



Vakhtang Burduli ¹⁾
Ramaz Abesadze ²⁾

*¹⁾ Dr hab., professor, Paata Gugushvili Institute of Economics
of Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
(Tbilisi, Georgia)*

** Corresponding author: e-mail: vakhtangburduli@gmail.com*



*²⁾ Dr hab., professor, Paata Gugushvili Institute of Economics
of Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
(Tbilisi, Georgia)*

** Corresponding author: e-mail: ramazabesadze@yahoo.com*

**TRANSFORMATION OF INDUSTRIAL, TECHNOLOGICAL
AND ORGANIZATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL
STRUCTURES OF THE COUNTRY ECONOMY
IN THE CONDITIONS OF INTEGRATION PROCESSES
OF GLOBALIZATION**

**TRANSFORMACJA STRUKTUR PRZEMYSŁOWYCH,
TECHNOLOGICZNYCH I ORGANIZACYJNYCH
I INSTYTUCJONALNYCH GOSPODARKI KRAJOWEJ
W WARUNKACH INTEGRACJI PROCESÓW GLOBALIZACJI**

**ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ ОТРАСЛЕВЫХ, ТЕХНОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ
И ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННО-ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНЫХ
СТРУКТУР ЭКОНОМИКИ СТРАНЫ В УСЛОВИЯХ
ИНТЕГРАЦИОННЫХ ПРОЦЕССОВ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ**

Abstract

The article examines the methodological and practical issues of transformation and formation of industrial, technological, organizational and institutional structures of the country's economy in the context of the integration processes of globalization. Modern interpretations of the sectoral and technological structures of the economy, the processes of technology development and their diffusion into host industries are highlighted and systematized. The influence of globalization factors on the sectoral and technological structure of the economy in individual countries is shown, the relationship between the development of technological structures and the transformation of organizational and institutional systems is revealed. The processes of transformation of the organizational

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2018 /Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Burduli V., Abesadze R., (2018) Transformation Of Industrial, Technological And Organizational And Institutional Structures Of The Country Economy In The Con-ditions Of Integration Processes Of Globalization. *International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences*,2 (8) 2018: 13-42

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924)

and institutional systems of the economy in the context of globalization and intercountry regionalization are identified and systematized.

Keywords: transformation of industrial, technological, organizational and institutional structures, integration processes of globalization, diffusion of technologies, innovative technologies, technological structure

Streszczenie

Artykuł zajmuje się metodologicznymi i praktycznymi problemami transformacji i kształtowania sektorowych, technologicznych, organizacyjnych i instytucjonalnych struktur gospodarki kraju w kontekście procesów integracyjnych globalizacji. Współczesne interpretacje sektorowych i technologicznych struktur gospodarki, procesy rozwoju technologii i ich dyfuzja do przemysłu goszczącego są podkreślane i usystematyzowane. Pokazano wpływ czynników globalizacyjnych na sektorową i technologiczną strukturę gospodarki w poszczególnych krajach, ujawniono związek między rozwojem struktur technologicznych a transformacją systemów organizacyjnych i instytucjonalnych. Procesy transformacji systemów organizacyjnych i instytucjonalnych gospodarki w kontekście globalizacji i regionalizacji między krajami są identyfikowane i usystematyzowane.

Słowa kluczowe: transformacja struktur sektorowych, technologicznych, organizacyjnych i instytucjonalnych, procesy integracyjne globalizacji, dyfuzja technologii, innowacyjne technologie, struktura technologiczna

Аннотация

В статье исследуются методологические и практические вопросы трансформации и формирования отраслевых, технологических, организационных и институциональных структур экономики страны в условиях интеграционных процессов глобализации. Освещены и систематизированы современные интерпретации отраслевой и технологической структур экономики, процессы развития технологий и их диффузии в хозяйственные отрасли. Показано влияние факторов глобализации на отраслевую и технологическую структуры экономики в отдельных странах, выявлена взаимосвязь между развитием технологических укладов и трансформацией организационных и институциональных систем. Выявлены и систематизированы процессы трансформации организационных и институциональных систем экономики в условиях глобализации и межстрановой регионализации.

Ключевые слова: трансформация отраслевых, технологических, организационных и институциональных структур, интеграционные процессы глобализации, диффузия технологий, инновационные технологии, технологический уклад

Article history: Received: 20.09.2018 / Accepted: 15.12.2018 / Published: 30.12.2018

JEL Classification: F 60, F 15, O 10

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2018 / Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Burduli V., Abesadze R., (2018) Transformation Of Industrial, Technological And Organizational And Institutional Structures Of The Country Economy In The Con-ditions Of Integration Processes Of Globalization. *International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences*, 2 (8) 2018: 13-42

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924)

Statement of the problem in general outlook and its connection with important scientific and practical tasks.

After the post-Soviet collapse of the economy in the early 1990s, in Georgia, as in most post-Soviet countries, the sectoral structure of the economy changed dramatically. Many necessary sectors and industries were lost. Although most of them were based on outdated technologies, the national economic complex was diversified and to a certain extent self-sufficient (given the sufficient balance between the volumes of import and export of products). Much time has passed since then, relative economic stability has been achieved in Georgia, construction is rapidly developing, transport infrastructure, production is equipped with IT technologies, but the industry structure still does not meet modern

standards of neoindustrial type. As a result, it is not possible to achieve satisfactory parameters of the export-import balance, reanimate many relevant industrial sectors on a new technological basis, use unclaimed agricultural production capacities. The main reason for this is the insufficient speed of perception of the possibilities of technological progress and integration into global and intercountry regional (for example, EU) world economic systems. Therefore, it is important to explore the modern processes of formation of sectoral, technological and organizational-institutional structures within individual countries in the context of the integration processes of globalization, to which this article is dedicated.

Analysis of the latest research in which the solution of the problem was initiated.

A number of authors' works are devoted to the analysis of the economy of a post-communist country and its development paths in the context of globalization (Abesadze R., Burduli V., 2011; Burduli V., 2007; Абесадзе Р., Бурдули В., 2011; Абесадзе Р. Высокие ..., 2011; Бурдули В., 2009; Бурдули В., 2008) etc. A fundamental study of these processes is given in the writings of V. Papava (Papava V., 2005; Papava V., 2011) etc. When considering the problems of modern interpretations of the sectoral and technological structures of the economy and the development of technologies and their diffusion into economic sectors, we were guided by the fundamental ideas of J. Gelbrait, E. Toffler (Toffler E.), S. Glazyev (Глазьев С. Возможности ..., Глазьев С., 2009), with their developments (Бурдули В., 2009; Церетели Г., Бурдули В., 1998; Burduli V. 2004, p. 113-132; Tsereteli G., 2003; etc), as well as

developments of foreign scientists (Хруцкий В., 1992; Семенова Е., 2006; Любимцева С., 2008; Фролов Д. 2011; etc). When systematizing the influence of globalization factors on the sectoral and technological structure of the economy, we took into account both the considerations of foreign authors (Структурная политика ..., 2018; The Barcelona ..., 2008; Стиглиц Дж., 1998; Бландиньер Ж.-П., 2010; Иванов Н., 2008; Ананьин О., Хаиткулов Р., Шестаков Д., 2010; Кузин Д., 1993; Хруцкий В., 1992; Кондратьев В. 2014; Турбан Г., 2010; Белов В., Баранова К., 2010; Смирнов Е., 2016) and the considerations of national authors (Papava V., 2005; Papava V., 2011; Abesadze R., Burduli V., 2011; Burduli V., 1996; Burduli V., 2004, p. 222-254, 332-338; Abesadze R., Burduli V., Datunashvili L., 2011; etc). In studying the relationship between the development

of technological structures and the transformation of organizational and institutional systems, we relied on the provisions outlined both in the works of foreign authors (Hamilton W., 1919; Shumpeter J., 1939; Веблен Т., 2007; Кондратьев Н., 2002; Мокуг J., 1999; Murphy K. M., Shlifer A., Wishny R. M., 1989; Rosenberg N., 1982; Глазьев С. Возможности ...; Глазьев С., 2009; Сизязкина М., 2008; Фролов Д., 2011; Бландиньер Ж.-П., 2010; Иванова Н., Данилин И., 2010; Архипов В., 2009; Кузин Д., 1993) and in some of our developments (Tsereteli G., Burduli V., 2004; Burduli V., Burduli K., 2008; Бурдули В.,

Церетели Г., 1998; Бурдули В., 2009; Абесадзе Р., 2011). In studying the problems of transforming organizational and institutional structures in the context of globalization, we primarily relied on the works published in the journal *World Economy and International Relations* (Шишков Ю., 2010; Иванов Н., 2008; Добросоцкий В., 2000; etc), as well as the work of J.-P. Blandinier (Бландиньер Ж.-П., 2010) and V. Khrutsky (Хруцкий В., 1992) and own developments (Burduli V., 2008; Бурдули В., 2016; Burduli V., Arevadze N., 2010; Abesadze R., Burduli V., Datunashvili L. etc).

Goals of the paper.

The main goal of the work is to identify and systematize the transformation processes of sectoral, technological, organizational and institutional structures of the economy in the context of globalization. The main goal includes the following sub-goals: the identification and systematization of modern interpretations of the sectoral and technological structures of the economy; identification and systematization of the processes of technology development and their diffusion into economic sectors; identification

and systematization of the influence of globalization factors on the sectoral and technological structure of the economy in individual countries; identification of the relationship between the development of technological structures and the transformation of organizational and institutional systems; identification and systematization of the transformation processes of organizational and institutional systems of the economy in the context of globalization and intercountry regionalization.

Exposition of main material of research. The initial prerequisites for the formation of a regional innovation policy and its mechanisms.

Modern interpretations of the sectoral and technological structure of the economy.

