

1998. – Pp. 115–137. 10. Ben Lockwood. Specific and ad valorem tariffs are not equivalent in trade wars / Ben Lockwood, Kar-yiu Wong // Journal of International Economics. – October 2000. – Vol. 52. – Issue 1.– Pp. 183–195. 11. Serpukhov M. Y. Methodychnе obgruntuvanniapozytsii krainy v torhovelniiviini / M. Y. Serpukhov // Ekonomist. – 2013. – No. 11 (313). – Pp. 55–57.

Інформація про автора

Серпухов Максим Юрійович – канд. екон. наук, доцент кафедри міжнародної економіки та менеджменту зовнішньоекономічної діяльності Харківського національного економічного університету (61166, Україна, м. Харків, пр. Леніна, 9а, e-mail: maximserpuhov@ukr.net).

Информация об авторе

Серпухов Максим Юрьевич – канд. экон. наук, доцент кафедры международной экономики и менеджмента внешнеэкономичес-

кой деятельности Харьковского национального экономического университета (61166, Украина, г. Харьков, пр. Ленина, 9а, e-mail: maximserpuhov@ukr.net).

Information about the author

M. Serpukhov – Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor of the Department of International Economics and Foreign Economic Activity Management of Kharkiv National University of Economics (9a Lenin Ave., 61166, Kharkiv, Ukraine, e-mail: maximserpuhov@ukr.net).

Рецензент

**докт. екон. наук,
професор Попов О. Є.**

**Стаття надійшла до ред.
21.06.2013 р.**

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NOTION OF THE CONTENT
AND STRUCTURE OF COMMUNICATION ACTIVITY
PROCESS IN ECONOMICS**

UDC 338.24.01

K. Naumik

The article deals with scientific approaches to modelling the process of communication in management and economics. The author divided communication models into classic, linear and non-linear ones, and carried out the comparative analysis of their elements. The conclusion on the necessity for a motivational and activity approach to studying the communication process in the economy was made. As a result, the author improved the communication model, introducing the categories of "need" and "production cycle", and considering the model in the aspect of the process of communication products production and communication capital formation.

Keywords: production, performance, communication, communicant, process, need, economy, effect.

**РОЗВИТОК ПОНЯТТЯ ЗМІСТУ ТА СТРУКТУРИ ПРОЦЕСУ
КОМУНІКАЦІЙНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ В ЕКОНОМІЦІ**

УДК 338.24.01

Наумік К. Г.

Розглянуто наукові підходи до моделювання процесу комунікації в управлінні й економіці. Моделі комунікацій розподілені автором на групи, а саме класичні, лінійні й нелінійні моделі. Проведено порівняльний аналіз їх елементів. Зроблено висновок про необхідність використання мотиваційно-діяльнісного підходу під час вивчення процесу комунікацій в економіці. У результаті автором удосконалена модель комунікацій, у яку введені категорії "потреба" й "цикл виробництва", сама ж модель розглянута в аспекті процесу виробництва комунікаційних продуктів і формування комунікаційного капіталу.

Ключові слова: виробництво, діяльність, комунікація, комунікант, процес, потреба, економіка, ефект.

**РАЗВИТИЕ ПОНЯТИЯ СОДЕРЖАНИЯ И СТРУКТУРЫ ПРОЦЕССА
КОММУНИКАЦИОННОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ В ЭКОНОМИКЕ**

УДК 338.24.01

Наумик Е. Г.

Рассмотрены научные подходы к моделированию процесса коммуникации в управлении и экономике. Модели коммуникаций распределены автором на группы, а именно классические, линейные и нелинейные модели. Проведен сравнительный анализ их элементов. Сделан вывод о необходимости использования мотивационно-

One of the earliest definitions of communication came from the Greek philosopher Aristotle. He defined Logos, inhered in the content or the message itself; Pathos, inhered in the audience; Ethos, inhered in the speaker [3; 4].

This classical triad (communicator – message – recipient) is used in all models of communication.

Harold Lasswell (1948) conceived of analyzing the mass media in five stages: "Who?", "Says what?", "In which channel?", "To whom?", "With what effect?" [6; 7].

Shannon&Weaver's theory described communication as a linear process in 1949 [8]. They were concerned with telephone and radio technology and wanted to develop a model that could show how information passed through channels. This approach to human communication comprises several key elements: a source, or a transmitter of a message, who sends a message to a receiver, the recipient of the message. The receiver is a person who makes sense out of the message. All of this communication takes place in a channel, which is a pathway to communication.

