UDC 351.824**DOI: 10.31110/2789-6536/2021-2/005****Features of management regional development in Ukraine: results of the sociological questioning****Kovalchuk Veronika**

Doctor of Public Administration Science, Professor, Head of Public Administration and Entrepreneurship Department, National Aerospace University «Kharkiv Aviation Institute», Kharkiv, Ukraine

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5321-8300

Victoriia Shvedun

Doctor of Science in Public Administration, Full Professor, Professor, Department of Public Administration and Entrepreneurship Department, National Aerospace University «Kharkiv Aviation Institute», Kharkiv, Ukraine

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5170-4222

Iryna Shulga

PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Foreign Languages, National Aerospace University «Kharkiv Aviation Institute», Kharkiv, Ukraine

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8960-9987

Abstract. Socio-economic transformations which have been taking place in Ukrainian society lately are connected closely to the transformation of the authoritarian control system, approaching of Ukraine to the standards of the European Union that, first of all, envisages raising fundamentally new tasks to prove optimal functioning and the development of regions. The aim of the paper is to study the peculiarities of the regional development management in Ukraine with the help of a sociological survey. The informational basis of the research consists of regulations of Ukraine, monographs and scientific articles on the research, publications on the

results of scientific and communicative activities, statistical information of international rating agencies, the results of the author's empirical research, educational publications, and personal research.

Keywords: regional development, management, sociological questioning.

Socio-economic transformations which have been taking place in Ukrainian society lately are connected closely to the transformation of the authoritarian control system, approaching of Ukraine to the standards of the European Union that, first of all, envisages raising fundamentally new tasks to prove optimal functioning and the development of regions. The solution of these problems within the limits of the powers given to the regions is constrained, foremost, with the clear goal-setting in the field of socio-economic development of regions. That allows every element to find its place in the general vector of forwarding motion of the state, to satisfy the community interests, aims and the opportunities of economic entities.

The problems of regions interaction with the center, regulation of these relations as the tool of regional development were paid attention to by V. Babaiev, Z. Herasymchuk, Yu. Hladkyi, A. Diehtiar, M. Dolishnii, V. Zhuk, L. Zaitseva, V. Keretsman, A. Kovalov, O. Korotych, Yu. Kuts, M. Latynin, V. Malikov, V. Medviediev, N. Nyzhnyk, O. Obolenskyi, H. Odintsova, S. Romaniuk, O. Topchiiev, A. Chemerys, A. Chystobaieva and other.

At the same time, despite the high level of scientific elaboration of the issues of regional development, the issues of managerial influence of the state on the socio-economic processes of the territorial level have not been developed sufficiently yet.

All of this necessitates the study of regional development management peculiarities in Ukraine.

Aim and objectives. The aim of the paper is to study the peculiarities of the regional development management in Ukraine with the help of a sociological survey. Based on the aim, the following main objectives of the study were formulated:

to assess the current socio-economic situation in Ukraine;

to determine the level of efficiency of regional development management in general and management of individual socio-economic spheres;

to identify the main problems and to determine the directions of the regional development management in improvement modern conditions.

Research methods. The study uses general and special research methods: the method of analysis and synthesis - to clarify the structure of the region system, as well as to determine the factors that affect the efficiency of its operation; abstract-logical method - to formulate conclusions and proposals in the areas of research; the method of formalization - to study the system of public administration of regional development, the definition of its subjects and objects; the method of statistical comparisons - to clarify the directions of the development of the region system and to determine the overall effectiveness of public administration influence on it; the method of the expert survey - to form an argument based of theoretical assumptions about the place and the role of the state in the functioning of the regional system and the development of areas for improving the mechanisms of public administration of its development.

Informational basis of the research. The informational basis of the research consists of regulations of Ukraine, monographs and scientific articles on the research, publications on the results of scientific and communicative activities, statistical information of international rating agencies, the results of the author's empirical research, educational publications, and personal research.

Main part. To identify existing problems and to determine the ways to improve the management of regional development, the author with the assistance of the Department of Political Science and Philosophy of the Kharkiv Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy under the President of Ukraine (KharRI NADU) conducted a survey. The respondents were the students of the master's degree of KharRI NADU, representing the executive authorities and local governments of the Kharkiv, Poltava, Sumy, and Luhansk regions.

