



GENERAL PROBLEMS OF THE MODERN RESEARCH AND INNOVATION POLICY

<https://doi.org/10.15407/scine18.02.003>

SYTNYK, H. P.¹ (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3083-5733>),
ZUBCHYK, O. A.¹ (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6480-409X>),
and OREL, M. H.² (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9071-5602>)

¹Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,
64/13, Volodymyrska St., Kyiv, 01033, Ukraine,
+380 44 239 3333, office.chief@univ.net.ua

²Interregional Academy of Personnel Management,
2, Frometivska St., Kyiv, 03039, Ukraine,
+380 44 490 9505, iapm@iapm.edu.ua

CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE PECULIARITIES OF MANAGING INNOVATION-DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE IN THE CURRENT CONDITIONS

Introduction. The financial, economic, and technological aspects dominate in ensuring innovation-driven development of any state, while the conceptual understanding of the peculiarities of managing this development is often underestimated.

Problem Statement. The trajectory of innovation-driven development is turbulent because of the nonlinear nature of management of this development, so the conceptual understanding of the peculiarities of this management is an important factor in terms of effective innovation policy.

Purpose. The purpose of this research is to get a conceptual understanding of the peculiarities of national innovation-driven development management in the current conditions of state formation.

Materials and Methods. Analytical review of regulations and scholarly theses with the use of content analysis, structural, functional, systemic, comparative, and abstract logical methods.

Results. A prerequisite for solving the problems of national innovation-driven development is the introduction of an approach that allows overcoming the institutional weakness of the state, given the presumption of instability and uncertainty of its existence. It has been proposed to consider this development as the introduction of new political and managerial processes, models and technologies, which ensure an acceptable level of national security. It has been shown that political technologies may be used for mind games in choosing the priorities of this development, and its nonlinear dynamics necessitates revising the goals, methods, and technologies in the activities of government entities and ensuring balance between its political and administrative components.

Citation: Sytnyk, H. P., Zubchyk, O. A., and Orel, M. H. Conceptual Understanding of the Peculiarities of Managing Innovation-Driven Development of the State in the Current Conditions. *Sci. innov.*, 18(2), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.15407/scine18.02.003>

Conclusions. The strategic imperative for reducing technological gaps between states is to take into account the turbulence of the trajectory of their innovation-driven development, which is typical for the nonlinear nature of its management, so both the innovation policy and mechanisms for its implementation shall take into consideration the instability and uncertainty of the state being.

Keywords: innovation-driven development of the state, social system, national security, political processes, public administration, and management of innovation-driven development.

State is a social system whose trajectory at certain stages may be chaotic and nonlinear. The reasons for this are activities of system elements that have conflicting interests and the influence of other systems. Therefore, the important components of the existence (being) of any state are management processes aiming at regulating the activities of the state in all spheres of public life. The state is also influenced by external factors that pose a risk of losing innovation capacity. At the same time, the globalization processes, the discussions related to the assessment of the mission of government institutions, the transformation of the very essence of power relations, and the development of information technology have radically changed public life and require adequate solutions in terms of innovation policy. However, as a rule, researchers focus primarily on financial, economic, and technology issues, while managerial aspects are ignored.

For example, Z. Yurynets in her research, has come to the logical conclusion that the diversity of problems of innovation-driven development of the economy determines the need to classify the conditions under which the national environment is formed and the development of economic entities is determined by innovation [1, 402]. However, analyzing these conditions, she does not pay due attention to understanding the potential of innovation systems in the countries that do not form the appropriate institutional support for innovation in the context of achieving the consolidation of interests and harmonious relations between society, government, business, public and R&D institutions. E. Redziuk and R. Dubas have concluded that the problems that hinder innovation and investment development, in particular, are the oligarchic monopoly and the lack of govern-

ment efforts to attract investment into the national economy [2, 3]. M. Kvak has expressed the opinion that the main factor that creates difficulties for the innovation development of Ukraine is the inefficient use of national wealth [4]. That is, these authors do not pay attention to the formation of relevant institutional support of innovation by subjects of management processes. This problem has been mentioned in the studies of O. Gudzinsky, S. Sudomir, T. Gurenko, O. Koleshchuk, and E. Khairova, who believe that the system for ensuring the organizational development of socio-economic actors through the development of values, organization of culture and culture of organization, organizational interaction and organizational behavior, organizational climate and management profile has become very relevant [5, 10]; the problems of effective implementation of innovation are imperfect legislative, R&D and administrative frameworks [6, 93]; the legal as well as the organizational and managerial frameworks play the key role in the transformation of the economy of the United States as innovation leader [7, 26]. V. Vyshnevsky, O. Garkushenko, and S. Kniazev have considered the problem of innovation-driven development in a more systematical way. They believe, that overcoming technological gaps is not a mere engineering or financial problem and shall start with measures aiming at the development of R&D sphere of Ukraine and the respective culture and institutions [8, 16–17]. T. Petrushina has drawn attention to the importance of active citizenship and urgent decisive actions to preserve and to strengthen the social capacity in the context of economic development of our country [9, 18].

