

UDC 330.341.2:338.242.2

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31651/2076-5843-2021-3-33-38>

HNATENKO Iryna

Dr. Sc. (Ekon), Associate Professor,
Kyiv National University of Technologies
and Design, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0254-2466>
q17208@ukr.net

PROKOPENKO Oleksii

PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor,
Luhansk National Agrarian University,
Sloviansk, Ukraine
ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7549-1137>
lnau.prokopenko@gmail.com

KUKSA Ihor

Dr. Sc. (Ekon), Professor,
Kharkiv National Agrarian University
named after V. Dokuchaiev, Kharkiv, Ukraine
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8486-2473>
igor.kuksa.23@gmail.com

NAHOLIUK Olena

PhD in Law, Associate Professor,
Luhansk National Agrarian University,
Sloviansk, Ukraine
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9743-3352>
nagolyk.lnau@ukr.net

MANAGEMENT BASES OF MODELING OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT STATE PRIORITIES: MOTIVATIONAL-COGNITIVE, SOCIO-ECONOMIC, STEREOTYPICAL-BEHAVIORAL FACTORS

The article summarizes the theoretical aspects of the investigate the managerial bases of modeling the state priorities of entrepreneurship development (motivational-cognitive, socio-economic, stereotypical-behavioral factors). The methodology of neo-innovative formation of state priorities of business development in innovative economy is offered. This methodology, in contrast to the existing ones in the scientific world, provides an author's view of the methodological architecture of state priorities based on equal dominance, unification and synergy, within the proposed methodology, systemic, process, evolutionary and stakeholder-oriented approaches. These approaches in the context of the proposed methodology - are the result of a holistic vision of identifying priorities for government regulation and support for entrepreneurship through the controlled influence of actors on the institutional matrix. The ontology of the proposed methodology is focused on deepening the problem field of research of causal relationships that determine the development of events in the institutional environment of entrepreneurship (market "failures", opportunistic behavior, inert business development, violation of complementarity between formal and informal institutions) and also involves the elimination of fragments that have been developed in science in describing the development of entrepreneurship in the innovative economy as a complex multidimensional and dynamic phenomenon.

Key words: management, modeling of business development, state priorities, motivational-cognitive factors, socio-economic factors, stereotypical-behavioral factors.

Introduction. The process of priorities formation of state support and state regulation by modern entrepreneurship necessitates the search for a fundamentally new methodological approach, which will best solve this problem. It is necessary to analyze and synthesize the existing methodological provisions in the context of Keynesianism, monetarism, institutional, non-institutional and other theories and on this basis to reproduce its own methodology for forming state priorities for entrepreneurship, which will identify the main guidelines for improving the business environment of entrepreneurship through the improvement of institutions, overcoming opportunistic phenomena in the national economy and stimulating an innovative way of developing domestic entrepreneurship. These facts determine the relevance of the research topic.

Literature review. In our study, taking into account the functions and principles inherent in the innovation economy, it is advisable to form a methodology for determining state priorities for entrepreneurship within institutionalism and its derived neo-institutional theories. Institutionalism at any time in the development of economic thought was at the height of scientific debate. The work of many domestic and foreign scientists is devoted to defining the essence of institutions and features of their functioning in entrepreneurship: A. Alchian, O. Auzan, V. Afanasyev, L. Hamidulaeva, S. Yerokhin, M. Yermoshenko, T. Eggertsson, V. Zotov, O Inshakov, I. Kitzner, F. Kotler, R. Coase, K. Menard, F. Knight, D. North, M. Porter, A. Smith, A. J. Strickland, A. Thompson, A. Filipenko, D. Frolov, F. Hayek, J. Schumpeter, etc. [3; 7-10].

The study of the concept of "institution" and determining the degree of its impact on socio-economic phenomena is deeply represented in the works of scientists of institutional and neo-institutional direction: T. Veblen, W. Hamilton, D. Clark, J. Commons, D. Lala, G. Maint, J. March, W. Mitchell, D. North, J. Hodgson, etc. [1-2, 4-6]. Despite the widespread coverage of this phenomenon by scientists, the place and role of the institutional environment of entrepreneurship in the context of determining state priorities for business development has not been studied actively enough.

