



УДК 334.722.1: 332.146.2(438)

JURII KARYIAGIN,

PH.D., professor, PhD,

Director of the Institute of Ukrainian–Polish cooperation

TOMASZ WOŁOWIEC, PH.D.,

Chair of Microeconomics, University of Information

Technology and Management in Rzeszów, Vice Director

of the Institute of Financial Research and Analyses in Rzeszów, Poland

**REGIONAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC POLICY
OF STIMULATING ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND
INCREASING WORKING PLACES
(CASE OF PODKARPACKIE PROVINCE COMMUNES)**

This article diagnoses the use of instruments supporting entrepreneurship by the Podkarpackie Province communes. The main research problem was formulated as follows: Do the instruments of supporting entrepreneurship used by self-government affect the development of economic initiatives in the area of the surveyed communes? We analyzed it in two areas. The first one focuses on the present state, analyzing the quality and directions of actions taken by commune authorities in supporting economic initiatives as well as their results. The second one attempts at pointing the solutions conducive to enterprise development and instruments ensuring their stimulation. The main problem is accompanied by a number of detailed questions about the most frequent and effective support forms, the reasons behind their choice, the assumptions of constructed development strategies and investments made to improve the conditions of conducting business activities.

Key words: regional policy, entrepreneurship, working places, Podkarpackie Province, self-government administration, communes, economic initiatives

Introduction. Social and economic development of each country is closely tied to cooperation between self-government administration and local entrepreneurs' community. Research conducted on the local level indicates strong relationship between the specificity of self-government budget policies and the development of entrepreneurship. This issue has been discussed in the analytical works of G. Carlino and E. S. Mills, T. J. Bartik, as well as D. Carlton and L. E. Papke [1, 2, 6, 7, 12]. They all emphasize a close tie between the policy of local authorities and location decisions made by businesses. According to the opinion expressed by D. Bondonio [3], creating and stimulating development of enterprising environment of self-government communities is an important phenomenon for many reasons, each of them playing a different role in shaping firm and stable social and economic structures. This view is also shared by T. F. Buss

© KARYIAGIN JU., WOLOWIEC T., 2012

[5], who claims that the key to effective entrepreneurship support is to perceive the significance of its development for local communities and to demonstrate to local authorities the benefits resulting from its stimulation.

The three-stage territorial division of the state is integrally connected with decentralization of competencies related to supporting economic initiatives. This issue is strongly emphasized by, among others, W. Misiąg and D. Grodzka [9]. The consequence of the currently functioning solution is that the central weight has been shifted to the lowest stage of territorial self-government units (Polish acronym – JST), namely the commune level, as far as the creation of business conditions is concerned. The gathered experiences (see B. Słomińska, U. Kłosiewicz-Górecka and B. Słomińska, T. Sadowska, J. Kondratowicz-Pozorska [13, 14]) confirm that the type of the development policy adopted by self-governments accounts for the fact that the possibilities available in this area are only partially used. It is necessary to establish both the directions of desired changes in the policy of managing local finances as well as to indicate the aims and the tools for their achievement. It is extremely vital to determine the key forms and methods of stimulating the development of economic initiatives, as well as to determine the specificity of these actions through adjusting them to the profile of the relevant self-government unit. These issues will constitute the subject of this article.

The research problem and methodology . This article is a diagnosis of the Podkarpackie Province communes as far as the use of instruments supporting entrepreneurship is concerned. The article defines one main research problem and a series of detailed questions which expand on the main problem. The set of questions we obtained in this way enabled us to direct our empirical analyses correctly. The main research problem was formulated in the following question: Do the instruments of supporting entrepreneurship used by self-government affect the development of economic initiatives in the area of the surveyed communes? The adopted research problem is described by two areas in which its analysis should be performed. The first one is the diagnosis of the present state. It covers the analysis of the quality and directions of present actions taken by commune authorities in supporting economic initiatives as well as their results. The second dimension is an attempt at pointing the solutions conducive to enterprise development and instruments ensuring their stimulation. The main problem defined in this way is accompanied by a number of detailed questions concerning, for example, the most frequently used instruments and the reasons behind their choice, the most effective support forms, the assumptions of constructed development strategies as well as investments made to improve the conditions of conducting business activities. The research process initiated in this way allowed us to verify the characteristics of the analyzed communes as regards the solutions used by them to support entrepreneurship. This has also allowed us to group dominant directions and solutions supporting economic initiatives taken up by the self-government.

