

UDC 342.9:351.82](477)“19/20”:930.1  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.39.364967

**Pavlo ARTYMYSHYN**

PhD (History), Senior Researcher of the Department of the Modern History of Ukraine, Ivan Krypiakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 4 Kozelnytska Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79026 (p.artymyshyn@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-7501-797X  
ResearcherID: AAA-2403-2022  
Scopus Author ID: 57836468200

**Mykola NADIEIKO**

PhD (Economy), Postdoctoral Fellow, Uzhhorod National University, 14 Universytetska Street, Uzhhorod, Ukraine, postal code 88000 (nadieiko.m.m@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0009-0000-1457-0387

**Павло АРТИМИШИН**

кандидат історичних наук, старший дослідник, старший науковий співробітник відділу нової історії України, Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, вул. Козельницька, 4, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79026 (p.artymyshyn@gmail.com)

**Микола НАДЄЙКО**

кандидат економічних наук, докторант ДВНЗ “Ужгородський національний університет”, вул. Університетська, 14, м. Ужгород, Україна, індекс 88000 (nadieiko.m.m@gmail.com)

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Artymyshyn, P., & Nadieiko, M. (2026). Extrajudicial Control Over the Activities of Public Administration Entities in the Field of Entrepreneurial Activity in Ukraine (the 20th – early 21st century): Historiography of the Issue. *Skhidnoievropejskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 39, 209–221. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.39.364967

**EXTRAJUDICIAL CONTROL OVER THE ACTIVITIES OF PUBLIC  
ADMINISTRATION ENTITIES IN THE FIELD OF ENTREPRENEURIAL  
ACTIVITY IN UKRAINE (THE 20th – Early 21st CENTURY):  
HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE ISSUE**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the article is to analyze the historiography of extrajudicial control over the activities of public administration entities in the field of entrepreneurial activity in Ukraine during the 20th and early 21st centuries, to identify the main research approaches, the degree of scholarly development of the issue, and the prospects for further studies. The research methodology is based on the principles of historicism, objectivity, and systematicity. Historiographical, problem-chronological, comparative and historical, and systemic methods have been applied. Scientific novelty: for the first time, the development of scientific approaches to the study of the control activities of public authorities in the sphere of entrepreneurship has been traced, the peculiarities of interpretation of extrajudicial*

forms of control different historical periods have been revealed, and a comprehensive analysis of the academic contributions of Ukrainian researchers has been carried out. **Conclusions.** In the study it has been determined that the issue historiography has undergone several stages of development reflecting the transformation of public administration and control mechanisms in Ukraine. It has been found that studies devoted to the period of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 focus on the formation of the first national control institutions, whereas research on the Soviet era predominantly characterizes control as an instrument of centralized governance and political supervision. Contemporary historiography examines extrajudicial control within the context of the democratization of public administration, the development of administrative appeal mechanisms, public oversight, the activities of ombudsman institutions, and the implementation of European standards of good governance. At the same time, it has been determined that comprehensive historiographical studies directly addressing the evolution of extrajudicial control in the sphere of entrepreneurial activity remain relatively scarce, which highlights the relevance and scholarly significance of further scholarly research in this field.

**Key words:** extrajudicial control, public administration, entrepreneurial activity, historiography, business entities, Ukraine, Russo-Ukrainian War.

### ПОЗАСУДОВИЙ КОНТРОЛЬ ЗА ДІЯЛЬНІСТЮ СУБ'ЄКТІВ ПУБЛІЧНОГО АДМІНІСТРУВАННЯ У СФЕРІ ПІДПРИЄМНИЦЬКОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ В УКРАЇНІ (XX – початок XXI ст.): ІСТОРІОГРАФІЯ ПРОБЛЕМИ