The purpose of the article is to investigate the managerial bases of modeling the state priorities of entrepreneurship development: motivational-cognitive, socio-economic, stereotypical-behavioral factors.

Results and discussion. Domestic and foreign scientists are constantly looking for new methodologies aimed at a more realistic study of motivational-cognitive, socio-economic, stereotyped-behavioral factors that shape the adaptive strategy of entrepreneurship in accordance with exogenously formed mental, natural and institutional conditions peculiar to certain economic system. At the same time, the functional significance of institutions in the formation of such a strategy is quite clearly established and generally recognized. In many scientific studies, scientists have proved quite deeply empirically and theoretically that the peculiarities of building an institutional matrix in an innovative economy significantly affects the strategy of entrepreneurial behavior. At the same time, there are significant differences in the scientific interpretation of the definition of appropriate ways, means and mechanisms to improve the institutional environment of entrepreneurship through the formation of state priorities, which are due to the use of alternative methodologies of individualism and holism (Table 1).

Table 1

Attributive Properties of Individualism and Holism*

Attributive properties	Individualism	Holism
Ontological basis	The formation of the institutional matrix is determined and conditioned solely by the actions of individuals who form and change institutions	Institutions are the primary link in the formation of the system, institutional rules determine the behavior of people
The predominant research method	Deductive - a system as a set of elements	Inductive - the elements form the system
The initiator of development	Western Europe of the late Middle Ages	USA
Human domination	(Renaissance)	Limited human dominance within the scope of an institution
Focus on goal setting	Complete domination and realization of individual human abilities	Determined by the group, the team
Predominant scientific theories	Self-determination by the individual	Institutionalism
The role of the state	Neo-institutionalism	Significant influence of the state on the system
Visualization of properties		

*Source: author's development

The evolution of theories of entrepreneurship, public administration, innovation and institutional development of systems testified to the economic "mainstream" methodologies of individualism in scientific thought by some representatives of economic schools. In particular, the conclusions related to this approach occupy a leading place in the views of representatives of neoclassical, Austrian scientific schools, neo-institutional, behavioral and evolutionary theories.

The methodological approach to the formation of priorities for entrepreneurship from the standpoint of individualism is based on the subject - as the primary link of institutional development, under the influence of which the institutional matrix is formed, based on the fact that the subject serves as the main starting point of scientific and practical analysis being endowed by cognitive-rational thinking and individualistic-intellectual properties.

In this case, public employees, businesses and representatives of infrastructure elements on the basis of individualistic preferences or personal preferences carry out the objective formation of institutions and initiate changes in the rules of their operation in unstable conditions of innovation economy. At the same time, such entities at their own or collective risk compare the possible benefits and costs of such formation, taking into account the national mentality, existing institutions, macro-, meso- and micro-environmental factors (individual, not institutions determine the prospects for further institutional development of entrepreneurship).

The effectiveness and final effect of this collective synergy in the formation of state priorities for entrepreneurship determines the level of final transaction and transformation costs at the macro-, meso- and microlevels, minimizes the uncertainty of the environment and allows to plan the entrepreneur's actions to form its own adaptation strategy.

From the standpoint of individualism, public, collective and private institutions do not appear as endogenous objects of formation of business development priorities due to the lack of subject-motivating behavior, but rather are exogenous constraints of such formation.

It is believed that the progressiveness, ramifications and prevalence in the scientific world of the methodology of individualism in the formation of state policy of entrepreneurship is due to its high congruence and competitiveness among other methodologies, which is due to the wide choice of alternative under different socio-economic and political conditions of economic system development. In addition, individualism became the basis for the formation of a significant number of derived fragmentary models of the subject description of the business environment and innovative economy, which are often combined in various scientific disciplines: psychology, law, philosophy, management, sociology, political science, etc. [8].

