

DOI: [10.55643/fcaptop.3.44.2022.3776](https://doi.org/10.55643/fcaptop.3.44.2022.3776)

Simkiv L.

D.Sc. in Economics, Professor,
Head of the Department of Theory of
Economics and Management, Ivano-
Frankivsk National Technical University
of Oil and Gas,
Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine;
ORCID: [0000-0001-8270-237X](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8270-237X)

Andrusiv U.

Candidate of Economic Sciences,
Associate Professor of the Department
of Economics and Management, Ivano-
Frankivsk National Technical University
of Oil and Gas,
Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine;
e-mail: andrusivu@ukr.net
ORCID: [0000-0003-1793-0936](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1793-0936)
(Corresponding Author)

Kupalova H.

D.Sc. in Economics, Professor,
Head of the Department of
Environmental Management and
Entrepreneurship, Taras Shevchenko
National University of Kyiv, Kyiv,
Ukraine;
ORCID: [0000-0003-4486-8349](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4486-8349)

Goncharenko N.

Candidate of Economic Sciences,
Associate Professor of the Department
of Environmental Management and
Entrepreneurship, Taras Shevchenko
National University of Kyiv, Kyiv,
Ukraine;
ORCID: [0000-0001-9274-9905](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9274-9905)

Dzoba O.

D.Sc. in Economics, Professor of the
Department of Entrepreneurship and
Marketing, Ivano-Frankivsk National
Technical University of Oil and Gas,
Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine;
ORCID: [0000-0003-0385-3693](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0385-3693)

Yushkevych O.

Candidate of Economic Sciences,
Associate Professor of the Department
of Management and Entrepreneurship
Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University,
Zhytomyr, Ukraine;
ORCID: [0000-0002-6906-5799](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6906-5799)

Received: 20/05/2022

Accepted: 08/06/2022

Published: 30/06/2022

© Copyright
2022 by the author(s)



This is an Open Access article
distributed under the terms of the
[Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

CONCENTRATION OF ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITY IN THE REGIONS OF UKRAINE IN THE CONTEXT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

ABSTRACT

The state and features of small business development in Ukraine are studied in the context of ensuring the postulates of sustainable development. Positive and negative trends and changes are revealed, prospects of the development of business structures are defined in terms of sustainable development. Assessing the concentration of entrepreneurial activity in the regions of Ukraine, we note the presence of certain fluctuations in the dynamics and interregional differences in the density of economic entities per 10 thousand population. Based on the analysis of the entrepreneurial activity in the regions of Ukraine, it is established that despite the insufficient level of small business development, its influence on the economic development of the regions is growing. This is confirmed by the calculated coefficient of the impact of revenues from small businesses to the local budget on GRP, the importance of which is growing in all regions. The calculation of the ratio of personnel costs in the field of small business to personnel costs in all enterprises shows its tendency to decrease in most regions, which is explained by an increase in business shadowing rather than lower wages and a reduced number of employees in these enterprises. It is proved that the development of entrepreneurship solves not only economic but also social issues. It is an effective means of restructuring, enhancing innovation, overcoming imbalances in certain market segments, creating new jobs and reducing unemployment. Stimulating the development of an entrepreneurial activity, supporting small business and creating conditions for economic management are among the primary tasks of the state's economic policy.

Keywords: sustainable development, concentrations of business activity, small business, disproportionality of economic growth, business structures, business entity

JEL Classification: M21, M11, Q12, O13, D20

INTRODUCTION

In the context of growing interregional disproportion, searching for ways to minimize the negative consequences of territorial uneven development, ensuring sustainable development, the activation of entrepreneurial activity is one of the most important tasks in the state. The intensification of business activity in the region is an important step in solving these problems. By its nature, small business is based on local needs, interests, with a focus on local markets, based on historical and centuries-old cultural traditions of the country, the diversity of existing cultures.

The gradual increase in the level of concentration of entrepreneurial activity is the main driver of innovative economic development and social stability of the regions, ensuring the postulates of sustainable development. At the same time, the business sector has a direct impact on the economic development of the regions, which is manifested in the stimulation and effective use of various innovations in economic processes. In the conditions of systemic restructuring of the national economy, the business sector plays a leading role and is an important factor in ensuring sustainable development. The main mechanisms of the impact of entrepreneurship on sustainable development are: increasing the technical level of technologies used, as well as their number; increasing

the efficiency of production processes; increasing labor productivity, product competitiveness, as well as the innovation component; updating offers on the labor market; changing the culture of entrepreneurship.