**Анотація. Мета статті** – проаналізувати історіографію позасудового контролю за діяльністю суб'єктів публічного адміністрування у сфері підприємницької діяльності в Україні у XX – на початку XXI ст., визначити основні дослідницькі підходи, ступені наукового опрацювання проблеми та перспективи подальших студій. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах історизму, об'єктивності та системності. Використано історіографічний, проблемно-хронологічний, порівняльно-історичний та системний методи. **Наукова новизна:** уперше простежено розвиток наукових підходів до вивчення контрольної діяльності органів публічної влади у сфері підприємництва, виявлено особливості трактування позасудових форм контролю в різні історичні періоди та здійснено комплексний аналіз наукового доробку українських дослідників. **Висновки.** У результаті дослідження встановлено, що історіографія проблеми пройшла кілька етапів розвитку, які відображають трансформацію державного управління та контрольних механізмів в Україні. З'ясовано, що у працях, присвячених періоду Української революції 1917–1921 рр., увага зосереджується на формуванні перших національних контрольних інституцій, тоді як дослідження радянської доби переважно характеризують контроль як інструмент централізованого управління та політичного нагляду. Сучасна історіографія розглядає позасудовий контроль у контексті демократизації публічного управління, розвитку механізмів адміністративного оскарження, громадського контролю, діяльності омбудсменських інституцій та впровадження європейських стандартів належного врядування. Водночас встановлено, що комплексні історіографічні дослідження, присвячені безпосередньо еволюції позасудового контролю у сфері підприємницької діяльності, залишаються нечисленними, що визначає перспективність подальших наукових розвідок у цьому напрямі.

**Ключові слова:** позасудовий контроль, публічне адміністрування, підприємницька діяльність, історіографія, суб'єкти господарювання, Україна, російсько-українська війна.

**Problem Statement.** The relevance of the scientific study of extrajudicial control over the activities of public administration entities in the sphere of entrepreneurial activity in Ukraine in the 20th and early 21st centuries in historiography is determined by the need to summarize and critically evaluate the scientific body of work devoted to the problems of state control, supervision and protection of business entities rights. Against the backdrop of the public administration system transformation, the reform of control and supervisory mechanisms, and the adaptation of national legislation to European standards, it is particularly important to examine how these issues are addressed in the existing historiography, what conceptual

approaches emerged during different historical periods, and which aspects remain under-researched. A historiographical analysis makes it possible to trace the evolution of scholarly views on the nature, forms and legal means of extrajudicial control, to determine the influence of socio-political and legal transformations on the development of relevant research, and to identify changes in the interpretation of the state role in regulating business activity.

**Review of Recent Research and Publications.** Certain aspects of state supervision, administrative appeals, activities of supervisory bodies, and the reform of public administration system have already been addressed in the historiography in one way or another (Artymyshyn, & Yaromiy, 2025; Bondarenko, 2020; Chubata, 2024; Hai-Nyzhnyk, 2006; Ilnytskyi, & Haliv, 2022). At the same time, there are currently few comprehensive historiographical studies that summarize the development of academic thought on extrajudicial control in the sphere of entrepreneurial activity in Ukraine during the 20th and early 21st centuries. This necessitates, in this publication, the systematization of existing academic work, the identification of key research areas, methodological approaches and issues for discussion, and the outlining of prospects for further research into specific aspects of extrajudicial control in the activities of public administration bodies and the protection of the rights of participants in business relations.

In this context, **the purpose** of the article is to analyze the historiography of extrajudicial control over the activities of public administration entities in the field of entrepreneurial activity in Ukraine during the 20th and early 21st centuries, to identify the main research approaches, the degree of scholarly development of the issue, and the prospects for further studies and early 21st centuries.

**Research Results.** An important component of the body of historiographical works on the subject under consideration, as well as its theoretical basis, consists of the studies on the phenomenon of legal remedies, which is significant for the entire field of law (including in the area of extrajudicial control over the activities of public administration bodies in the sphere of entrepreneurial activity). For example, according to O. Onufriienko, legal means constitute a set of legal phenomena of a substantive and functional nature, through which participants in legal relations realize and achieve both private and socially significant goals (Onufriienko, 2004, pp. 14–15). O. Hanzenko defined them as a set of legal forms, methods, means and techniques through which parties to legal relationships realize their private or public goals, needs, interests and legitimate aspirations (whether of individuals, society or the state) (Hanzenko, 2016, pp. 36–37). At the same time, A. Denysova interpreted legal means as phenomena manifested through corresponding legal instruments and practical mechanisms for their implementation, by means of which the interests of legal subjects are satisfied and both private and public goals are achieved. The researcher emphasized that legal means serve as key instruments of legal influence, reflect social, instrumental and personal value of law, shape sectoral legal regimes and ensure the functioning of the legal regulation mechanism (Denysova, 2010, pp. 190–191).

