals]. M.: Refl-buk, K.: Vakler, 2001. [in Russian].

Література

1. Ансофф И. Стратегическое управление / И. Ансофф ; пер. с англ. — М. : Экономика, 1989. — 519 с.
2. Питерс Т. В поисках эффективного управления / Т. Питерс, Р.В. Уотермен ; пер. с англ. — М. : Прогресс, 1986. — 296 с.
3. Ouchi W. Theory Z: How American Business can meet the Japanese Challenge / W. Ouchi. — Addison-Wesley, 1981. — 283 p.
4. Drucker P. Managing for results / P. Drucker. — (N. Y. : Harper & Row, 1964). Publisher : HarperBusiness; Reissue edition, 2006. — 256 p.

5. Drucker P. The Practice of Management / P. Drucker. — (Harper, N. Y., 1954 ; Heinemann, L., 1955) Publisher : HarperBusiness; Reissue edition, 2006 — 416 p
6. Армстронг М. Performance Management. Управление эффективностью работы / М. Армстронг, А. Бэрон ; пер. англ. — М. : Hippo Publishing, 2007. — 384 с.
7. The 2014 Reputation Leaders Study / Reputation Institute [Electronic source]. — Access mode : <https://www.reputationinstitute.com/research/Reputation-Leaders-Study>.
8. Макконел К.Р. Экономикс / К.Р. Макконел, С.Л. Брю. — М. : ИНФРА-М, 2003. — 983 с.
9. Махлуп Ф. Производство и распространение знаний в США / Ф. Махлуп. — М. : Прогресс, 1966. — 462 с. («The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States», 1962).
10. Економіка знань: уроки для Росії [Електронний ресурс] / акад. В.Л. Макаров ; за участі А.С. Варшавського, А.Н. Козирева, Л.Е. Мінделі, С.Б. Пермінова, А.І. Терехова // Вісник Російської Академії наук. — Т. 73, № 5. — С. 450 (2003) наукова сесія загальних зборів РАН (19 XII 2002). — URL : <http://vivovoco.rsl.ru/vv/journal/vran/session/vran5.htm>.
11. Hosking Geoffrey. Trust and distrust: a suitable theme for historians? / Geoffrey Hosking // Royal Historical Society, 2006. — P. 95–115.
12. Hosking Geoffrey. Trust: a History / Geoffrey Hosking.— Oxford University Press, 2014. — 256 p.
13. Hosking Geoffrey. Trust: Money, Markets, and Society [Electronic source] / Geoffrey Hosking. — 2011. — Access mode : <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2010-09-06-hosking-en.html>.
14. Covey Stephen M.R. Smart Trust: The Defining Skill that Transforms Managers into Leaders / Stephen M.R. Covey. — Publisher: Free Press ; Reprint edition, 2013. — 320 p.
15. Covey Stephen M.R. The SPEED of Trust: The One Thing that Changes Everything / Stephen M.R. Covey. — Publisher: Free Press; Reprint edition, 2008. — 354 p.
16. Економічний словник [Електронний ресурс]. — URL : http://economy_en_ru.academic.ru/16117/credibility_gap.
17. Банки Германии переживают самый глубокий кризис доверия / портал UBR, 11 Августа 2012 [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа : <http://ubr.ua/finances/banking-sector/banki-germanii-perejivaut-samyi-glubokii-krizis-doveriia-154702>.
18. Dowling Grahame. Creating Corporate Reputations / Grahame Dowling. — Oxford University Press, 2002. — 320 p.
19. Fombrun Charles J. Stakeholder Tracking and Analysis: The RepTrak® System for Measuring Corporate Reputation [Electronic source] / Charles J. Fombrun, Leonard J. Ponzi and William Newburry // Corporate Reputation Review. — 2015. — Vol. 18. (February 2015). — P. 3–24. — Access mode : <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/crr/journal/v18/n1/full/crr201421a.html>.
20. Шепель В.М. Имиджелогия. Как нравиться людям / В.М. Шепель. — М. : Народное образование, 2002. — 500 с.
21. Гусева Т.Э. Как защитить честь, достоинство и деловую репутацию? [Электронный ресурс] / Т.Э. Гусева. — Режим доступа : <http://pravoznai.ru/2011/03/kak-zashhitit-chest-dostoinstvo-i-delo>.
22. Почепцов Г. Имиджелогия: теория и практика / Г. Почепцов. — К. : Рефл-бук Ваклер, 2006. — 576 с.
23. Панасюк А.Ю. Формирование имиджа: стратегия, психотехнологии, психотехники / А.Ю. Панасюк. — М. : Омега-Л, 2007. — 266 с.
24. Букша К.С. Управление деловой репутацией. Российская и зарубежная PR-практика / К.С. Букша. — М. : ООО «И.Д. Вильямс», 2007. — 144 с.