In terms of addressing the problems of innovation-driven development of the state, unambigu-

ous and clear interpretation of the definition of “innovation” among researchers and managers is crucially important. Often, they interpret everything new in science and technology as innovation, just mentioning the innovation component in certain sections of documents. Pursuant to the legislation of Ukraine, innovation shall mean newly created (used) and (or) improved competitive technology, product or service, as well as organizational and technical solutions of production, administrative, commercial or other nature, which significantly improve the structure and quality of production and (or) the social sphere [10]. The recent decree of the President of Ukraine states that in order to accelerate Ukraine’s transition to an innovation-driven model of development, it has been decided to establish an Interdepartmental Commission to coordinate the activities of government bodies in the field of national security and defense for integrated high technology development [11]. That is, the transition of the state to an innovation-driven model of development is associated with the technology aspect. The draft strategy for innovative development of Ukraine for 2010–2020, which was developed in the context of the globalization challenges, emphasized the importance of achieving the consolidation of interests and establishing harmonious relations between society, state, government, business and other public and R&D institutions [12, 14].

However, the approved Strategy for the development of innovation for 2030 addresses the sphere of innovation whose locomotive should be the formation of innovation ecosystem rather than the innovation-driven development of the state [13]. This is an evidence of the lack of a proper vision in the government policy of how to transfer Ukraine to an innovative path of development as well as the lack of understanding of the components of the government policy and ideas about the dangers to sovereignty of the state, which may be caused by its inefficiency, insofar as, in fact, solving the problem of innovation-driven development means to overcome the institutional weakness of the state, which conditions the current po-

litical and socio-economic state of society, and having done this, to form a national innovation system that has to be a separate object of the government policy.

Hence, the financial, economic and technology aspects dominate in solving the problem of innovation-driven development of the state, while the importance of the managerial aspects of this development is underestimated. For the management processes being nonlinear by their very nature, under identical conditions, some states become technological leaders, while others are outsiders. Therefore, it is important to conceptualize the features of the management of this development in the present-day conditions. The purpose of this research is to analyze the process of innovation-driven development of the state as a social phenomenon and the problem of determining the development priorities; to consider the metamorphosis of the concept of “power” and D. Rodrick’s “globalization trilemma” as challenges to the development of the state; and to disclose the features of management processes and strategic planning at different stages of the existence of the state.

Innovation-Driven Development as Social Phenomenon and Determination of its Priorities

Many social phenomena that describe the essential characteristics of social objects represent not only the characteristics of social reality, but also its deeper processes latently connected with this phenomenon. Among these processes there is innovation-driven development of the state. Because of geopolitical, geoeconomic and socio-cultural transformations, the need to take into account the cumulative effect of the dangers to the sovereignty and to disclose its essence is not a trivial task. Therefore, despite the growing number of publications, the conceptual and categorical apparatus of innovation science is far from being perfect and exhaustive. The analysis of research works that deal with problems of innovation-driven development has shown that there are two approaches to the disclosure of the content of this term.

According to the first, attention is focused on the need to develop disruptive technology, to remove technological gaps, etc. [14–16], while the second one aims at improving the legal framework, institutional reforms, etc. [9, 17, 18].

The difference in the approaches is reflected at the regulatory level. In the first case, we deal with the sphere of innovation activity of the state and the innovation processes aiming at the development of high-tech sector, etc. [13], whereas the second approach focuses on the investment development of the state and its efforts towards world leadership, etc. [19]. It is also important that the priorities of innovation-driven development starts to be considered in the context of national security, as the security vector has been distinguished for the sake of achieving the goal of the Sustainable Development Strategy *Ukraine – 2020* [19]. At the same time, for determining the priorities of innovation-driven development within both approaches, we need to answer the question who and how determines the priorities at the official level and who and how decides on their hierarchy. It is difficult to give an unambiguous answer because these priorities are intertwined with national interests, and since the ruling elite often tries to pass off their own interests under the appearance of national ones, there is always a danger of the interests of pro-government elites substituting for the innovation priorities. Eventually, the definition of national interests depends on the professional preferences of government authorities (the subjective factor), while the definition of the related priorities for innovation development is way to find a rational allocation of resources that are limited (the objective factor). This means that these priorities always have the objective and the subjective aspects. So, it is not logically that those who prepared the Strategy for Innovation Development did not set any priorities for innovation-driven development, stating that they might be subject to the influence of current interests, which would lead to distortions of the government policy [13]. In view of the above, this means the lack of a strategic vision of ways of