The analysis of the instruments applied to support entrepreneurship and their effectiveness required adoption of time framework enabling us to examine the relation between the activities of self-governments and measurable effects of undertaken initiatives. The time horizon of the analysis covered years 2006–2009 inclusive. The verification of the scope of application and effectiveness of particular support forms used by JST required transformation of the concepts in which research problems were formulated into variables. The independent variable was the instruments of supporting entrepreneurship by communes, catalogued into three groups: infrastructural instruments; legal and organizational instruments and promotional instruments.

The territorial dimension of conducted analyses covered the area of the Podkarpackie province, located in the south-east of Poland. The research sample reflecting the population structure had the layer and proportional characteristics. Each layer corresponded with the type of commune. The size of the research sample was chosen so as the percentage of each category

of analyzed communes corresponded with the percentage of such communes in the province, namely: rural, urban, town-and-country communes as well as cities with district rights. In the layers selected in this way, we conducted the samplings, following the scheme of the sampling without replacement). The chosen sample consisted of 61 communes (including 7 urban communes (2 of them were cities with district rights), 11 town and country communes and 43 rural communes) [8].

The diversity of factors influencing the development of entrepreneurship accounted for the fact that each determinant affecting entrepreneurship was evaluated on the basis of established scale of correlation power verified over four analyzed years. The scale reflecting the direction and power of correlation between parameters reflecting instruments of supporting entrepreneurship and parameters reflecting the effects of applying particular support forms covered graduation of the relationship power. The analysis covered the direction and power of the relationship between applying a particular instrument and the effects invoked by it (that is whether it contributed to the support of entrepreneurship, and if so, to what extent).

The adopted method was divided into two stages. The first stage was the static analysis for each year separately, using the linear correlation coefficient. It consisted in examining the existence of a relation between the use of particular instruments of supporting entrepreneurship and the effects of these activities. In the second stage we focused on the analysis covering the whole examined period, due to the fact that the instrument used in 2006 could affect the conditions of enterprise development not only in 2006 but also in the next years. Therefore it was necessary to verify the influence of a given instrument on the development of entrepreneurship in the whole examined period.

Formula 1

The measure of correlation between variables (CM)

$CM = \sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i r_i$	<p>Where:</p> <p>i – number of analyzed year,</p> <p>α_i – ratio typical for the i-th year (that is the weight assigned to linear correlation coefficient for r_i),</p> <p>r_i – linear correlation coefficient for the examined pair of variables (that is the used instrument of supporting entrepreneurship and the measurable result of its application year, $r_i \in [-1; 1]$).</p>
----------------------------------	--

Source: Own elaboration

Determining weights α_i we adopted the following assumptions:

assumption: $\alpha_i \geq 0$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$). It was assumed that weights α_i take values of above zero or zero, which means that the instrument applied in a particular year influenced or did not influence the development of entrepreneurship, while it did not have negative influence (its use did not worsen the conditions of conducting economic activity).

assumption: $\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i = 1$. It was assumed that the sum of α_i coefficients for the whole analyzed period ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$), equals 1 – ($\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 1$)

Defining the measure of correlation (CM) we assumed that $[-1; 1]$ and is contained in the

same range as the linear correlation coefficient r_i – therefore: $-1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i r_i \leq 1$.