The total number of the respondents was 133 people. According to the results of the survey, the respondents were distributed (in% to those who answered) according to

their gender: men - 33.3; women - 66.7;

their ages: from 18 to 29 - 43.7; ages 30 to 39 - 25.8; ages 40 to 49 - 28.9; ages 50 to 59 years - 0.8; 60 years old and older - 0.8;

their place of residence: a regional center - 38.7; a city with a population of more than 50 thousand people - 23.4; a city with the population of less than 50 thousand people - 18.5; an urban-type settlement - 16.1; a village - 3.3;

their place of work: staff at the regional council - 3.2; a higher educational institution - 6.5; a public organization - 0.8; a state enterprise - 7.3; armed forces - 2.4; a city executive committee - 15.3; regional state administration - 6.5; a private enterprise - 4.1; a village council - 3.2; a district council - 6.4; a district administration in the city - 8.1; district state administration - 20.9; a territorial subdivision of the central body of the executive power - 8.1; a central executive body - 3.2; other institution - 4.1;

- their nature of work: senior management of the organization - 3.4; a senior level manager - 3.4; a middle level manager - 9.2; a lower level manager - 28.6; an ordinary employee - 55.4;

- their region of residence: Kharkiv region - 57.8; Luhansk region - 14.1; Poltava region - 13.3; Sumy region - 10.2; Kyiv region - 1.6; other - 3.

A general statistical description of the study results is given in Appendix B.

The vast majority of the respondents (60.9%) say that Ukraine's economy is currently in critical condition, another 15.8% believe that it is in deep crisis.

This is a rather alarming indicator, because the respondents are those people who know the real state of affairs regarding the economic processes that are taking place. This situation has developed as a result of a long-standing trend, which, according to respondents, has taken place over the past three years. In this regard, the majority (54.2%) of respondents said that the economic situation in Ukraine over the past three years had had clearly or rather negative dynamics.

The main responsibility for the difficulties of Ukraine's economic development, in general, was placed on the central authorities, namely the current government of Ukraine (42.1% of respondents believe that the main responsibility lies with it) and the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (30.1%), which does not approve the necessary laws,

the governing elite as a whole (31.6%) or oligarchic clans (30.1%), - table. 1. Respondents also place a significant responsibility on those entrepreneurs who do not want to pay taxes fairly, without which is impossible to implement the state budget and therefore many programs of socio-economic development.

At the same time, the respondents don't believe that the responsibility for the existing economic difficulties in Ukraine lies with local state executive bodies (only 8.3% noted them) and even more so with local self-government bodies (0%). Two more important points that follow from the answers to this question% should also be noted. Firstly, respondents are not inclined to place the responsibility for the difficult situation in Ukraine's economy on the "external factor" - International banks, foundations, organizations (only 3.8% consider them responsible), the Russian Federation (2.3%), the United States (1.5%) or the European Union (0.7%), realizing that the necessary response to external challenges must be provided by internal actors.

Table 1

Distribution of the answers to the question: "Who, in your opinion, is primarily responsible for the difficulties that occur in the economic development of Ukraine?" (in% to the respondents)

№	Liabile parties	%
1.	The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine	30,1
2.	International banks, funds, organizations	3,8
3.	Ukrainian bankers, representatives of big business	6,1
4.	Oligarchic clans	30,1
5.	Local executive bodies of State authority	8,3
6.	Local authorities	0
7.	The current government	42,1
8.	The previous government	12,1
9.	Political opposition	3,1
10.	Pro-government parties	3,8
11.	Entrepreneurs unwilling to pay taxes	21,1
12.	Former President of Ukraine	4,5
13.	Current President of Ukraine	19,6

14.	Ruling elite	31,6
15.	The people of Ukraine	12,8
16.	Russian Federation	2,3
17.	European Union	0,7
18.	The USA	1,5
19.	Other	3,8
20.	Were unsure	3,1

Secondly, the respondents also do not lay basic responsibility on political actors, either pro-governmental or opposition, though they lay responsibility on Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. It is a certain confirmation of not formed as yet operating institutes of civil society, to that belongs including political parties that had not only to influence the forming of public policy but also to bear the responsibility for it along with government bodies.

A critical situation in economy presumably is not in the last turn related to in efficiency of some imperious subjects.

As can be seen, at the central level only the President got the estimation of efficiency, higher than zero, all others got negative estimations. A direct correlation is here traced with the answers of the respondents to the responsibility for an unsatisfactory economic situation in Ukraine.