25. Machiavelli Niccolò. Il Principe / Niccolò Machiavelli [Electronic source]. — Access mode : http://www.letteraturaitaliana.net/pdf/Volume_4/t324.pdf — Edizione di riferimento: a cura di Luigi Firpo, Einaudi, Torino 1961.
26. Локк Дж. Опыт о человеческом разумении [Электронный ресурс]. / Дж. Локк ; пер. с англ. А.Н. Савина. — Режим доступа : http://sbiblio.com/biblio/archive/lokk_opit.
27. Имидж [Электронный ресурс] / Википедия. — Режим доступа : <http://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Имидж>.
28. Репутация [Электронный ресурс] // Википедия. — Режим доступа : <http://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Репутация>.
29. Шепель В.М. Имиджелогия. Как нравится людям / В.М. Шепель. — М. : Народное образование, 2002. — 500 с.
30. Краткий психологический словарь / под общей ред. А.В. Петровского и М.Г. Ярошевского ; ред.-сост. Л.А. Карпенко. — 2-е изд., расшир., испр. и доп. — Ростов н/Д. : «ФЕНИКС», 1998. — 512 с.
31. Кондратьев М.Ю. Социальная психология : словарь / М. Ю. Кондратьев. — М., 2006. — 176 с.
32. Коммуникативная функция подсознания [Электронный ресурс] // Психология общения : энциклопед. словарь / под общ. ред. А.А. Бодалева. — М. : Изд-во «Когито-Центр», 2011. — Режим доступа : <http://vocabulary.ru/dictionary/1095/word/komunikativnaja-funkcija-podsoznanija>
33. Богданов Е. Психологические основы «Паблик рилейшнз». — 2-е изд. / Е. Богданов, В Зазыкин. — СПб. : Питер, 2004. — 204 с.
34. Королько В.Г. Паблік рілейшнз. Наукові основи, методика, практика : підруч. — 2-е вид. доп. / В.Г. Королько. — К. : Видавничий дім «Скарби», 2001. — 400 с.
35. Почепцов Г.Г. Паблік рилейшнз для професіоналов / Г.Г. Почепцов. — М.: Рефл-бук, К. : Ваклер, 2001. — 188 с.

ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ УПРАВЛЕНИЯ КОРПОРАТИВНОЙ РЕПУТАЦИЕЙ В КОНТЕКСТЕ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ПАРАДИГМЫ УПРАВЛЕНИЯ

Деревянко Елена Георгиевна,

доктор экон. наук, доцент, профессор
кафедры экономики, учета и финансов
Национального университета пищевых
технологий

Аннотация. В статье обосновываются основные положения теории корпоративной репутации в контексте современного менеджмента. Так в XXI в. меняется место (функции) бизнеса в системе формирования мировоззрения человека: бизнес в информационной экономике из пассивного реципиента системы ценностей, созданной религией, семьей и культурой, становится одной из сил, направленно формирующей мировоззрение своих стейкхолдеров. Таким образом, актуализируется новая функция бизнеса — формирование системы ценностей общества в контексте управления репутацией компаний. Современное управление репутацией компании разви-

вається в русле концепції «економіки довіри»; сутністю репутації компанії являється довіре заінтересованих лиц. Довіре — соціально-психологічна основа репутації, являючися первопричиною економічного взаємодія потенціальних інвесторів і бізнеса, банків і їх вкладчиків, виробників і споживачів, отримує ціннісні змієня і сєйчас становить ціннісний економічний категорієй.

Ключевые слова: економіка довіри, стейкхолдери, система цінностей, порівняння іміджа і репутації, психологія і соціологія в управлінні.

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ОСНОВИ УПРАВЛІННЯ КОРПОРАТИВНОЮ РЕПУТАЦІЄЮ В КОНТЕКСТІ СУЧАСНОЇ ПАРАДИГМИ УПРАВЛІННЯ

Дерев'янюк Олена Георгіївна,

доктор економічних наук, доцент,
професор кафедри економіки, обліку
та фінансів Національного університету
харчових технологій