The Linear Model also introduces the concept of noise – which is anything not intended by the informational source. There are four types of noise: Semantic noise; Physical (external) noise; Psychological noise; Physiological noise.

In apparent elaboration Lasswell and/or Shannon&Weaver extended the components to include the notions of perception, reactions to a situation, and message context. The concepts of this model became staples in communication research and emphasized such items as Entropy, Redundancy, Noise, Channel.

Although this view of communication process was highly respected many years ago, but the classical and linear approaches are very limited for several reasons. Firstly, a more obvious problem of the linear model is its suggestion that communication flows in one direction only: from a sender to a receiver. Secondly, the linear model presumes that there is only one message in the communication process. Thirdly, the model considers that communication has a definable beginning and ending. Fourthly, the model suggests that communication is simply one person speaking to another, a feature that oversimplifies the complex communication process.

Wilbur L. Schramm proposed the interactional model of communication which emphasizes the two-way communication process between communicators [9]. It represents that communication goes in two directions: from a sender to a receiver and from a receiver to a sender. This circular process suggests that communication is an ongoing process. The interactional view illustrates that a person can perform the role of either a sender or a receiver during an interaction, but not both roles simultaneously. One essential element to the interactional model is feedback, which is the response to a message. Feedback may be verbal or non-verbal, intentional or unintentional. It helps communicators to know whether or not their message is received and the extent to which meaning is achieved. A final feature of the interactional model is a person's field of experience, it refers to how a person's culture, experiences and heredity influence his/her ability to communicate with another person. The interactional view assumes two people speaking and listening, but not at the same time. It was this criticism that inspired the development of the third model of communication.

Wilbur L. Schramm was a forefather in the growth of a basic model of communication. Wilbur Schramm's model emphasizes the idea of highlighting the process of encoding and decoding the message. Schramm proposed this process as a reciprocal circular communication between the sender and receiver. The Shannon-Weaver model is a more mathematical and technological one, Schramm incorporates the study of human behavior in the communication process.

The Berlo's model (the SMCR model) is not specific to any particular communication [10]. Berlo's model consists of a number of factors under each of the elements: S-Source (the source is where the message originates) and Receiver (the Receiver is where the message ends) are formed under the communication skills (the individual's skill to communicate: ability to read, write, speak, listen etc); attitudes (towards the audience, subject); knowledge (about the subject one is going to communicate on); social system (various aspects in society). It is where the communication takes place; culture that comes under social system. Encoder: The sender of the message (message originates) is referred as encoder, so the source is encoding the

message here. Message is formed under Content, Elements (content is accompanied by some elements), Treatment as the way in which the message is passed on or delivered; Structure and Code of the message. Only when the code is proper, the message will be clear, improper use may lead to misinterpretation.

The channel consists of five senses. The five senses which we use are the following: Hearing, Seeing, Touching, Smelling, Tasting.

Linear Models, thanks to the simplifications, facilitate the understanding of the sequence of events. In most cases, they do not reflect the real state of the system. In practice, often there is not simply consistent exchange of information, and there are typically more complex processes, which include the structure, not only people but also their thoughts, feelings, attitudes, social experience, emotional and mental state, and more.

Non-Linear geometric model of communication as a triangle is the Newcomb's model of communication was introduced by Theodore Newcomb at the University of Michigan in 1953 [11]. He gives different approach to the communication process. The main purpose of this theory is to introduce the role of communication in a social relationship (society) and to maintain social equilibrium within the social system. He does not include the message as a separate entity in his diagram, implying it only by use of directional arrows. He concentrates on the social purpose of communication, showing all types of communication as a means of sustaining relationships between people. Sometimes it's called as an "ABX" model of communication.

The four-sides model (also known as communication square or four-ears model) is a communication model by Friedemann Schulz von Thun (1981) [3; 4]. According to this model every news has four messages. The four sides of the news are fact, self-revealing, relationship, and appeal.

In The Prospect of Rhetoric (1968), Sam Becker presented a mosaic model of communication, arguing that "our traditional concept of the message has severely limited usefulness for understanding contemporary communication" [3; 4]. The emphasis of rhetorical studies should probably remain upon the message, in a way that is more descriptive of what a man as a receiver is exposed to, rather than what a man as a source creates. We construct messages which are, in effect, overlaid to form the large and complex communication environment or "mosaic" in which each of us exists. This mosaic consists of an immense number of fragments or bits of information on an immense number of topics. These bits are scattered over time and space and modes of communication. Each individual must grasp from this mosaic those bits which serve his needs, must group them into message sets which are relevant for him at any given time, and within each message set must organize the bits and close the gaps between them in order to arrive at a coherent picture of the world to which he can respond.

