

FORMATION OF THE INNOVATIVE ENTREPRENEURSHIP CULTURE: CAPABILITIES AND PROBLEMS

Revaz GVELESIANI

*Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
revaz.gvelesiani@tsu.ge*

Abstract

A seriously growing “field of problems” of the entrepreneurship culture is not perceived, or is even ignored, often. In such cases, the strategy is recognized as relevant, and resources are focused on it. Barriers, inner conflicts, unsuccessful or defeated strategies and the refusal of the market is a result of all this. The entrepreneurship culture is an extremely sensitive parameter and, for its formation and development it is necessary to take and implement the rational decisions which should envisage in particular the aspect of the essence of the culture, while all this may be reflected only in the sensitive-to-culture management.

An absolutely different way of starting the entrepreneurship, namely, the establishment of a company from the components, indicates an innovative entrepreneurship culture. Being in harmony with social values is a precondition for its success. Without changing the mentality in the digital entrepreneurship, enterprises are not able to implement a rapid and large-scale introduction of innovations that can bring a success. Considering that in the digital economy an accent is made on manufacturing the intelligent-intensive products, this factor makes it very actual to overcome the problems of digitalization of the entrepreneurship culture.

Keywords: *Entrepreneurship culture, social value, economic interests, social entrepreneurship, digital economy*

JEL Classification: *A13, M14, M19*

I. INTRODUCTION

The entrepreneurship culture is an implicit consciousness of an enterprise (organization, etc.), which appears in the action of its members, and then reacts on it by controlling both formal and informal behavior of individuals. In other words, entrepreneurship culture means learn the types and rules of interdependence of individuals, as to how do they perceive economic developments, where do they design and introduce the proprieties.

Successful guidance of entrepreneurship is possible if its strategy and culture are in harmony with each other. With regards to the entrepreneurship strategy, the entrepreneurship culture acts to manage the personnel “behavior” in the enterprise on one hand, and to achieve its compliance with the strategy, on the other hand. However, so rarely the enterprises demonstrate different forms of breach of the individual and group actions. If they affect the entrepreneurship culture, it will cause more global, i.e. both systemic and structural violations that, in its turn, will lead to a pathological organizational culture. Just such pathology of the entrepreneurship culture makes it difficult to achieve compliance between the entrepreneurship strategy and the entrepreneurship culture (Gvelesiani, 1999)

At the leading small and medium-sized enterprises of the world market, the priorities are the innovative management structure, personal qualities of business leaders and the management-personnel collaboration. A purpose of the management should be finding a compromise and achieving compliance between the opposing parties. Just such an art of management determines a rule of action of the leading companies of the global market. Bringing the strategy and culture of entrepreneurship in line with each other may be ensured by such a model of the innovative management a core of which is introduced by ambitious goals and strong management. The latter, in its turn, determines the internal competences of the entities and ensures their orientation. The internal competences imply the officers selected and motivated through a strong “labor test” a permanent innovation of the goods and services, and a reliance on the own forces. Internal competences are ultimately transformed into external market opportunities, which, in turn, cover the narrow focus of the market (in goods, services, technologies), proximity to customers, clear advantages and global orientation.

II. METHODOLOGY

Both general and specific research methods were used in this article, namely – the methods of analysis, synthesis, historical, logical, induction, deduction, scientific abstraction, comparative analysis, statistics (selection, grouping, observation, dynamics, etc.), static, as well as the methods of experimental evaluation.

III. RESULTS

Absolutely Different Way of Starting the Entrepreneurship

Until now and almost in all cases, an attention of novice entrepreneurs was focused on the resources, i.e. how much capital does the company own? What kind of production equipment, tools, and devices does it hold? Etc. This is nothing but a vision that is based on the company's resources. However, a balance is shifted. Today we can start entrepreneurship without the traditional resources. The ideas and the ways of their implementation are more important now. Today we may consider companies as a product of an idea. To confirm this, Günter Faltin - a noble German scientist and entrepreneur and founder of the legendary "Teekampagne" provides the principles of existence of components and of labor distribution. According to Günter Faltin, a creative idea is decisive, not the high technologies. So, the first step towards entrepreneurial activity is to find out an idea and develop it until a perfect conception and develop an idea of the idea before forming a perfect concept will have been formulated. The next step is to find those already existing professional components, by help of which you will become able to implement the idea with considering all its artistic details (Faltin, 2008).

