IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN SUPPORT OF YOUTH INNOVATIVE ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN THE UNION STATE

Grishin Viktor Ivanovich, Plekhanov Russian University of Economics
Abramov Ruslan Aharonovich, Plekhanov Russian University of Economics
Sokolov Maksim Sergeevich, Plekhanov Russian University of Economics

ABSTRACT

Aim of the study: *When considering entrepreneurship as a function, small and large entrepreneurs are singled out. On one side are the founders of small firms, often retaining the position of private owners. Their businesses face tough problems of survival, freedom of decision-making is very limited and depends on larger market participants. Innovation, they often cannot afford because of the limitations and lack of resources. Being sandwiched between three major forces - the state, large capital and organized wage labor, this group often simply does not have the ability to be focused on innovation and social change, it remains to try to adhere to the status quo.*

Methodology: *Economic sociologists complement the functional approach with a structural approach, highlighting entrepreneurs as a set of social groups. And in the construction of samples for empirical research, entrepreneurs usually do not include those who implement the entrepreneurial function, since their selection before the study is often difficult, but the creators and leaders of new, primarily non-governmental organizations.*

Conclusion: *This set of entrepreneurs is extremely heterogeneous. Fundamental differences between groups of entrepreneurs are related to the scale and scope of business, property rights, management schemes, the origin of capital, the nature of technological and financial chains in which their enterprises are embedded. The characteristics of different groups of entrepreneurs also include demographic characteristics, such as ethnicity, gender, age.*

Keywords: Region, Innovation System, Youth, Entrepreneurship, Structure, Formation.

INTRODUCTION

This group of entrepreneurs is extremely heterogeneous (Friedline, 2016). Fundamental differences between groups of entrepreneurs are related to the scale and scope of activities, property rights, management schemes, the origin of capital, the nature of the technological and financial chains in which their enterprises are embedded (Cho, 2016). Characteristics of different groups of entrepreneurs also include demographic characteristics such as ethnicity, gender, age (Arasti, 2015).

Entrepreneurial action is characterized by the development of special strategies related to work in conditions of obviously incomplete knowledge and active development of new information, closely intertwined with intuitive principles (Wai-Mui Yu, 2018). There is less formalism, regulations and more organizational creativity. The entrepreneur is also distinguished by a more relaxed attitude to risk (Biney, 2019). The remuneration of his work is less

guaranteed, more subject to fluctuations depending on the success or failure of undertakings, often pushed back in time - to the date of implementation of the organizational project (Penney, 2018).

LITURATURE REVIEW

Entrepreneurial nature should be sufficiently mobile. Entrepreneurial actions are likely to become strategic actions, as the implementation of an entrepreneurial project requires planning and persistent, often long-term efforts to achieve the goal (Bischoff, 2014). The beginning of such a project is often associated with a strategic choice, associated with sharp turns of fate and the risks of possible losses. The entrepreneur takes on the burden of uncertainty, makes decisions in the absence of sufficient information, makes non-standard, and sometimes irrational with t,h. surrounding, actions (Knijn, 2012). This notes its deviation from the standard model of "*Economic Man*" in political economy (Zoltok, 2017). Nevertheless, the entrepreneur often acts as the basis of this model and the model itself came from him (Brixiová, 2014).

METHODOLOGY

As a conclusion that characterizes the position of economic theory on the consideration of entrepreneurship, we can say that here it is presented quite faceless - as a function necessary for successful economic development, whether the formation of new enterprises or risk bearing, innovation or saving transaction costs (Manimala, 2017).

The figure of the entrepreneur himself remains vague (Ernkvist, 2016). Historians and sociologists, considering the problem of entrepreneurship, pay attention to the groups of people who have taken on this function. They show the origins and background of the modification and transformation of business figures, consider the social aspects of entrepreneurship (Woodcraft-Scott, 2015).