The sectoral structure of the economy is one of the main parameters that determine one or another level of indicators of the country's socio-economic development. Therefore, it is very important to study its state and dynamics, identify the directions of rationalization of this structure, improve the economic mechanisms that coordinate its transformation.

Production in each specific economic sector is carried out on the basis of a set of technologies, both specific to the industry and used in many industries, which are gradually developing, on the basis of which labor productivity increases, the parameters of material intensity and energy intensity of production change, the capital intensity of production changes. There are also new industries based on the use of new technologies in production, and the spread and use of technologically new products produced

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2018 / Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Burduli V., Abesadze R., (2018) Transformation Of Industrial, Technological And Organizational And Institutional Structures Of The Country Economy In The Conditions Of Integration Processes Of Globalization. *International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences*, 2 (8) 2018: 13-42

Economics and Social Sciences, 2 (8) 2018: 13-42

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924)

with their help, both for production purposes and for mass consumption, is taking place.

As is known, economic sectors (branches in the context of types of activity or in terms of types of products or services produced in them) develop on the basis of diffusion of innovations in them, or, in other words, diffusion of new technologies in them. Moreover, there is not only an upgrade (modernization) of physical technologies, but also social and institutional (management or business technologies, i.e. technologies of market and other production interrelations, as well as technologies of state coordination of structural and sectoral development), to which the rapid development of IT technologies and modern globalization processes are bringing their contribution (which in themselves are largely due to technological progress).

First of all, modern and promising sectoral structures should be considered in an enlarged generalized aspect, defined by the terms post-industrial (D. Bell) or super-industrial (third wave) (E. Toffler) structure, which are used mainly in relation to developed countries. However, for developing countries (including new industrial and post-Soviet), the term “neo-industrial structure” is more appropriate (the term “new industrial society” as we know was introduced by J. Galbraith. Here we use the term “neo-industrial” in the context of the development of industry and the technological structure of the economy, it can also be used in the characterization of business structures). This term more accurately reflects the trends of economic development observed in the world (including in developed countries) and is increasingly used in scientific and public literature. Thus, the concepts of “neoindustrial technological structure”, “the structure of neoindustrial

economy (economies)”, “neoindustrial phase of development”, “neoindustrial type of development”, “European... services of neo-industrial economy”, “neoindustrial systems ... national industrial structures” and others are now found on the Internet more often (in scientific literature, in presentations of large corporations, etc.) than in conjunction with the term “post-industrial”. The latter term, in our opinion, does not quite accurately reflect the structural and economic phenomena occurring in developed and developing countries. After all, the industry is not curtailed, it takes on new features, many new “industries” appear (i.e., sectors), and existing ones are being modernized. Perhaps, only to a certain extent decreased its total specific consumption of materials (in a unit cost of manufactured products and services).

Achieving a neo-industrial type of economic structure of a country suggests the following nature of the development of this structure in the context of economic sectors:

- the emergence of new industries, first of all, the production of information and telecommunications (IT) equipment, as well as some others, which acquire considerable weight in the industry structure;
- sustainable development of innovation activity both within individual economic sectors of the economy, and as objects of a separate sector of the economy;
- an increase in the share of intellectual products and services in the total cost of products and services produced;
- an increase in the share of the service sector in the total volume of products and services produced;
- sustainable development of industries with high and key technologies, as well as the production of relevant products and services;

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2018 /Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Burduľi V., Abesadze R., (2018) Transformation Of Industrial, Technological And Organizational And Institutional Structures Of The Country Economy In The Con-ditions Of Integration Processes Of Globalization. *International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences*,2 (8) 2018: 13-42

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924)

- timely diffusion of new and modernized technologies in a number of traditional industries;

- transformation and change of the role and place in the economy of some key traditional industries, in other words, the emergence on their base of new, to some extent, replacing the industries based on the use of new innovative technologies (the most typical examples are the production of metal plastics, which replaces a very capacious part of the traditional ferrous metallurgy industry; complete replacement of tube electronic computing equipment and technologies of their use by computer technologies);

- in Georgia, as in a post-Soviet country, re-animation on the basis of modernized technologies temporarily lost the importance of traditional industries (in light industry, high-tech industries, furniture industry, etc.);

- orientation of the development of the agro-industrial complex towards the goals of ensuring the country's long-term food security;

- development of technologies for the production of individualized services and products (individual tailoring, housing, furniture, some types of medical care, etc.). However, in the economic literature in this aspect, the possibility of a wide individualization of the production of vehicles, IT technologies and some other products is exaggerated (which can be provided only for very rich people and cannot acquire mass character; the prevailing trend here is the opposite and considers standardization). In addition to studying the sectoral structure directly in the context of economic sectors, differentiation of industries (types of activities) in terms of the technologies they use (new technologies and traditional, key (leading) and high, etc.), as well as other

criteria, is becoming increasingly important. (export-oriented, import-substituting, according to the nature and relevance of the goods produced), since appropriate evaluation characteristics help to make more effective decisions on the coordination of production development (including its institutional organizations) in public administration and business environment as well.

There are various options for differentiating industries (or individual industries) according to the criterion for assessing the level of technology in which these industries (or sectors, corporations) are considered low-tech, medium-tech or high-tech (Любимцева С., 2008, p. 31), or by industries (or industries) based on high and key (leading) technologies (according to the German Institute for Economic Research (DIV) (Семенова Е., 2006, p. 14)). In all these cases, the level of manufacturability is determined by the share of expenditure on research and development in sales. At the same time, some researchers, in order to establish the level of manufacturability, are guided by fixed levels of interest that determine the share of R & D in sales. However, in many corporations and, therefore, in their respective industries, these figures vary from year to year and therefore a number of research centers (for example, the US National Fund) determines their nomenclature arbitrarily, without formulating special criteria (Семенова Е., 2006, p. 15).

In the theory of long-term technical and economic development (Глазьев С. Возможности ...; Глазьев С., 2009), in the system of "technological structure", both technologies and sectors are structured: the technologies of the key factor of the technological structure, and the core of the technological structure, as well as other sectors,

in which, in the process of their technological development, differ, there is a diffusion of the necessary technologies of the dominant technological structure. The combination of technologies (technological structure) and sectors (some technologies are simultaneously represented by sectors), together with technological and institutional interconnections, is considered as a technological mode, which in any country is in a process of continuous development. Modernization of existing industries can also occur on the basis of modernization of industry-specific old technologies.

Consideration of the economy in the context of the real and financial sectors of the economy is becoming increasingly important, firstly, in order to research and develop proactive measures to prevent unwanted operations in the process of interaction between various sectors of the real and financial sectors of the economy that can provoke negative phenomena in the economy, secondly so that theorists could understand the institutional contradictions of the global system of reproduction of fictitious capital, due to the manifestation of which prices to a certain extent lose their objectivity, which complicates the process of expedient inter-sectoral and inter-country flow of capital (Бурдули В., 2009, p. 30; Фролов Д. 2011, p. 31). By the way, organizational and institutional issues of improving the interaction of the financial and real sectors were considered by us in (Burduli V., Burduli K., 2008; Burduli V., 2004, p. 113-132; Бурдули В., Церетели Г., 1998), and the current development trends of the institutional organization associated with the real production of the financial sector are in (Burduli V., Kuratashvili A., 2008; Burduli V. 2004, p. 113-132; Церетели Г., Бурдули В., 1998).

Modern methods of structuring sectors according to the above and other criteria (for example, in the form of branches of primary, secondary and third sectors) and, most importantly, the development strategy of the sectoral structure in Georgia, based on the use of these criteria, are highlighted in the works of G. Tsereteli (Tsereteli G. 2000; Tsereteli G., 2003), which gave orientation to our current developments in this direction.

There are systems for classifying sectors according to other criteria. So in South Korea and in some other countries, industries already 20-30 years ago differed in the "criterion of priority." The main priority criteria were the following: 1. The export potential of the sectors 2. The outlook for demand for the sectors's products in the domestic market 3. Prospects for the development of the country in the case of accelerated development of the industry (or "the achievement of a high industrial stage by a country"); 4. Minimizing the deficit in the country's trade balance; 5. Minimizing dependence on raw materials and imports, reducing the resource intensity of the industry as a whole (this criterion, generally speaking, like the rest, is important not only for sectors of industry, but also for other sectors of the economy); 6. a favorable side effect (increasing the efficiency of other sectors; now the term "industry multiplier effect" is more commonly used instead of this term) (Хруцкий В., 1992, p. 97, 98). It should be noted that some sectors satisfy several priority criteria at once. At present, some more criteria can be added to these criteria, for example: 7. High level of competitiveness of the sector in the world market; 8. High intellectual intensity of the sector; 9. Sufficiently high labor and intellectual intensity of the sector due to the reduction of material and energy intensity; 10. Minimum or zero

level of environmental pollution, the possibility of full utilization of waste, and some others.

In modern statistical reporting (as opposed to previous reporting), the sectoral structure of the economy is considered as the structure of the economy by type of activity, large aggregated activities are often called sectors (industrial sector, agricultural sector, construction sector) or areas of activity (services). More detailed activities, for example, in industry, in most economic research are called sectors. As a matter of fact, the type of activity literally means a specific specialty, for example, a manager, a marketer, etc. In the statistical reporting, some of these workers, depending on their position, are displayed in various economic sectors, and some - in sectors that reflect specialty. For example, a marketer may work in an industrial company and in a specialized marketing company. In the first case, in the statistical reporting he will be taken into account in the industrial sector, in the second - in the aggregate sector "service sector". To avoid misunderstandings, we note that the term "type of economic activity" in our study means the same thing as the economic "branch", which is more often used in the economic literature. In any sector, production is carried out on the basis of its characteristic set of technologies.

Technology development and their diffusion in economic sectors.