G. Faltin advises: "Of you want to create something interesting and revolutionary, learn to neglect your customers, because a function of most of them is very similar to the mirror that reflects the already passed way and, at the same time it is too conservative, boring, devoid of imagination". He indicates also that "Usually, successful entrepreneurs do not invent something new, but simply take the already existing items and arrange them differently, i.e. they create a new thing by arranging the existing components". Innovation is mainly created there where a radical confrontation to the established practice takes place (Faltin, 2008, p.98-99).

Thus, there are three stages, according to which we can radically change a landscape of entrepreneurship. In fact, these are just mental steps, a way to see a problem from a different angle, which gives us an opportunity to approach to the issue of starting an entrepreneurship by completely different way. The first step here is to recognize that today a good concept is more important than a capital; the second step is to apply more radically in the field of the entrepreneurship the labor distribution principle; and, the third step is to set up a company consisting of components. The labor distribution and socialization provides us with the opportunity to establish a company that will be formed almost by components only. In our view, this model of G. Faltin really indicates on the beginning of the "entrepreneurial spring" for start-upper entrepreneurs.

The companies established by this way, operate with high efficiency from the very beginning, require considerably less capital, reduce risks, are less sensitive to typical crises which may occur in line with growth of and, implement successfully their social, competitive, structural, and employment functions, and by this, support a reduction of inequality existing within the society

The currently existing inequality in the society increasingly enhances the trend of transition from the business entrepreneurship to the social entrepreneurship. The idea of social entrepreneurship is being established globally and, it is probably preconditioned by fact that the concept of support to the social problems is linked with the idea of entrepreneurial initiations, purposeful organization and orderly management of expenses by name of the company. Such a concept meets a movement that realizes that governments, administrations, and existing social organizations are not fighting sufficiently to solve the problems of certain types, perhaps because they are operating inefficiently are busier with administering of the organization than with satisfying the social needs, or, are simply rigid and outdated. We need "social entrepreneurs" who are able to search for innovative approaches to solving the new complex problems and react appropriately (Faltin, 2014).

A successful entrepreneurship is in demand of people who are more than individuals only and who can gain an increased profit. Naturally, a serious role plays also a wish of something spectacular, independence, and success. Money and accumulated wealth are the signs of success only. Generation of founders often live economically.

A difference between social and business entrepreneurs is much smaller than people think. As a matter of fact, we may become witnesses of a convergence: reduction of the budgetary resources allocated for social services, enforces the social entrepreneurs to apply more frequently the methods of efficiency and market orientation, while the possibilities of obtaining more information, transparency, competition, and comparison, enforce the business entrepreneurs to manufacture better products and serve honestly to their customers, if they want to have a long-term success.

Being in Harmony with Social Values – Precondition for Success of Entrepreneurship Culture

Being in harmony with the social values is a precondition of the success (Morgan, 1991). The idea of entrepreneurship should be linked to the social values and problems, but at the same time, indifference towards social problems raises fear in people undermines their confidence and, this almost has negative consequences, in the long run, at least. Today, the entrepreneurs must demonstrate a much higher level of responsibility, but it does not require equal moral motivation - only a desire of survival and success. Consequently, we can say that the business entrepreneurs considering their own interests move to the direction of the social entrepreneurship.

The well-operable markets creates the mechanisms which predetermine desirable behavior, while this latter is the critically important feature of a functioning society.

As for the prospects of the social entrepreneurship, as result of spread of the concept of entrepreneurship over the social arena, individuals, who are skeptic towards business, may become more open with regard to entrepreneurship as to the activity and, this is more creative and congenial than a business of large anonymous companies and multimillionaires (Faltin, 2008).

Progress important for all in two points. First of all, it provides:

- Evaluation of scientific achievements and innovations; and
- At the same time, shows how close we are to the target.

Use of this notion by the second point of view, does not require explanation, as the the set objective itself determines the evaluation. By the first sense, progress implies striving to something completely new and still unachievable. By view of rationality, in this case a man is happy with his achievements and creativity. Such a joy is not necessarily to be purposefully rational, i.e. it is not depended on the benefits that you may receive through approaching to the set goal. However, this strengthens our joy. The main thing is not to use a knowledge but to get and deepen it (Hayek, 1960).

In both cases, there appears a certain doubt about regarding the progress, of how desirable it is. Researches always try to substantiate such a critical position in terms of the Cognition Theory, knowledge socialization, and ethics.