Анотація. У статті, з позиції необхідного розвитку теорії та методології науки як базису конкурентоспроможної економіки України, обґрунтовуються основні положення теорії корпоративної репутації в контексті сучасного менеджменту. Так, у ХХІ ст. змінюється місце (функції) бізнесу в системі формування світогляду людини: бізнес в інформаційну епоху з пасивного реципієнта системи цінностей, створеної релігією, сім'єю і культурою, стає однією з сил, що направлено формує світогляд своїх стейкхолдерів. Таким чином, актуалізується нова функція бізнесу — формування системи цінностей суспільства в контексті управління репутацією компаній. Сучасне управління репутацією компанії розвивається в руслі концепції «економіки довіри»; сутністю репутації компанії є довіра зацікавлених осіб. Відзначаємо вагомий внесок у створення методологічної бази, розвиток і поширення концепції «економіки довіри» на рівні компаній та інших організацій американського дослідника Стівена Кові-молодшого. Вчений аргументує існування невикористаного потенціалу ефективності бізнес-процесів в руслі застосування принципів довіри менеджментом компаній, він обґрунтовує і пояснює механізм «хвиль довіри» і стоїть на позиціях «соціальної екології», визначаючи концепцію довіри як основу всіх комунікацій, відносин і зв'язків у бізнес-середовищі. Результатом формування необхідного рівня довіри до компанії є мультиплікативне скорочення витрат на маркетинг, оскільки «самі споживачі стають його головними промоутерами, менеджерами з продажу та маркетологами». Доведено, що проблематика дослідження репутації прийшла в економіку з суміжної сфери гуманітарних наук: психології, соціології та філософії. Довіра — соціально-психологічна основа репутації, що є першопричиною економічного взаємодія потенційних інвесторів і бізнесу, банків та їх вкладників, виробників і споживачів, отримує ціннісні виміри й зараз стає ціннісною економічною категорією. Разом з тим, репутація компанії має ознаки економічної категорії (маркетинговий інструмент, управління контактами з ключовими стейкхолдерами, управління інформацією та знаннями, фактор розвитку компанії,

ділова активність) і вартісної категорії (забезпечення прибутковості і прибутковості, капіталізація активів). Саме на вартісній сутності репутації компанії акцентують увагу зарубіжні дослідники.

Ключові слова: економіка довіри, стейкхолдери, система цінностей, порівняння іміджу і репутації, психологія і соціологія в управлінні.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 04.11.2018

УДК 658.5

DOI 10.33111/sedu.2018.43.035.046

Серобян Арпіне Мікаелівна*

РОЛЬ СТРАТЕГІЧНИХ РЕСУРСІВ В УПРАВЛІННІ ВЕРТИКАЛЬНО-ІНТЕГРОВАНИМИ СТРУКТУРАМИ

Анотація. Стаття присвячена аналізу теоретичних аспектів поняття стратегічних ресурсів у системі стратегічного управління, зокрема вертикально-інтегрованих структур. З'ясовано сутність вертикальної інтеграції у сучасних умовах розвитку економіки із урахуванням концепції стратегічного управління. У статті розглянуто основні положення аналізу ефективності ресурсного забезпечення діяльності підприємства з позиції ресурсної теорії. Подано авторське трактування стратегічних ресурсів підприємства та запропоновано їхню класифікацію. Доведено, що раціональне використання стратегічних ресурсів на основі застосування сучасних прогресивних систем менеджменту виступає основним чинником підвищення ефективності функціонування підприємства.

Ключові слова: вертикальна інтеграція, стратегічне управління, стратегічна діагностика, адаптивність, компетенції організації стратегічні ресурси, ресурсний підхід.

Вступ. Одним з основних напрямків формування і функціонування економічних суб'єктів на сучасному етапі є економічна інтеграція. Вона може бути характерною для різних процесів на рівні регіону, галузі, підгалузі, міжгалузевого об'єднання, у національному або світовому масштабі. Сутність інтеграції полягає в тому, що за такої взаємодії розширюється та зміцнюється виробничо-технологічний потенціал, з'являється можливість спільного використання ресурсів, а також об'єднання капіталів. Ефективність господарської діяльності інтегрованих структур залежить від раціонального використання наявних стратегічних ресурсів кожного підприємства. З огляду на це актуальним є дослідження ролі стратегічних ресурсів у системі управління вертикально-інтегрованими структурами.

Різними аспектам досліджуваної проблеми свою увагу приділяли Д. Рікардо, Дж. Мілль, Т. Мальтус, Дж. Барні, Б. Вернерфельт, Д. Тіс, Р. Грант, П. Блау, Р.

* **Серобян Арпіне Мікаелівна** — аспірантка кафедри стратегії бізнесу, ДВНЗ «Київський національний економічний університет імені Вадима Гетьмана», serobianarpine@gmail.ru