In order to establish the numerical value α_i we adopted the following line of thinking: as the instrument used in i – th year influenced the ratio describing the development of entrepreneurship in that year and in the next years, therefore the direction and correlation in the analyzed year were also influenced by the actions taken in previous years. Detailed assumptions concerning the activities taken in a particular period and their influence on the development of entrepreneurship in consecutive years are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Actions concerning support of economic initiatives and their influence on entrepreneurship development

Actions taken \ Influence	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total
2006	+	–	–	–	1
2007	+	+	–	–	2
2008	+	+	+	–	3
2009	+	+	+	+	4
Total					10

Source: Own elaboration

The first year of the analyzed period was 2006, thus the use of support instruments brought the weakest effects. Then, respectively, each consecutive year in which communes supported entrepreneurship, brought better results, as there were new instruments and the sum of instruments from previous years active in it. This leads us to the assumption that $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_4$. Taking into consideration the above, we adopted the assumption that $\alpha_1 = 0,1; \alpha_2 = 0,2; \alpha_3 = 0,3; \alpha_4 = 0,4$.

Depending on the value of CM, we assumed the following scale of correlation:

1. Very strong correlation, when $0.9 \leq |CM| \leq 1$,
2. Strong correlation, when $0.75 \leq |CM| < 0.9$,
3. Weak correlation, when $0.25 \leq |CM| < 0.75$,
4. Very weak correlation, when $0 < |CM| < 0.25$,
5. Lack of correlation, when $|CM| = 0$.

In case when the correlation coefficient for a given pair of variables in the analyzed period did not have the stable sign CM was not established as positive and negative values would neutralize each other. In such situation we interpreted only correlation coefficients for each year separately.

The analysis of the influence of independent variables on dependent ones also took into account verification of quality parameters corresponding to the instruments of supporting entrepreneurship used by communes. Similarly to quantity data – quality parameters were analyzed in relation to dependent variables describing the development of entrepreneurship. Due to the fact that in qualitative research we resign from the postulate of sample representativeness (creating

possibilities of wide generalizations) and reliability (allowing us to repeat the survey using the same tool) – the choice of variables was governed by the specificity of a particular survey [16].

To evaluate the influence of using the above instruments on dependent variables we used the tests for significance of differences for independent variables. These tests verified whether the differences appearing between two or more compared groups were statistically significant [11]. As a result, the algorithm for choosing the test of significance of differences pointed to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (see Diagram 1).

Diagram 1

The hypothesis about the conformity of both samples against the alternative hypothesis

<p>H0: $m_N = m_S$ (means in analyzed groups are equal) against alternative hypothesis:</p> <p>H1: $m_N \neq m_S$ (means in analyzed groups in a statistically significant way differ)</p>	<p>Where:</p> <p>m_S – mean established for a given dependent variable in a group using a given instrument,</p> <p>m_N – mean established for a given dependent variable in a group not using a given instrument.</p>
--	---

Source: Own elaboration

The rejection of the null hypothesis H0 for the alternative hypothesis H1 on the significance level of 0.05 meant that there was some influence of a particular instrument on a dependent variable. The evaluation of the influence of each instrument on dependent variables was made on the basis of evaluating average values for the analyzed groups. The analysis incorporated establishing average values of dependent variables both for communes which used and those which did not use a particular instrument, and also evaluating the significance level p, at which the null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis, or when there were no grounds for rejecting the null hypothesis. The effectiveness of the instrument was confirmed by dependent variables for which there was statistically significant difference between means, proving the influence of using a particular instrument on the development of entrepreneurship in the area of the Podkarpackie province communes.

The scope of using infrastructural instruments by commune self-governments.