Such importance of the phenomenon of entrepreneurship for the economic, social and political development of the regions in terms of sustainable development makes its study consistently relevant over a long period. In addition, in the context of the economic and political crisis, an entrepreneurial activity must play a particularly important role, to carry out the mission of economic and social breakthrough in all regions. It alone is able to save the economy from a critical recession, revive the process of progressive development, provide the entire social system with capacity, flexibility, and dynamics and ensure sustainable development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Increasing the efficiency of entrepreneurship is one of the main factors of positive structural changes and modernization of both regional and national economies, improving the quality of life [1]. At the same time, it should be noted that the effectiveness of small businesses largely depends on the level of concentration of entrepreneurial activity in the regions, proper infrastructure and their support at both state and regional levels [2].

Intensification of the development of entrepreneurship as a dynamic and mobile sector of the region's economy plays an important role in creating a competitive environment for business structures. It also provides for solving employment problems, improving welfare, filling the market with goods and services, infrastructure development, economic and social growth and environmental management in the region [3]. The ability of a small business to structure the market puts forward the task of its revival and it ranks among priority measures for the development of the country's economy. According to [4] economic growth in the country and the region is increasingly determined by many small innovative companies concentrated in the area, rather than by big business. Based on research, the authors conclude that the most sound strategy for innovative entrepreneurship in the region is a strategy of cooperation between different types of companies to overcome their weaknesses, expand existing opportunities and enhance innovation and entrepreneurial opportunities. Scientists [5] in their study argue that in the process of business development financial resources that have a high impact on the development of small and medium enterprises play an important role. Rohozian et al, [6] concluded that no country is able to develop successfully alone, therefore, it is necessary to emphasize the deployment of such cooperation at the interregional level. This, in turn, will increase the level of entrepreneurial activity. Barinova et al, [7] examined the uneven development of entrepreneurship in Russia, because the risks of doing business, the complexity and length of administrative procedures, access to capital, regulation and informal community norms are extremely important. Li, [8] argues that growth-oriented entrepreneurship prefers agglomerated regions and does not value the ability to create knowledge, although both the ability to create knowledge and the maturity of factors are important for the region to involve entrepreneurs who pursue technological opportunities. Belás et al, [9] conducted a study of the business environment of small and medium enterprises in the Czech Republic and Slovakia and concluded that the most important business risk was a market risk, which was accompanied by financial and personal risks. Simkiv et al. [10], Andrusiv, [11] and Popadinets et al, [12] say that innovation and entrepreneurial activity have a direct impact on the development and economic growth of the country. Zelinska et al, [13] argues that social capital is the catalyst for entrepreneurial activity. Improving the efficiency of small business at the regional level should be based on the interests of the local community, local governments, business structures, i.e. all economic entities located within the region. Achieving compromises between competing or divergent interests of government and entrepreneurs is one of the goals of ensuring the effective development of entrepreneurship in the region. This is what [14; 15; 16] focus on in their studies. Under these circumstances, increasing entrepreneurial activity becomes a determining factor in the ability of communities to self-development, as it will increase local budgets, expand production and social infrastructure, efficient use of the endogenous potential of territories [17; 18; 19].

However, changes in society do not always have a positive effect on the activities of small and medium businesses. Therefore, despite the significant amount of research on business structures, identifying trends in entrepreneurship in the regions of Ukraine, awareness of its competitive advantages and development problems, determining the level of concentration of entrepreneurial activity remain relevant and need further study.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the article is to study the state and features of small business development, to determine the level of concentration of entrepreneurial activity in the regions of Ukraine and its impact on the dynamics of economic development of the regions in the context of ensuring the postulates of sustainable development.

METHODS

To achieve the set goals, the following research methods were used in the work: theoretical generalization – for the implementation of generalization and systematization of theoretical provisions on the uneven development of entrepreneurship; system analysis – to determine the impact of the business sector on the economic development of regions and sustainable development; comparative and economic analysis – for diagnosing the financial and economic state of small business in the regional aspect; structural analysis – to assess the dynamics of changes in indicators characterizing the level of concentration of entrepreneurial activity in the regions; statistical grouping – to establish the level of concentration of business entities and their activities in the regions; formalization method – to determine the measures for the formation and effective development of entrepreneurship; abstract-logical and empirical – for theoretical generalizations and formulation of research conclusions. The tabular procedure is used to visualize the results obtained.