The highest estimations were got by regional and local imperious subjects, such as a head of regional state administration on the whole and a municipal city's head. Although even on condition of receipt of positive estimation about the level of efficiency of activity none of the brought imperious subjects over crossed a limit in 0,5, that would give ground to count activity effective. Negative estimations of the present general economic situation, dynamics of its development, the efficiency of most imperious subjects activity were reflected on the prognosis of the economic situation in Ukraine in a year's time. The relative majority of the respondents (34,5%) consider that it will remain the same, i.e critical. The fourth of the polled (24,1%) believes that the economic situation will get wore. Only 21.2% are optimistic, i.e. those who believe that the situation will improve.

It should be noted again that the respondents are not ordinary citizens who often give subjectively-emotional estimations to what take place in the country, but people who own reliable information on the state of businesses in the different spheres of socio-economic life. Consequently, the respondents understand and what is necessary to do for the improvement of the economic situation in Ukraine. The major steps which might be taken for this purpose, in the opinion of the most polled, are the strengthening of the fight against corruption at the level of central government (this steps was marked by 46,6% of the polled), the simplification of the terms for the activity of medium and small business (36,1%), bringing the economy out of the shadows with the help of "tax amnesty"(33,1%), the change of the tax system, a decline of taxes for local producers in particular (32,3%). That is, as we can to see, basic steps that are offered by the respondents are aimed to the improvement of business-atmosphere, first of all, for local entrepreneurs.

Such measures as ensuring transparency of political and administrative decisions (27.8%), strengthening the fight against corruption at the local government level (23.3%), stabilization of legislation in the economic sphere (21.8%), creation of favorable conditions for attracting foreign investments (21.8%) also received a significant number of supporters

The respondents consider the following measures to improve the current economic situation in Ukraine to be less effective: the maximum restriction of state intervention in economic processes (8.3%) and strengthening economic ties with Russia and the countries of the Customs Union (9.8%).

The economic development of the country should provide for the maximum use of the opportunities of different regions, thus taking into account their peculiarities in the development and implementation of state economic policy. However, only a little over a third of the respondents (36.8%) said that the state economic policy took into account the specifics of the region in which they live, another 25% said that they were not taken into account, and 37.6% hesitated to give an unambiguous answer. All this indicates a lack of consideration of regional

interests by the central authorities or the ineffectiveness of the established direct and feedback on this issue.

However, it cannot be said that there is no state policy in the field of regional socio-economic development. According to the respondents, the main goals of state regulation of regional socio-economic development should be the following:

- creating conditions for the development of entrepreneurship as a major factor in the socio-economic development of the state and its regions (35.7%);

- ensuring an increase in employment (33.3%);

- ensuring the integrated development of the regions economy which provides a combining of those industries that are important for the development of the national economy, and those that provide regional development, as well as infrastructure (32.6%);

- ensuring the ability of territorial communities and local governments to independently address pressing issues of local socio-economic development (31.1%);

- promoting the development of regional development infrastructure, including food, land, labor and capital markets, including commodity exchanges, wholesale markets, agro-trading houses, auctions, fairs, procurement cooperatives, branded trade enterprises, etc. (22.5%).

Among the least important goals, the respondents included the following: ensuring a rational territorial division of labor between regions (3.1%); ensuring the transfer of responsibility for regional development to local executive bodies (4.6%); strengthening the economic integration of the regions (5.4%); ensuring the transfer of responsibility for regional development to local governments (8.5%). As you can see, these goals are aimed at increasing the economic capacity and independence of the regions, creating the necessary conditions for their sustainable development. To achieve the relevant goals, the activity must be based on certain principles. The respondents see the following main principles of state policy in the field of regional socio-economic development:

- publicity, transparency of state regional policy (28.8%);

maximum approximation of services provided by public authorities and local governments to direct consumers (27.3%);

innovation, systematic implementation of organizational, structural, economic and social innovations, search and implementation of new management schemes and technologies (25.8%);

proportionality and balance of socio-economic development of different regions (25.0%);

social orientation, focusing on taking into account the interests of people, meeting social needs (24.2%);

harmonization of national, regional and local interests (23.5%);

stimulating close cooperation between executive authorities and local governments in the development and implementation of measures for regional development (23.5%);

constitutionality and legality of policy implementation (22.7%). The defined aims and principles should be focused on achieving a high level of regional development - table. 2.