innovation development of the state rather than the neutralization of dangers to the policy because of substituting the interests of government and business for the development priorities. Thus, research and regulative documents do not mention the need to revise the conceptual approach for the sake of ensuring innovation-driven development of the state, i.e. overcoming the institutional weakness of the state, as a strategic imperative. It is also important that such a revised approach shall take into account the presumption of instability and uncertainty in the existence of the state, as a result of destabilization that always accompanies efforts towards switching the country to the desired trajectory of development. The main tool for this switch is reforms that, depending on their goals, scale, and consequences, cause different types of destabilization. If the initiators support gradual transformations as a condition for gaining the desired dynamics of state development in the post-destabilization period, we are talking about the evolutionary type of destabilization. If the goal of reforms is to modernize the institutions by changing the vectors of social development, we deal with the modernization type of destabilization. Its initiators may want to turn the country on a trajectory of progressive development, but may also pursue selfish goals, as evidenced by the experience of the former Soviet Union, where under the slogans of *perestroika* the political system was modified in such a way as to meet the needs of the ruling elite that transformed from builders of communism into ardent supporters of capitalism. Obviously, in both cases, it is important to properly monitor the results of reforms, otherwise their initiators find themselves in a situation of “reform for the sake of reform”, in which the inefficiency of government institutions increases while the development potential of the state decreases.

If the precondition for the government institutions to enter the trajectory of progressive development is the implementation of reforms aiming at removing obstacles to the formation of a new type of socio-political relations, it is likely that

there is the destabilization of the transformational type. In these circumstances, there is a risk of civil conflict that may be triggered if the initiators of reforms strive after satisfying their needs rather than the needs of society. In such a case, the state may be further stagnating. The mentioned types of destabilization are caused by the fact that the operation of the state constantly generates the processes causing permanent disturbances and crises in its institutions that need to be reformed. Therefore, finding out the sources and causes of these phenomena allows government authorities to choose solutions that are appropriate to the dangers to the national interests and the corresponding priorities of state development. At the same time, the priorities should be chosen in the context of seeking public consensus on reforms. The lack of consensus is often caused by the presence of opposing views on the factors of security of the society and the state under conditions of destabilization among the social groups and the pro-government elite.

It is obvious that the development of strategies for innovation-driven development of the state given the real situation and national interests is planning the future of the state. Therefore, innovation-driven development as the creation, assimilation, and dissemination of various types of innovations in the state shall be interpreted in the context of its political, economic, social, and humanitarian development given the principles and strategic ideas of the modern world order. This means that we talk about the feasibility of introducing a paradigm of innovation-driven development in Ukraine, which should include the integrated use of civilizational, synergetic approaches and institutional analysis. Therefore, it is proposed to understand the innovation-driven development of the state as transformations in its institutions as a result of management decisions, the consequences of which are the introduction of new organizational and legal principles, political and managerial processes, models and technologies to achieve an acceptable level of national security as an ultimate goal of this development under con-

ditions of loss of stability of the state caused by internal processes, external restrictions, and initiated reforms. This interpretation of innovation-driven development of the state allows studying this phenomenon given the innovation policy factors and possible types of destabilization in the state, which may stem from the reforms and taking into account the effect of management processes on innovation-driven development. The above considerations have shown the necessity of introducing an integrated approach while identifying the priorities of innovation-driven development of the state, whose elements should be as follows: using the principles of systemic and synergetic analysis; taking into account changes in priorities for the structure of production; understanding that social systems consist of interrelated political, economic, legal, and other elements; taking into account the philosophical, political, sociological, legal, and ethical aspects of security of individual, society, and government institutions. The last subparagraph is explained by the fact that in the “individual security — security of society — state security” triad their relationships may differ, depending on the dynamics and consequences of destabilization. For example, if there is a danger of civil armed conflict, the priority of ensuring the national security becomes obvious, as preserving the territorial integrity, sovereignty, and constitutional order in the country comes to the fore.

Metamorphosis of Power and the Rodrick “Trilem of Globalization” as Challenges to the Innovation-Driven Development of the State

Solving the problem of individual security implies the need for a dominant government institution that provides a collective choice in the context of ensuring the security of individuals, society, and the state [20]. It contains discursive elements on optimizing the balance of power in the individual — society — state triangle, which generates discussions related to assessments of the state mission in the context of human and social security. They have been intensified in the

modern era that is characterized by the generation of challenges to the institutional capacity of the state and other institutions responsible for social governance and security of individuals. Z. Bauman metaphorically describes the era marked with the transition from the structured world burdened with social conditions and obligations to the flexible world that is free of barriers and borders as “fluid modernity” [21]. The consequences of the transition are profound transformations in the spheres of human life where there are dominating the processes of deregulation of socio-economic and socio-political relations, increasing uncontrollable trends, and growing insecurity and uncertainty [22]. Therefore, the search of strategies for innovation-driven development of the state has become more complicated. Solving this problem is mixed up by changing perceptions of the principles of gaining and exercising the state power, given the transformation of relations in the triangle of sources of power (violence – wealth – knowledge), in which the latter plays an increasing role and becomes a major tool for social governance used by the ruling elite. Alvin Toffler focused on the growing influence of the mass media that produce a flow of contradictory images, symbols, and “facts” as a result of which the more data, information, and knowledge are used by the management system, the more difficult may be for anyone, including political leaders, to get an idea of what is really happening [23, 317]. This requires the restoration of institutions and technologies of social management as a prerequisite for ensuring the innovation-driven development of the state. At the same time, political technologies armed with means of informatics may be used to manipulate the public consciousness in terms of choosing the priorities of this development, and management today is not exclusive competence of government bodies that are increasingly intertwined with transnational corporations, which results in the marginalization of national-oriented administration that should aim at protecting the interests of society and the state [24, 143–144]. Therefore, the transition to a new type of