RESULTS

Small business is an important element of the economy in the context of sustainable development, which mobilizes financial and production resources of the population, is a serious factor in structural restructuring, and plays an important role in creating conditions for the development of competitive enterprises in the region, ensuring employment of the population, and supporting the social stability of public relations. However, in Ukraine, the development of small business is characterized as unsatisfactory. Among European countries, Ukraine has a small number of small business entities per 10 thousand inhabitants. And although their share in the GNP in Ukraine has more than doubled over the past ten years, however, in comparison with European countries, this figure remains insignificant.

A characteristic feature of small business in Ukraine is the unevenness, which affects almost all aspects of this area of the national economy.

First, the growth rates of small businesses are uneven, which is explained by the lack of an effective mechanism for implementing regional policies to support small businesses; high level of taxation; lack of proper regulatory framework for small business development; limited financial resources; imperfection of the system of accounting and statistical reporting of small business, limited information and advisory support, and the like.

Secondly, there are differences in the organizational and territorial concentration of business entities. The largest share of business entities, taking into account all organizational and legal forms, was concentrated in Kyiv (25.6% of the number of EDRPOU subjects) and a number of regions (Dnipropetrovsk region – 7.6%, Kharkiv region – 7.3%, Odesa region – 7.01%). Due to the military conflict in the east of the country, the Donetsk and Luhansk regions experienced the greatest decline in entrepreneurial activity compared to other regions. A large number of enterprises in these regions were liquidated or re-registered in other regions of Ukraine. The consequence of this process was an increase in the share of business entities in the Lviv, Zaporizhzhia, Dnipropetrovsk and Kharkiv regions.

Third, unevenness is characteristic of the sectoral structure of a small business, which there is reason to believe is unsatisfactory from the point of view of state interests, although it to a certain extent coincides with global trends. In particular, the structure of a small business by type of economic activity is still dominated by areas of non-productive activities, especially those that have a relatively rapid turnover of funds. Therefore, trade enterprises, which number almost 988 thousand units, dominate together with industrial enterprises – 131 thousand units, while the number of businesses providing educational, medical, consulting, innovation and other services is several times smaller. In the field of trade and services, the share of small and medium enterprises is 27.2% of the total number of enterprises, in the industry – 12.4%, agriculture – 13.6%, construction – 8.5%.

Under such conditions, the study of the concentration of small and medium enterprises becomes relevant, because, as the experience of developed countries shows, small business forms the preconditions for socio-economic development of the country as a whole and its individual regions, and acts as a leading sector of the market economy given the postulates of the concept of sustainable development [22]. To analyze the concentration of business entities in certain regions of the country, the main structural indicators of the activities of state-owned entities (enterprises and individual entrepreneurs) in the regional context were selected: the number of entities, the number of employees and employees, the volume of products sold [23, 24].

First of all, let's calculate the average value of each indicator for all regions (except Kyiv):

$$x_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_{ij}}{n} \quad (1)$$

where x_j is the average value of the j-th indicator;

x_{ij} is the value of the j-th indicator of the i-th region;

n is the number of regions.

The next step is the formation of each indicator j of the set A_j , which includes those regions whose parameter level exceeds the calculated average value:

$$A_j : i \in A_j, \dots \text{if } x_{ij} > \bar{x}_j$$

The S_i function displays the number of indicators for which the region i exceeds the calculated average value.

$$S_i = \sum_{j=1}^m \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i \in A_j \\ 0, & \text{if } i \notin A_j \end{cases}$$

Where m is the number of analysed indicators.

The average value of the S_i function of all regions can be determined by the formula:

$$\bar{S}_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n S_i}{n} \quad (2)$$

As a result of the calculation, we determine the regions whose value of the S_i function exceeds the calculated average value. This sample forms a set of AS :

$$AS : i \in AS, \dots \text{if } \dots S_i > \bar{S}$$

The calculations revealed three groups of regions with different degrees of concentration of business entities and their activities (Table 1):

- high degree of concentration: Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhzhia, Kyiv, Lviv, Odesa and Kharkiv regions (the number of values of the analyzed parameters, the level of which exceeds the value of the average (8));
- average degree: Vinnytsia, Donetsk and Poltava regions (4);
- below average: all other regions.