P. Watzlawick did extensive research on how communication is effected within families [12]. P. Watzlawick defines five basic axioms in his theory on communication, popularly known as the "Interactional View": "One Cannot – Not Communicate"; "Every communication has a content and relationship aspect so that the latter classifies the former and is therefore a metacommunication"; "The nature of a relationship is dependent on the punctuation of the partners of communication procedures"; "Human communication involves both digital and analog modalities"; "Interhuman communication procedures are either symmetric or complementary".

Westley&Macleane realized that communication does not begin when one person starts to talk, but rather when a person responds selectively to his/her physical surroundings [13]. This model considers a strong relation between responds from surroundings and the process of communication. Communication begins only when a person receives a message from surroundings. Each receiver responds to the message they received based on their object of orientation. There are main elements: news articles or information (x), Feedback (f), Clients (a), Reader or Audience (b) and Gate Keeper (c). Westley&Macleane communication model is Two-Dimensional. It cannot account for multidimensions; this means this model will not be applicable for typical communication events that involve broader context and wide range of communication messages.

Maletzke's model of the mass communication process is extremely useful because of its comprehensiveness and complex

interaction of the factors at play [14]. The self-image of the communicator corresponds with that of the receiver. Both act upon and are influenced by the Message which is itself constrained by the dictates of the Medium chosen. To add to the complexity, the message is influenced by the communicator's image of the receiver's image of the communicator. Maletzke's model suggests that in the communication process, many shoulders are being looked over. The more the shoulders, the more compromises, the more adjustments.

The complex conceptualization implies the way in which messages are diffused among social groups via opinion leaders. The importance of the model lies in the challenge it offered to previously held ideas about a one-step flow of media messages. No longer could the audience be seen as a mass of unconnected individuals. They were socially related and those relationships influenced the ways they both changed. In 1940 Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet developed an elaborate research design to study the impact on voters of that year's mass-communicated presidential election campaign [15]. At first they were interested in how the members of given social categories media material related to the election and what role this content played in influencing their voting intentions.

Thus, the research suggested a movement of information through two basic stages: from the media to relatively well-informed individuals who frequently attended to mass communications; from those persons through interpersonal channels to individuals who had less direct exposure to the media and who depended upon others for their information. This communication process was called the two-step flow of communication.

Barnlund's (1970) Transactional Model of communication reflects the fact that we usually send and receive messages simultaneously. It suggests that the communication process is fluid and relational [16; 17]. The sender and receiver are mutually responsible for the effect and the effectiveness of communication.

In the transactional model, personal fields of experience still exist but they overlap with each other. This is an important addition to the understanding of the communication process because it demonstrates the existence of an active process. In the Linear Model, meaning is sent from one person to another. In the Interactional Model, meaning is achieved through a feedback mechanism. The Transactional Model takes the meaning-making process one step further: it assumes that people build shared meaning in their communication.

The answers to the above questions form a representation of a specific communication process with different models.

The practice of mass communication shows that the development of communication patterns makes sense to introduce such a significant component as obstacles, barrier of communication.

The model of the communication process developed by Yu. Vorontsov is of substantial interest [18]. As the components Yu. Vorontsov highlights: a source of information, the communicator, the message, the recipient, the communication channel, extralinguistic message parameter, the source of mechanical obstruction, the source of semantic constraints, class and social filters, personal and individual filters, semantic fields, field communications environment, loss of information, feedback "the recipient – the communicator," feedback "the recipient – the source of information". Yu. Vorontsov's model encourages researchers to consider that the communication is not the type of "communicator – recipient," and study it as a system of conditions and factors. This approach to the analysis of communication considerably deepened understanding the process and made it more manageable, and therefore more efficient. Systematic study of the communication process allows to simulate possible scenarios to understand the causes of the processes.

The basis of communication activities – a word (or message, information) – was correctly defined by Aristotle. But exactly who, what and how are the key questions of modern communication study. Unfortunately the modern communicational models are not economic. Some authors mention communication only as a function [19]. There is no any economic category or process included in. So, the main problem is to estimate the communicational activity economically. The author considers that the communication process should be examined from the perspective of motivational and active approach in economics. It allows to allocate and to select such economic categories as resources and products, to use monetary approach to estimate the efficiency. There is a logical consideration of the communication

process as a need-oriented one, where the priority is to meet the needs as a result of production cycle of communications (Figure).