knowledge-based social governance is quite controversial and ambiguous. Social systems are known to behave differently, depending on whether they are in equilibrium or imbalanced state. However, in any case, management systems have to be rebuilt, inasmuch as their current structure is based on intelligence. In this context, it is important to analyze the essence of power that is based on competencies, as studied by Erich Fromm who concludes that competence is not necessarily an integral part of power, because, for example, power may be a result of money invested in election campaign, and therefore there may be no connection between competence and power [25]. It is also important that globalization accelerates the separation of power, as there has been being formed a “transnational bloc” of capitalists, government officials, and intellectuals whose goal is making enormous profits instead of protecting national interests. As a result, in the context of postmodern projects, it has been more and more often discoursed in the scholarly circles that the government bodies are incapable of solving problems within their conventional competence either [32–35]. The COVID-19 pandemic has given additional impetus to these discussions. While analyzing the pandemic consequences, Klaus Schwab and Thierry Muller have concluded that it has led the world to a “great reboot” of the global order, which has to radically transform the way the world operates, and that nation-based states are an anachronism. Therefore, in their opinion, transnational corporations should be replaced by global ones that have to take over the functions of the state [26]. While reflecting on globalization and nationalism, Schwab and Muller use D. Rodrik’s “trilemma of globalization” that it is impossible to attain economic hyperglobalisation, national sovereignty, and democracy simultaneously, because only two of these things can be achieved at any one time [27]. Democracy and national sovereignty may exist until globalization is restrained, democracy falls victim for the sake of globalization and the national sovereignty, and as democracy and globalization expand, the national

sovereignty has no place. D. Rodrick proposes a world economic system in which, in his opinion, we may avoid the trilemma of globalization, in particular by perceiving developing countries as full partners [27]. However, for Schwab and Müller it is important that the possibilities of global governance are destroyed as a result of the revival of nationalism [26, 47]. Therefore, the proposed “great reboot” is a modernization of the global order, which aims at forming a government of global elite, in which the state has no place, and therefore, it makes no sense to talk about innovation-driven development of the state.

It should be noted that the EU is a good illustration of the trilemma of globalization, as the co-existence of economic integration with democracy involves the adoption of fundamental decisions at the supranational level, which weakens national sovereignty. Therefore, Britain's exit from the EU was a reaction to “European globalization,” as the United Kingdom did not want to continue losing sovereignty and democracy and the associated opportunities to identify and to realize national interests, and in such a way neutralized the danger of becoming a “political dwarf” in the system of international relations. In the context of what has been said, Ulrich Beck notes that Europeans only pretend that Germany, France, Italy and other countries exist, but they have long since disappeared, because there is nothing more that has underpinned the national sovereignty world until recently, and thus, the national sovereignty has long ceased to create a general order of relations, which should include all other principles of behavior, and therefore been unable to respond to political challenges [28, 7–11]. Z. Bauman shares this opinion. He states that there is no hope for government agencies whose purpose is to ensure security, because freedom of public policy is constantly destroyed by new global forces [21, 199]. Jean Baudrillard fully agrees with him, according to him, cultural identification is realized through access to pleasure, which is controlled because the consumer gets a specific identity from cultural environment, which is a product of mass

culture, rather than through ideological and political mobilization [29]. As a result, the formation of societies with a blurred national identity speeds up, i.e. their cultural code is being eroded, which is a real threat to the development of national sovereignty. Considering the peculiarities of the metamorphosis of power in the modern era, it is necessary to keep in mind that this is not easy to secure the desired level of security of the state and the welfare of every individual at the same time. Material needs are a factor that keeps people in touch with everyday reality. Therefore, they tend to prioritize their goals that are mainly economic in their nature, and the ineffectiveness of conventional ways of integrating and coordinating the actions of individuals puts on the agenda the problem of constituting a new type of sociability that should ensure a balance of power in the triangle individual – society – state as a prerequisite for minimizing the risk of disintegration of society and ensuring innovation-driven development of the state.

The Peculiarities of Management Processes and Strategic Planning in the State at Different Stages of its Existence

We can distinguish the three stages in the existence (being) of the state: “operation,” “development,” and “decline.” The stage of “operation” is characterized by keeping the vital activity of the state at a certain level and maintaining the functions that determine the integrity, qualitative certainty, and content of government institutions within a certain interval of its existence. The stage of “development” covers the interval of existence of the state, which is characterized by a process of permanent and irreversible transformations to acquire a new quality, which has an essential character, a certain form, and positive consequences for the viability of the state. At the stage of “decline,” there are the processes in which the vital potential of the state is exhausted, which results in decay of the state. The content of the activities of the public governance and administration

entities and the peculiarities of the existence of the state at these stages are obviously interdependent. For the purpose of this research, it is important to analyze the activities of these entities at the stages of operation and development.