One of the vital determinants of the development of economic initiatives is infrastructure conditions [4, 10, 15]. More than 70% of communes believe that a good state of technical infrastructure is a determining factor when locating economic entities and a factor stimulating the development of entrepreneurial initiatives. Nearly 23.5% of communes claimed that the construction and/or modernization of infrastructure are also a manifestation of local authorities' activities for self-government community. The calculated correlation between the independent variable, which is the level and quality of commune infrastructure and dependent variables (describing the development of entrepreneurship), indicated the existence of a relationship between technical infrastructure and the number of economic entities. The direction of this correlation informs us that the initiatives aiming at building, developing or modernizing infrastructure are a determining factor in development of economic initiatives. This is confirmed by the calculated $CM = 0.73$. The values of CM describing the relation between the used instrument and other independent variables were on a slightly lower level.

The presented values of CM clearly demonstrate that technical infrastructure is not the strongest determinant shaping the business environment in a commune. Among the parameters describing conditions of conducting economic activity in surveyed communes, the most positive ones are those of telephone connections and communication infrastructure (respectively 76.6%

and 57.45% of positive comments). The next two factors determining the level of local entrepreneurship, that is the availability of utilities, that is gas, electricity, water (55.32% of positive marks) and availability of attractive land for investment (51.06% of positive indications).

The presented findings compared with the data concerning the amount of money allocated in the analyzed period for expenditure in infrastructure allow us to state that a considerable part of analyzed communes still have great needs and are forced to maintain investment continuity. Among all surveyed communes, nearly 62% indicated that they used investment instruments to support entrepreneurship. Simultaneously, nearly 60% joined initiatives assuming co-financing development ventures. For this purpose, JST took up some forms of inter-commune cooperation and joined the initiatives of local organizations of entrepreneurship support. The cooperation between the sectors was confirmed by as many as 49% of sampled communes.

The scope of using legal and organizational instruments by the Podkarpackie communes. A special group of instruments are those constituting legal and organizational form of supporting entrepreneurship. This category is undoubtedly the richest and widest, incorporating diverse instruments [4, 10, 15]. Here we could place the local law tools, organizational instruments and institutional solutions. For our discussion, of key importance here are expenditure instruments, especially the category of property expenditure. The analysis of collected material indicated very strong correlation between the application of characterized support forms and variables describing the development of entrepreneurship. The calculated CM showed that using the above instrument best translated into the number of people employed in the commune (CM = 0.98) and mobility of production factors (CM = 0.97). A very strong correlation also characterized the dependence between expenditure on property and the number of economic entities (CM = 0.97). Simultaneously, a very high value of CM = 0.95 described relations between property expenditure and the number of non-governmental organizations and business surrounding institutions registered in the commune.

The next analyzed instrument was investment expenditure on supporting new areas of production and modern technologies. The verification of the empirical material enables us to establish the existence of a very strong relation between using this instrument and the development of entrepreneurship. The effectiveness of the used support form was confirmed by high values of CM, which, as regards the influence of this instrument on the number of economic entities, oscillated around 0.95. A similar high value of CM characterized the ratios of taking up work (CM = 0.83) and mobility of production factors (CM = 0.95). The use of the above support forms translated into the ratio of people using trainings organized or financed from PUP funds aimed at professional activation of the unemployed (CM = 0.71), as well as the number of organizations and institutions in business surroundings operating in the analyzed JST (CM = 0.95). Investment expenditure was reflected in the growth of the number of companies and the development of non-governmental organizations and business surroundings institutions. The finally calculated CM indicated positive relation between the used support form and the growth of interest in PUP trainings aimed at professional activation of the unemployed.

Another instrument belonging to the expenditure category was communes' expenses on creating Centers of Business Support (Polish acronym – CWB). The application of the indicated instrument led to the increase of the number of people who took advantage of the loans offered by PUP to open a small business, and further the development of institutional background supporting entrepreneurial initiatives. The calculated CM indicated a very strong correlation between the level of investment expenditure on creating a system of tax preferences and the development of entrepreneurship on the area of the analyzed JST. The use of the above forms of support translated mostly into increased employment (CM = 0.96), and further into increased number of economic entities, mobility of production factors and the development of organizations supporting entrepreneurship (CM = 0.95).