V. Averianov made a significant contribution to the development of the theoretical and legal foundations of control within the public administration system. Among other things, he viewed control as one of the basic functions of public administration, ensuring the legality, discipline and effectiveness of the activities of executive bodies. The scholar emphasized that control is a necessary condition for the implementation of administrative decisions, since it is precisely through control that the compliance of the practical activities of public authorities with the set tasks and the requirements of legislation is verified. At the same time,

V. B. Averianov focused on the issues of improving the system of accountability and oversight of executive bodies, viewing them as important guarantees of adherence to the principles of the rule of law and democratic governance (Averianov, 2003, p. 203). At the same time, as early as the 2000s, the scholar, together with a team of colleagues, advocated the need to reform administrative law in Ukraine and to transition from a state-centred to a people-centred model of public administration; they argued for the need to reorient control activities from predominantly punitive functions towards ensuring the rule of law, protecting the rights and legitimate interests of individuals and legal entities, as well as increasing the accountability of public authorities to society. They emphasized the need to establish clear limits on state interference in the sphere of private interests, which is of particular importance for ensuring freedom of entrepreneurial activity and the development of mechanisms for the extrajudicial protection of the rights of business entities (Averianov, 2004, pp. 27–35).

Ultimately, the bulk of the research consists of studies that directly address various aspects of extrajudicial oversight of the activities of public administration bodies in the field of business in Ukraine – both in a historical context and at the present day.

I. Kozachok briefly touched upon the historical experience of the formation and development of state and municipal control, noting only in very general terms that the origins of the system of state control in Ukraine were linked to the Central Rada's establishment of a control department, which was subsequently reorganized first into the Secretariat of State Control, and subsequently – by the Bolsheviks – into the People's Commissariat of State Control. Subsequently, according to the researcher, during the Soviet period, control bodies were tasked with improving the functioning of the state apparatus, countering bureaucracy and mismanagement, overseeing the implementation of decisions by party and state bodies, and ensuring compliance with the law. At the same time, as I. Kozachok argued, in Soviet Ukraine, as in other union republics, a ramified system of comprehensive state control had taken shape. Its functioning was based on a centralized model of governance, under which key decisions were taken by the highest party and state structures. Such a system entailed constant supervision of the activities of enterprises, institutions and organizations and was aimed at ensuring their complete subordination to state bodies and party leadership. Only the emergence of an independent Ukraine in 1991 created the conditions for a significant democratization of this system (Kozachok, 2020, p. 153).

L. Dikan focused in somewhat greater detail on the historical origins of this type of control. The researcher argued that during the period when the Ukrainian lands were part of the Russian Empire, Ukraine did not have its own control bodies, and control functions were carried out by imperial state control institutions subordinate to the Ministry of Finance. Their activities encompassed the audit of financial statements, cash transactions, accounting documents and the general economic condition of individual regions. Even after the revolutionary events of 1917, the main tasks of the control bodies remained unchanged: ensuring legality, the proper use of state funds and oversight of the activities of government bodies and economic institutions.

During the era of the Ukrainian Revolution, control functions took on particular significance. Local branches of the Russian Provisional Government, the Ukrainian Central Rada, Pavlo Skoropadskyi's Hetmanate and the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic regarded control as a vital instrument for ensuring the targeted use of financial resources, particularly funds received to maintain the army and the state apparatus. During this period, the first Ukrainian state control body was established – the Control Department, which

was soon reorganized into the Secretariat of State Control. Following the establishment of the Soviet power, its successor became the People's Commissariat of State Control of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, formed in January 1919 in Kharkiv.