A criticism that is relied on the Cognition Theory is not directed against the progress, it does not share the position only, which overestimates cognitive intellectual abilities. Essentially, it is a critic of constructive rationalism that takes origin from Descartes and Francis Bacon's works. This form of rationalism confronts critical rationalism which proceeds from David Hume's works [Popper, 1960/2002]. Followers of constructivist rationalism believe that the true reality of nature can be understood with the help of mind and observation, while the critical rationalism focuses on the existence of evolutionary element in a human mind and on a possibility of making mistake. An error may occur beyond the margins of pure logic; therefore, possibilities of empirical observations cannot be rejected in advance.

From a constructive position it is easy to argue that a person can do as much as he knows (*tantum possumus quantum scimus*, Bacon). The researchers who supported this position made impressive progress in the XVIII and XIX centuries, that as if proved a power of knowledge in dominating over the nature. That's why in this period it was quite reasonable the optimism stating that use of mind brings a progress. Such an excessive assessment of mental possibilities was contributed also by fact of giving an exaggerated significance to the mind in the formation and development of society and economics (Hayek, 1959/2004).

The tradition of constructivist rationalism due to such exaggerated optimism towards the mind, was fairly "reproached" in the Cognition Theory" and, called "Mental Arrogance" (Röpke, 1944; Hennis, 1984). However, this does not mean that there an absolute suspicion towards progress was justified. In terms of socialization of knowledge, progress is nothing but the result of the reaction to the distribution of labor. It is known that a distribution of a scientific work is associated with growing specialization. The immediate participants of the research process understand how increasing paces their field of discipline is narrowing. While as for an external observer, for him it becomes more and more difficult to obtain knowledge fragmentally, which application has an impact on the everyday processes too.

Thus, a gap emerges, which becomes a source of new reproofs and extraordinary thinking (Jonas, 1979/2003). On the other hand, commercialization of competent scholars' publications have never had such a greater chance for positioning on the market (Boulding, 1962) as they have today. The use of such chances would reduce the number of remarks expressed towards deepening the knowledge by reason of labor distribution. The diverse forms of scientific relations are the spontaneous reaction of the open society on the undesirable side effects of the scientific progress. The most difficult thing is to deal with the suspicions of the ethical nature, expressed towards the progress, since they argue that the scientific advancement of mankind does not cause its moral improvement. Uncontrollable desire of domination over the nature means that there is no effective moral limit. To this end, the experiments (genetic-technical manipulations) aimed to change the human genetic structure, are always provided as an example. In connection to the above, a philosopher Hans Jonas stepped forward with the appeal: "Take care of God's image." He offers us to "be modest in human being as he was and is; Let's think about what can happen in the fictional future" (Jonas, 1979/2003).

The above presented position of a human's self-awareness considers it to be his/her job to decide whether it is possible to turn this moral demand into maximum. On the other hand, the open society will consider otherwise such a possibility. In the "fictional future," it is expected that people will be tempted to protect "the image of God" by force. Under the circumstances when freedom is faced a total threat, a question arises in connection to the aforementioned maximum: "Whether its specific realization is possible without abuse of power. In addition, we should also take into consideration that the threats related to use of knowledge, acquire an intensive political forms just in the open societies. This may be proved by the environmental protection-related discussions, which provide the preventive assessments on the results of techniques and their

institutionalization. Therefore, it should be said that open societies too focus on the negative sides of progress and make decisions on applying the relevant political measures. Such measures may happen not to be satisfactory to people who know well the case, but they should take into account that there are lots of more important problems related to the procedures adopted against restriction of freedom. Thus, any single problem that can be brought to the forefront during discussions at this stage should not weaken the attention of society towards other, much more important issues.

We have already shown what the correlation existing between the progress and the freedom of action. It is impossible to break the laws of nature that create objective boundaries of an event that may happen. But, their scientific discovery expands the already existing possibilities of human action. From the economic point of view, progress is related to the phenomenon of innovation. Market is always open for innovations (industrial innovations) because its state is being improving through them (innovative processes). In terms of demand, both of them mean the improvement of opportunities

Misinterpretation of a competition as one of the methods of distribution may be deemed as the origin of conflicts between the economic progress and the social justice. In terms of the social justice, certain adjustments are required for the positions related to the income gained as a result of achievements of the scientific progress. However, on the other hand, such the adjustment would weaken or even abolish at all the incentives to create any innovation. In this case society would become poorer than it should have been. Such a "socialization" of the results of scientific progress misses from attention the fact that it is just the competition that activates and strengthens the process of reaching to them.