Production efficiency in the system of national accounts is measured in the context of economic sectors. At the same time, technological progress occurs and can be traced in the context of the types of technologies. Therefore, in order to assess the effectiveness of introducing new or modernized production technologies into economic sectors, it is important to trace the diffusion

of various technologies into economic sectors in the context of the adopted sectoral nomenclature of national accounts (with more detailed elaboration of industries and agriculture).

Adhering to the principles of systematization of sectors and technologies, given in the theory of long-term technical and economic development (Глазьев С. Возможности ...; Глазьев С., 2009), one can trace the diffusion efficiency of new and modernized traditional technologies into economic sectors. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the development of technological structures, the transition from one dominant technological order to another, is similar to the processes presented by E. Toffler in relation to the transition from the pre-industrial stage to the industrial and from industrial to the "superindustrial", as a sequence of waves. The wave of E. Toffler is a breakthrough in science and technology. The development of agriculture was such a jerk for the first wave, an industrial revolution was - for the second wave. The third, "superindustrial" wave is the introduction of new modern technologies (IT technologies, etc.), which is currently developing (Toffler E.). Similarly, the transition from one "industrial" technological structure to another is based on the emergence of new "technologies of a key factor and core" of a particular technological structure. And here, too, there is a gradual process: at the same time there are elements, and key and other technologies of the previous and now dominant technological structure are being introduced. It is noteworthy that such an approach makes it possible to present the process of technological development and evaluate its effectiveness in a sufficiently detailed aspect (which is important for making effective management decisions in both the business

environment and government structures), both in the context of individual business sectors and in the whole - in terms of the quality assessment of the sectoral structure of individual countries.

The spread of technology (diffusion) into the sectoral structure of the country's economy as a whole and into individual economic sectors is as follows:

- new sectors are being formed that produce production and consumer technologies of a "key factor" oriented towards neo-industrial development within the framework of the modern technological order;

- in the post-Soviet countries, on the basis of modernization, some lost technologies (industries, production), representing a necessary component of a neo-industrial economic structure, are being reanimated;

- to a varying degree (depending on the technological nature of sectors), there is a diffusion of key factor technologies into other sectors and a corresponding modernization of production technologies in them (for example, in some developing countries the use of technology is increasing, especially in agriculture relating to the technologies of the key factor of the 4th technological mode of the internal combustion engine; in the modern, providing neoindustrial type of development, the 6th technological structure, diffusion occurs in commercial sector of IT technology, technologies of mechanical processes automation, etc.);

- however, the technological modernization of traditional industries takes place not only through the introduction of key factor technologies, but also the "refinement" of the technologies used without their participation (for example, in agriculture, through the modernization of traditional crop rotation schemes, soil enrichment system and

its defense from erosion; in traditional industries, the "fine-tuning" of mechanical technologies takes place also on the basis of the inclusion of elements of key factor technologies and without their participation).

In general, new and high technologies, the development of which is of paramount importance for the formation of a modern technological structure and the corresponding sectoral structure of the neo-industrial type, can be classified as follows (Abesadze R., 2011, p. 3, 4; Бурдули В., 2011, p. 24): cognitive technologies, in most branches of IT technology, computer software technology and automation of mechanical processes, microelectronics, biotechnology (microbiology, molecular and cellular biology, biochemistry, embryology, etc.), nanotechnology, photonics, etc., atomic physics, aerospace technology, environmentally friendly energy sources (based on the use of renewable resources), possibly electric power engines (if you can create enough small-sized batteries), new ecologically sufficiently clean technologies for utilization and industrial waste processing, etc. Cognitive technologies are especially promising (computer technologies and programming, with programmers who have a deep knowledge of any related current specialty; nanometrology; scanning microscopes, etc.). Of course, most of the key technologies of previous technological structures, as well as modernized technologies of the basic industries (agriculture, food and light industries, etc.), which provide basic vital human needs and are the most important components of the modern neo-industrial economic structure, do not lose their value either.

The impact of globalization factors on the sectoral and technological structure of the economy in individual countries.

The development in individual countries of the sectoral and technological structure of the economy is currently not possible to be considered in isolation from the processes of globalization, which is also evident from the above text. However, in this subsection an attempt is made to formulate systematically the most important aspects of the impact of globalization factors on the formation of the sectoral and technological structure of the economy of individual, primarily developing countries. Technological development in itself affects the forms and methods of organizing modern globalization processes, is the main generator of their development and distribution. And the spread of technological progress and, accordingly, the formation of progressive, characteristic of neo-industrial development, sectoral structures in many countries is one of the characteristic features (even the main feature) of modern globalization. Therefore, the scientific study of this particular process must be given special attention. Among the factors of modern globalization that influence and determine the formation and development of the sectoral and technological structure of individual (especially developed and developing) countries, the following should be noted:

1. Significantly increased the possibility of accelerated diffusion of new production technologies from countries - technological leaders to recipient countries (with a favorable economic climate in these countries), both developed and developing. Moreover, the development of new and modernized technologies takes place both by attracting real foreign capital (primarily in the form of TNS enterprises) and by purchasing and mastering new and modernized traditional technologies (in the conditions of small and medium-sized countries, production of its

own production technologies is possible only for certain selected directions);

2. New opportunities are opening up for the accelerated adaptation of the organizational and institutional structures of business and the state institutional systems that support it to the perception of new technologies and the neo-industrial transformation of the sectoral structure of the economy within the framework of the developing global and regional economic orders. Examples of a number of developed and developing countries (in which a favorable institutional business climate is established and a modern organizational and institutional business structure has been created) clearly demonstrate this fact. [Бландиньер Ж.-П., 2010; Иванов Н., 2008];

3. The role of international technological cooperation is greatly enhanced. The economies of countries, their sectors and business are included in the relevant global and regional interstate networks. This is an extremely important process, ensuring the greatest possible sectoral and technological diversification of production, especially in a small country with a transforming economy, for business environment of which is very important to participate not only in global, but also, especially, in regional cooperation technological networks;

4. The development of globalization is increasingly regulated by global economic organizations. Trade liberalization (tariff reduction), which is regulated by the WTO, on the one hand, expands export opportunities for countries, on the other hand, to a certain extent, it puts pressure on national producers. Both factors have a definite influence on the development of the sectoral and technological structure in individual countries;

5. The IMF and the WB when issuing loans also prescribe certain conditions for their

use: appropriate agreements on the use of loans have a positive influence on the effective development of sectoral and technological structures in the recipient countries (see (Papava V., 2011. The role ...) and other works of the specified author);

6. Certain advantages to countries are provided by their participation in regional inter-country organizations, by agreements which (on customs tariffs, on the use of regional development funds, etc.) also provide an opportunity to rationalize the sectoral and technological structure in individual countries. However, even in the conditions of participation in regional unions, governments of individual countries should control the situation so that the development of individual industries was not curtailed;

7. Trade liberalization in the context of globalization intensifies competition at the international level, which prompts governments and business representatives to take active measures to increase the competitiveness of products of national enterprises;

8. Equipped with modern technologies, TNCs are increasingly being introduced into national production systems, thereby contributing to the formation of country-specific industry structures. However, more and more countries are joining global processes, creating a favorable economic climate for business, which aggravates cross-country competition to attract TNC enterprises to these countries;

9. Globalization processes (low trade tariffs, availability of information on the proposed technologies, etc.) facilitate the purchase by domestic entrepreneurs of new licensed technologies for the manufacturing industries. States and business should make the necessary efforts to train specialists and labor to master such technologies and produce competitive products;

10. Installations and prescriptions of the WTO and global credit institutions to some extent weaken the capabilities of domestic producers due to the pressure of competing imports and a certain difficulty in exports, because the use of mechanisms for its subsidization is limited. However, the possibility of supporting and protecting national business is still allowed: subsidies and compensation fees can be applied in accordance with the article on subsidies and countervailing measures of the GATT (of which the WTO is the successor), the Agreement on Agriculture, the Agreement on Textile Products. In the form of temporary measures, anti-dumping measures and countervailing duties (discriminatory measures for individual countries and individual trading partners) and tariffs and quotas are applied to compensate for fair competition with imports detrimental to the local industry (non-discriminatory measures applied to all partners). Non-tariff methods of regulation are also used that are not provided for in WTO agreements and do not contradict them. Permanent measures are also practiced (general exemption from obligations), which must be officially approved by the WTO Council [Турбан Г., 2010, p. 431] and are provided only in rare cases.

11. Under the influence of globalization processes, in order to adapt to them, the functions of government in individual countries are changing. In successfully developing countries, national systems supporting neo-industrial development and, consequently, business are becoming increasingly sophisticated.

In the 90s, as we know, state support for structural sectoral (industrial) policies began to be limited (by the attitudes of global economic organizations) to. However, the range of economic policy objectives in

2003 was complemented by the creation of national innovation systems, designed to perform part of the functions that were traditionally associated with industrial policy (Ананьин О., Хаиткулов Р., Шестаков Д., 2010, p. 23). As we know, government support for the innovation sector is encouraged by global economic organizations and is intensively used in many countries (Abesadze R., Burduli V., 2011).