During the Soviet period, the system of state control underwent numerous reorganizations, yet its core functions remained unchanged. Control bodies conducted audits of budgetary funds, verified the accuracy of accounting and reporting, and monitored the use of material and financial resources. Over the years, these functions were performed by the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate, the Financial Control Department, the State Financial Control, the Financial and Budgetary Inspectorate, and the Control and Audit Department. At the same time, the control system gradually became increasingly centralized and evolved into a component of the command-and-control administrative management mechanism, geared towards implementing the decisions of the party and state leadership. In the second half of the 20th century, alongside financial control, bodies of public control developed, designed to involve the public in oversight activities. They monitored the implementation of state plans, the efficient use of resources and the activities of state institutions. However, the control system remained primarily an instrument of centralized management, which led to its excessive bureaucratization and formalization. Towards the end of the USSR's existence, an attempt was made to modernize the system by establishing the USSR Chamber of Control, but its activities ceased with the collapse of the Union.

Following Ukraine's declaration of independence, a new phase in the development of state control began, linked to the transition to a market economy and a democratic model of public administration. In 1993, the State Control and Audit Service was established, and subsequently a network of new control institutions was formed, including the Accounting Chamber, the State Treasury and other specialized bodies. The development of the modern control system took place in two main stages: formation (1990 – 1997) and subsequent improvement and reform (since 1998). Current reforms are aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of control, bringing it into line with European standards, ensuring financial discipline and improving oversight mechanisms in a market economy and democratic governance (Dikan, 2006, 21–27).

V. Bortniak also put forward similar arguments. In discussing the development of the system of state control over business in Ukraine, he identified several key milestones that reflect the transformation of public administration and economic relations. As he argued, the first state control body in Ukraine was established by the Central Rada, initially in the form of a control department, which was subsequently reorganized into the Secretariat of State Control (of the Ukrainian State under P. Skoropadskyi), and later into the Bolshevik People's Commissariat of State Control (NKDC) of the Ukrainian SSR. (Its composition initially included the Supreme Socialist Inspectorate, founded in January 1919, which in early May 1919 separated from the NKDC to form the independent People's Commissariat of Soviet Socialist Inspection (NK RSI)). Its remit included oversight of the financial, administrative, military, industrial, agricultural and transport sectors. The main tools of its work were preliminary, ongoing and subsequent audits, the verification of financial statements, estimates and economic plans, as well as the detection of abuses and violations in the workings of the state apparatus.

In 1920, following the reorganization of state control bodies, the All-Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Inspection (RSI) was established, becoming the sole body of socialist state control. Its activities were aimed at scrutinizing the work of Soviet institutions, combating bureaucracy and ensuring the implementation of state decisions. However, excessive

centralization and the desire to extend control to all spheres of state administration led to an overload of the inspection apparatus and reduced the effectiveness of its oversight work. Consequently, in the early 1920s, the structure of the RSI was simplified, and its activities became more systematized (Bortniak, 2020, pp. 33–34).

Furthermore, according to V. Bortniak, the period of the New Economic Policy and subsequent industrialization led to the emergence of new supervisory institutions. In particular, in 1924, the Institute of State Accounting Experts was established, designed to ensure proper accounting and reporting at state, cooperative and private enterprises. At the same time, the system of financial control developed: within the structure of the People's Commissariat of Finance, there were financial control bodies, which were later transformed into the Financial and Budgetary Inspectorate and the Control and Audit Departments. The latter were granted broad powers to conduct documentary audits of the activities of enterprises, institutions and organizations.

Ultimately, as the scholar summarized, during the Soviet period the control system gradually evolved into a comprehensive mechanism of state supervision, aimed not only at ensuring legality and financial discipline, but also at implementing the political objectives of the party and state leadership. The main areas of activity for the control bodies were the improvement of the state apparatus, the fight against bureaucracy and mismanagement, as well as monitoring the implementation of party and government decisions. This model was based on strict centralization of management and the state's desire to control virtually all aspects of the activities of enterprises and organizations.

Following Ukraine's declaration of independence, the system of state control underwent significant changes. The abandonment of the command-and-control model, the development of a market economy, private property and entrepreneurship led to a reduction in direct state intervention in economic activity. At the same time, new control institutions were established, in particular the Accounting Chamber, the State Treasury of Ukraine and other specialized bodies. The development of the state financial control system went through stages of formation, institutional development and harmonization with European standards. In these circumstances, control gradually transformed from an instrument of administrative coercion into a mechanism for ensuring the legality, transparency and efficiency of economic relations, supplemented by financial, audit, public and other forms of control (Bortniak, 2020, pp. 34–36).