Operation as a process hinders development, but at the same time is its prerequisite. Development destroys certain processes of operation, causes instability, but also creates conditions for improving their sustainability in the future. Due to this, there arise crisis situations that are the result of the accumulation of contradictions in the state at the stage of "operation" and are a prerequisite for the transition to the stage of "development." The contradictions necessitate the adoption of appropriate decisions that may aim at maintaining or changing the status of the state as a system and provide for the determination of certain goals. Therefore, it is important to find out the specifics of establishing the goals of the governance entities in terms of the planning of transformations of the state at different stages of its existence. At the stage of operation, the state usually is relatively stable, as traditions, established norms, procedures, etc. dominate attempts to carry out disruptive changes in the political, economic and other systems. Therefore, the management processes at this stage are characterized by the predominance of routine relations between the elite and the electorate, parties, local governments, etc., i.e. there are relations that are periodically repeated according to standard procedures. This routine leads to the dominance of management methods and technologies inherent in public administration and, therefore, for these methods, at the stage of operation, it is important to preserve the functions of the state, the implementation of which ensures integrity, quality, and content of the state. The above factors determine the imperative for the operation of public governance and administration entities, namely: the executive and administrative activities. They have clearly regulated management functions aiming at implementing applicable legislation through making and monitoring the implementation of re-

levant decisions and providing administrative services, and the main methods for realizing these functions are administrative ones: organization and stabilization (regulation), administration, and disciplinary measures. Therefore, in this case, it is necessary to talk about public administration as a function aiming at ensuring the effective operation of government institutions in the conditions of stability. Its components are as follows: forecasting and planning; coordination and regulation; supervision over the activities of public administration entities in the context of their influence on the course of political, economic, and other processes through the establishment of relationships and exchange of information between their elements. Thus, public administration hinders the development of the state, but is a condition for its further innovation-driven development. In view of the above, it is obvious that public administration is dominated by bureaucracy that may be effective in routine matters, but is often incapable of making creative and innovative decisions in the face of challenges to the life of the state.

The development of the state is conditioned by complex influence of external and internal factors, which generates instability, destroys the established processes of the state operation, but at the same time creates the necessary conditions for their more sustainable and high-quality implementation in the future. In these conditions, the objective reality is a crisis situation as a turning point in the existence of the state, a hallmark of which is the exacerbation of political, social, and other contradictions in the state. This requires the adoption of management decisions conditioned by a fundamentally different imperative for the activities of governance entities. These activities should aim at restructuring the organizational and functional structure of government institutions. This means the transformation of their qualitative and quantitative characteristics, which provides the corresponding requirements for strategic forecasting and planning, and therefore the performance of inherent functions of pub-

lic administration. That is, in conditions of instability in the state, the dominant activity of the governance entities is to support permanent and irreversible transformations of government institutions until they get a new quality.

The fundamental differences in the strategic planning goal-setting under conditions of state instability and in the stable state deserve special attention. The peculiarities of planning in conditions of instability are, in particular: a high degree of uncertainty in the conditions under which management decisions are made and, consequently, a significant variability in the ability of governance entities to choose alternatives, which necessitates their focus on quality analysis and synthesis. situational approaches, the use of political and strategic forecasting. These specific features of planning make it difficult to determine the priorities of innovation-driven development of the state, as there is a fundamental difference between the strategic planning goal-setting for the development of the state and that for the national security. In order to set a goal for the national security, it is important to identify the factors that cause dangers, while the goal-setting for the development planning is based on the objectively existing needs for the development of the state. The specificity of goal-setting of governance entities at the stage of the state existence, which is characterized by instability of social processes determines significant features of the content and mechanisms of other management functions: organization, coordination, motivation, supervision, and the need for leaders to think strategically and to have a vision of optimal direction of the state development. This shows that in the conditions of instability of social processes in the state, public governance plays a decisive role as a higher level of management as compared with administration. Public governance uses not only administrative management tools, but also political, economic, and other processes, interaction with civil society institutions and international actors, involving society in solving important security problems, and so on. The above allows us to explain

why today researchers have been making efforts to develop methodological principles of crisis management strategy in the governance theory [30]. While trying to understand why in modern conditions these strategies have become ineffective, U. Beck figuratively called modernity "crisis era" or "crisis society" [31]. At the same time, the defining features of modern crisis situations include, in particular, a shortening in crisis response time and the growing role of transnational corporations in the weakening of the capacity of government institutions. Therefore, the development of the state and the dynamics of crisis situations in it are nonlinear, which necessitates nonstandard solutions for identifying the determinants of the trajectory of its innovation-driven development, when there are opportunities for rapid, nonlinear transition to another state. This transition is characterized by a certain ratio of objective and subjective factors that have led to it, however, always requires radical changes in goals, methods, and technologies of the activities of governance entities and the divisions of the goals related to innovation-driven development into the two groups. The first group is related to managing the likelihood of a crisis situation. The second one is related to managing the level of protection of government institutions in crisis situations. The subjects to be influenced by these entities are usually interrelated political, economic, and other processes. Their peculiarity is, in particular a high level of uncertainty; limited time for decision making; poor predictability of trends, scale and timing of the transformation of a crisis situation into an emergency.