Of course, structural sectoral (industrial) policies (Burduli V., 1996; Burduli V., 2004, p. 222-254, 332-338; Кузин Д., 1993; Хруцкий В., 1992) has not lost its significance even now, more precisely, its value is increasing more and more (see, for example, V. Kondratiev's article "Fresh breath of industrial policy" (Кондратьев В. 2014)). *It is more accurate to call industrial policy "structural sectoral policy", since its range of tasks includes coordination of the development not only of industries, but also of agriculture, construction, etc. (in Germany, it has long been originally designated as "sectoral structural policy" (Белов В., Баранова К., 2010)); at the same time, it is possible to identify separate areas in it, for example: the policy of ensuring food security; the policy of coordinated development of agricultural production, providing light industry with raw materials, and relevant sectors of this industry (textile, leather and footwear); support policies for export-oriented industries, import-substituting industries, etc.* However, the role and importance of individual instruments of structural sectoral (industrial) policy has changed. For example, it became limited to direct subsidies for the export of industrial products, subsidies for activities and exports of agricultural enterprises associated with the direct growth of agricultural products, as well as subsidies for food exports in

general (that is, industrially processed agricultural products and unprocessed ones). Non-innovation support has shifted to a greater extent towards indirect regulatory methods (tax, financial and credit), although in some developed and developing countries there are different types of funds supporting industry development. And in agriculture, support is governed by the conditions of the so-called "yellow", "blue" and "green" baskets of the WTO (Abesadze R., Burduli V., Datunashvili L., 2011; Burduli V., Datunashvili L., 2012).

Another circumstance that we want to note is the need for a rational combination of structural, industrial (structural sectoral), regional (structural regional) and innovation policies, as well as business coordination in the private sector (according to the Association Agreement of Georgia with the EU - "Enterprise policies"), since the degree of interrelation between the mechanisms for their coordination depends on the effectiveness of development and functioning of innovation systems, in particular, and the economy, in general. The role of innovation policy, which in developed countries is becoming an essential component of structural policy, is growing more and more. So, E. Smirnov calls it an innovative vector of industrial policy, the importance of which is increasing (Смирнов Е., 2016). As is known, Georgia has signed the Association Agreement (Association ...) with the EU, in the provisions of which the "structural policy" is shown in the broad sense, then "industrial policy" and "innovation policy" are clearly defined as an integral part of industrial policy and "Enterprise policy" as well. In the study (Структурная политика ..., 2018), all dots above the "i" are placed: structural policy is viewed as in-

dustrial policy in a broader sense, and innovative and regional policies are its most important components.

Formulated in a number of scientific developments, modern principles of neoliberal politics [The Barselona ..., 2008; Стиглиц Дж., 1998], some of which are already reflected in the attitudes and regulations of global international organizations, allow states to modernize economic policies within certain limits, reacting to current short-term and long-term circumstances, and in particular, to modernize measures aimed at supporting the non-industrial sector development.

The relationship between the development of technological structures and the transformation of organizational and institutional systems.

The development of the technological structure of the economy (and more precisely the technological structure) is closely interconnected with the development of organizational and institutional forms of business and the mechanisms of state regulation of economic development. When studying this interdependence, it is necessary to proceed from the fact that the processes occurring in a modern globalizing economy can be explained with a sufficient degree of reliability on the basis of the complementarity (synthesis) of realistic provisions of both old and relatively new economic theories, which is actually substantiated, for example, in the monograph (Papava V., 2011). The interconnection and interdependence of the development of a set of technologies and providing an institutional-organizational economic superstructure help to comprehend the relevant developments of some classics of economics (Hamilton W., 1919; Shumpeter J, 1939; Веблен Т., 2007; Кондратьев Н., 2002).

In addition, at different times, especially in the last period, many scientific papers have been published explaining certain aspects of this interdependence, for example (Мокыр J., 1999; Murphy K. M., Shlifer A., Wishny R. M., 1989; Rosenberg N., 1982; Глазьев С. Возможности ...; Сизякина М., 2008; и др.). Of particular interest is the approach of M. Sizyagina, in which, in the context of the T. Veblen-C. Airs dichotomy between the industry (technology system) and business, first, it is shown that technologies have their own set of institutional relationships and structures, second, institutions are considered as social technologies; third, it is stated that technology development "requires the participation of many complementary and interdependent actors, including, along with business organizations and state educational centers, research institutes, technical societies, trade unions and others. ". Naturally, the system of institutions, in addition to social, includes business technologies, technologies of state and global regulation, and they are implemented through specific organizations (corporations, various forms of small and medium business, systems of state and global regulation, etc.) and the relationship between them. Organizations included the author of the term "institutionalism" William Hamilton himself, who under institutions meant customs, corporations, trade unions, the state, etc. (Hamilton W., 1919). In our work (Tsereteli G., Burduli V., 2004), when classifying institutions and characterizing their relationship with the structure of production, it was argued that organizations should be included in the system of institutions, since their structure and attitudes also change (taking into account a certain time lag) under the impact of technology development and their characteristic formal and informal institutions. Therefore,

institutions should be viewed in a broad sense as institutions, organizations, related norms, rules and procedures that form the regulatory mechanisms for the transactions of their agents [Иншаков О., 2010]. Compromise technological interpretation of institutions allows us to develop their understanding of “not so much as “restrictions” of behavior, but rather as certain effective ways of activity” (Nelson R. R., 2002, p. 22), and “forming a holistic theory of economic development and crises involves the synthesis of institutional and technological paradigms based on the recognition of the key role of institutions in the progress of transformational and transactional technologies” (Фролов Д., 2011, p. 28), which we pointed out in our works (Burduli V., Burduli K., 2008; Бурдули В., Церетели Г., 1998). Taking into account the above considerations, the relationship between the development of the technological structure of the economy and the backbone institutional and organizational structure of production and its state and global regulation in the framework of economic conjuncture cycles is considered below.

Recently, new approaches have been formed, linking the impact of the level of development of the technological structure on the state of the economy and economic relations in both in-country and international (global) aspects. The substantive theory in this direction is the theory of long-term technical and economic development (Глазьев С. Возможности ...; Глазьев С., 2009), especially from the point of view of interpreting the causes of economic crises in general and the last world economic crisis in particular.

In this theory, techno-economic development is presented as a process of consistent replacement of large complexes of technologically related industries and is shown

how the structure of the technological mode changes, the institutional and organizational forms of its market and state coordination and regulation change in the course of the impact of long waves of economic conditions (Кондратьев Н., 2002), the production complexes of a new technological order are emerging in the depths of the dominant order in a certain period of time and how this order is gradually transformed into a subsequent, more developed, technological way with the corresponding infrastructure of market coordination and state (and interstate) regulation.

According to this concept (Глазьев С. Возможности ...; Глазьев С., 2009), starting from the industrial revolution in England up to now, five technological structures have consistently changed, and now in the depths of the fifth technological order, the sixth is born, and life cycles of technological structures are gradually shrinking as the NTP accelerates and the duration of research and production cycles decreases. In each technological order, the key factors of the technological structure are identified, that form its core and the set of supporting industries; a period of dominance of the technological structure is also established. So, the key factor of the 4th technological order (1930-1970) was the internal combustion engine and petrochemistry, and the core was the automobile, tractor construction, nonferrous metallurgy, durable goods, synthetic materials, organic chemistry, oil production and processing. At the same time, the core of the new (5th) technological order was being formed. In the fifth technological order (1970–2010), the key factor was microelectronic components, the core - the electronics industry, computing, fiber optic equipment, software, telecommunications, robotics, gas production and processing, information services.

In each order, the supporting industries of the technological order are distinguished. In our opinion, almost all existing sectors of the real, financial and other sectors of the economy are carrying branches, because under the influence of scientific and technological progress (to a greater or lesser extent, the product of the key factor and the core take part in their technologies) their continuous development occurs, as a result of which the proportions of the sectoral structure of the economy (in terms of production, employment, etc.) change in accordance with the specifics of each technological order.

In this regard, it should be noted that one should not underestimate the role of some traditional activities that are fundamental in any technological structure, so it is also necessary to include them in the structure of supporting industries of newer technological structures (Бурдули В., 2009), despite the fact that technological development opportunities of some of them, for example, the textile and food industries, have to a certain extent reached saturation, and investment in innovative technological re-equipment in these sectors is lower than in the industries that form the core of the technological order and in most of the supporting industries. Moreover, in some periods the technological lag of some traditional industries becomes problematic even in developed countries. This was the case, for example, in the 70s with the textile industry in Europe (Ж.-П. Бландиньер, 2010. p. 13), and later, problems with the technological lag of this industry arose in the United States. It is impossible to exaggerate the role of some new, partly "virtual" sectors, the oversaturation of which manifests itself in the downward wave of the life cycle of the technological structure. At the same time, it should be noted that in the process

of development of the technological structure, the capital market cannot accurately identify the necessary production volumes of a developing industry, in the process of scientific and technical progress occurs not only capital flows into new industries, but also the release of workers from the sphere of material and other production sectors, and there is also a need to attract them to a new industry, ensuring the functioning of production at a new stage of technological development, i.e. redistributing of employees, ensuring the release of workers with work in new sectors of activity.

Thus, the place of both traditional (old) and new industries is determined in the process of technological development, and the redundancy of certain technologies is detected only on a downward wave of cycles (especially long wave) of economic conjuncture. The costs of development of technological structures are inevitable, their decrease can be facilitated only by a well-thought-out policy of state regulation (and now regulation by global and regional interstate organizations) of the market.

With the development of technological orders, there is also a change in the institutional and organizational structures of production, which are mainly determined by the inherent properties of the technological orders, and there is also a sector specificity of changes, which is more pronounced in the context of large production sectors. Thus, in the process of development of the 5th technological mode in industry, network forms of organizing production have been greatly developed. The Fordist method of management and organization of production to some extent gives way to the network principle (Абесадзе Р., 2011; Бландиньер Ж.-П., 2010), organized industrial and innovation clusters are formed vertically and horizontally (in the context of

regions), the principles of interaction of large, medium and small enterprises, forms of competition of enterprises that become more and more global, change.

The development of technological structures is accompanied by a change in the institutional and organizational forms of market coordination and state and global regulation of the economy. Many of these forms are developing under the influence of the characteristics of the emerging technological structures and they must be attributed to the system of immanent factors that characterize the technological structure. However, some are formed under the influence of political factors, the dominant views in society on the coordination of economic development and other factors that are subjective in relation to the immanent development of technological structures. S. Glazyev considers this process in the following context: regimes of state regulation in the leading countries; international regulatory regimes; major economic institutions; organization of innovative activity in the leading countries (Глазьев С. Возможности ...). Adhering to this systematization, we list the main characteristics of these parameters in the framework of the 5th technological order.