Table 2

Distribution of answers to the question: "What indicators, in your opinion, can determine the level of socio-economic development of a particular region?" (in % to the respondents)

№	Factors	%
1.	The number of residents living outside the officially established subsistence minimum	46,1
2.	The number of registered non-state enterprises	6,1
3.	The number of vacation spots, locations for sports	16,1
4.	The number of people employed in non-state enterprises	8,5
5.	The number of service enterprises	6,1
6.	The level of people's saving	13,1
7.	The level of foreign economic activity	9,2
8.	The level of collected taxes	14,6
9.	Unemployment rate	55,4
10.	The level of childhood illnesses, morality rate	11,5
11.	The overall mortality rate	21,5
12.	People's income level	50,8
13.	The level of public satisfaction with the activities of local authorities	14,6
14.	The level of satisfaction of the population with local authorities	8,5
15.	Crime rate	10,8

16.	Birth rate	15,4
17.	The level of social tension	18,5
18.	The state of housing and utilities sector	20,8
19.	The population growth rate	7,7
20.	The growth rate of output	19,2
21.	Were unsure	6,1

According to the respondents, the main indicators that can be used to determine the level of socio-economic development of a particular region are the following: unemployment rate (55.4%); income level of the population (50.8%); the number of inhabitants living outside the officially established subsistence level (46.1%). All these indicators are in one way or another directly related to the level of well-being of the population of the region.

The least important indicators are the number of registered non-state enterprises and the number of service enterprises (6.1% each).

To ensure a high level of regional development, a long-term strategy is needed to achieve these goals. Almost half of the respondents (48.8%) said that at the level of their region there is their long-term (5 years or more) strategy of socio-economic development, while a significant number of the respondents (41.9%) hesitated to give an unambiguous answer to this question.

At the same time, the vast majority of respondents (66.2%) consider it appropriate to develop such strategies.

Among those respondents who indicated the existence of a strategy for socio-economic development of their region, 39.9% said that this strategy was implemented either in full or in part. At the same time, a fifth (19.3%) stated that the existing strategy was not being implemented, i.e. it did not give tangible results for the development of the region, so it may need to be corrected or revised. There is no doubt that the level of regional development affects all socio-economic spheres. In assessing the state of affairs in various areas of their region, the respondents identified it mainly at the average level. The best situation is in such areas as the development of culture, the development of education and science, the development of the media, which belong to the intangible spheres, as well as in energy (Table 3).

Table 3

Distribution of answers to the question: "Assess the current state of affairs in your region in the following areas" (on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means that the area is in deep crisis, 5 - the area is developing dynamically)

№	Areas	Estimation
1.	Energy	3,24
2.	Housing and utilities sector	2,62
3.	Health services	2,77
4.	International (transboundary) collaboration	3,01
5.	Industry	2,78
6.	Mass-media development	3,27
7.	Cultural development	3,37
8.	Education and science development	3,30
9.	Development of the enterprise	2,97
10.	Agriculture	2,84
11.	Social protection of the population	3,12
12.	Transportation infrastructure	3,06
13.	The management of public property	2,90

The worst situation is observed in housing and communal services, which, in principle, is not unexpected, given its general situation in the country and the huge number of unresolved problems in this area.

The answers to this question are fully correlated with assessments of the degree of effectiveness of regional governance in some areas (Table 4). As you can see, the more effective, according to the respondents, the management of a particular area is, the better it is. This applies to those areas that are best developed (culture, education and science, media) and those that are least developed (housing and communal services, health care, industry).

Table 4

Distribution of answers to the question: "Assess the degree of effectiveness of regional governance today in some areas" (on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 - completely inefficient, 5 - very effective)

№	Areas	Estimation
1.	Energy	3,06
2.	Housing and utilities sector	2,72
3.	Health services	2,76
4.	International (transboundary) collaboration	3,05
5.	Industry	2,89
6.	Mass-media development	3,24
7.	Cultural development	3,26
8.	Education and science development	3,30
9.	Development of the enterprise	3,07
10.	Agriculture	2,95
11.	Social protection of the population	3,12
12.	Transportation infrastructure	3,12
13.	The management of public property	3,01

However, if we consider the effectiveness of the management of socio-economic development of a region as a whole, the relative majority of the respondents (40.5%) hesitated to define it unambiguously. Among those who did so, the prevailing opinion is that management is inefficient - 36.5% against 23% of the respondents who believed that management was effective.

These assessments demonstrate that the integrated perception of the effectiveness of regional authorities differs from the assessment of their solution in certain areas of their responsibility. At the same time, the respondents used various indicators in assessing the overall effectiveness (Table 5).