The analysis allows us to state that the concentration of business entities in Ukraine is typical for regions with a high level of socio-economic development. The main reasons for this state of concentration of entrepreneurial activity of small enterprises are:

- for small businesses there is almost no legal framework that would take into account their interests;
- significant differences in the levels of socio-economic development of the regions, which are due to demographic, historical, geographical, environmental features;
- lack of a scientifically sound, clearly defined national strategy for small business development [25; 26]. This results in deepening interregional disparities and the concentration of economic activity and financial results only in more developed regions.

Thus, on the one hand, entrepreneurship is the factor that stimulates the development of the territory, and, on the other hand, the high level of socio-economic development of the region stimulates entrepreneurial activity and contributes to the maximum use of the internal potential of this territory and ensures sustainable development.

Table 1. Main structural indicators of activity of business entities of the regions of Ukraine, 2020 (in% to the general indicator by country). Note: * Excluding the temporarily occupied territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the city of Sevastopol and part of the anti-terrorist operation zone. (Source: [20; 21])

Regions	The number of host subjects		The number of employees		The number of employees		The volume of sold products		The number of indicators whose values are above the average for all regions
	Entrepreneurship	natural persons-entrepreneurs	Entrepreneurship	natural persons-entrepreneurs	Entrepreneurship	natural persons-entrepreneurs	Entrepreneurship	natural persons-entrepreneurs	
Ukraine	3.1	3.7	4.6	3.8	3.5	3.8	2.4	3.5	
Vinnitsia	2.7	4.0	2.7	4.0	2.6	4.0	1.9	3.8	4
Volyn	1.7	2.3	1.8	2.5	1.8	3.0	1.9	2.3	0
Dnepropetrovsk	8.2	7.5	10.4	7.9	10.4	8.4	11.4	8.2	8
Donetsk *	2.7	3.5	4.3	3.8	4.4	4.1	5.0	2.9	4
Zhytomyr	1.9	2.9	2.1	3.0	2.1	3.1	1.2	2.8	0
Transcarpathian	1.8	3.0	1.4	2.9	1.4	2.7	0.7	2.8	0
Zaporozhye	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2	3.5	3.7	8
Ivano-Frankivsk	2.3	3.0	1.6	3.4	3.0	4.0	1.1	2.6	1
Kyiv	5.6	5.5	5.3	5.0	5.3	4.4	5.3	5.9	8
Kirovograd	2.3	1.9	1.6	2.0	1.6	2.1	1.1	1.6	0
Luhansk *	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.3	0.4	0.9	0
Lviv	5.4	6.5	5.5	6.9	5.5	7.4	3.8	6.7	8
Mykolayivska	3.2	2.9	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.1	1.6	2.2	1
Odessa	6.9	7.2	4.7	6.5	4.7	5.5	4.1	6.3	8
Poltava	3.1	3.4	3.9	3.6	3.9	4.0	3.2	3.4	4
Rivne	1.6	2.3	1.6	2.7	1.5	3.3	0.7	2.1	0
Sumy	1.7	2.3	1.9	2.6	1.9	2.9	1.1	2.1	0
Ternopil	1.4	2.1	1.3	2.4	1.4	2.7	0.8	1.9	0
Kharkiv	6.7	8.8	6.2	9.2	6.2	9.7	4.1	9.2	8
Kherson	2.3	2.4	1.4	2.3	1.4	2.1	0.8	1.8	0
Khmelnysky	2.1	3.6	1.9	3.6	1.9	3.5	1.1	2.8	0
Cherkasy	2.6	3.1	2.2	3.3	2.2	3.6	1.9	3.3	0
Chernivtsi	1.2	2.7	0.9	2.5	0.9	2.2	0.3	2.0	0
Chernihiv	1.7	2.2	1.8	2.2	1.7	2.3	1.1	2.1	0

At the same time, we should note that small and medium businesses in European countries account for a significant share of GDP. Thus, in Germany they account for 60% of GDP, and in Italy – 70% (The small business act for Europe). Therefore, when analysing the impact of the concentration of entrepreneurial activity on the dynamics of economic development of the regions, it is necessary to calculate the coefficient of the impact of revenues from small businesses to the local budget on the gross regional product (Table 2).

The effect of this coefficient varies from 0 to 1.

$$KN_j = \frac{O_j}{VRP_j} \quad (3)$$

KN_j is the coefficient of the impact of revenues from small businesses to the local budget on the gross regional product in the j -th region;

O_j is the amount of common tax revenues to the local budget from small businesses in the j -th region;

VRP_j is the value of gross regional product in the j -th region.