Under the conditions of the development of the 5th technological order, the Keynesian methods of regulation were replaced by neoliberal methods, there was a significant decrease in the intensity of state regulation, including regulation of financial markets and capital markets. To some extent, there was a weakening of the trade union movement, connected, in particular, with the aforementioned decline in the role of Fordist methods of regulation and organization of production in favor of networking. State support for small and medium businesses increased, but when the financial and eco-

nomical crisis hit in 2008, most countries preferred financial support from large banks and industrial corporations, but indirect tax and financial regulation methods increased everywhere. In general, measures of state support for the economy and the social sphere (the latter supports demand) increased significantly during the crisis. They are temporary in nature, although the possibility of prolonging the actions of some fiscal and financial-credit methods of regulation introduced during the crisis is not excluded.

In international regulatory regimes, the role of regional inter-country regulatory bodies (especially in the EU) and global economic organizations (IMF, GATT-WTO, etc.) has increased. Among the main economic institutions the role of large national and transnational corporations with modern technologies became even more active, but the role of outsourcing greatly increased, which initiated the formation of many medium and small enterprises within developed countries and the development of production in a number of developing countries, including NIS. In the field of information technology, there has been an international integration of small and medium-sized firms. All this contributed to the development of network methods of organization and management. In many industries, the integration of production and sales occurred during this period, which reduced the number of intermediaries.

In the field of organization of innovations: there was a development of innovative and industrial-innovation zones; state support for new technologies has increased; forms of cooperation between universities and research institutes with production have developed; new modes of ownership have appeared for the intellectual, in particular, software, product and biotechnology; in the

USA and some other countries, and more recently in China, an innovative venture business has developed; before the crisis, innovative activity in large corporations increased, but during the crisis a number of corporations experienced a certain failure, but it is obvious that it will increase again, especially in connection with the needs of the new technological order.

Currently, the fifth technological order in developed countries is at the end of a downward wave of a large cycle of economic conditions, which, in particular, is evidenced in one way or another by the crises of the late 90s of the twentieth century (financial crisis, the beginning of the IT crisis) and the first decades of the twenty-first century - IT crisis, energy-ecological, food and, finally, the most serious, financial and economic, which, despite the measures taken by the government regulation, has a certain loop in the temporal aspect. This is evident, in particular, from the low GDP growth rates of developed countries and the high levels of unemployment in many countries. The fact that during the final stage of a downward wave of a large cycle of economic conjuncture a series of economic crises continues for a certain period, was established in N. D. Kondratieff's theory (based on an empirical analysis of previous periods) (Кондратьев Н., 2002) and is confirmed as predicted by him economic events of the 30s of the twentieth century, and modern events as well.

The fact of the development of technological structures in the framework of long and other waves of economic conditions is confirmed by the collapse of the value of the property of new leading industries in the framework of long and other waves of economic conditions in the stock markets. So, during the crisis of 2000-2001 the market value of the "new economy" companies

collapsed on average by 60%, while in general their collapse cost investors almost 0.5 trillion US doll. (Иванова Н., Данилин И., 2010, p. 26). Such situations of the emergence, according to modern terminology, of "bubbles" in the process of overheating, and then deterioration of the conjuncture in new industries, occurred in the earlier technological patterns. Thus, during the "construction of railways in the nineteenth century there was a speculative rise in the value of companies involved in this area, followed by the collapse of many of them. Nevertheless, this construction served as a powerful stimulus for overall economic growth" (Иванова Н., Данилин И., 2010, p. 27). However, IT sector companies survived during the recent crisis and continue to operate successfully, despite the fact that their stock value has sharply declined. The nature of the "creeping" food crisis of 2005–2008, when food prices were steadily rising in the world, is also associated with the conditions for the development of the 5th technological order and the emergence in its depths of production of the new 6th technological order. So, one of the main reasons for the increase in food prices is the fact that in a number of countries food crops are used to produce biofuels (Архипов В., 2009, p. 51). Technologies for the production of biofuels are also new, although it is not known how appropriate their wide inclusion in the technological structure of the new technological order is, since their appearance, in addition to the impact of higher food prices, caused a serious additional burden on the planet's already depleted land resources. The lessons of this crisis also indicate how important it is to correctly define the role of traditional industries, in this case agriculture, in the modern technological order.

Finally, let's talk about the current financial and economic crisis of 2008. How much does it fit into the theory of long-term technical and economic development and the theory of long waves of economic conjuncture cycles? As you know, the root cause of the crisis was overheating in the financial sector, which caused, in particular, the collapse of the US mortgage loan market, then the collapse of an incomparably larger, mostly "virtual" in essence, derivatives market. Other deep crises also began with the collapse of financial markets. In particular, the crisis of 1929 also began with the collapse of the stock market, then went over to the banking sector and manifested itself in an overproduction crisis that affected all major sectors of the real sector due to a decrease in effective demand caused by an unprecedented increase in unemployment. And the root causes of this lay in deepening the inconsistency of the technological structure of the market with the needs of the disparity of prices for industrial and agricultural products, the release of workers in industry, agriculture and other industries due to the development of technology and the inability of the business sector to switch to other activities in a timely manner.

One of the main reasons that triggered the outbreak of the 2008 crisis was a colossal "overheating" in the sphere of new "technologies" of the financial market, namely, the derivatives market, which indicates the separation of the "virtual" part of the financial sector from the real economy, credit operations and financing demand and production. But, unfortunately, this also affected the ability of the "real" financial sector to finance material production, which was the reason for the assistance of the states in this part of the financial sector. The difficulties that have arisen in the sector of

material production and services in developed countries due to the lag and deepening of the mismatch of the technological structure with the needs of the market, this time to a certain extent have been alleviated by the recent increase in demand in developing countries, the transfer of technology investments to developing countries where the saturation of the market with modern technologies was lower (although there was a decline in production during the crisis). That is, the globalization factor, to a certain extent, smoothed the depth of the crisis and the current crisis at the stage of the downward wave of the large cycle of the 5th technological order conjuncture did not entail such serious consequences as the crisis of 1929-1933. However, its manifestations are not over yet. To accelerate overcoming its impact on the economy, the state and society should orient the constitutional and organizational forms of coordination and regulation to accelerate the development of both traditional and new industries in accordance with the requirements of the 6th technological mode in the modernization of traditional and other supporting industries and the development of new, key industries constituting the core of the key structure.

Even knowing what new promising technologies originated in the depths of the fifth dominant technological order, it is difficult to determine with great certainty the technology of the key factor of the new technological order. Assumptions about the content of key technologies are expressed in various publications. Apparently, as noted in the previous paragraph, the key technologies that in one way or another influence the nature of technologies in all sectors without exception will be cognitive (cognitive), nano-, bio- and information-communication technologies, environmentally friendly energy sources, perhaps, electric-

battery engines (if small enough, sufficiently capacious batteries can be created), etc. The core represents industries based on these technologies, whose products will be used as raw materials and technology in other industries.

Let us now consider the possible directions of development of institutional and organizational forms of coordination and regulation of the economy.

In the field of state coordination and regulation, in particular, in the conditions of the recent crises, the inefficiency of the neoliberal regulatory mechanism has emerged. In order to neutralize the crisis processes that have arisen during the last financial and economic crisis most countries began to apply methods of direct financing for the production of crisis sectors and sectors of the economy and additional investments as well in the social sphere (temporarily), as well as additional indirect methods of tax and financial credit regulation. It is obvious that some states will reconsider to a certain extent approaches to state regulation (which, however, in some areas is limited by the guidelines of the WTO and other international organizations). There are reactive and proactive systems of government regulation (Кузин Д., 1993). Reactive regulation begins when negative events in the economy have already occurred. This was done in most countries during the crisis that began in 2008. Proactive regulation provides for proactive measures in order to prevent or smooth out the manifestation of crisis or other negative phenomena in the economy. Such regulation was widely used in European countries, especially within all varieties of the continental model, during the period of dominance of the Keynesian regulatory model, then the intensity of proactive regulation gradually subsided, but still used in some countries, which allowed

them to mitigate the crisis, but to do it in full failed everywhere. It seems that, taking into account the increasing frequency of crises and the experience of the modern, deepest crisis since the Great Depression, in many countries the regime of continuous proactive regulation will somewhat intensify.

In the development of international regulatory regimes, it is obvious that, besides the EU, the role of other large regional organizations will increase. Some changes in the attitudes of the WTO, on the basis of negotiations and the establishment of consensus between developed, developing and other countries, are also supposed to be expected. What should be the attitudes of a small country, in particular, Georgia, which is in the period of post-communist transformation of the economy, in the field of technology development and bringing the sectoral structure of the economy into a state that meets the requirements of the modern technological structure? In our opinion, firstly, in the structure of the economy, it is necessary to restore the role of some traditional industries based on the use of modern technologies in them. Secondly, to diversify production on the basis of medium and small enterprises based on new, widely used technologies of the 5th technological order. Thirdly, it is necessary to navigate one or several new industries from the core of the modern technological order (for example, the health care industries, or a slightly wider range of industries, in sizes that are within the potential of a small country) and focus the business environment on development of production in selected industries, with appropriate support from the state and the public. Such development should be ensured by further improving the mechanisms for coordinating and regulating the economy, taking into account the

trends occurring in the regulatory systems of developed and most successful developing countries and taking into account the prescriptions of international regulatory bodies.

Transformation of the organizational and institutional structures of the economy in the context of globalization.