The lion's share of research on extrajudicial control over the activities of public administration entities in the sphere of entrepreneurial activity consists of studies on the legal aspects and processes of these phenomena at the present stage in Ukraine. T. Halachenko, in examining the concept and essence of control over entrepreneurial activity, asserts that it is an integral element of the social management system, since without an assessment of the actual implementation of established norms and requirements, management activity loses its effectiveness and is reduced to purely declarative provisions. At the same time, in the researcher's view, state control acts as a specific verification mechanism operating within the system of state coercion. Accordingly, the entity subject to control is obliged to comply with the lawful requirements of the controlling body, in particular to provide the necessary information or ensure access to it. Such requirements are based on legally defined powers to conduct inspections, supervision or monitoring, which constitute the substance of control activities (Halachenko, 2023, pp. 699–702).

At the same time, in another study defining the concept of a public supervisory body in the field of business activity, T. Halachenko noted that this refers to a public authority or other institution defined by law, as well as their officials, who are vested with the relevant

competence and procedural powers to initiate, conduct and record the results of control measures, as well as to adopt response measures with the aim of establishing the compliance of the controlled entity's activities with the requirements of the law. The lawfulness of such an entity's activities is ensured by the existence of a proper legal basis, the exercise of powers within the defined scope of competence, compliance with established procedures, proper justification of decisions taken, a sufficient evidential basis, and the guarantee of the possibility of effective administrative and judicial appeal (Halachenko, 2024, p. 830).

In describing the administrative and legal status of entities responsible for ensuring the realization of citizens' rights in the sphere of entrepreneurial activity,

O. Leonov argued that it encompasses the totality of the objectives of their activities, the tasks and functions assigned to them, the powers and competences granted by law, as well as the established accountability for the results of their implementation. Its specific nature is determined primarily by the tasks that the legislator assigns to a specific entity within the mechanism for ensuring the realization of the right to engage in entrepreneurial activity. Given the functional purpose of such entities, the researcher identified several groups among them. He classified entities that carry out regulatory and legal control of entrepreneurial activity by establishing generally binding rules of conduct in the relevant sphere – in particular, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, the President of Ukraine, and the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine – into the first group. The second group, in his view, consists of bodies authorized to verify individuals' compliance with statutory requirements for conducting business activities and to carry out their state registration. , the third group, as the researcher stated, includes bodies that make decisions on granting special permits, approvals or licences required for carrying out certain types of economic activity, including those related to the use of natural resources. He classified the fourth group as comprising institutions whose primary purpose is to promote the development and support of entrepreneurship. Finally, in his view, the fifth group comprises entities that perform control and supervisory functions regarding compliance with legislation in the economic sphere, ensuring fair competition and preventing breaches of established requirements for the conduct of business activities (Leonov, 2023, p. 111).

M. Nadieiko notes that extrajudicial oversight of the activities of public administration bodies in the field of entrepreneurship is an important component of the mechanism for ensuring the legality, transparency and accountability of public authorities, which contributes to the effective protection of the rights and legitimate interests of business entities without placing an excessive burden on the judicial system. In the author's view, the role of this phenomenon is particularly heightened in the context of a more complex regulatory environment, the digitalization of administrative processes and European integration, which necessitates the introduction of modern, flexible and preventive forms of control.

Extrajudicial control is comprehensive and multi-level in nature and is implemented through a system of interrelated institutional and procedural mechanisms. Its main forms include administrative appeals, state supervision (control), parliamentary control, the activities of ombudsmen, including the business ombudsman, public control, as well as e-governance tools and alternative dispute resolution methods. Taken together, these elements form a coherent system of influence over the activities of public administration bodies (Nadieiko, 2024, p. 907).