In determining the personal qualities of people capable of entrepreneurial function, economic explanations are completed psychological inclinations. Emphasize very different properties (Greenwald, 2015):

- Intelligence and focus on new knowledge (I. Kirzner).
- Imagination and ingenuity (J. Shackle.).
- Personal energy and will to action (F. viser, Y. Schumpeter.).
- The combination of intelligence and imagination (Werner Sombart).

We can say that these properties are inherent in young people and are expressed by its characteristics, noted by different researchers, both psychologists and sociologists.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Th. Schumpeter stressed that the entrepreneur is in continuous motion. Among the personal qualities he needs intuition and flair required to detect new and unusual ways to switch from one mode of action to another (Khalid, 2016). We need energy and will to abandon the established order, to overcome the structural and institutional inertia, to act contrary to the circumstances. It is important to have certain charismatic qualities, the ability to make people believe that it does not exist yet, the presence of personal resources, the role of which increases when it is impossible to rely on tradition or the established formal order (Santos, 2012).

The concept of D McClelland, linking the phenomenon of entrepreneurship with an increased need for achievement, has become very popular (Gawell, 2013). This property is stronger than natural laziness and is more important than a simple thirst for profit and public recognition. Among the personal qualities that have to entrepreneurship, often recorded an increased propensity to risk and internal locus of control, reliance on their own strength as opposed to the influence of external circumstances (Mohamad, 2016).

As part of the issue of personal characteristics, it is noted that when organizing a business from scratch, it is necessary to take into account that people often have to make decisions spontaneously, acting on the situation, take responsibility, since there is uncertainty, high risks and possible small returns on the project. At the forefront are such personal qualities as (Maas, 2015):

Focus on future development: the growth and development perspective should outweigh the attachment to existing privileges and incomes;

- quick and easy learning and self-learning.
- passion for their work and the idea of the project.
- a high working capacity and adaptability of vennosti.
- ability to work in a team.

Social parameters are also added to psychological ones. For example, entrepreneurs are relatively often from large families. The nature of the family also plays a role. An example is the "reactive model" where the entrepreneur is seen as marginalized and nonconformist, influenced by the authoritarian role of the father in the family where the child was raised. Strict control forms in the individual rejection of restrictions and external power, authority, which can complicate social adaptation, as well as give impetus to the entrepreneurial impulse (Gerosa, 2013).

Researchers also pay attention to economic behavior, which is largely due to the level of economic consciousness, mediated, in turn, the needs, interests, value orientations of people. It forms the goals of labor and social activity of one kind or another, the motives of social and economic behavior. On the economic consciousness also have an impact the education system, ideology and installation family and social environment.

Ideology can also be a factor in the development of entrepreneurship. For example, the promotion of individualistic values, the struggle for the well-being and growth of the middle class, the promotion of “the desire to achieve”. At the end of the 20th century, awareness and recognition of the importance and benefits of entrepreneurship is revived. This phenomenon was due to the fact that in addition to the problems of deindustrialization and structural crises, most of the Western countries accustomed to their leadership faced the problems of maintaining the falling competitiveness of many sectors of national economies in the context of increasing globalization of markets, the need to re-integrate into global chains of production and promotion of goods. These problems were also directly related to the crisis of state regulation and bureaucratic economic organizations. All this led to talk about the need to revive the entrepreneurial spirit, which contributed to the coming to power in the leading Western countries of conservatives, prone to more liberal economic policy.

Entrepreneurship involves a relatively closed system of value orientations, such as independence, self-realization, the desire for individual success in tangible material forms. The ideology of the liberated entrepreneurial spirit proclaims the right of everyone to economic initiative for the purpose of their material well-being. It is an essential element of a liberal ideology that focus on the reconquest of the individual life spaces "*From Below*".