The economic forms of modern globalization are the result of the development of technological structures, i.e. the result of the interconnected development of technological, sectoral, institutional and organizational structures. They are related to the spreading and distribution of new and traditional technologies in the economic sectors of various countries, the international diffusion of innovations, the emergence of global and intercountry regional institutions of regulation and coordination, the characteristics of intercountry capital flow and productivity growth, the sharp development of international trade and production cooperative ties and international scientific and technical cooperation, with the deepening of managerial relationships (in state and knowledge structures) within individual states, on an intergovernmental regional and global scale, strengthening the role and activity of TNCs, developing and redefining the role of medium and small enterprises, individual entrepreneurship, the growing role of network methods of organizing and managing production, developing vertically and horizontally (in terms of regions) organized clusters.

The economic roots of modern globalization arose much earlier, before the term “globalization” arose after the 70s. In the process of globalization, together with the development of technology, the forms of intrastate and interstate capital overflow are changing, significant changes occur in the

system of commodity exchange (in particular, export-import volumes in world trade are constantly growing and now have reached 60% of world GDP (Шишков Ю., 2010, p. 8)), forms of ownership and management are developing, the role of resource-saving and intellectual technologies is growing, the innovation component of technological structures has long gone beyond individual countries. The growth of the global population requires the continuous growth of traditional branches of material production in the context of their modernization. Acceleration of technological development causes, on the one hand, the release of part of workers in traditional industries, and on the other hand, the emergence of new activities that have an increasingly strong influence on the formation and change of the structure of employees, leads to the direction of increasing efforts to solve problems associated with sectoral, technological and regional restructuring of the economy and reducing unemployment.

At the same time, in modern conditions, in the coordination of sectoral development, along with the process of globalization, the process of regionalization is also developing (both in the intercountry aspect and in the context of individual countries and their regions). For example, the process of in-country regionalization (increasing the role of in-country regions in coordinating economic development) is due to the objective conditions for the development of modern technological structures in the context of globalization and its manifestation began long ago, back in the 70s of the 20th century (Didier P., 1989; Martin P., Nonn H., 1989; Абесадзе Р., Бурдули В., 2011; Лопатников Д., 2006).

Together with the development of globalization, the growth in the number and the gradual evolution of the functions of global

and intercountry lending and regulatory bodies, the functions of state and regional intra-state coordination bodies are changing, and they are being adapted to new conditions. Spontaneous reaction of local societies to objective processes caused by the development of technological structures and conditions of globalization is the tendency to restructure institutional and organizational structures, which can be traced "at all levels of society's life - from firms and communities to integration blocks of states. One of the paradoxes of globalization is that it goes hand in hand with localization processes: there is an increase in the economic and political role of local communities that find themselves drawn into a complex system of global connections and dependencies. This opens up new opportunities for them and at the same time creates new threats, forcing them to independently look for means of adaptation to new conditions" (Иванов Н., 2008, p. 4). For successful development in the new conditions, local communities must find ways to coordinate their development and incorporate into the systems of international and domestic cooperation that are adequate to these conditions, which will ensure the competitiveness of their firms both domestically (which is open to competing goods in the context of globalization) and internationally.

It should be noted that at the local (country and in-country regional) level, the response to the challenges of globalization and adaptation to them is often delayed. To some extent, this is typical for all post-Soviet countries that are in a transformational period, in which the existing technological structure in many industries is quite backward and does not comply with the principles of neo-industrial development. In particular, the share of production systems with a high stage of generating added value (that is,

with a high degree of processing from raw materials to final products) is small, the spread of modern forms of industrial cooperation (including in the innovation sphere) the development of modern export-oriented systems and import-substituting enterprises is late. Therefore, a theoretical understanding of the challenges of globalization and the development of prerequisites for the creation at the levels of the country and its regions of a modern economy based on ensuring sustainable neo-industrial development and improving the regulatory mechanism of this process are necessary. Despite the fact that in Georgia, as is evident from indices of rating agencies, the institutional and prudential mechanism is much more favorable for business development than in many other countries, it is necessary to further improve it in order to achieve a higher rate of sustainable neo-industrial development in comparison with rates typical for the current period, especially in the development of production systems that provide a high stage of processing (for example, in industry it is necessary to orient not only on the creation of assembly plants, but on the creation of a set of industries that provide the maximum possible processing from raw materials and materials to the final product). In the context of globalization, due to increased competition, the need to expand sales markets for products and services, the need to reduce production costs through the use of cheaper labor and other favorable conditions, an increasingly important role is played by inter-country movement of capital flows (primarily in the form of technology). The process of transferring to developing countries not only traditional technologies, but also IT technologies, automation systems for mechanical processes, flexible technologies and other high-tech technologies, especially in countries with a

large consumer market or with preferential opportunities to export products to other countries are occurring (for example, by participating in interstate regional associations). Those developing countries that have favorably oriented regulatory systems for attracting modern technologies are able to develop at the most modern level.

The transformation of redistribution systems (capital, technology, diffusion of innovations, growth of labor productivity, and within countries — budget revenues and expenditures) is primarily determined by the conditions of developing inter-country and in-country markets, which change as a result of technology development, demand conditions and market coordination. Systems of global, intercountry, regional, state, and domestic coordination and regulation are also experiencing transformation as a result of the action of modern exogenous and endogenous realities, but as a result of the pressure of some factors (special interest groups, the need to achieve a compromise of interests between different countries and within countries between different population groups etc.) the necessary decisions are often made late. As a result of the development of network forms of organization and production management in the context of globalization, a profound reorganization of the mode of production occurred (Бландиньер Ж.-П., 2010, p. 3), which is embodied in changing the structure and scale of production in TNCs, in changing the forms of interaction between large corporations, medium and small firms and, domestically and internationally, within certain types of activities (especially in IT and some other new technologies), in the emergence of networks of medium and small firms. Network methods of organization and interconnections ensure close co-

operation of business entities in the framework of common information, scientific, technical, financial and marketing networks, thereby reducing production costs. Such cooperation does not exclude competition within networks and increases competition between networks in the global market (Иванов Н., 2008, p. 5).

For developing countries and for countries whose economies are at the stage of post-Soviet transformation, the problem of sectoral and technological diversification of production at the level of the country as a whole and its regions is becoming increasingly urgent. In the context of globalization, new and modernized traditional technologies, especially IT and flexible technologies, automation systems for mechanical processes, etc., the processes of outsourcing and franchising, which under the conditions of development of network structures and corresponding forms of industrial cooperation, make it possible to increase the role of small and fast medium-sized enterprises, as well as divisions of high-tech TNCs at the local level (small and medium-sized countries and their regions). Also within these local entities, industrial cooperation of local enterprises is developing, both as a whole with TNCs and with their enterprises located at local levels. The liberalization of international trade, as well as opportunities for TNCs, favor the export sales of their products. Therefore, the diversification of production on the basis of these mechanisms, ensuring a high stage of product processing in the corresponding production systems, is an important factor that has arisen in the context of globalization for the effective neo-industrial development of production (particularly in small countries and their regions), which makes it possible to master and use modern technologies.

To solve these problems of diversification of production, local communities (small and medium-sized countries and their regions) create a favorable investment environment on their territory, in particular: create convenient tax systems for investment and production; with the participation of businesses, they create the necessary financial systems, train specialists and labor through creating the necessary training systems, create the necessary transport communications and modern product promotion systems, as well as other elements of the production infrastructure, including utilities, develop the main and regional centers of attraction (Burduli V., 2006; Burduli V., Arevadze N., 2010, p. 89, 92). Special economic zones (industrial and innovative-industrial nature) are an extreme form, which makes it possible to diversify production at the level of local communities.

Thus, to solve in Georgia the tasks that stem from the challenges of globalization in achieving sustainable and accelerated neo-industrial development of the country, such as the formation of a modern sectoral and technological structure, the accelerated development of industry and agriculture, innovation and agro-industrial complexes, the development of centers of gravity, improvement of business structures in economic sectors, diversification of the economy in the country and its regions, development of regional service systems The development of organizational and institutional systems for the coordination of social and economic development in the country as a whole and in its regions is necessary.

This primarily involves the development of an appropriate strategy in which must be defined:

- ways to improve the system of distribution of powers between the central, regional and local governments;

- at all levels of management ways to improve the institutional structure;

- the task of becoming a modern technological structure. This means at the country level as a whole and in terms of its regions (taking into account the conditions and characteristics of the regions) the choice (in cities and rural areas) of priority sectors, the development and implementation of policies to stimulate the development of centers of gravity (central, industrial hubs, innovation centers, etc.), determining the development paths of export-oriented, import-oriented and other relevant industries based on the creation of auxiliary and production facilities necessary for their functioning;

- ways to diversify production (in cities and rural areas) in the country as a whole and in the context of its regions;

- along with large cities, the development of centers of attraction of small and medium sizes;

- ways to stimulate the development of the necessary for the main production of the real sector of auxiliary services and firms (in rural areas) characteristic of a market economy;

- ways of establishing an effective in modern conditions relationship between large, medium and small enterprises, as well as - the relationship between attracted foreign enterprises and the development of national entrepreneurship.

To implement the neo-industrial development strategy and ensure the implementation of sectoral (industrial) policies, it is necessary to further improve the mechanisms of coordination and regulation of such development. This is especially important for a country under the post-communist transformation and it involves both at country and local (regional, local) levels

coordinating the development of market institutions and organizations (financial, production) and government regulation tools. It should be borne in mind that neoindustrial development involves not only the development of new and traditional high-tech industries, but also the creation of an industry structure in which the traditional industries that satisfy the main material needs of a human being (fabric and clothing, footwear and other leather goods) occupy an appropriate place. Meanwhile, production in these sectors in Georgia after the post-communist collapse of the economy has sharply declined, which declines agricultural production as well. The impossibility of marketing the corresponding raw materials (wool, leather, silkworm cocoons) makes many agricultural enterprises unprofitable, and production in agriculture is declining. Therefore, in the neo-industrial development strategy, together with the provision of favorable conditions for the development of high-tech industries, it is necessary to provide measures to stimulate business in order to reanimate these industries on a new technological basis.