Table 5

Distribution of answers to the question: "What indicators can be used to assess the overall efficiency of regional executive bodies?" (in % to the respondents)

№	Indicators	%
1.	Execution of a large number of tasks at the minimum cost of their performance	20,2
2.	Number of citizens who are provided with services within the existing powers	21,7
3.	The amount of collected taxes	15,5

4.	The level of use of opportunities provided by current legislation	15,5
5.	Unemployment rate within the reporting area	27,9
6.	The level of well-being of the territorial community	49,6
7.	The level of satisfaction of the territorial community with their activities	31,8
8.	The level of increase in their available material resources	22,5
9.	The level of increase of their intangible resources (political, information, etc.)	6,2
10.	Population growth rates	17,1
11.	Accuracy and timeliness of execution of orders and instructions of higher bodies	14,7
12.	Were unsure	9,3

The respondents consider two to be the most important indicators of the overall efficiency of regional executive bodies: the level of well-being of the territorial community (noted by 49.6% of the respondents) and the level of satisfaction of the territorial community with their activities (31.8%). It is interesting that if the first indicator can be considered as an integral indicator of government activity, and for some period, which is measurable by definite components, the second reflects the subjective attitude of the citizens to the government activities (also for some period), which sometimes even more important than objective indicators.

The respondents are well acquainted with the activities of regional authorities - table 6.

Table 6

Distribution of the answers to the question: "What factors, in your opinion, hinder the effective work of regional authorities in your region?" (in % to the respondents)

№	Indicators	%
1.	Bureaucracy	37,9
2.	Lack of community feedback	20,2
3.	Lack of material incentives for employees	43,4
4.	Lack of opportunities for career advancement for employees	18,6
5.	Lack of opportunities for employees of the unit to improve their skills	3,1
6.	Lack of necessary rights for employees	8,5
7.	Lack of necessary material base, resources	33,3
8.	Lack of the necessary legal framework	10,1
9.	Lack of the necessary financial base	40,3
10.	Lack of trained personnel	19,4

11.	Lack of real division of powers with self-government bodies	16,3
12.	Lack of modern office equipment	8,5
13.	Lack of clearly defined functions and tasks for employees	12,4
14.	Tense psychological situation in the collective	9,3
15.	Insufficient activity planning	13,2
16.	Incompetence of many employees	22,5
17.	Incompetence of management	14,7
18.	Low wages	38,8
19.	Passivity of the territorial community	9,3
20.	Widespread corruption and bribery	29,5
21.	Pressure from central executive bodies	16,3
22.	Nothing interferes with the work of our organization	3,1
23.	Were unsure	6,9

The respondents identified the factors which hinder the effective work of regional authorities in their region (only 6.9% of respondents were reluctant to do so).

Among the most significant factors, along with material and financial, such as a lack of material incentives for employees (43.4% of respondents), a lack of the necessary financial base (40.3%), low wages (38.8%), and a lack of necessary material base, resources (33.3%), the respondents also pointed to such subjective factors as bureaucracy (37.9%) and widespread corruption, bribery (29.5%).

These views are also confirmed by assessments of the various factors impact on the effectiveness of management of region socio-economic development (Table 7).

As can be seen, the effectiveness of regional development management is mostly influenced by the low social status and income level of civil servants and local government officials (this factor was noted by 53.2% of the respondents), the low qualification level of most local government officials (51, 6%), the high level of corruption at the level of local executive bodies (51.2%), the high level of corruption at the level of central authorities (50.8%), the lack of legally established mechanisms of regional authorities responsibility to the population). That is, in this case, the

respondents prefer the subjective factors that are present in the activities of public authorities to regional development management.

According to the respondents, the lack of regional economic development programs (33.6%), inadequate actions of the local political opposition (34.6%), dictates of international banks and organizations (35.2%), too strict centralization of public administration, the lack of independence of its units (36.2%) influence region development management the least.