The described features of the state in a stable and unstable conditions necessitate the application of a systematic approach to decision-making related to ensuring the innovation-driven development. At the same time, attention should be focused on understanding the needs of people, social groups, and government institutions and identifying the factors that take into account these needs. In social systems, the boundaries between its elements are determined by qualitative and

quantitative characteristics of their identity, which together condition the qualitative difference between this system and other ones. In such systems, there is a constant conflict between the elements for which the priority is to ensure its integrity and those that give priority to autonomy. Due to this, in the state, simultaneously there are the processes aiming at the convergence of the goals of its elements and the formation of relationships between them and the processes that lead to their weakening. At the same time, there are different trends in society, which are the result of diversity of social interests and are objective in their nature.

However, social relations for the individual have a subjective dimension, which manifests itself in his/her intentions, behavior, feelings, etc. This fully applies to any management systems with active elements. In such systems there are always the processes related to the integration of political, government, and other structures as well as the opposite processes, therefore, some resistance to the introduction of innovation changes should be taken into account. Its forms may be different, and the intensity depends on many factors, including the degree of destruction of established traditions and understanding of the need for changes. In general, the reasons for resisting innovation changes in the state are a combination of political, economic, psychological, and other factors.

Finally, the organizational and functional structure of the system of public governance and administration is formed by the political and the administrative components. The main functions of the former are the development and adoption of political decisions. The key function of the latter is the implementation of these decisions. Therefore, this structure always contains political and administrative blocks, which are distinguished by their mission in determining the trajectory of innovation development of the state. The political block is involved in the development of regulations aiming at strengthening the institutional capacity of the government, and the administrative block is responsible for outlining ways

to achieve the policy goals, reviewing and preparing documents, managing resources needed to achieve these goals.

This is an evidence of the fact that public policy and public governance and administration are closely linked with each other in terms of determining and implementing the priorities of innovation-driven development of the state. Unfortunately, in Ukraine the organizational and legal frameworks for the formation of the political and the administrative components of the system of public governance and administration have been often modified, which negatively affects the effectiveness of their interaction. Thus, the institutional and functional imbalance of the political and the administrative components of the system of public governance and administration always has an adverse impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of the system activities. Therefore, the priority is to ensure a balance between these components, which is the crucial prerequisite for the formation of an effective mechanism for making and implementing decisions on the priorities of innovation-driven development of the state. At the same time, despite a promising potential of the Western political and managerial approaches to eliminate this imbalance, in order to be implemented in the domestic field they should be adapted to cultural and political national realities.

Conclusions

A prerequisite for solving the problems of innovation-driven development of the state is the introduction of an approach that would overcome the institutional weakness of the state, given the presumption of instability and uncertainty in its existence, which may take place in the course of transition of the state to a desired trajectory. Innovation-driven development shall mean the transformation of government institutions, the introduction of new organizational and legal frameworks, political and administrative processes, models and technologies, which provide an acceptable level of national security in the conditions

where the state loses its stability. Also, it should be borne in mind that globalization accelerates the process of forming a “transnational bloc” of capitalists, government officials, and intellectuals, whose goal is to generate profits rather than to protect national interests, and that political technologies may be used to manipulate public consciousness in terms of choosing innovation priorities. In particular, it has been more and more often discoursed in the scholarly circles that the government bodies are incapable of solving problems within their conventional competence either. The development of the state generates instability, destroys the established processes of its operation, so in these conditions, the priority for the government entities is to support the process of permanent and irreversible transformations in its institutions that should acquire a new quality. At the same time, there is a fundamental difference between the goal-setting by the government entities for planning the development of the state and for ensuring its security, and the nonlinear dynamics of the development necessitates nonstandard solutions to identify the determinants of the trajectory of this development. This transition requires radical transformations of the goals, methods, and technologies in the activities of government entities and the grouping of the

goals into those related to managing the likelihood of crisis and those related to ensuring an acceptable level of protection of individual, society, and institutions in crisis situations. An important prerequisite for the formation of an effective mechanism for decision-making and implementation of priorities for innovation-driven development of the state, given the cultural and political national realities, is to ensure a balance between the political and the administrative components of public administration.