In our opinion, in the institutional modification of this methodology, the individualistic action of the subject, which determines the state priorities of business development, should be associated with his personal mental consciousness, synthesized through the prism of personal ideas about the necessary rules and functions of business institutions. Within the framework of individualism, there is an understanding that institutions are only a part of the endogenous environment of entrepreneurship, which can and should be influenced by the regulator with its existing powers. At the same time, the current institutional matrix forms a certain framework of society, ensuring the stability or vice versa of entrepreneurship and determines the sampling of tools for forming the adaptation strategy of the enterprise taking into account the action of exogenous factors influenced by man. However, the institutional matrix is in constant transformation. As an example, T. Veblen rightly recognized the problem of the existence of constant discrepancies between the institutions already functioning in the institutional matrix and the latent factors of the external environment, which fundamentally change the institutional environment in a new way [2]. D. Nort determined that the initiator of changes in the institutional matrix should be entrepreneurs engaged in innovation. At the same time, entrepreneurs should exclusively legally influence business institutions in order to reduce imbalances in the market environment and minimize their own transformation and transaction costs [1].

At the same time, the entrepreneur is not always able to change the elements of the institutional matrix, which are also exposed to the external environment that is formed in the innovation economy. Some external changes are explicit, sometimes difficult to predict exogenous (wars, natural disasters, man-made disasters, etc.), but mostly institutional changes are endogenous, reflecting the activities of individuals who maximize their own usefulness. Radical structural changes in prices for goods, technologies and factors of production, lower social standards of the population, ultimately lead to the

transformation of models and adaptation of the behavior of contractors. In contrast to individualism in determining the state priorities for entrepreneurship in an innovative economy is methodological holism. Within it, institutions are considered as the primary link in the formation of the social system, while institutional rules determine the motivation of people, the manifestation of opportunistic behavior or institutional friction between the actors of the innovative economy is practically not taken into account. The pioneers in the use of the term "holism" were K. Smets (1926) and A. Grochi (1947), who actively used it in their scientific work and initiated the development of derivative ideas and theories of innovative development [3].

At this time in economic thought, the disputes between the supporters of individualism and holism, in the process of forming state priorities for business development do not stop. Researchers are trying to answer the question of which of the methodological approaches is more congruent for the implementation of the process of transforming the institutional matrix of entrepreneurship, and, accordingly, to determine the priorities of business development.

The embryos of the ideas of holism in economic thought can be traced in the works of K. Marx and T. Veblen (at the same time in the works of scientists sometimes there is a duality in the views on the use of holism and individualism) [6]. Methodological individualism together with holism was one of the approaches of thorough research, to which K. Marx referred when analyzing the causal relations, dynamics and factors of development of the socio-economic system. Holistic views in economic thought were partly held by representatives of traditional institutionalism and various areas of unorthodox economic theory: T. Veblen, J. Galbraith, W. Mitchell, J. Clark, J. Commons, K. Myrdal, K. Palani, J. Hodgson and others. The ontology of holism is based on the recognition of the leading role of institutions in the transformation of the business environment, and entrepreneurs are already acting on the basis of learned norms and values that have been established in business institutions. The key problem of holism is the over-absolute role of the market or institutional environment, which determined the motives of the entrepreneur as part of such an environment and underestimating the role of the stakeholder or regulator in transforming the institutional matrix. The principles of methodological holism were partly based on objective philosophical theory of life, socio-economic constructivism and minimizing the need for rational choice of interaction in the economic system in the sense that the creation of business institutions should be seen as the best communication between economic agents. However, objective philosophical theory, constructivism or rationalism are not able to fully reveal meaningful explanations of the institutional behavior of the actors in the system. At the same time, there are other extremes where individualism over-absolutizes man as a stakeholder of the innovative economy, endowed with boundless knowledge, professional experience, intellectual abilities and managerial skills, without regard to his selfish intentions and opportunistic behavior. To solve the goal of the dissertation, it is advisable to develop another methodology, which involves expanding and supplementing existing methodologies for the object of our study.