According to calculations, in 2020 in almost all regions there was an increase in the impact of revenues from small businesses to the local budget on the gross regional product compared to 2013. The greatest influence of this coefficient is observed in such regions as Lviv, Vinnytsia, Kharkiv, Odesa, Zhytomyr, Kherson, Chernivtsi. Thus, we can conclude that the share of revenues from small businesses in GRP is increasing, which in turn has a positive effect on the dynamics of economic processes in the regions.

Table 2. Regional distribution of the impact of revenues from small businesses to the local budget on the gross regional product in 2013-2020. * Note: Excluding the temporarily occupied territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the city of Sevastopol and part of the anti-terrorist operation zone. (Source: [20; 21])

№	Regions	Coefficient of the impact of revenues from small businesses to the local budget on gross regional product	
		2013	2020
1	Vinnytsia	0.44	0.55
2	Volyn	0.37	0.46
3	Dnipropetrovsk	0.21	0.32
4	Donetsk*	0.22	0.34
5	Zhytomyr	0.48	0.63
6	Zakarpattia	0.53	0.69
7	Zaporizhia	0.31	0.41
8	Ivano-Frankivsk	0.32	0.41
9	Kyiv	0.31	0.49
10	Kirovohrad	0.35	0.39
11	Luhansk*	0.29	0.46
12	Lviv	0.40	0.60
13	Mykolaiv	0.39	0.50
14	Odesa	0.46	0.61
15	Poltava	0.26	0.32
16	Rivne	0.42	0.49
17	Sumy	0.40	0.47
18	Ternopil	0.44	0.54
19	Kharkiv	0.48	0.68
20	Kherson	0.51	0.62
21	Khmelnyskyi	0.47	0.59
22	Cherkasy	0.40	0.53
23	Chernivtsi	0.65	0.78
24	Chernihiv	0.40	0.52
25	City of Kyiv	0.24	0.39

The income received by employees is a significant indicator for the economic development of the region. Therefore, it is necessary to take into account the ratio of personnel costs in the field of small business to personnel costs in all enterprises (Table 3).

$$KV_j = \frac{V_j^{MB}}{VP_j} \quad (4)$$

where KV_j is the ratio of personnel costs in the field of small business to personnel costs at all enterprises in the j -th region;

V_j^{MB} stands for the personnel costs in the field of small business in the j -th region;

VP_j stands for the personnel costs at all enterprises in the j -th region.

Thus, in most regions, there is a tendency to reduction of personnel costs in the field of small business in relation to personnel costs at all enterprises. This decrease was due to both lower wages and a decrease in the number of employees at enterprises. However, the actual number of employees in the business is much higher, as the use of unregistered wages

and the payment of wages "under the table" have not been eradicated. At the same time, in several regions (Ivano-Frankivsk, Chernivtsi, Kherson, Odesa, Mykolayiv, Kirovohrad) this ratio has increased.

Table 3. Regional distribution of personnel costs in the field of small business to personnel costs at all enterprises in 2013-2020. Note: * Excluding the temporarily occupied territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the city of Sevastopol and part of the anti-terrorist operation zone. (Source: [20; 21])

№	Regions	The ratio of personnel costs in the field of small business to personnel costs in all enterprises	
		2013	2020
1	Vinnitsia	0.24	0.23
2	Volyn	0.19	0.17
3	Dnipropetrovsk	0.10	0.10
4	Donetsk*	0.09	0.05
5	Zhytomyr	0.23	0.21
6	Zakarpattia	0.25	0.19
7	Zaporizhia	0.14	0.12
8	Ivano-Frankivsk	0.24	0.26
9	Kyiv	0.16	0.15
10	Kirovohrad	0.26	0.27
11	Luhansk*	0.08	0.09
12	Lviv	0.17	0.17
13	Mykolaiv	0.18	0.19
14	Odesa	0.19	0.20
15	Poltava	0.14	0.13
16	Rivne	0.23	0.21
17	Sumy	0.17	0.16
18	Ternopil	0.25	0.25
19	Kharkiv	0.18	0.18
20	Kherson	0.28	0.30
21	Khmelnyskyi	0.25	0.23
22	Cherkasy	0.21	0.21
23	Chernivtsi	0.31	0.32
24	Chernihiv	0.23	0.20
25	city of Kyiv	0.17	0.18

Nevertheless, small enterprises operating in the regional economy take an active part in the balanced economic development of territories, create jobs, increase incomes, and partially strengthen the budget stability of regions against the background of stagnation of bankrupt large industrial enterprises.