The improvement of **the fiscal mechanism** aimed at ensuring neoindustrial development involves improving the tax rate system (in particular, introducing the progressiveness of the income tax rate), introducing a system of tax incentives focused on stimulating accelerated development and creating an enabling environment for priority industries, which is practiced in various forms in developed and many developing countries (Burduli V. 2008; Бурдули В., 2016). In some countries, special lines are allocated in the budgets (permanently or temporarily) to support the priority sectors (industries) of the private sector, which are used either directly (now within the framework of the rules established by the WTO)

or with the help of organizations created for this purpose (for example, development banks) and supported by legislation (as an example, the Japanese law of 1983 “On special measures to improve the structure of certain industries” (Хруцкий В., p. 100). In a number of countries, there are special organizations for coordinating the food market and supporting the export of agricultural products (see: Добросоцкий В., 2000)).

The fiscal mechanism of Georgia requires improvement from the point of view that at the regional (district) level there is no fiscal system. This is when, in the context of globalization, the functions of regional coordination in developed countries are growing, especially in the area of business support and the creation of a production structure on a regional scale. At present, the competition for the attraction of real foreign capital, equipped with modern technologies, and, above all, TNC enterprises, has greatly intensified among developing countries. “After all, along with the branches of TNCs, new production technologies are coming, access to the much-desired capital resources is opening, and most importantly, it is possible to use well-known brands and distribution networks to enter the markets of large countries” [Шишков Ю., 2010, p. 8]. Taking this into account, and also taking into account the fact that it is impossible to create a full-fledged industrial (branch) complex based on modern technologies in any country, especially in a small one, it is necessary to envisage fiscal and other institutional preferences for the functioning of TNC enterprises in the country and other companies equipped with modern technologies (suitable for placement in the country) of the real sector (this does not apply to agriculture, since with the extensive involvement of foreigners in it, would leach of the national producer from rural areas).

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2018 /Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Burduli V., Abesadze R., (2018) Transformation Of Industrial, Technological And Organizational And Institutional Structures Of The Country Economy In The Con-ditions Of Integration Processes Of Globalization. *International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences*, 2 (8) 2018: 13-42

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924)

The granting of such preferences can be negotiated on the basis of separate negotiations with companies intending to locate their enterprises in the country (if the reasonability of their involvement is justified), which is accepted in international practice ("in the area of international direct investment migration, a sovereign state has to agree with a quasi-sovereign TNC" (Шишков Ю., 2010, p. 9)). It is naturally necessary to encourage the purchase and development of modern technologies of the real sector by domestic entrepreneurs.

The financial policy in the country should be more clearly aimed at stimulating (within the framework of the rules established by the WTO) the establishment of enterprises based on technologies characteristic of modern technological structures, in order to accelerate the formation of a neo-industrial type of industry structure in the country. The already well-developed system of private banks in the country with the help of state-regulated banking instruments needs to be more clearly focused on increasing the volume of long-term lending for the development of priority sectors, through the appropriate use of central bank's regulatory mechanisms. For developed countries, the presence of financial-industrial groups is typical, within which the financing of industrial development by commercial banks is facilitated. In addition, in developed countries there are private and state development funds or investment funds for additional financing in the form of subsidies for priority industrial and agricultural enterprises within the framework of the rules established by the WTO regulations and recommendations of global credit organizations. In Georgia, at present, there is a private, rather large co-investment fund and a state-owned partner fund. Ways to

improve the performance of these funds based on their specific reorganization, as well as ways to create financial-industrial groups in Georgia are presented in our work (Бурдули В., 2016). To subsidize agricultural production currently exists a separate procedure regulated by the WTO. A number of our works suggests ways of expediently subsidizing agricultural development within the framework of the relevant WTO guidelines (Abesadze R., Burduli V., Datunashvili L., 2011; Burduli V., Datunashvili L., 2012).

At the state level as a whole, as well as at the level of its regions and local entities, the further development of the institutional mode of management is necessary (in public and private enterprises, as well as between them and between the state and private enterprises). Following the example of developed countries, the variety of mechanisms for the economic management of state-owned enterprises should grow, as well as the variety of contracts between the state and private enterprises for the execution of works ordered by state, regional and local authorities. Also of great importance is the development of institutional relations, which are carried out on the basis of dialogue and conclusion of contracts between state and regional bodies, on the one hand, and entrepreneurs, on the other, on state preferences and business obligations. The development of modern institutional relations in rural areas based on the creation of branch associations of owners, the formation of state, mixed and private specialized auxiliary enterprises, organizations, firms and farms and the allocation of subsidies to agricultural producers for the development of primary production is particularly relevant.

Conclusions.

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2018 /Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Burduli V., Abesadze R., (2018) Transformation Of Industrial, Technological And Organizational And Institutional Structures Of The Country Economy In The Con-ditions Of Integration Processes Of Globalization. *International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences*,2 (8) 2018: 13-42

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924)

Technological development and the development of economic mechanisms of globalization are interrelated and interdependent processes. They influence the formation of sectoral structures in individual countries, and also determine the corresponding development of institutional and organizational structures of business both at the global level and in individual countries. Under the influence of technological progress in the context of globalization, global, regional intercountry and country authorities and mechanisms of coordination and regulation are also being improved and adapted to new conditions.

Countries that are adapting to globalization conditions in a timely manner and, above all, capable of a sustainable perception of technological progress in the context of globalization, are successfully moving to the modern neo-industrial stage of development.

For the formation of an effective sectoral structure characteristic of neo-industrial development, it is important to master the experience of successfully developing countries in systematizing and evaluating the effectiveness of sectoral and technological

structures and the priority of individual industries and technologies, as well as in institutional and organizational support of neo-industrial development of the sectoral structure business. Research and systematization of these processes are conducted in this article.

The tasks of creating an effective sectoral structure of the neoindustrial type in the context of globalization in the country undergoing post-communist transformation, particularly in Georgia, imply further improvement of sectoral and technological structure evaluation systems (with a corresponding development of statistical reporting methods and their processing), business organization systems and, of course, the state coordination systems promoting its development (taking into account the critical assessment and perception of this experience). This will ensure a deeper integration of the country's economy into the system of global and interstate regional cooperative (including through the involvement of TNC enterprises) and trade relations, the formation of a neo-industrial branch structure, the achievement of high and rational employment and sustainable socio-economic development.

References:

1. Abesadze R., Burduli V., Datunashvili L. (2011). *Problems of regulation of the country's food security (in Georgian)*. – Proceedings of Scientific Works of Paata Gugushvili Institute of Economics of TSU. Tbilisi. Georgia.
2. Abesadze R., Burduli V. (2011). *Innovative Activities and their Coordination under Advancing Globalization*. – The Caucasus & Globalization. Volume 3. Issue 4. CA&CC Press. SWEDEN.
3. Abesadze R. (2011). *High technology and economic development (in Georgian)*. - In the collection: Actual Economic Problems under Globalization. Tbilisi. Georgia.
4. Abesadze R. (2011). *Some Theoretical Aspects of Economic Development – The Caucasus & Globalization*. Volume 5. Issue 4. CA&CC Press. SWEDEN.

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2018 /Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Burduli V., Abesadze R., (2018) Transformation Of Industrial, Technological And Organizational And Institutional Structures Of The Country Economy In The Con-ditions Of Integration Processes Of Globalization. *International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences*, 2 (8) 2018: 13-42

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924)

5. *Association Agreement between, on the one hand, the EU and the European Atomic Energy Association and their member countries, on the other hand, Georgia* (in Georgian).
6. Ayres C.E. (1962). *The Theory of Economic Progress*. New York: Shocken Books.
7. Burduli V., Arevadze N. (2010). *Regional Factors of Employment Growth and their Influence on Economic Development (Georgian Case Study)*. – The Caucasus & Globalization. Volume 4. Issue 1-2. CA&CC Press. SWEDEN.
8. Burduli V., Burduli K. (2008). *The need to establish the relationship between the institutional and technological development of the real and financial sectors of the economy in Georgia and its regions (in Georgian)*. – Б сб.: Collection of Scientific Works of Paata Gugushvili Institute of Economics. Volume I. Tbilisi. Georgia.
9. Burduli V., Datunashvili L. (2012). *Food security of the country as an object of regulation (in Georgian)*. - In the collection: Priorities for sustainable agricultural development (materials of the international conference). Tbilisi: TSU publishing house.
10. Burduli V. (1996). *Industrial policy: institutional support and implementation mechanism (in Georgian)*. – Известия АН Грузии. Серия экономическая, 1996, №1-2.
11. Burduli V., Kuratashvili A. (2008). *Development of the institutional organization of the financial sector in the context of globalization (in Georgian)*. - In the collection: Collection of Scientific Works of Paata Gugushvili Institute of Economics. Volume I. Tbilisi. Georgia.
12. Burduli V. (2004). *The mechanism of regulation of the economic development of the country and the ways of its practical implementation (on the example of Georgia)*. Tbilisi: Metsniereba (in Georgian, Abbreviated content - in Russian).
13. Burduli V. (2008). *The Potential of Higher Investment Activity in Georgia*. – The Caucasus & Globalization. Volume 2. Issue 4. CA&CC Press. SWEDEN.
14. Burduli V. (2007). *The Role of Globalization in Reviving the Economy of Countries in Transition (A Case Study of Georgia)*. – The Caucasus & Globalization. Volume 1. Issue 3. CA&CC Press. SWEDEN.
15. Burduli V. (2006). *Ways of development of regional centers of social and economic attraction in Georgia (in Georgian)*. – J.: Sakartvelos Ekonomika, 2006, №11.
16. Cimoli M., Dosi G. (1995). *Technological Paradigms, Patterns of Learning and Development: An Introductory Roadmap*. _ Journal of Evolutionary Economics. 1995, V. 5, # 3, pp. 243-268.
17. Didier P. (1989). *Le Nord – Pas-de-Calais fase aux nouvelles dynamiques economiques: pratiques et jeux de l'amenagement regional*. – Hommes et terres Nord, 1989, №4.
18. Hamilton Walton. (1919). *The Institutional Approach to Economic Theory*. American Economic Review, Supplement 9 (1): 309-318.