With reference to the characterized instrument, we should point out that the activities initiated by communes to stabilize solutions concerning tax reliefs and exemptions play a vital part. The evaluation of the significance level indicated that the use of activities aimed at stabilizing solutions in tax policy affected the growth of the number of economic entities registered in the commune.

Another category of legal and organizational forms of supporting entrepreneurship were lower maximum rates in local taxes, classified as income instruments. Among the analyzed local taxes, only property tax and transport means tax showed influence on the development of entrepreneurship. The value of calculated CM enabled us to establish that there was a very weak relation between lowering the maximum rate of tax and dependent variables describing the development of entrepreneurship. This very weak influence was confirmed by low values of CM for both property tax ($CM = -0.47$), and transport means tax ($CM = -0.22$). The collected data allowed us to establish that the power of influence exerted by lower rates of single local taxes on the development of entrepreneurship was definitely lower than in case of creating complex systems of tax preferences, comprising, apart from lower rates, also exemptions, deferment of payments and redemption of tax dues.

The Podkarpackie province communes most frequently pointed at the use of tax instruments, including lower maximum rates of local taxes. Further places in the ranking were occupied by cooperation with local economic entities and creating strategies taking into account support of entrepreneurial initiatives. Communes were much less involved in training and consulting activities or undertakings improving the attractiveness of local communities for investors. The instruments of creating local guaranty and loan funds enjoyed very low popularity.

The scope of using promotional instrument by the Podkarpackie province communes. The calculated values of CM indicated the existence of a strong correlation between the communes' expenditure on promotion and the dependent variables describing the development of entrepreneurship. From the perspective of the location of economic activity, apart from infrastructural conditions, construction of tax solutions and the attitude of commune authorities to external capital, the issues of esthetic environment and public safety and order in the commune are also important [4, 10, 15]. Most of the surveyed JST (over 93%) evaluated the state of natural environment and environment esthetics positively, 21.3% – very positively. Simultaneously, the analysis allowed us to find out that 70.2% of units evaluated positively public safety and order, while only slightly over 23% of indications were very positive. The presented data is mostly the effect of the activities of local authorities in investment expenditure on environment protection. The estimated value of CM showed a strong relation between the use of the above instrument and the value of dependent variables describing the development of entrepreneurship. The highest value of CM characterized respectively the number of people employed in the area of the commune and the ratio of mobility of production factors. In both cases the value of CM equaled 0.89 and was on the border between strong and very strong relation between using this form of support and the development of entrepreneurship. A slightly lower value of CM characterized the parameter describing the number of economic entities registered in the commune ($CM = 0.88$), as well as the ratio of taking up work ($CM = 0.87$). Strong influence of independent variable was also shown in case of the number of non-governmental organizations and business environment institutions registered in the area of the commune and the dependent variable reflecting the number of people participating in trainings organized or financed by PUP, aimed at professional activation of the unemployed. The value of calculated CM was respectively 0.82 and 0.80.

Another form of support used by communes, classified as a promotional instrument, was the establishment of separate units within the office, dealing with promotion of the commune and local products. The analysis of empirical data confirmed very strong relation between using this

instrument and the number of people employed in the area of the commune (CM = 0.96). The comparable value of CM described other dependent variables, namely the mobility of production factors, number of non-governmental organizations and business environment institutions and the number of economic entities registered in the area of the surveyed communes. With reference to each of the above-mentioned variables, the value of CM was 0.95, which proved the existence of a very strong relation between the use of the above instruments and the value of the parameters indicating the development of entrepreneurial initiatives. Some of the surveyed communes confirmed that they used (as an additional instrument of supporting entrepreneurship) special programs promoting the commune and local products. Among key components of these types of programs, communes mentioned supporting local companies in entering new markets, facilitating location of centers for business support in the commune as well as help in making contacts with entrepreneurs in the region.

The systematic presentation of postulated solutions in the area of entrepreneurship support.