At the same time, today the development of entrepreneurial activity in the regions and its impact on ensuring sustainable development must be considered within the framework of a new active and balanced regional policy, taking into account both sectoral and regional characteristics. In particular, the envisaged expansion of the powers of the regions should take place with an increase in their responsibility for the course and results of socio-economic transformations in the region. Of course, it will be impossible to solve these important issues without the proper support of small and medium enterprises.

In view of this, the priority measures that will create favorable conditions for the formation and effective development of small and medium enterprises in Ukraine in terms of sustainable development are the following:

- the formation of an information and consulting environment for comprehensive service of business structures, which will contribute to ensuring free access of entrepreneurs to information (legal, regulatory, reference, marketing, scientific and technological, commercial), obtaining advice on all issues in the process of both creation and the functioning of small businesses [27]. Such information and the consulting system should perform the following functions: providing access to information necessary for the functioning of enterprises; assistance in the implementation of operational services related to the registration of an enterprise, banking operations, transportation, insurance, accounting automation; providing information on the state of the market, enterprise management, selection of technologies, participation in fairs, training; organizing contacts between entrepreneurs based on the use of new information technologies; implementation of the primary examination of proposals from entrepreneurs in the region;

formation of communication platforms for the exchange of experience. The users of the information and consulting support system can be not only small businesses but also regional and local institutions to support the development of small businesses; various public associations of entrepreneurs; institutions of entrepreneurial infrastructure, etc.;

- the creation of financial and credit support, which provides for direct guaranteed loans, targeted subsidies, concessional lending, guarantees to credit companies, targeted budget financing, mediation in contacts with investment funds, foreign investors, and the development of promising forms of financing (leasing, insurance, bills of exchange, etc.);
- attraction of investments and intensification of innovative activity of the business sector of the regions, its creative and multiplicative function;
- introduction of an effective system of training and retraining of personnel for entrepreneurial activity, which will help to cover the training not only of existing entrepreneurs but also of those who are just starting their own business. Education and training exist today outside the strategy of economic development, market demands, and forecasts of regional entrepreneurship in our country. The influx of new people into the business is seriously constrained by both competition and the fact that young people give priority to work in the civil service, in large commercial structures, where a steady income is provided;
- formation of an infrastructural environment for small business activities. Through infrastructure facilities, business contacts are established between entrepreneurs, which contributes to the self-organization of small businesses. The infrastructure for supporting entrepreneurship is designed to provide additional opportunities for small businesses, and help overcome specific difficulties and problems that objectively arise before them, especially for novice entrepreneurs.

CONCLUSIONS

According to the conducted study, in Ukraine, there is an uneven concentration of small and medium enterprises by region. This indicates that in the regions of Ukraine (except the capital) the level of saturation of small enterprises is still very far from the indicators that are typical for developed countries.

By type of economic activity, the structure of a small business is still dominated by areas of non-productive activities, especially those that have a relatively fast turnover of funds, in particular, trade enterprises, while enterprises providing educational, medical, consulting, innovation and other services – several times less.

The calculations show that in all regions there is an increase in the impact of revenues from small businesses to the local budget on the gross regional product compared to the previous period, which in turn has a positive effect on the dynamics of economic processes in the regions. The greatest influence of this coefficient is observed in such regions as Lviv, Vinnytsia, Kharkiv, Odesa, Zhytomyr, Kherson, and Chernivtsi.

The calculation of the ratio of personnel costs in the field of small business to personnel costs at all enterprises shows a tendency to reduce personnel costs in the field of small business in relation to personnel costs at all enterprises. This decrease was due to both lower wages and a decrease in the number of employees at enterprises. However, the actual number of employees in the business is much higher, as the practice of using unregistered hired labor and payment of wages "under the table" continues. At the same time, in several regions (Ivano-Frankivsk, Chernivtsi, Kherson, Odesa, Mykolaiv, and Kirovohrad) this ratio has increased.