Our proposed methodology - neo-innovative formation of state priorities for business development (unlike traditional ones, which we studied), provides a modern methodological paradigm for the formation of such priorities in an innovative economy, based on equal dominance, unification and synergy, within the proposed methodology, system, process, evolutionary and stakeholder-oriented approaches. These approaches in the context of the proposed methodology - are the result of a holistic vision of the problems of identifying priorities of state regulation and support for entrepreneurship through the controlled influence of actors on the institutional matrix.

Conclusions. The methodology of neo-innovative formation of state priorities of business development in innovative economy is offered. This methodology, in contrast to the existing ones in the scientific world, provides an author's view of the methodological architecture of state priorities based on equal dominance, unification and synergy, within the proposed methodology, systemic, process, evolutionary and stakeholder-oriented approaches. These approaches in the context of the proposed methodology - are the result of a holistic vision of identifying priorities for government regulation and support for entrepreneurship through the controlled influence of actors on the institutional matrix.

The ontology of the proposed methodology is focused on deepening the problem field of research of causal relationships that determine the development of events in the institutional environment of entrepreneurship (market "failures", opportunistic behavior, inert business development, violation of complementarity between formal and informal institutions) and also involves the elimination of

fragments that have been developed in science in describing the development of entrepreneurship in the innovative economy as a complex multidimensional and dynamic phenomenon.

References (in language original)

1. Гнатенко І. Визначення інновацій як інструментарію національного підприємництва. *Науковий вісник Одеського національного університету імені І. Мечникова. Серія «Економіка»*. 2018. Т. 23. Вип. 5 (70). С. 38-42.
2. Гнатенко І. Вплив національного інноваційного підприємництва на сталий розвиток ринку праці. *Вісник Херсонського державного університету*. 2018. № 32. С. 69–72.
3. Гнатенко І. Методологічні основи інституціонального аналізу національної системи інноваційного підприємництва. *Економічний вісник Запорізької державної інженерної академії*. 2018. № 6 (18). С. 70-74.
4. Гнатенко І. Методологічні аспекти розвитку інноваційного підприємництва: теорія та практика: монографія. Харків: СГ НТМ «Новий курс», 2019. 253 с.
5. Ходаківська О., Гнатенко І., Дяченко Т., Сабій І. Моделі підприємництва в умовах інноваційної економіки та економіки знань: управління ресурсами та витратами. *Інвестиції: практика та досвід*. 2021. № 15. С. 5–11.
6. Brockova K., Rossokha V., Chaban V., Zos-Kior M., Hnatenko I., Rubezhanska V. Economic mechanism of optimizing the innovation investment program of the development of agro-industrial production. *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*. 2021. Vol. 43. No. 1. P. 129-135.
7. Hnatenko I., Kuksa I., Orlova-Kurilova O. Paragenesis of entrepreneurship and innovation as drivers of the future economy. *Strategic Management: Global Trends and National Peculiarities*. Collective monograph. Poland: Publishing House «Baltija Publishing», 2019. P. 48-61.
8. Hnatenko I., Kuksa I., Orlova-Kurilova O., Moisieieva N., Rubezhanska V. State regulation of innovative employment in the context of innovative entrepreneurship development. *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*. 2019. № 41 (2). P. 228-236.
9. Lozhachevska O., Navrotska T., Melnyk O., Kapinus L., Zos-Kior M., Hnatenko I. Management of the logistical and marketing behavior of innovation clusters in territorial communities in the context of digitalization of society and the online market. *Laplace In Review*. 2021. № 7 (3). P. 315-323.
10. Zos-Kior M., Hnatenko I., Isai O., Shtuler I., Samborskyi O., Rubezhanska V. Management of Efficiency of the Energy and Resource Saving Innovative Projects at the Processing Enterprises. *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*. 2020. Vol. 42. No. 4. P. 504-515.