In the economic system, progress is manifested in the form of innovation and, serves as a source of structural changes. On the one hand, it generates a new chance of gaining the incomes, while on the other hand it creates a threat to the already existing possibilities. Innovation affects individuals, threatens their economic stability, creates new challenges for them. Failure to meet such challenges, leads to structural unemployment and/or social degradation (forced change of status).

In general, progress is a source for changes, while the changes create a demand for reorientation and adaptation with the new situations. Delaying in adaptation with the processes of the economic development creates conflicts. In the economy there exists a possibility of collision towards the objectives of security and the attainment of the goals of the social justice, as the burden of conformity is unevenly distributed, while the distribution of useful results of the scientific progress is not envisaged at all (Gvelesiani, Gogorishvili, 2018).

In view of the social values, progress is related to the problems of its measurement. As far as a compliance with the processes of the economic development is associated with certain difficulties, it is necessary to take rational measures and provide assistance to people. These events usually face the barriers, since the processes of demonstration of a political will to act in this direction, are characterized by inertia. Another threat that accompanies to providing assistance, is that it can be turned into a permanently demand of an individual who will not do anything for ensuring his/her self-development.

Problems of Digitalization of Entrepreneurship Culture

The contemporary global changes are caused by intensive scientific-and-technical development. Formation of digital economy is an imminent and progressive phenomenon that affects live matter and changes the process of natural development. Digital technologies affect independently the development of human society and, this factor requires a thorough study of their place and role in a society. The trends of globalization have revealed a new function of the state that is connected with capital-intensity of digitalization of the national economy. In the digital economy, emphasis is re-shifted on production of the intellectually intensive products, which requires large capital expenditures. At the same time, the problems arise in both developing and developed countries with small and free economy.

The developed countries with the large and free economy hold the possibilities for implementation of their autonomous economic policy in the digital economy, that that can not be said about small and free economies and lowly developed countries.

A common goal of the digital economy development policy is already undergoing a continuous transformation because it proceeds from the postmodern paradigm of the processes of development and, is focused on an individual (not on a human society). Outstanding persons of our time (Bill Gates, among them) think that without changing the mentality in the digital entrepreneurship, enterprises are not able to implement a rapid and large-scale introduction of innovations that can bring a success. Such a situation is complicated by the fact also that introduction of digital innovations destroys markets and causes many undesirable and unforeseen processes both for enterprises and a whole community. Namely, growth of unemployment among specialists based on the introduction of innovations, immigration and emigration processes, etc., generate social aggression, nihilism, depression, terrorism, and confrontations, in general. Moreover, the producers of the digital products and services think that a content of objectives of any single specialist, corporation, as well as of the main objectives of the governmental economic policy are growth and developed due to daily search for the innovations.

Progress of the digital world originates demand on a new type of the qualified labor resources. The postmodern paradigm of our thinking considers a human community as the unity of people with different types of thinking and consciousness in which certain conflicts (and as a result, the severe consequences thereof) are inevitable. If take into consideration that a cause of reason of any political conflict (in any time and in any community) is the economic interests while a main component of their motivation is to derive material benefits, then it becomes clear that the new digital era, which creates the a waste availability of goods and services, allows people to re-shift gradually accents to receiving intangible benefit that creates considerably greater motivation and changes the content and form of the conflict of interests. The great humanists of the world were the individuals of highly developed consciousness who saw the progress and the the ultimate goal of a human in the understanding and empowering their own capabilities (Frisch, 1989).

VI. CONCLUSION

Problems arising from the digital changes often precede the possibilities of enterprises - to respond to them through the manner of traditional managerial culture. Traditional managerial culture, first of all, requires to specify and identify the problems and, in some cases, readiness for making risky decisions. Thus, everything that we find in the theory and practice of management may turn into the hindering factor for introduction and sustainable development of innovations, in terms of formation of the digital economy. This refers especially to the decisions on a quick and effective response to the changes in the market system in terms of uncertainty. Specialists, entrepreneurial entities and state economic policies are changing fundamentally in the process of total digitalization which has already begun and evolves with a lightning speed. For adapting to the digital world in conditions of uncertainty, the entrepreneurship, society and the state have to change the directions of the development of the economic policy, that is impossible to implement without a new type of thinking (the mentality of development and growth, and the new culture).