Thus, the scholarly novelty of this research is the conceptual understanding of the management of innovation-driven development of the state, which allows the authors to conclude that the imperative to reduce technological gaps between states is to take into account the turbulence of the development trajectory as a result of the nonlinear nature of its management. Therefore, the innovation policy and the mechanisms for its implementations shall take into consideration instability and uncertainty of the state as a social system. The prospects for further research are to develop the conceptual framework of the policy of innovation-driven development of the state and the mechanisms for its implementation given the nonlinear nature of the management of this development.

REFERENCES

1. Yurynets, Z. V. (2016). *Innovation strategies in the system of increasing the competitiveness of Ukraine's economy*: Doctor's thesis. Lviv: ONTU [in Ukrainian].
2. Redzyuk, E. V. (2019). Creating an effective financial and investment environment in EU countries is an experience for Ukraine. *Problems of innovative investment development*, 20, 4–13. <https://doi.org/10.33813/2224-1213.20.2019.1> [in Ukrainian].
3. Dubas, R. G. (2018). Management of innovation and investment development of the national economy of Ukraine. *Problems of innovative investment development*, 16, 4–13. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Piir_2018_16_2 [in Ukrainian] (Last accessed: 12.02.2021).
4. Kwak, M. V. (2020). Determinants of the formation of the trajectory of innovative development of the state in the modern economic space. *Economic space*, 155, 20–24. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2224-6282/155-4> [in Ukrainian].
5. Gudzinsky, O. D., Sudomir, S. M., Gurenko, T. O. (2018). Institutionalism in the development of socio-economic systems: methodological aspect. *Problems of innovation and investment development*, 15, 4–12. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Piir_2018_15_2 [in Ukrainian] (Last accessed: 25.02.2021).
6. Koleschuk, O. Ya. (2019). Models of formation and development of innovative activity: international experience. *Economics Bulletin*, 1 (65), 86–95. <https://doi.org/10.33271/ev/65.086> [in Ukrainian].

7. Khairova, E. A. (2013). The model of US innovative development in the context of modern development. *Culture of the peoples of the Black Sea region*, 259, 23–26. URL: <http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/92453/05-Hairova.pdf?sequence=1> [in Ukrainian] (Last accessed: 25.02.2021).
8. Vishnevsky, V. P., Garkushenko, O. M., Knyazev, S. I. (2020). Technological gaps: concept, models, ways to overcome. *Science and Innovation*, 16(2), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.15407/scin16.02.003> [in Ukrainian].
9. Petrushina, T. O. (2020). Sociological understanding of the modernization of modern Ukrainian society. *Science and Innovation*, 16(5), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.15407/scin16.05.003> [in Ukrainian].
10. Law of Ukraine «On Innovation» (2002). Information of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (VVR). Kyiv. 36, 266. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/40-15#Text> [in Ukrainian] (Last accessed: 10.04.2021).
11. Decree of the President of Ukraine of December 28, 2020 «On the decision of the National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine of December 28, 2020» On improving the state policy of innovative development of Ukraine» (2020). Kyiv. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/589/2020#Text> [in Ukrainian] (Last accessed: 15.04.2021).
12. Strategy of innovative development of Ukraine for 2010–2020 in the context of globalization challenges. (2009). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
13. Order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine of July 10, 2019 № 526-r. «On approval of the Strategy for the development of innovation for the period up to 2030». (2019). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
14. Vishnevsky, V. P., Garkushenko, O. M., Knyazev, S. I. (2020). Technological gaps: concept, models, ways to overcome. *Science and Innovation*, 16(2), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.15407/scin16.02.003> [in Ukrainian].
15. Pisarenko, T. V., Kvasha, T. K., Rozhkova, L. V., Paladchenko, O. F., Bohomazova, V. M., Molchanova, I. V., Berezniak, N. V. (2019). *The state of innovation and activity in the field of technology transfer in Ukraine in 2018: Analytical reference*. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
16. Kwak, M. V. (2020). Determinants of the formation of the trajectory of innovative development of the state in the modern economic space. *Economic space*, 155, 20–24. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2224-6282/155-4> [in Ukrainian].
17. Libanova, E. M. (2011). Modernization of Ukraine's economy in the context of social challenges. *Demography and social economy*, 1(15), 52–58 [in Ukrainian].
18. Gudzinsky, O. D., Sudomir, S. M., Gurenko, T. O. (2018). Institutionalism in the development of socio-economic systems: methodological aspect. *Problems of innovation and investment development*, 15, 4–12. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Piir_2018_15_2 [in Ukrainian] (Last accessed: 21.02.2021).
19. Decree of the President of Ukraine on the Strategy of Sustainable Development «Ukraine – 2020». (2020). URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/5/2015#top> [in Ukrainian] (Last accessed: 15.03.2021).
20. Hobbes, T. (1991). *Leviathan, or Matter, the form or power of the state, ecclesiastical and civil*. V. 2. Moscow [in Russian].
21. Bauman, Z. (2008). *Fluid modernity*. Sankt Petersburg: Peter [in Russian].
22. Bauman, Z. (2005). *Individualized society*. Moscow [in Russian].
23. Toffler, A. (2003). *Metamorphoses of power*. Moscow [in Russian].
24. Pugach, V. G. (2019). Metamorphoses of the ruling class of the modern state. *Expert: paradigms of legal sciences and public administration [electronic edition]*, 138–145. <https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-9660-2019-4-2-138-145> [in Ukrainian].
25. Fromm, Erich. (1998). *Psychoanalysis and Religion; The art of loving; To have or to be?* Kiev [in Russian].
26. Schwab, K., Muller, Th. (2020). COVID-19: The Great Reboot. World Economic Forum [in Russian].
27. Rodrik, D. (2014). *The paradox of globalization. Democracy and the future of the world economy*. Moscow [in Russian].
28. Beck, U. (2007). *Power and its opponents in the era of globalism. New world political economy*. Moscow [in Russian].
29. Baudrillard, J. (2006). *Consumer society*. Moscow [in Russian].
30. Andersen, N. B. (2010). Situational Analysis of Crisis Communication and Warnings. *Abstract from the 17th ISA World Congress of Sociology (11–17 July 2010, Göteborg)*. Göteborg, Sweden [in English].
31. Beck, U. (2000). *Risk society. On the way to another modernity*. Moscow [in Russian].
32. Khadzhyradieva, S., Slukhai, S., Rachynskyi, A. (2020). Public Administration in Ukraine: Adjusting to European Standards. *NISPacee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, XIII(1), 81–108. <https://doi.org/10.2478/nispa-2020-0004> [in English].
33. Nelipa, D., Tsvykh, V., Zubchyk, O., Sytnyk, G., Hrebonozhko, Ye. The New Public Management paradigm as a further interaction of the public and private sectors. *Revista San Gregorio*, 1, 42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.36097/rsan.v1i42.1552> [in English].
34. Shulga, M. A., Nelipa, D. V., Vorotin, V. Y., Korchak, N. M., Vashchenko, K. O. (2021). When does the state disappear? (in memory of Rudolf Kjellen). *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 795–804. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS2.1421> [in English].