REFERENCES / ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Huggins, R., Waite, D., & Munday, M. (2018). New directions in regional innovation policy: A network model for generating entrepreneurship and economic development. *Regional Studies*, 52(9), 1294-1304. DOI: <https://doi:10.1080/00343404.2018.1453131>.
2. Schölin, T., Ohlsson, H., & Broomé, P. (2017). The role of regions for different forms of business organizations. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 29(3-4), 197-214. DOI: <https://doi:10.1080/08985626.2016.1257072>.
3. Hamadamin, H. G., Azeez, T. M., & Hawbashfaisal Suliman. (2019). Entrepreneurs and their impact on knowledge diffusion, jobs and economic growth in Kurdistan region government. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 23(3), 658-672. DOI: <https://doi:10.37200/IJPR/V23I3/PR190355>.
4. Andreeva, E. L., Simon, H., Karkh, D. A., & Glukhikh, P. L. (2016). Innovative entrepreneurship: A source of economic growth in the region. *Economy of*

- Region*, 12(3), 899-910. DOI: <https://doi:10.17059/2016-3-24>.
5. Pedchenko, N., Strilec, V., Kolisnyk, G. M., Dykha, M. V., & Frolov, S. (2018). Business angels as an alternative to financial support at the early stages of small businesses' life cycle. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 15(1), 166-179. DOI: [https://doi:10.21511/imfi.15\(1\).2018.15](https://doi:10.21511/imfi.15(1).2018.15).
 6. Rohozian, Y., Zablodska, I., Tatarchenko, O., Zavoyskih, Y., & Korsakova, O. (2017). Assessment process of economic expediency for the interregional cooperation: Ukrainian-Polish content. *International Journal of Economic Research*, 14(16), 375-386.
 7. Barinova, V. A., Zemtsov, S. P., & Tsareva, Y. V. (2018). Entrepreneurship and institutions: Does the relationship exist at the regional level in Russia? *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, (6), 92-116.
 8. Li, X. (2017). Exploring the spatial heterogeneity of entrepreneurship in chinese manufacturing industries. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 42(5), 1077-1099. DOI: <https://doi:10.1007/s10961-016-9474-7>.
 9. Belás, J., Demjan, V., Habánik, J., Hudáková, M., & Sipko, J. (2015). The business environment of small and medium-sized enterprises in selected regions of the Czech Republic and Slovakia. *Ekonomie a Management*, 18(1), 95-110. DOI: <https://doi:10.15240/tul/001/2015-1-008>
 10. Simkiv, L., Shults, S., Lutskiv, O., & Andrusiv, U. (2021). Analysis of the dynamics of structural processes in the context of ensuring sustainable development. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 10(1), 153-167. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2021.v10n1p153>
 11. Andrusiv, U., Galtsova, O. (2017). Evaluation of innovation activity of construction enterprises. *Scientific bulletin of Polissia*, 3(11), P.1, 204-215 DOI: [https://doi:10.25140/2410-9576-2017-1-3\(11\)-204-215](https://doi:10.25140/2410-9576-2017-1-3(11)-204-215).
 12. Popadinets, I., Andrusiv, U., Galtsova, O., Bahorka, M., & Yurchenko, N. (2021). Management of motivation of managers' work at the enterprises of Ukraine: Innovative aspects. *Management Systems in Production Engineering*, 29(2), 120-131. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/mspe-2021-0016>
 13. Zelinska, H., Andrusiv, U., Galtsova, O., & Dmytrenko, M. (2021). Management of social risks and their impact on the spheres of human life in the conditions of sustainable development of Ukraine. *Problemy Ekorozwoju*, 16(2), 116-124. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35784/pe.2021.2.12>
 14. Anderson, A. R., & Gaddefors, J. (2016). Entrepreneurship as a community phenomenon; reconnecting meanings and place. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 28(4), 504-518. DOI: <https://doi:10.1504/IJESB.2016.077576>.
 15. Berglund, K., Gaddefors, J., & Lindgren, M. (2016). Provoking identities: Entrepreneurship and emerging identity positions in rural development. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 28(1-2), 76-96. DOI: <https://doi:10.1080/08985626.2015.1109002>.
 16. Siemens, L. (2019). Strengthening and sustaining a community through reciprocal support between local businesses and the community. *Journal of Enterprising Communities*, 13(5), 668-680. DOI: <https://doi:10.1108/JEC-09-2018-0060>
 17. Chalmers, D. M., & Shaw, E. (2017). The endogenous construction of entrepreneurial contexts: A practice-based perspective. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, 35(1), 19-39. DOI: <https://doi:10.1177/0266242615589768>
 18. Diochon, M. (2003). Entrepreneurship and community economic development. *Entrepreneurship and community economic development* (pp. 1-258)
 19. Kneysler, O., Andrusiv, U., Spasiv, N., Marynychak, L., & Kryvytska, O. (2020). Construction of economic models of ensuring Ukraine's energy resources economy. Paper presented at the 2020 10th International Conference on Advanced Computer Information Technologies, ACIT 2020 - Proceedings, 651-656. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACIT49673.2020.9208813>
 20. State statistics service of Ukraine. 2020. The population of Ukraine. http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/operativ/operativ2007/ds/nas_rik/nas_u/nas_rik_u.html (13.12. 2021).
 21. Budget of Ukraine, Statistical yearbook of Ukraine official site of the state statistics service of Ukraine, 2020, URL: www.ukrstat.gov.ua
 22. Andrusiv U., Zelinska H., Galtsova O., Seleznova O., Bahorka M., & Yurchenko N. (2022). Socio-economic development in the context of using reasonable specialization in the economy of Ukraine. *Financial and Credit Activity Problems of Theory and Practice*, 2(43), 248-258. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55643/fcaptop.2.43.2022.3729>