VII. REFERENCES

1. Faltin G. (2008), *Kopf Schlaegt Kapital*, Carl Hanser Verlag, Muenchen, pp. 14-17; 98-99; 178; 181-182.
2. Morgan G. (1991), „Emerging Waves and Challenges: The Need for New Competencies and Mindsets.” In: Henry, J. (Hrsg.): *Creative Management*. Sage Publications, London/Newbury Park/New Delhi.
3. Gvelesiani R. (1999), *Strategy and Culture of Success of Small and Medium Entrepreneurship*. Publishing House “Samshoblo”, Tbilisi, p.87 (in Georgian);
4. Koch W., Czogalla Ch. (2004), *Grundlagen der Wirtschaftspolitik*, 2. Auflage, Lucius & Lucius, Stuttgart.
5. Gvelesiani R., Gogorishvili I. (2012), *Economic Policy*, Book I, Publishing House “Universali”, Tbilisi (in Georgian);
6. Gvelesiani R., Gogorishvili I. (2012), *Economic Policy*, Book II, Publishing House “Universali”, Tbilisi (in Georgian);
7. Simon H. (1996), *Die Heimlichen Gewinner (Hidden Champions)*, Die Erfolgsstrategien unbekannter Weltmarktfuehrer, Frankfurt/Main, New York, p.11.
8. Klump R. (2011), *Wirtschaftspolitik, Instrumente, Ziele und Institutionen*, 2. Auflage, Pearson Studium, Muenchen;
9. Faltin G. (2014), *Mind Defeats Capital*, Tbilisi, TSU Publishing House, p.209 (translation from English into Georgian);
10. Hayek F.A. (1960), *The Constitution of Liberty*, Neudruck, London u.a. Wiederabdruck in: Bosch A. und R. Veit Hrsg., *Hayek Gesammelte Schriften Bd. B3, Die Verfassung der Freiheit*, Tuebingen 2005. p.40.
11. Popper K.R. (1960), *On the Sources of Knowledge and of Ignorance*; wiederabgedruckt in ders.: *Conjectures and Refutations – The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, 5. Aufl., Neudruck; London u.k. 2002. pp. 3-30.
12. Hayek F.A. (1959), *Missbrauch und Verfall der Vernunft – Ein Fragment*. Wiederabdruck in: Bosch, A. und R. Veit (Hrsg.), *Hayek Gesammelte Schriften Bd. A2, Sozialwissenschaftliche Denker*, Tuebingen 2004.
13. Röpke W.(1944). *Civitas Humana – Grundfragen der Gesellschafts- und Wirtschaftsreform*, 4. Aufl., Bern 1979.Hennis W.(1984). *Wurzeln und Grenzen der Modernitaet*; in B. Klingenstein (Hrsg.): *Krise des Fortschritts*, Wien u.a. pp. 139-151.
14. Boulding K. E.(1962). K.E. (1962). *Knowledge as a Commodity*; wiederabgedruckt in ders. (Hrsg.): *Beyond Economics – Essays on Society, Religion, and Ethics*, Ann Arbor 1968, pp.141-150.
15. Jonas H. (1979), *Das Prinzip Verantwortung*, Nachdruck, Frankfurt a. M., 2003. pp. 393.
16. R. Gvelesiani, I. Gogorishvili (2014), *The Basic Problems for the Realization of the Concept of Economic Policy*. XII International Conference on Economics and Management, International Science Index, Vol. 8. No:11; November 10-11, 2014, Madrid, Spain, pp. 532-535.
17. R. Gvelesiani (2015), *Intrinsic Contradictions of Entrepreneurship Development and Self-development*. World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology International Journal of Economics and Management Engineering, Madrid, Spain, p.1344-1346.
18. R. Gvelesiani (2015), *The Influence of Interest Groups on Economic Policy and Its Contradictory Results*, Journal of Academy of Business and Economics, IABE, Volume 15, № 2, 2015. ISSN: 1542-8710, Roma Tre University, Italy, Editor: South Stockholm University, Sweden, p.35-40.
19. R. Gvelesiani (2016), *Individuals and Economic Groups” Interests and Behaviour in the Economic and Political Decision-making Process*, European Journal of Business Research (EJBR), IABE, Volume 16, № 1. ISSN: 1945-2977, University of Pisa, Italy, Editor: Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria, p. 97-103.
20. R. Gvelesiani (2016), *Strengthening of the Tendency Towards Social Entrepreneurship as a Demonstration of the Potential for the Improvement of Modern Society’s Moral Characteristics*, International Journal of Strategic Management (IJSJM), IABE, Volume 16, № 2, 2016. ISSN: 1555–2411. University of Florence, Italy, Editor: Trinity Western University, Canada, p. 17-22.
21. R. Gvelesiani (2017), *SOCIAL INEQUALITY – THE REVEALING FORM OF CONFLICTS AMONG THE MAIN SOCIETAL VALUES*, Journal of International Management Studies (JIMS), Volume 17, #1, ISSN: 1930-6105, University of Sassari, Italy, Editor: Trinity Western University, Canada, p.59-64.