References

1. Hnatenko, I. (2018). Vyznachennya innovatsiy yak instrumentariyu natsional'noho pidpryyemnystva [Definition of innovations as tools of national entrepreneurship]. *Naukovyy visnyk Odes'koho natsional'noho universytetu imeni I. I. Mechnykova. Seriya "Ekonomika"*, 23, 5 (70), pp. 38-42.
2. Hnatenko, I. (2018). Vplyv natsional'noho innovatsiynoho pidpryyemnystva na stalyy rozvytok rynku pratsi [The Impact of National Innovative Entrepreneurship on Sustainable Development of the Labor Market]. *Visnyk Khersonskoho derzhavnoho universytetu-Bulletin of the Kherson State University*, 32, pp. 69-72.
3. Hnatenko, I. (2018). Metodolohichni osnovy instytutsional'noho analizu natsional'noyi systemy innovatsiynoho pidpryyemnystva [Methodological bases of institutional analysis of the national system of innovative entrepreneurship]. *Ekonomichnyj visnyk Zaporizkoji derzhavnoji inzhenernoji akademiji-Economic Bulletin of Zaporizhzhya State Engineering Academy*, 6(18), pp. 70-74.
4. Hnatenko, I. (2019). Metodolohichni aspekty rozvytku innovatsiynoho pidpryyemnystva: teoriia ta praktyka [Methodological aspects of innovative entrepreneurship development: theory and practice], New Course, Kharkiv, Ukraine.
5. Khodakivska, O.V., Hnatenko, I.A., Dyachenko, T.O. & Sabiy, I.M. (2021). Modeli pidpryyemnystva v umovakh innovatsiynoyi ekonomiky ta ekonomiky znan': upravlinnya resursamy ta vytratamy [Models of entrepreneurship in terms of innovation economy and knowledge economy: resource and cost management]. *Investytsiyi: praktyka ta dosvid*, 15, pp. 5–11.
6. Brockova, K., Rossokha, V., Chaban, V., Zos-Kior, M., Hnatenko, I. & Rubezhanska, V. (2021). Economic mechanism of optimizing the innovation investment program of the development of agro-industrial production, *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 43.1, 129-135.
7. Hnatenko, I., Kuksa, I. & Orlova-Kurilova, O. (2019). Paragenesis of entrepreneurship and innovation as drivers of the future economy, *Strategic Management: Global Trends and National Peculiarities*. Collective monograph. Poland: Publishing House “Baltija Publishing”.
8. Hnatenko, I., Kuksa, I., Orlova-Kurilova, O., Moisieieva, N. & Rubezhanska, V. (2019). State regulation of innovative employment in the context of innovative entrepreneurship development, *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 41 (2), pp. 228-236.
9. Lozhachevska, O., Navrotska, T., Melnyk, O., Kapinus, L., Zos-Kior, M. & Hnatenko, I. (2021). Management of the logistical and marketing behavior of innovation clusters in territorial communities in the context of digitalization of society and the online market, *Laplace In Review*, 7 (3), pp. 315-323.

10. Zos-Kior, M., Hnatenko, I., Isai, O., Shtuler, I., Samborskyi, O. & Rubezhanska, V. (2020). Management of Efficiency of the Energy and Resource Saving Innovative Projects at the Processing Enterprises, *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 42.4, pp. 504-515.

ГНАТЕНКО Ірина Анатоліївна

доктор економічних наук, доцент,
Київський національний університет технологій та
дизайну, м. Київ, Україна

ПРОКОПЕНКО Олексій Володимирович

кандидат філософських наук, доцент,
Луганський національний аграрний університет,
м. Слов'янськ, Україна

КУКСА Ігор Миколайович

доктор економічних наук, професор,
Харківський національний аграрний університет
ім. В.В. Докучаєва,
м. Харків, Україна

НАГОЛЮК Олена Євгенівна

кандидат юридичних наук, доцент,
Луганський національний аграрний університет,
м. Слов'янськ, Україна