Fig. Communicational productive process

So, there are the main items for the diagnosis of qualitative and quantitative characteristics of the communication process: needs, the producer (the communicator, the sender), the consumer (the recipient); communication product (communication product, information, knowledge, experience); communication capital, the channel of communication. Using this model of communication gives an opportunity to evaluate its effectiveness.

Thereby, it is necessary to describe qualitative and quantitative characteristics of the communication productive process in further researches.

References: 1. Report "Measuring the Information Society 2012" [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/publications/mis2012.aspx>. 2. Dance Frank. Toward theory of human communication: original essays // Frank Dance (ed.). Human communication theory. – New York, USA : Holt, 1967. – Pp. 288–309. 3. Effective Communications : (Management Extra) by Elearn. – Oxford : Publisher: Routledge, 2007. – 128 p. 4. Davis Foulger. Models of the Communication Process. Brooklyn College/CUNY, February 25, 2004 [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://davis.foulger.info/research/unifiedModelOfCommunication.htm>. 5. Katz E. The Two-Step Flow of Communication / E. Katz // Public Opinion. – 1957. – No. 21. – Pp. 61–78. 6. Lasswell H. The structure and function of communication in society / H. Lasswell // "The Communication of Ideas" / Bryson Lyman (ed). – New York : Harper, Institute for Religious and Social Studies, 1948. – Pp. 37–51. 7. Communication Theory: All About Theories for Communication. Lasswell's Model [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://communicationtheory.org/lasswells-model/comment-page-1/>. 8. Shannon C. E. A Mathematical Theory of Communication / C. E. Shannon // Bell System Technical Journal. – 1948. – Vol. 27. – July and October. – Pp. 379–423, 623–656. 9. Schramm W. (ed.). Mass communications. – 2nd ed. – Urbana, IL : University of Illinois Press, 1960. 10. Berlo D. K. The process of communication: An introduction to theory and practice. – New York : Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1960. 11. Communication Theory: All About Theories for Communication. The Newcomb's Model [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://communicationtheory.org/the-newcomb's-model>. 12. Watzlawick P. Pragmatics of

human communication: A study of interactional patterns, pathologies, and paradoxes / P. Watzlawick, J. H. Beavin, D. D. Jackson. – New York : W. W. Norton, 1967. 13. Communication Theory: All About Theories for Communication. Westley and MacLean's Model of Communication [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://communicationtheory.org/westley-and-maclean's-model-of-communication>. 14. Maletzke G. Medienwirkungsforschung / G. Maletzke. – Tübingen, Germany : Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1981. 15. Paul F. Lazarsfeld Philosophy of Science and Empirical Social Research Original Research Article / F. Paul // Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. – 1966. – Vol. 44. – Pp. 463–473. 16. Dean C. Barnlund. Public and private self in communicating with Japan / C. Dean Barnlund // Business Horizons. – 1989. – Vol. 32. – Issue 2. – March – April. – Pp. 32–40. 17. Barnlund D. C. Communication: the context of change / D. C. Barnlund // C. E. LARSON & F DANCE (ed.) Perspectives on communication : colloquium proceedings. – Speech Communication Center (Milwaukee, USA). – 1988. – Pp. 24–40. 18. Моисеева А. П. Основы теории коммуникации : учебн. пособ. / А. П. Моисеева. – Томск : Изд. ТПУ, 2004. – 128 с. 19. Мироненко І. І. Дослідження системи факторів, які сприяють формуванню та розвитку взаємовідносин машинобудівних підприємств зі споживачами продукції / І. І. Мироненко // Економіка розвитку. – 2012. – № 1(61). – С. 103–106.

References: 1. Report "Measuring the Information Society 2012" [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/publications/mis2012.aspx>. 2. Dance Frank. Toward theory of human communication: original essays // Frank Dance (ed.). Human communication theory. – New York, USA : Holt, 1967. – Pp. 288–309. 3. Effective Communications : (Management Extra) by Elearn. – Oxford : Publisher: Routledge, 2007. – 128 p. 4. Davis Foulger. Models of the Communication Process. Brooklyn College/CUNY, February 25, 2004 [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://davis.foulger.info/research/unifiedModelOfCommunication.htm>. 5. Katz E. The Two-Step Flow of Communication / E. Katz // Public Opinion. – 1957. – No. 21. – Pp. 61–78. 6. Lasswell H. The structure and function of communication in society / H. Lasswell // "The Communication of Ideas" / Bryson Lyman (ed.). – New York : Harper, Institute for Religious and Social Studies, 1948. – Pp. 37–51. 7. Communication Theory: All About Theories for Communication. Lasswell's Model [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://communicationtheory.org/lasswells-model/comment-page-1/>. 8. Shannon C. E. A Mathematical Theory of Communication / C. E. Shannon // Bell System Technical Journal. – 1948. – Vol. 27. – July and October. – Pp. 379–423, 623–656. 9. Schramm W. (ed.). Mass communications. – 2nd ed. – Urbana, IL : University of Illinois Press, 1960. 10. Berlo D. K. The process of communication: An introduction to theory and practice. – New York : Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1960. 11. Communication Theory: All About Theories for Communication. The Newcomb's Model [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://communicationtheory.org/the-newcombs-model>. 12. Watzlawick P. Pragmatics of