The classification of proposed solutions aiming at creating conditions for effective support of entrepreneurship concentrates on five areas:

- 1) state legislature;
- 2) improving effectiveness of using available support instruments by local authorities;
- 3) possibility of creating and developing business environment institutions in local environment;
- 4) building awareness of availability of public aid for entrepreneurs;
- 5) risk related to realization of PPP projects.

This division is finished with the modeling of the influence of quantitative factors on the effectiveness of activities taken up by the Podkarpackie province commune authorities to support the development of entrepreneurship. In order to explain the influence of particular instruments of supporting economic initiatives on the development of entrepreneurship in the Podkarpackie province, we conducted estimation, verification and analysis of the following linear econometric model:

Formula 2

Initial linear econometric model

$Y = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot X_1 + \alpha_2 \cdot X_2 + \dots + \alpha_k \cdot X_k + \varepsilon$	<p>Where:</p> <p>Y – dependent variable, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n – independent variables by means of which we want to explain the analyzed variable Y, ε – random element which synthetically reflects all random factors influencing the analyzed variable.</p>
---	---

As the dependent variable we took the number of economic entities according to REGON (National Business Registry). The candidates for independent variables were the instruments of supporting entrepreneurship, with reference to which we confirmed the dependence indicating a relation between using them and the results of these actions on the development of entrepreneurship side. From the ‘catalogue’ of the instruments meeting the above requirement, eleven independent variables were selected. Then we conducted an estimation of the linear model parameters. We obtained the model consisting of three independent variables, that is: variable amount of property expenditure of communes (in thousand PLN), variable using lower than maximum rates of property tax by communes (% lowering of the rate) and variable expenditure on promotional aims incurred by the commune (in thousand PLN). The model took the following form:

Formula 3

Linear econometric model explaining the influence of support instruments on entrepreneurship development

$$\hat{Y} = 81.13 + 0.22 X_2 - 5.92 X_4 + 10.98 X_{10}$$

(80.16)
(0.01)
(2.11)
(0.70)

Source: Own elaboration

Next we conducted the verification of the model. It boiled down to examining three properties, that is the degree of compliance of the model with empirical data, quality of structural parameters and selected properties of remainder distribution. The analysis of adjustment of the model to empirical data has shown that it explains 99.2% of variations in the number of economic entities. On the basis of the model, relying on the interpretation of ai coefficients, we evaluated the quantitative influence of particular explanatory variables on the total number of companies. We distinguished the following regularities:

- a) increased property expenditure of a commune by one thousand PLN causes the growth of economic entities by 0.22 (at unchanged values of other explanatory variables);
- b) lowering the property tax rate by 1% will cause the increase of 5.92 in the number of economic entities (at unchanged values of other explanatory variables);
- c) increasing commune expenditure on promotion by one thousand PLN will cause the growth of economic entities by 10.98 (at unchanged values of other explanatory variables).

We also evaluated the relative significance of the examined variables in the econometric model. The measure of relative significance of explanatory variable Xi in explaining changes of the explained variable Y is the coefficient of <<significance>> bi defined in the following way:

Formula 4

Coefficient of significance

$b_i = a_i \frac{\bar{x}_i}{\bar{y}} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k$	<p>Where:</p> <p>\bar{x}_i – arithmetic mean of explanatory variable,</p> <p>\bar{y} – arithmetic mean of explained variable,</p> <p>a_i – value of structural parameter ai.</p>
--	---

Source: Own elaboration

The calculated arithmetic means of particular variables equaled:

$$\bar{y} = 1091.311, \bar{x}_2 = 3946.43, \bar{x}_4 = 27.951, \bar{x}_{10} = 26.779$$

On the other hand, the modules of significance coefficients of other explanatory variables had the following values:

$$b_2 = 0.796, b_4 = 0.150, b_{10} = 0.269$$

The values of particular coefficients indicate that the amount of property expenditure of a commune has the greatest significance in describing the total number of economic entities. The weights of two other independent variables (corresponding to instruments of supporting entrepreneurship used by communes) in the analyzed model are clearly lower, with expenditure on promotion exerting more influence on stimulating economic initiatives.