Furthermore, the study proposes a classification of legal instruments for extrajudicial oversight. Based on their functional purpose, these are categorized as preventive (information requests, consultations, public discussions, online services), corrective (orders,

demands, decisions of supervisory bodies, measures in response to violations), restorative (administrative appeals, ombudsman's recommendations, mediation) and punitive (fines, administrative and economic sanctions). Based on the subject criterion, a distinction is made between internal administrative measures (internal control, internal audit, disciplinary procedures) and external measures (parliamentary, public and independent institutional control). In terms of form of implementation, he distinguished between normative measures (legal norms, principles, regulatory acts) and procedural measures (acts of law enforcement, complaints, inspections, requests, electronic tools). Finally, according to the scholar, the effectiveness of non-judicial control is determined not only by the existence of relevant legal mechanisms, but also by the level of their practical application, the independence of supervisory bodies, the clarity of procedural safeguards, as well as the degree of digitalization and transparency of public administration, with the transformation of oversight activities from a predominantly punitive model to a preventive one – aimed at preventing violations and developing partnership relations between the state and business – being particularly important (Nadieiko, 2024, p. 907).

V. Iniakhin, in describing the interaction between public administration bodies and business entities as a key instrument through which state policy in the sphere of economic activity is implemented, and through which the fundamental principles of stimulating entrepreneurship as the basis for economic development and, consequently, the economic stability of the state, find their expression, whilst clarifying that such interaction, on the one hand, is multifaceted and is therefore implemented at several levels (depending on the scale and specifics of social relations, the author distinguishes the national, regional, sectoral and local levels of such interaction, each of which is characterized by its own tasks, composition of participants and implementation mechanisms), whilst on the other hand, it is not of an unlimited nature but is carried out within the limits defined by current legislation and the practical needs of administrative activity, and is determined by a number of factors, among which the following are decisive: the scope of powers and competences of public administration bodies; the range of business entities operating in the relevant sector; the list of issues constituting the subject of their interaction; the strategic goals and priorities enshrined in policy-making regulatory acts that define the main directions of public authorities' activities; and the need to ensure a balance between the public interests of society and the legitimate interests of business entities (Iniakhin, 2023, pp. 7–10).

In her doctoral thesis, V. Voiutka comprehensively analyzed the administrative and legal framework for control and supervisory activities in the business sector and proposed her own interpretation of its essence, content and characteristics. Thus, she defined control and supervisory activities as a legally regulated mechanism for ensuring legality and the rule of law in the economic sphere, implemented through a system of forms, methods and means of control and supervision. V. Voiutka argued that such activities constitute a specific type of law enforcement activity carried out by public administration bodies, are procedural in nature, are conducted exclusively within the framework of procedures defined by law, and are aimed at achieving a balance between the protection of public interests and the safeguarding of freedom of entrepreneurial activity. She focused on the characterization of entrepreneurial activity as an object of control and supervision. The researcher noted that its specific nature is determined by the freedom of enterprise, the economic and social significance of economic activity results, as well as its impact on the implementation of state economic policy. According to the scholar, control and supervision activities encompass both procedures for registering and terminating

business activities and the verification of compliance by business entities with the requirements established by law, including licensing, permitting and other obligations. The author has also systematized the legal foundations for the exercise of control and supervision, which cover the constitutional, legislative and subordinate levels of legal regulation.

A key finding of the study was the identification of administrative and legal forms and methods of control and supervision in the business sector. The author highlights forms such as licensing, certification, accreditation, inspections, audits and monitoring, and proposes a classification of control and supervisory methods into general and specialized categories. The need to improve administrative legislation in this area is justified by increasing the effectiveness of control procedures, expanding the use of modern analytical and digital tools, and ensuring adequate safeguards for the rights of business entities during the implementation of control measures (Voiutska, 2024).

In examining Ukraine's experience of extrajudicial control in the field of business activity, a researcher V. Vasyliiev considered it in the context of legal mechanisms for combating offences in the relevant sphere. In the study, the author argues that the effective development of entrepreneurship in Ukraine depends on the state creating appropriate legal, organizational, economic and socio-political conditions that ensure the effective exercise of the constitutional right to engage in business activities. The researcher also devotes considerable attention to the analysis of administrative offences in the field of entrepreneurship, among which are classified (depending on the nature of the infringement) offences against entrepreneurial activity, the principles of fair competition and consumer rights. A key focus of his work is the study of the administrative-legal mechanism for countering offences in the field of entrepreneurship, which V. Vasyliiev defines as a system of preventive and enforcement measures implemented by authorised bodies with the aim of ensuring compliance with legislation and preventing offences (Vasyliiev, 2019, pp. 27–29).