Given the unsatisfactory level of efficiency of socio-economic development management, the respondents were asked to identify the main tasks of local authorities to ensure its improvement. Among those who received the most support from the respondents were the following:

Table 7

Distribution of answers to the question: "Assess the impact on the effectiveness of management of socio-economic development of your region of the above factors" (in % to respondents)

Doesn't affect	Factors	Affects
16,9	High level of corruption at the level of central authorities	50,8
12,9	High level of corruption at the level of regional executive bodies	47,6
14,6	High level of corruption at the level of local executive bodies	51,2
16,2	High level of corruption at the level of local governments	47,9
13,6	High energy prices	47,2
8,0	Lack of legally established mechanisms of responsibility of regional authorities to the population	50,4
15,2	Lack of regional economic development programs	33,6
13,6	Lack of a clear division of powers between the executive and local governments	44,8
20,8	Dictatorship of international banks and organizations	35,2
16,1	Too rigid centralization of public administration, lack of independence of its units	36,2
21,8	Inadequate actions of the local political opposition	34,6
12,8	Imperfect judicial system, high level of dependence of the judiciary	44,0

14,4	Low level of qualification of the majority of civil servants, their unwillingness to act in new conditions	45,6
12,9	Low level of qualification of most local government officials	51,6
9,6	Low social status and income level of civil servants and local government officials	53,2
8,8	Weakness of the material and technical base of the authorities	48,0
10,5	Traditions and methods of management of the command-and-control system of the Soviet times applied now	41,9

ensuring the development of various types of infrastructure, including road transport, energy, engineering and utilities, science, communications, information, and communication, socio-cultural, recreational, market (this task was noted by 50.8% of the respondents);

establishing more effective feedback from the authorities with the population (30.5%);

conducting the most severe actions against corruption (28.9%);

promoting the growth of business activity of the population (households) and the expansion of entrepreneurial activity (28.1);

more active use of foreign experience in territory management (22.7%);

improvement of the system of selection of administrative staff (21.1%);

ensuring the involvement of leading scientists, entrepreneurs, public figures in the management (20.3%);

assistance in strengthening the financial and economic base of administrative-territorial entities (20.3%).

Thus, respondents propose a comprehensive approach to improving the management of regional development, which is based on a variety of tasks - economic, political, and purely managerial, which should ensure the achievement of the main goals of regional development, competitiveness, and welfare of its population.

Conclusion

1. The poll results showed that the economic situation in Ukraine in recent years continued to be complicated, due to both objective external and subjective internal causes. The latter include insufficiently effective management of regional development, especially in the housing and communal services sector.

In the current conditions in Ukraine, regional development depends not only on regional but also on central authorities. However, if central authorities are to create appropriate "framework" conditions for regional development, then regional authorities must address specific tasks to ensure regional development, the most important of which are to ensure the development of various types of infrastructure and establish more effective feedback from authorities with the people.

2. In the course of the research it was established that in modern Ukraine the scientific bases of regional development planning were only at the stage of formation. It is noted that forecasting together with regional diagnostics is the starting point for further programming and planning. By its very purpose, programming itself corresponds to long-term strategic planning and is one of the forms of state intervention in the economy to mitigate the sharpness of regional contrasts and social contradictions. In Ukraine, as in most other CIS countries, the program methods of regional policy are still given insufficient attention, various state and regional programs that are adopted are either not implemented or are not implemented effectively enough. Therefore, the task of improving the implementation of forecasting and programming of socio-economic processes of development of individual territories and the country as a whole is urgent. It is taken into account that scientifically substantiated development requires a rational approach to solving urgent regional problems, which is one of the main tasks of the concept - a strategic plan for the development of any socio-economic system. Based on this, the concept of regional development, aimed at creating governance mechanisms that can flexibly and quickly respond to possible changes in internal and external socio-economic situation, allows ensuring unity, complexity and strategic nature of management decisions, ensuring the effectiveness of management.

References

1. Cheshire P., Gordon I. Territorial competition: some lessons for policy // *Annals of Regional Science*. – 1998. – 32. – P. 321–346.
2. Industrial districts and Inter-firm Cooperation in Italy / Edited by R. Pyce, G. Becattini and W. Sengenberger. Geneva: ILO, 1991. – 237 p.
3. Kuznets S. Population Change and Aggregate Output. – Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1960. – 314 p.
4. Martin P. Public policies, regional inequalities and growth // *Journal of Public Economics*. – 1999. – 73(1). – P. 85–105.
5. Morgan K. Sustainable regions: governance, innovation and scale // *European Planning Studies*. – 2004. – 12(6). – P. 871–889.
6. Paasi A. Deconstructing regions: notes on the scales of spatial life // *Environment and Planning A*. – 1991. – 23. – P. 239–256.
7. Perrons D. Globalisation and Social Change: People and Places in a Divided World. – London: Routledge, 2004. – 322 p.
- Porter M. The competitive advantage of the inner city // *Harvard Business Review*. – 1995. – 73. – P. 55–71.