**УПРАВЛІНСЬКІ ОСНОВИ МОДЕЛЮВАННЯ ДЕРЖАВНИХ ПРІОРИТЕТІВ РОЗВИТКУ
ПІДПРИЄМНИЦТВА: МОТИВАЦІЙНО-КОГНІТИВНІ, СОЦІАЛЬНО-ЕКОНОМІЧНІ,
СТЕРЕОТИПНО-ПОВЕДІНКОВІ ЧИННИКИ**

***Проблема.** Процес формування пріоритетів державної підтримки та державного регулювання розвитку підприємництва зумовлює необхідність пошуку принципово нового методологічного підходу, який у найліпший спосіб дозволить вирішити проблему. Необхідно здійснювати аналіз та синтез існуючих методологічних положень в контексті розвитку кейнсіанства, монетаризму, інституціональної, неінституціональної та інших теорій і на цій основі відтворювати власну методологію формування державних пріоритетів розвитку підприємництва, яка дозволить визначити основні орієнтири поліпшення бізнес-середовища підприємництва через удосконалення інститутів, подолання опортуністичних явищ та стимулювання інноваційного шляху розвитку підприємництва.*

***Метою** статті є наукове обґрунтування управлінських основ моделювання державних пріоритетів розвитку підприємництва, зокрема мотиваційно-когнітивних, соціально-економічних, стереотипно-поведінкових чинників.*

***Результати.** Запропоновано методологію формування державних пріоритетів розвитку підприємництва в інноваційній економіці. Зазначена методологія, на відміну від існуючих у науковому світі, передбачає авторський погляд на методологічну архітектуру формування державних пріоритетів, засновану на рівному домінуванні, об'єднанні і синергізмі, в рамках запропонованої методології, системного, процесного, еволюційного та стейкхолдерорієнтованого підходів. Дані підходи в контексті запропонованої методології є результатом цілісного бачення проблематики виявлення пріоритетів державного регулювання і підтримки підприємництва за допомогою контрольованого впливу акторів на інституціональну матрицю. Онтологія запропонованої методології сконцентрована на поглибленні проблемного поля дослідження причинно-наслідкових зв'язків, що визначають розвиток подій в інституціональному середовищі підприємництва (ринкових «провалів», опортуністичної поведінки, порушенні компліментарності між формальними та неформальними інститутами), а також передбачає усунення фрагментарностей, що склалися в науці при описі розвитку підприємництва в інноваційній економіці як складного багатовимірного і динамічного феномена.*

***Наукова новизна.** Наукова новизна одержаних результатів дослідження полягає в удосконаленні теоретичних положень, методичних та науково-практичних рекомендацій щодо застосування управлінських основ моделювання державних пріоритетів розвитку підприємництва, зокрема мотиваційно-когнітивних, соціально-економічних, стереотипно-поведінкових чинників.*

***Висновки.** В інституціональній модифікації запропонованої методології індивідуалістичну дію суб'єкту, що визначає державні пріоритети розвитку підприємництва, слід пов'язувати з його персональною ментальною свідомістю, що синтезується крізь призму особистісних уявлень стосовно необхідних правил і функцій інститутів підприємництва. У межах дії індивідуалізму, відбувається розуміння того, що інститути – це лише частина ендогенного середовища підприємництва, на яку регулятор може та повинен впливати наявними у нього владними повноваженнями. При цьому поточна інституціональна матриця формує певний каркас суспільства, забезпечуючи стійкість або навпаки регрес підприємництва та зумовлює вибір інструментарію формування адаптаційної стратегії підприємства з урахуванням дії чинників-екзогенів, на які вплинула людина. Акцентовано увагу на використанні мотиваційно-когнітивних, соціально-економічних, стереотипно-поведінкових чинників.*

***Ключові слова:** управління, основи моделювання, державні пріоритети, розвиток підприємництва, мотиваційно-когнітивні чинники, соціально-економічні чинники, стереотипно-поведінкові чинники.*

Одержано редакцією: 24.05.2021
Прийнято до публікації: 03.08.2021