

REGIONAL GROWTH AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN BELARUS, RUSSIA AND UKRAINE

РЕГИОНАЛЬНОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ И ПРЕДПРИНИМАТЕЛЬСКАЯ ИНИЦИАТИВА В БЕЛАРУСИ, РОССИИ И УКРАИНЕ

According to the 2010 Doing Business report Belarus ranks 58, Russia 120 and Ukraine 142 [1]. Sorted by GDP at purchasing power parity per capita for 2009, Russia ranks 56, Belarus — 73, and Ukraine — 103 [2]. While Ukraine is lagging behind, Belarus ranks higher on ease of doing business, and Russia has better growth indicators.

Strong belief that entrepreneurship plays an important role both in developed and emerging economies seems to be commonly accepted by politicians, economists, and global institutions. At first glance Ukraine is a good example (poor conditions for the entrepreneurial activity lead to low GDP), but Belarus is not (entrepreneurship should be one of the pillars for its permanent economic growth). Comparing data for these three countries can provide interesting results in validating of commonly accepted belief.

Firms growth is usually related to more intensive entrepreneurial activity (Faberman 2002). Thus typical measure of entrepreneurial activity is a quantity of newly established businesses. But other factors, like output or number of new jobs created by small business, should also be considered. Different aspects of entrepreneurial activity are often combined in so called total entrepreneurial activity indexes (TEA). They can be country specific (for instance Kauffman Index of Entrepreneurial Activity for the USA) or global. The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, the largest single study of entrepreneurial activity in the world, estimates global entrepreneurial activity for 43 countries, including Russia [4]. As Ukraine and Belarus are not considered in GEM, first task is to construct comparable TEA.

If constructed, TEA index can be used to at least in two ways. First, to differentiate between types of economies, thus justifying to need for different policies. As shown by Thurik (2009) there are two main types of economies: managed and entrepreneurial economy. Following Thurik, one can analyze connection between TEA and economic development, checking for the U-shape relation [5]. This insight in the essence of entrepreneurship is obligatory for shaping and justifying policy measures, as policies which made the managed economy successful are counterproductive in the entrepreneurial economy. Second, an institutional approach to explaining differences in the levels of entrepreneurship and economic growth can be used. The institutional approach to growth argues that institutions influence the productivity of resource use. Following Hall & Sobel one can test

the hypothesis that institutional quality is a determinant of regional differences in entrepreneurship and economic growth [6].

Positive outcomes from constructing comparable TEA for Belarus, Russia and Ukraine will not be limited to two mentioned applications. In any case it will lead to new studies, knowledge and future development.

Literature

1. Data from The Doing Business 2010 report, provided by the International Finance Corporation [Electronic resource]. — Mode of access: <http://www.doingbusiness.org>.
2. Data from The World Factbook, provided by the Central Intelligence Agency [Electronic resource]. — Mode of access: <http://www.cia.gov>.
3. *Faberman, Jason R.* Job flows and labor dynamics in the U.S. / Jason R. Faberman. — Rust Belt. — Monthly Labor Review. — September. — 2002. — P. 3–10.
4. Data from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor [Electronic resource]. — Mode of access: <http://www.gemconsortium.org>.
5. *Thurik, R.* Entrepreneurship, Economic Growth and Policy in Emerging Economies UNU-WIDER / R. Thurik. — Research Paper. — 2009. — № 12.
6. *Hall, J.C.* Institutions, Entrepreneurship, and Regional Differences in Economic Growth / J.C. Hall, R.S. Sobel. — Southern Journal of Entrepreneurship 1. — 2008. — № 1. — P. 69–96.

*Т.П. Сандуца, ст. преподаватель
КТУМ (Кишинев, Молдова)*

ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА БЮДЖЕТНОГО ПЛАНИРОВАНИЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ДЛЯ ПРЕДПРИЯТИЙ ПОТРЕБКООПЕРАЦИИ МОЛДОВЫ

В современных условиях эффективное управление финансами является важнейшей сферой деятельности любого субъекта социально-рыночного хозяйства, особенно предприятий потребительской кооперации, ведущих в основном коммерческую деятельность. Выход на новые рынки, расширение объема продаж должны основываться на доскональных финансовых расчетах.

В ответ на подобные тенденции наиболее приемлемым является внедрение интегрированной системы анализа и планирования финансовых ресурсов, именуемой «бюджетное планирование». Данный механизм позволяет осуществить текущий и оперативный контроль поступления и использования ресурсов, а также создать условия для формулирования эффективной финансовой стратегии с целью достижения намеченных результатов.

На уровне предприятий бюджетное планирование необходимо понимать как инициативную деятельность хозяйствующего субъекта и его структурных подразделений по предвидению перспектив своего бу-