Conclusions. In the article the directions of present actions taken by commune authorities in supporting economic initiatives were researched. One of the vital determinants of the development of economic initiatives is infrastructure conditions (telephone connections and communication infrastructure, the availability of utilities, that is gas, electricity, water and availability of attractive land for investment). The initiatives aiming at building, developing or modernizing infrastructure are a determining factor in development of economic initiatives.

A special group of instruments are those constituting legal and organizational form of supporting entrepreneurship. Of key importance here are expenditure instruments, especially the category of property expenditure, investment expenditure on supporting new areas of production and modern technologies, activities initiated by communes to stabilize solutions concerning tax reliefs, lower maximum rates in local taxes.

The issues of esthetic environment and public safety and order in the commune, such as expenditure on environment protection, the number of non-governmental organizations and business environment institutions registered in the area of the commune, are also important for development of entrepreneurship. The key components of these types of programs, communes mentioned supporting local companies in entering new markets, facilitating location of centers for business support in the commune as well as help in making contacts with entrepreneurs in the region.

The proposed solutions aiming at creating conditions for effective support of entrepreneurship concentrates on five areas:

- 6) state legislature;
- 7) improving effectiveness of using available support instruments by local authorities;
- 8) possibility of creating and developing business environment institutions in local environment;
- 9) building awareness of availability of public aid for entrepreneurs;
- 10) risk related to realization of PPP projects.

Bibliography

1. *Bartik T. J.*, (1985), "Business Location Decisions in the United States: Estimates of the Effects of Unionization, Taxes and Other Characteristics of States," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 3 (January): 14–22.
2. *Bartik T. J.*, (1988), "The Effects of Environmental Regulation on Business Location in the United States," *Growth and Change* (Summer): 22–44.
3. *Bondonio D.*, (2003), "Do Tax Incentives Affect Local Economic Growth? What Mean Impacts Miss in the Analysis of Enterprise Zone Policies," *Center for Economic Studies, Working Papers* with number 03–17.
4. *Brown S., Hayes K. J., Taylor L.L.*, (2002), "State and local policy, factor markets and regional growth," *Working Papers* 02 02, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas.
5. *Buss T. F.*, 2001. The Effect of State Tax Incentives on Economic Growth and Firm Location Decisions: An overview of the Literature. *Economic Development Quarterly* 15 (1): 90–105.
6. *Carlino G., Mills E. S.*, (1985), "Do Public Policies Affect County Growth?" *Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Business Review*, July-August: 3–27.
7. *Carlton D.*, (1983), "The Location and Employment Choices of New Firms: An Econometric Model with Discrete And Continuous Endogenous Variables," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 65 (August): 440–449.
8. *DePaulo P.*, Sample size for qualitative research. The risk of missing something important, *Quirk's Marketing Research Review*, December 2000.

9. *Grodzka D.*, Instrumenty wspierania działalności przedsiębiorstw przez jednostki samorządu terytorialnego, [in:] G. Gołębiowski (editor), Wybrane problemy wspierania przedsiębiorstw w Polsce, Biuro Analiz Sejmowych, Warszawa 2008.
10. *Holmes T. J.*, (1998), "The Effect of State Policies on the Location of Manufacturing: Evidence from State Borders," *Journal of Political Economy*, University of Chicago Press, vol. 106(4).
11. *Mynarski S.*, Analiza danych rynkowych i marketingowych z wykorzystaniem programu Statistica, Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej w Krakowie, Kraków 2003.
12. *Papke L. E.*, (1991), "Interstate Business Tax Differentials and New Firm Location: Evidence From Panel Data," *Journal of Public Economics* 45(1): 47–68.
13. *Sadowska T.*, Rola samorządów w stymulowaniu rozwoju przedsiębiorczości lokalnej, *Folia Universitatis Agriculture Stetinensis* 232. *Oeconomica* 42. Akademia Rolnicza, Szczecin 2003.
14. *Stomińska B.*, Gmina w procesach stymulowania przedsiębiorczości „Samorząd Terytorialny”, No 3, 2007.
15. *Szewczuk A.*, Czy polski system wspiera rozwój lokalny? – [in:] A. Pomorska (editor), Kierunki reformy polskiego systemu podatkowego, UMCS, Lublin 2003.
16. *T. Bauman*, O możliwościach zastosowania metod jakościowych w badaniach pedagogicznych, [in:] T. Pilch (editor), *Zasady badań pedagogicznych*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”, Warszawa 1998.