Analyzing the features of the behavior model corresponding to the "*Market*" person, it is estimated as an adequate type of value orientation to work, which combines the value of high earnings with such means of ensuring it as hard work and risk-taking. At the same time, "*Permanent*" means is hard work, and risk-taking is necessary mainly in situations of choice, where the right decision can provide a significant gain. Less adequate to a market economy is a focus on a quiet job with a moderate salary or a job with a lower salary, but giving confidence that the employee will not lose it.

The choice of one or another orientation can be considered an integral characteristic that reflects personal properties, as well as properties determined by belonging to certain socio-demographic, socio-professional groups.

CONCLUSION

Speaking about young people, in the course of sociological research, she showed, firstly, a greater willingness to work hard compared to other age groups, and secondly, a lower willingness to risk than to work hard, although it is among young people the highest proportion of those who are prone to it.

It is important to study the motives of entrepreneurial activity. The main conditions for the formation of factors of motivation of entrepreneurial activity include: region of residence, gender, age, marital status, availability and duration of professional experience.

By definition, the motive for generating monetary income is mandatory, but although it stands out as Central, it is not an end in itself, nor is it an end in itself. First, entrepreneurship acts as an act of not just strategic, but also creative activity with a high degree of autonomy in decision-making. The entrepreneur is thus fascinated by the process of this activity, in which he seeks independence and self-realization. Secondly, the earned money is important first of all as a criterion of success, they show how well the conceived business project is realized. They also become a means of ensuring social recognition and improving the business reputation of the entrepreneur. Thus, a relatively narrow economic motive is completed by the motives of satisfaction from the creative process and social motives.

If we turn to the sociology of youth, there are a number of social factors, such as society, the state, its social institutions, the media (macro factors), the type of settlement, ethnic group, local media, enterprises, educational institutions (meso factors), family, friendly environment, educational group, primary labor collective and other structures with which a person directly interacts (micro factors), which have a versatile impact on youth as a social group. These factors can not be ignored in the study of the formation of motivation in determining the professional activity and future employment of young people.

It is also noted that among young entrepreneurs motivation can be both external (money) and internal. External motivation is usually quite weak. The greatest motivational ability has the desire to get results, obsession, enthusiasm, excitement, "*Courage*".

In the study of entrepreneurial motivation, there are theories that distinguish "*Born*" entrepreneurs, based on their biological predisposition (or in terms of Ln. Gumilyov, "passionarity"). This also removes the problem of the impact of the social environment on this type of business. But sociology is of little interest to this kind of theory, including because such "*Born*" or "*Psychological*" entrepreneurs in the total population of all people engaged in this activity, the minimum number.

One explanation for this is that for many people, going into business is forced. To start a business, you often have to change your place of work, place of residence, profession, partially

break off the accumulated links with human capital or social skills acquired in life. In the 1980s, a number of American empirical studies found that entrepreneurs who had a clear idea of a product or service before they decided to start a business were four times fewer than those who took up a business without having such an idea. And for 2/3 of the founders of new firms, the reason is the negative incentives - dissatisfaction with their previous work, its content or prospects, the threat of dismissal or even the inability to get a job.

One of the reasons for the mass withdrawal of entrepreneurs, which largely explains the emergence of its wave in the 1970s and 80s in the Western world, was the tightness in certain segments of the labor market. It encouraged highly skilled professionals to set up their own technology, information and Advisory firms, and low-skilled workers to start their own small business in trade and consumer services. Thus, the difficulties in the labor market associated with job search, the threat of loss of work or deterioration of career prospects stand out as factors of leaving the business case.

Young people face many problems in the labor market: discrimination of young professionals and people without experience, lack of demand for a number of specialties, various options for cheating employers of employees, tensions in the labor market in the regions, small opportunities for self-realization, creativity and career building, low wages, etc. Entrepreneurial activity becomes in this case an attractive option, sometimes there are situations of forced transition to this type of activity.