human communication: A study of interactional patterns, pathologies, and paradoxes / P. Watzlawick, J. H. Beavin, D. D. Jackson. – New York : W. W. Norton, 1967. 13. Communication Theory: All About Theories for Communication. Westley and MacLean's Model of Communication [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://communicationtheory.org/westley-and-maclean's-model-of-communication>. 14. Maletzke G. Medienwirkungsforschung / G. Maletzke. – Tübingen, Germany : Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1981. 15. Paul F. Lazarsfeld Philosophy of Science and Empirical Social Research Original Research Article / F. Paul // Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. – 1966. – Vol. 44. – Pp. 463–473. 16. Dean C. Barnlund. Public and private self in communicating with Japan / C. Dean Barnlund // Business Horizons. – 1989. – Vol. 32. – Issue 2. – March – April. – Pp. 32–40. 17. Barnlund D. C. Communication: the context of change / D. C. Barnlund // C. E. LARSON & F DANCE (ed.) Perspectives on communication : colloquium proceedings. – Speech Communication Center (Milwaukee, USA). – 1988. – Pp. 24–40. 18. Moiseeva A. P. Osnovy teorii komunikatsii : uchebn. posob. [Bases of Communication Theory : textbook] / A. P. Moiseeva. – Tomsk : Izd. TPU, 2004. – 128 p. 19. Myronenko I. I. Doslidzhennia systemy faktoriv, yaki spryiauiu formuvanniu ta rozvytku vzaiemovidnosyn mashynobudivnykh pidpriemstv zi spozhyvachamy produktsii [Study of Factors that Shape and Develop the Relationship Between the Engineering Enterprises and Consumers] / I. I. Myronenko // Ekonomika rozvytku. – 2012. – No. 1(61). – Pp. 103–106.

Information about the author

K. Naumik – Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor of Tourism Department, doctoral student of Kharkiv National University of Economics (9a Lenin Ave., 61166, Kharkiv, Ukraine, e-mail: naumik@ukr.net).

Інформація про автора

Наумік Катерина Георгіївна – канд. екон. наук, доцент кафедри туризму, докторант Харківського національного економічного університету (61166, Україна, м. Харків, пр. Леніна, 9а, e-mail: naumik@ukr.net).

Информация об авторе

Наумик Екатерина Георгиевна – канд. экон. наук, доцент кафедры туризма, докторант Харьковского национального экономического университета (61166, Украина, г. Харьков, пр. Ленина, 9а, e-mail: naumik@ukr.net).

*A double-blind
peer review has been held.*

*Стаття надійшла до ред.
27.06.2013 р.*

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ПІДХОДИ ДО ВИЗНАЧЕННЯ ДЖЕРЕЛ ВИРОБНИЧОГО ІНВЕСТУВАННЯ ВІТЧИЗНЯНИХ КОРПОРАЦІЙ

УДК 330.322(477)

Климова Н. І.

Систематизовано найбільш важливі джерела виробничого інвестування, які у своїй єдності забезпечують комплексний позитивний вплив на інвестиційну активність українських корпорацій: розширення нормативної бази амортизаційної політики, вдосконалення механізмів емісійної діяльності, розвиток ринку корпоративних цінних паперів, розширення сфери довгострокового кредитування, формування системи захисту й гарантування повернення інвестиційних коштів, активізацію ролі держави в розробці галузевих та регіональних інвестиційних програм, посилення зобов'язань інвестора щодо модернізації виробництва. Розглянуто питання джерел виробничого інвестування вітчизняних корпорацій. Запропоновано інвестиційну стратегію корпорації, визначено основні етапи її реалізації.

Ключові слова: інвестиційна діяльність, інвестиційні ресурси, інвестиційна стратегія, амортизаційні відрахування, корпорація.