КАРЯГИН Ю. ВОЛОВЕЦЬ Т.

РЕГІОНАЛЬНА СОЦІАЛЬНО-ЕКОНОМІЧНА ПОЛІТИКА СТИМУЛЮВАННЯ РОЗВИТКУ МАЛОГО БІЗНЕСУ ТА ЗБІЛЬШЕННЯ ЗАЙНЯТОСТІ НАСЕЛЕННЯ (НА ПРИКЛАДІ ПІДКАРПАТСЬКОГО ВОЄВОДСТВА)

У статті досліджено інструменти підтримки та розвитку малого бізнесу, що використовуються в комунах Підкарпатської провінції у Польщі. Основна проблема дослідження сформульована таким чином: чи впливають інструменти підтримки підприємництва, які використовують органи самоврядування, на розвиток економічних ініціатив? Ми проаналізували цю проблему в двох вимірах. Перший з них присвячений сучасному стану, аналізу якості та заходів, що їх вживають органи самоврядування з метою підтримки економічних ініціатив, а також їх результати. Другий стосується визначення напрямів політики стимулювання розвитку підприємництва та її інструментів. Основна проблема супроводжується низкою конкретизованих питань щодо найбільш уживаних і ефективних форм підтримки, причин їх вибору, пропозицій стосовно побудови стратегії розвитку та інвестицій для покращення умов ведення підприємницької діяльності.

Ключові слова: регіональна політика, інструменти розвитку малого бізнесу, зайнятість населення, Підкарпатське воєводство, органи самоврядування, комуни, економічні ініціативи.

КАРЯГИН Ю., ВОЛОВЕЦЬ Т.

РЕГИОНАЛЬНАЯ СОЦИАЛЬНО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКАЯ ПОЛИТИКА СТИМУЛИРОВАНИЯ РАЗВИТИЯ МАЛОГО БИЗНЕСА И УВЕЛИЧЕНИЯ ЗАНЯТОСТИ НАСЕЛЕНИЯ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ ПОДКАРПАТСКОГО ВОЕВОДСТВА)

В статье исследованы инструменты поддержки и развития малого бизнеса, используемые в коммунах Подкарпатской провинции в Польше. Основная проблема исследования сформулирована следующим образом: влияют ли инструменты поддержки предпринимательства, которые используются органами самоуправления, на развитие экономических инициатив? Мы проанализировали эту проблему в двух измерениях. Первое посвящено современному

состоянию, анализу качества и мер, принимаемых органами самоуправления с целью поддержки экономических инициатив, а также их результатов. Второе касается определения направлений политики стимулирования развития предпринимательства и его инструментов. Основная проблема сопровождается рядом конкретизированных вопросов, касающихся наиболее употребляемых и эффективных форм поддержки, причин их выбора, предложений относительно построения стратегии развития и инвестиций для улучшения условий ведения предпринимательской деятельности.

Ключевые слова: региональная политика, инструменты развития малого бизнеса, занятость населения, Подкарпатское воеводство, органы самоуправления, коммуны, экономические инициативы.

JEL Classification: E27, H71, H76, O18, R10

Стаття надійшла до редакції журналу 29.08.2012 р.