19. Martin P., Nonn H. (1989). *Stratégies des acteurs publics en Alsace en matière de développement économique et d'aménagement:1982-1989.* – Hommes et terres nord, 1989, №4.
20. Mithell, W. C. (1927). *Business Cycles: The problems and its Setting*, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.
21. Mokyr J. (1999). *The Lever of Riches: Technological Creativity and Economic Progress*. New York: Oxford University Press. Cambridge.
22. Murphy K. M., Shlifer A., Wishny R. M. (1989). *Industrialization and the Big Push* // Journal of Political Economy. V. 97, #5, pp. 1003-1026.
23. Nelson R. R. (2002). *Bringing Institutions into Evolutionary Growth Theory* // Journal of Evolutionary Economics. Vol. 12, № 1-2.
24. Papava V. (2005). *Necroeconomics (Lesson from Georgia)*. – Lincoln – Shanghai: iUniverse, Inc.
25. Papava V. (2011). *Non-traditional economics*. – Tbilisi. Georgia. (in Georgian).
26. Papava V. (2011). *The role of the Breton Woods institutions in the post-communist transformation of the Georgian economy (in Georgian)*. – Proceedings of Scientific Works of Paata Gugushvili Institute of Economics of TSU. Volume IV. Tbilisi. Georgia.
27. Schumpeter J. (1939). *Business Cycles: A Theoretical, Historical and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process*. Vol. I and II. New York, Toronto, London: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company.
28. Rosenberg N. (1982). *Inside the Black Box: Technology and Economics*. New York: Cambridge of University Press.
29. The Barcelona Development Agenda / The Washington Consensus reconsidered: Towards a New Global Governance. Ed. By N. Serra and J. E. Stiglitz. Oxford, 2008.
30. Toffler E. – Electronic resource: ru. wikipedia.org/wiki/Третья_волна_(Тоффлер)
31. Tsereteli G., Burduli V. (2004). *The need to use the principles of institutionalism in the sphere of the structural organization of production in a post-communist country (in Georgian)*. - In the collection: "Problems of development of a market economy in Georgia." Collection of scientific papers of the Institute of Economics. P. Gugushvili Academy of Sciences of Georgia. Volume IV. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.
32. Tsereteli G. (2003). *On the issue of assessing the effectiveness of state regulation of a post-communist country (in Georgian)*. - In the collection: Problems of development of market economy in Georgia. Volume III. Tbilisi. Georgia.
33. Tsereteli G. (2000). *Strategic goals of the development of productive forces and the ways of their realization (in Georgian)*. - In the collection: Problems of development of market economy in Georgia. Volume I. Tbilisi. Georgia.
34. Абесадзе П., Бурдули В. (2011). *Региональные аспекты ускорения темпов экономического развития Грузии*. – Общество и экономика. 2011, №7.
35. Абесадзе П. (2011). *Сетевая экономика и основные направления ее формирования в Грузии*. В книге: *SPOŁECZEŃSTWO SIĘCI*.

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2018 /Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Burduli V., Abesadze R., (2018) Transformation Of Industrial, Technological And Organizational And Institutional Structures Of The Country Economy In The Con-ditions Of Integration Processes Of Globalization. *International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences*, 2 (8) 2018: 13-42

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924)

- GOSPODARKA SIECIOWA W EUROPIE ŚRODKOWEJ I WSCHODNIEJ. T.1, "WYDAWNICTWO KUL", Lublin, 2011, с. 186-191.
36. Ананьин О., Хаиткулов Р., Шестаков Д. (2010). *Вашингтонский консенсус: пейзаж после битв.* – МЭиМО, 2010, №12.
 37. Архипов В. К. (2009). *К вопросу о мировом продовольственном кризисе.* – Экономист, 2009, №3.
 38. Белов В.Б., Баранова К.К. (2010). *Промышленная политика в Германии.* В сборнике: *Промышленная политика европейских стран* (Институт Европы РАН). М., – Электронный ресурс: [ieras.ru/doclad/259/259-1%20\(1\).doc](http://ieras.ru/doclad/259/259-1%20(1).doc)
 39. Бландиньер Жан-Поль. (2010). *Изменение основополагающих производственных и общественных парадигм.* Трансформация общественного сектора в Европе (опыт стран ЕС)./ http://www.recer.ru/files/documents/04_10_10/Blandinieres_Paradigms_Ru.pdf ;
 40. Бурдули В. (2011). *Взаимосвязь развития технологических укладов и трансформации экономических систем.* – В сб.: *Actual Economic Problems under Globalization.* Tbilisi. Georgia.
 41. Бурдули В. (2009). *Вопросы структурной перестройки экономики Грузии и роста уровня занятости.* Ekonomisti, 2009, #5.
 42. Бурдули В. (2016). *Формирование экономических механизмов привлечения свободных финансовых ресурсов национального бизнеса на создание производств в актуальных секторах экономики.* – Ekonomisti, 2016, № 1 (Volume VIII). Стр. 46-66. – Электронный ресурс: http://www.pgie.tsu.ge/contentimage/sxvadasxva/jurnali_ekonomisti/_1-2016__pdf
 43. Бурдули В. Церетели Г. (1998). *Финансовая система Грузии и проблемы развития и структурной организации производства.* – Известия АН Грузии. Серия экономическая, 1998, №4.
 44. Веблен Т. (2007). *Теория делового предприятия.* М.: Дело.
 45. Глазьев С. *Возможности и ограничения технико-экономического развития России в условиях структурных изменений в мировой экономике.*/ С. Ю. Глазьев. www.spkurdyumov.narod.ru/glaziev/htm
 46. Глазьев С. (2009). *Мировой экономический кризис как процесс смены технологических укладов.* – Вопросы экономики, 2009, №3.
 47. Добросоцкий В. (2000). *Государственное регулирование продовольственного рынка.* – МЭиМО, №9.
 48. Иванова Н., Данилин И. (2010). *Антикризисные программы в инновационной сфере.* – МЭиМО, №1.
 49. Иванов Н. (2008). *Глобализация и общество: проблемы управления.* – МЭиМО, №4.
 50. Иншаков О.В. (2010). *Институция и институт: проблемы категориальной дифференциации и интеграции.* – Экономическая наука современной России, 2010, №3.
 51. Кондратьев Владимир (ИМЭМО РАН). (2014). *Свежее дыхание промышленной политики.* – Электронный ресурс:

ISSN 2450-2146 / E-ISSN 2451-1064

© 2018 /Published by: Międzynarodowy Instytut Innowacji Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój w Warszawie, Polska

 This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Burduli V., Abesadze R., (2018) Transformation Of Industrial, Technological And Organizational And Institutional Structures Of The Country Economy In The Con-ditions Of Integration Processes Of Globalization. *International Journal of New Economics and Social Sciences*,2 (8) 2018: 13-42

[DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924](https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.9924)

http://www.perspektivy.info/rus/ekob/svezheje_dyhaniye_promyshlennoj_politiki_2014-05-22.htm

52. Кондратьев Н. Д. (2002). *Большие циклы конъюнктуры и теория предвидения*. Н. Д. Кондратьев. Избранные труды. М.: Экономика, 2002.
53. Кузин Д. (1993). *Промышленная политика развитых стран: цели, инструменты, оценки*. – Вопросы экономики, 1993, №9.
54. Лопатников Д. Л. (2006). *Экономическая география и регионалистика*. – М.: Гардарики.
55. Любимцева С. (2008). *Инновационная трансформация экономической системы*. – Экономист, 2008, №9.
56. Региональная политика стран ЕС. М.: ИМЭМО РАН, 2009.
57. Семенова Е. (2006). *Возможности инновационного типа развития*. – Экономист, 2006, №6.
58. Сизякина М. С. (2008). *Взаимосвязь технологического и институционального развития экономики*. – Экономический вестник Ростовского государственного университета. – 2008, т. 6, №4, ч. 4.
59. Смирнов Е. Н. (2016). *Инновационный механизм развития экономики Европейского союза*. Автореферат на соискание ученой степени д. э. н. Москва. РФ.
60. Стиглиц Дж. (1998). *Многообразные инструменты, шире цели: движение к пост-Вашингтонскому консенсусу*. – Вопросы экономики, 1998, № 8.
61. Структурная политика в России: новые условия и возможная повестка (*Доклад НИУ ВШЭ*). – ж.: Вопросы экономики, 2018, №6.
62. Турбан Г. В. (2010). *Развитие международной торговли и рост протекционизма*. – Вісник Донецького національного університету, Сер. В: Економіка і право, Вип. 2, Т. 2, 2010.
63. Фролов Д. (2011). *Теория кризисов после кризиса: технологии versus институты*. – Вопросы экономики, 2011, №7.
64. Хруцкий В. (1992). *Рыночные системы и варианты структурной перестройки промышленности*. – Российский экономический журнал, 1992, №3.
65. Церетели Г., Бурдули В. (1998). *Проблемы становления финансовой системы Грузии*. – Известия АН Грузии. Серия экономическая, 1998, №4.
66. Шишков Ю. (2010). *Государство в условиях глобализации*. – МЭиМО, 2010, №1.