35. Zubchyk, O. A., Boichenko, M. I., Sytnyk, G. P., Levkulych, V. V. (2021). New tendencies of sustainable development: providing personal security and quality of life as a new national security paradigm. *E3S Web Conf.*, 277 02003. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202127702003> [in English].

Received 07.08.2021

Revised 05.11.2021

Accepted 12.11.2021

Г.П. Ситник¹ (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3083-5733>),

О.А. Зубчик¹ (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6480-409X>),

М.Г. Орел² (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9071-5602>)

¹ Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка,
вул. Володимирська, 64/13, Київ, 01033, Україна,
+380 44 239 3333, office.chief@univ.net.ua

² Міжрегіональна Академія управління персоналом,
вул. Фрометівська, 2, 03039, Київ, Україна,
+380 44 490 9505, iapm@iapm.edu.ua

КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНЕ ОСМИСЛЕННЯ ОСОБЛИВОСТЕЙ УПРАВЛІННЯ ІННОВАЦІЙНИМ РОЗВИТКОМ ДЕРЖАВИ В СУЧASНИХ УМОВАХ

Вступ. При вирішенні проблеми забезпечення інноваційного розвитку держави домінують фінансово-економічні та технологічні аспекти, а концептуальному осмисленню особливостей управління цим розвитком не надано належної уваги.

Проблематика. Траєкторія інноваційного розвитку держав є турбулентною через нелінійну природу управління цим розвитком, тому концептуальне осмислення особливостей управління зазначеного управління є чинником ефективної інноваційної політики.

Мета. Концептуальне осмислення особливостей управління інноваційним розвитком держави в сучасних умовах державотворення.

Матеріали й методи. Аналітичний аналіз нормативних актів і наукових праць з використанням контент-аналізу, структурно-функціонального, системного, компаративного, абстрактно-логічного методів.

Результати. Передумовою вирішення проблем інноваційного розвитку держави є запровадження підходу, який передбачає подолання її інституційної слабкості, враховує презумпцію нестабільності та невизначеності її буття. Запропоновано під цим розвитком розуміння впровадження нових політико-управлінських процесів, моделей і технологій, які забезпечують прийнятний рівень національної безпеки. Показано, що політичні технології можуть маніпулювати суспільною свідомістю при виборі пріоритетів вказаного розвитку, а його нелінійна динаміка зумовлює необхідність зміни цілей, методів і технологій в діяльності суб'єктів управління та забезпечення збалансованості між його політичною та адміністративною компонентами.

Висновки. Стратегічним імперативом зменшення технологічних розривів між державами є врахування турбулентності траєкторії їхнього інноваційного розвитку, яка зумовлена нелінійною природою управління ним, тому інноваційна політика та механізми її імплементації мають враховувати нестійкість та невизначеність буття держави.

Ключові слова: інноваційний розвиток держави, соціальна система, національна безпека, політичні процеси, публічне управління, управління інноваційним розвитком.