Prepared under the grant of Plekhanov Russian University of Economics on the topic

"Development of mechanisms of state support for youth entrepreneurship in the Union State of Russia and Belarus"

REFERENCES

Aishah, S., Ilyani, A., Musramaini, M., & Hasni, A. (2016). Empowerment of Young Entrepreneurs Through Entrepreneurship Education: Students' Perception. *Regional Conference on Science, Technology and Social Sciences (RCSTSS 2014)*, 991-97.

Biney, I.K. (2019). Unearthing entrepreneurial opportunities among youth vendors and hawkers: challenges and strategies. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *8*(1), 1-12.

Bischoff, K.M., Michael, M.G., & Michael, F. (2014). Entrepreneurship training in developing countries. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology Help the Vulnerable: Serving the Underserved*, ed. Walter Reichman. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 92-119.

Brixiová, Z., & Thierry, K. (2014). Youth Employment in Africa: New Evidence and Policies from Swaziland. *Disadvantaged Workers: Empirical Evidence and Labour Policies*, eds. Miguel Ángel Malo and Dario Sciulli. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 181-202.

Cho, Y., David, R., & Samantha, W. (2016). Supporting self-employment and small-scale entrepreneurship: Potential programs to improve livelihoods for vulnerable workers. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy*, *5*(1), 1-7.

Ernkvist, M. (2016). The role of dual institutional- and technological entrepreneurship in the formation of the japanese social-game Industry. *Global Game Industries and Cultural Policy*. Anthony Fung. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 91-124.

Friedline, T., & Stacia, W. (2016). Young adults' race, wealth, and entrepreneurship. *Race and Social Problems, 8*(1), 42-63.

Gawell, M. (2013). Social entrepreneurship: Action grounded in needs, opportunities and/or perceived necessities? *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *24*(4), 1071-90.

Gerosa, A., & Alessandro, N.T. (2013). The culture of entrepreneurship: creating your own job. *European View, 12*(2), 205-214.

Greenwald, D., & Samantha, C. (2015). The context for social entrepreneurship in the Middle East. *Social Entrepreneurship in the Middle East, 1*, 39-66.

Khalid, A., & Hassan, B. (2016). University Students' Perceptions and Attitudes About Entrepreneurship and Their Intentions to Startup Businesses: Literature Review. *Business Challenges in the Changing Economic Landscape, 2*, 343-54.

Knijn, T., & Mark, S. (2012). European union and member states' youth policy agendas. *Work, Family Policies and Transitions to Adulthood in Europe*, 39-74.

Maas, G., & Paul, J. (2015). An Overview of Systemic Entrepreneurship. *Systemic Entrepreneurship: Contemporary Issues and Case Studies*, 1-21.

Manimala, M.J., & Princy, T. (2017). Entrepreneurship education: Innovations and Best Practices. *Entrepreneurship Education: Experiments with Curriculum, Pedagogy and Target Groups*, 3-53.

Penney, K., Dimitris, B., Tim, V., & Robert, W. (2018). When pedagogic worlds collide: Reflections on a Pan-european entrepreneurship education project. *Experiential Learning for Entrepreneurship: Theoretical and Practical Perspectives on Enterprise Education*, 245-263.

Santos, F.M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 335-351.

Christina, W., & John C.K.L. (2018). Sustaining entrepreneurship education in Hong Kong as a Learning City Through Partnership Building. *Entrepreneurial Learning City Regions: Delivering on the UNESCO 2013, Beijing Declaration on Building Learning Cities*, 137-54.

Clare, W.S., & Fatimah, S.B. (2015). Social enterprises: A panacea for engaging youth and inspiring hope? *Social Entrepreneurship in the Middle East, 1*, 107-28.

Zoltok, S. (2017). Youth, Crisis, and Learning. *Youth as/in Crisis: Young People, Public Policy, and the Politics of Learning*, 181-195.

Zahra, A., Zarei, H., & Didehvar, F. (2015). Identifying the evaluative indicators of regulatory policies for the development of social entrepreneurship. *Public Organization Review, 15*(3), 453-74.