

PhD in Economics Hviniashvili T.

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University (Ukraine)

**PROBLEMS OF STIMULATING THE INNOVATIVE ACTIVITY OF
MODERN BUSINESS STRUCTURES**

One of the promising drivers both for the current progressive socio-economic development and, in general, for the complete transformation of the domestic economic system, capable of overcoming all modern economic threats and socio-political challenges, is the quantitative and qualitative improvement of internal innovation processes. Their actual presence determines the level of national scientific and technological capabilities for the rapid creation, support, production and integration of the latest results of intellectual work into the highest priority areas of the economy and public life in general [5].

The role of innovations themselves (innovative products, goods, services and technologies) is also closely related to their ability to improve, coordinate and simplify certain socio-economic aspects [3]. At the same time, to accelerate innovative development and ensure stable growth of the national economy, the physical presence of the innovation processes under consideration is objectively insufficient. In reality, this also requires a specialized system of regulatory parameters – innovation policy, which involves integrated management of innovation activities at the corporate, regional and state (national) levels.

At the same time, as basic tools for such management influence, in addition to restrictive norms, public authorities can use predominantly strictly limited budgetary support. In particular, they direct available resources to proactively support priority areas of fundamental and applied research, assist in the development and modernization of business structures, develop innovation infrastructure, improve human resources and other ways to stimulate innovation activity.

At the same time, in modern ambiguous macro and microeconomic conditions, the use of the noted tools, just like the construction of the state innovation policy itself, is closely related to the continuous increase in the volume of difficult to predict negative circumstances – innovation risks that can lead to both partial destabilization and complete destruction of the national innovation system. At the same time, the study of the nature of the real threats emergence shows that their root causes lie not

only in the external and internal environment of the innovation system's key subjects, but also in the structure of the innovation processes themselves, associated with the objective uncertainty of the research results and subsequent production and integration activities.

The totality of these conditions predetermines the position of the risk load level in the system under study as one of the maximum in relation to both national and world practice as a whole. It should also be noted that the innovative activity of business structures is of particular importance both for the content of national innovation processes and for the regulatory parameters of state innovation policy, and, consequently, for the critical level of risk load [2]. At the same time, an entrepreneurial structure should be understood as an independent economic entity created to produce products, perform work and provide services in order to satisfy public needs and make a profit, including through the implementation of innovative activities.

In practice, they actually act, simultaneously, as producers and consumers of innovative products, thereby accumulating, systematizing and satisfying the diverse interests of the population, the state, the scientific community, innovation support centers and all other resource-supplying organizations [4]. At the same time, the implementation of any operations by real entities is directly related to the risks of business activity, which, together with the previously noted uncertainty and innovative threats, lead to an exceptional concentration of risk load in this segment of the innovation system. In addition, it must be borne in mind that the practical measures considered by many researchers to stimulate innovative activity, improve the quality of innovation processes, as well as increase the number of involved business structures, in the absence of proper risk control, can not only minimize the economic and innovative efficiency of such measures, but also lead to a negative, poorly predictable change in the level of innovation risk load [1].

The formation and implementation of effective public policy, regardless of the current level of socio-economic development of the country, is impossible without due attention to the issues of innovative transformation of both the production activities of business structures and the integration of high-cost high-tech technologies into the social sphere, including into the private life of the population. Innovations actually act as a driver for the development of all social processes and phenomena, since they represent the results of intellectual work directly aimed at improving various areas of

social life. At the same time, despite the importance of innovation policy as an integral element of the overall national socio-economic policy, its formation is closely related to many integrative, multicomponent, difficult to predict and often risk-prone parameters, which are debatable for many modern researchers and current representatives government bodies.

References:

1. Ardito, L., Petruzzelli A. M., Dezi, L., Castellano, S. The influence of inbound open innovation on ambidexterity performance: does it pay to source knowledge from supply chain stakeholders? *Journal of Business Research*. 2020. Vol. 119. P. 321-329.
2. Grynko T.V., Gviniashvili T.Z., Moroka D.M. (2021) Peculiarities and priorities of innovative development of business structures in modern changing conditions [Osoblyvosti ta priorityty innovatsiinoho rozvytku pidpriemnytskykh struktur v suchasnykh minlyvykh umovakh]. *Ekonomichnyi prostir*. No. 175. P. 52-58. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2224-6282/175-10>.
3. Grynko T.V., Gviniashvili T.Z., Romanova L.P. Naukovo-metodychnyi pidkhid do formuvannia mekhanizmu upravlinnia rozvytkom innovatsiinoho potentsialu pidpriemstva [A scientific and methodological approach to the formation of a management mechanism for the development of the innovative potential of the enterprise]. *Innovation and Sustainability*. 2022. No. 4. P. 30-38. <https://doi.org/10.31649/ins.2022.4.30.38>.
4. Grynko, T., Yermakova, H. (2011) Sutnist innovatsiinoi aktyvnosti pidpriemstva ta yii otsinka [The essence of the enterprise's innovative activity and its evaluation] *Business Inform: Scientific journal*. 2011. № 11 (406). P. 62-64.
5. Hacklin, F., Bjorkdahl J., Wallin M. W. Strategies for business model innovation: How firms reel in migrating value. *Long range planning*. 2018. Vol. 51. No. 1. P. 82-110.

Білоус В. Є., Гончаренко В. А.

Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара (Україна)

ФРАНЧАЙЗИНГ ЯК СПОСІБ РОЗВИТКУ БІЗНЕСУ

Стрімкий розвиток економіки потребує постійного вдосконалення форм організації підприємництва. Однією з таких форм є франчайзинг. Сутність франчайзингу полягає в тому, що одна юридична особа – компанія (франчайзер) надає іншій юридичній особі (франчайзі) можливість придбати франшизу, тобто здійснювати комерційну діяльність під назвою цієї компанії або її торгової марки [1, с. 87]. Франчайзинг користується популярністю в багатьох галузях через ефективність та швидкість розширення мережі, хоча має ряд переваг та недоліків, як для франчайзера, так і для франчайзі. Щодо переваг, то до них можна