23. Cherchata, A., Popovychenko, I., Andrusiv, U., Gryn, V., Shevchenko, N. & Shkurovatskyi, O. (2022). Innovations in Logistics Management as a Direction for Improving the Logistics Activities of Enterprises. *Management Systems in Production Engineering*, 30(1) 9-17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/mspe-2022-0002>
24. Stough, R. R. (2016). Entrepreneurship and regional economic development: Some reflections. *Investigaciones Regionales*, 2016 (36Specialissue), 129-150.
25. Orlovska, Y., Cherchata, A., & Kovalenko, O. (2021). Development of intellectual economy: some approaches for policy elaborating. *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies*, 6(2), 116-124.
26. Melnyk, M., Korcelli-Olejniczak, E., Chorna, N., & Popadynets, N. (2018). Development of Regional IT clusters in Ukraine: institutional and investment dimensions. *Economic Annals-XXI*, (173), 19-25.
27. Popadynets, N., Shults, S., & Barna, M. (2017). Differences in consumer buying behaviour in consumer markets of the EU member states and Ukraine. *Economic annals-XXI*, (166), 26-30.

Сімків Л., Андрусів У., Купалова Г., Гончаренко Н., Дзьоба О., Юшкевич О.

КОНЦЕНТРАЦІЯ ПІДПРИЄМНИЦЬКОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ В РЕГІОНАХ УКРАЇНИ В КОНТЕКСТІ СТАЛОГО РОЗВИТКУ

Досліджено стан та особливості розвитку малого підприємництва в Україні в контексті забезпечення постулатів сталого розвитку. Виявлено позитивні й негативні тенденції та зміни, визначено перспективи розвитку бізнес-структур в умовах сталого розвитку. Оцінюючи концентрацію підприємницької діяльності в регіонах України, визначено наявність певних коливань у динаміці та міжрегіональних відмінностей у щільності суб'єктів господарювання на 10 тис населення. На основі аналізу підприємницької діяльності в регіонах України встановлено, що, незважаючи на недостатній рівень розвитку малого бізнесу, його вплив на економічний розвиток регіонів зростає. Це підтверджує розрахований коефіцієнт впливу надходжень від суб'єктів малого підприємництва до місцевого бюджету на ВРП, значення якого зростає в усіх регіонах. Розрахунок співвідношення витрат на персонал у сфері малого бізнесу до витрат на персонал на всіх підприємствах демонструє його тенденцію до зниження в більшості регіонів, що пояснюється збільшенням тінізації бізнесу, а не зниженням заробітної плати та скороченням числа працівників на цих підприємствах. Доведено, що розвиток підприємництва вирішує не лише економічні, а й соціальні питання. Це ефективний засіб реструктуризації, активізації інновацій, подолання дисбалансів у певних сегментах ринку, створення нових робочих місць і зниження рівня безробіття. Стимулювання розвитку підприємницької діяльності, підтримка малого бізнесу та створення умов для управління економікою є одними з першочергових завдань економічної політики держави.

Ключові слова: сталий розвиток, концентрація ділової активності, малий бізнес, диспропорційність економічного зростання, підприємницькі структури, суб'єкт господарювання

JEL Класифікація: M21, M11, Q12, O13, D20