22. R. Gvelesiani (2017), THE PROBLEM OF CONSIDERING POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF THE CONSISTENT REFORMS IN THE ECONOMIC-POLITICAL DECISIONS, Review of Business research (RBR), Volume 17, #2, ISSN: 1546-2609, University of Sassari, Italy, Editor: University of Osijek, Croatia, pp.19-24.
23. R. Gvelesiani (2017), POSSIBILITIES OF IMPLEMENTING THE PRACTICAL ECONOMICAL POLITICS RATIONALLY, EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS RESEARCH™ (EJBR), Volume 17, № 2, ISSN: 1945-2977, dx.doi.org/10.18374/EJBR-17-2.3, New York Institute of Technology, USA, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: Professor Christine Duller, Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria, p.25-30.
24. R. Gvelesiani (2018), ENTREPRENEURSHIP POLICY OF THE FIRM “SIEMENS” IN GEORGIA AT THE END OF THE XIX CENTURY AND BEGINNING OF XX CENTURY, Journal of International Business and Economics (JIBE), Volume 18, № 2, ISSN: 1544-8037, Institute for Social Science Research (ISF), Munich, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: Scheherazade S. Rehman, Ph.D. School of Business, The George Washington University, Washington D.C., U.S.A, p.27-32. www.iabe.org
25. R. Gvelesiani (2018), The Problem of Compatibility of Market Liberty With Social Equality, EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS RESEARCH™ (EJBR), Volume 18, №1, ISSN: 1945-2977, Institute for Social Science Research (ISF), Munich, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: Professor Christine Duller, Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria, p.39-44. www.iabe.org
26. R. Gvelesiani (2019), The problem of making optimal decisions on the implementation of economic policy objectives, The 2nd International Conference on business, Management and Economics , ISBN:978-609-8239-66-9 , The ACAVENT, Vienna School of International Studies, Vienna, Austria, 21-23 June 2019, <https://www.icbmeconf.org/june-2019-vienna/>
27. R. Gvelesiani (2018), ROLE OF ASSESSMENT IN DECISION MAKING AND EMPIRICAL EXAMINATION OF THEIR RESULTS, volume 18, № 2, 2018, Las Vegas, Nevada, p41-44, www.iabe.org
28. Gvelesiani R., Gogorishvili I. (2018), Decision-making Technology in the Economic Policy, Publishing House “Universali”, Tbilisi, p.68 (in Georgian)
29. The Paris Review. Frisch Max, (1989), The Art of Fiction No113. Interviewed by Jodi Daynard. <https://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/2367/max-frisch-the-art-of-fiction-no-113-max-frisch>.
30. Silagadze A, Zubiashvili T. (2016) Foreign Direct Investment in Georgia. International Journal of Arts and Sciences. Vol. 09. Number 02, USA. pp. 63-71. <http://www.universitypublications.net/ijas/0902/index.html>
31. Silagadze A, Zubiashvili T., Atanelishvili T. (2016), The Use of Drinking Water in the Conditions of Maintaining Ecological Balance. Refereed International Journal Ecoforum. Vol. 5. №1, pp. 65-69.
32. <http://www.ecoforumjournal.ro/index.php/eco/article/view/365>
33. Silagadze A, Tvalchrelidze A, Zubiashvili T, Atanelishvili T. Aspects of China’s Economic Development. Refereed International Journal Ecoforum. Vol. 5. №1, 2016, pp. 47-64.
34. <http://www.ecoforumjournal.ro/index.php/eco/article/view/321>
35. Zubiashvili T., Atanelishvili T., Some Aspects of the Georgia – CIS Trade Relations. Refereed International Journal Ecoforum. Vol. 8. №2, 2019. <http://www.ecoforumjournal.ro/index.php/eco/article/view/978>