The author paid particular attention to state and public oversight as key elements in ensuring the rule of law in the sphere of business activity. V. Vasyliiev emphasized the leading role of state oversight in the mechanism of legal regulation of economic relations, and also highlighted the importance of public oversight and the activities of public councils as institutional forms of civil society participation in combating offences. Finally, in the paper, the author examined issues of licensing, administrative procedures and administrative liability of business entities, and justified the need for deregulation of economic activity, the elimination of duplication of control functions by government bodies, the improvement of the system of administrative sanctions, and the introduction of a risk-based approach to the exercise of state supervision and control (Vasyliiev, 2019, pp. 29–33).

At the same time, the researchers L. Khomko and H. Kulhavets defined state control over the activities of business entities as a system of inspections and monitoring of business entities' activities, aimed at identifying violations of legislation, preventing negative phenomena and stopping unlawful activities (Khomko, & Kulhavets, 2016, p. 302).

L. Soroka views the phenomenon of state control in this context more broadly – as a complex of organizational, legal, informational and inspection measures carried out by authorized state bodies with the aim of ensuring the legality of economic activity, protecting consumer rights, guaranteeing the proper quality of goods and services, and safeguarding public interests (Soroka, 2020, p. 174).

At the same time, although researchers generally acknowledge that the current legislation on state supervision (control) in the sphere of economic activity – which sets out the principles

for organizing supervisory activities, the scope of authorized bodies, and the procedures for carrying out supervisory measures – prior to 2022 formed a system that generally ensured the performance of the functions assigned to it (even though a significant number of special and subordinate regulatory acts in this sphere often led and continues to lead to fragmentation of legal regulation, duplication of powers among supervisory bodies, and ambiguity in law enforcement practice) (Yarema, 2021), in the context of the introduction of martial law in Ukraine, the issue of state control in the business sector, in the opinion of scholars, is becoming increasingly relevant. Reform in this area is needed, taking into account new socio-economic and security conditions, whilst simultaneously strengthening the legal regulation of the supervisory activities of executive authorities, clarifying their powers and improving mechanisms for interaction between the state and business entities, whilst at the same time adopting a gradual approach from a supervisory function towards ensuring the proper protection of the rights, freedoms and legitimate interests of individuals and business entities (Punda, 2023).

For example, K. Bortniak, O. Merdova, V. Tsomra and other researchers emphasize that, in the current context of the Russo-Ukrainian war, the administrative and legal regulation of state control in the sphere of business activity has taken on new characteristics in the context of revising existing administrative and legal norms and improving mechanisms for interaction between regulatory bodies and business entities. Among the key areas of such changes, the researchers highlight the need to clearly define the objectives of state control, establish transparent rules for interaction between executive authorities and business entities, and specify the rights and obligations of officials exercising control powers; ensuring the principles of integrity and compliance in the activities of supervisory bodies as an important condition for improving the effectiveness of state oversight. At the same time, the researchers emphasize the need to take into account the specificities of how individual regions operate under martial law and to adapt control mechanisms to new security challenges. In this regard, the report justifies the need to strengthen state control at regional and local levels, as well as to expand opportunities for public oversight, which requires further regulatory and legal framework development and improvement of relevant legal mechanisms (Bortniak, Merdova, Tsomra, Daraganova, & Mykhailov, 2023, p. 289).

Ultimately, M. Blikhar concluded that, despite certain advances made in Ukraine in the field of administrative and legal regulation of state control over business entities in the post-Soviet era, a number of significant problems still exist which negatively impact the effectiveness of control mechanisms and hinder further reform of the public administration system. The author identified the most significant of these as the insufficient regulation of certain aspects of control activities at the legislative level, the fragmentary and contradictory nature of the regulatory framework, and the lack of a clear and systematic classification of types of state control in the field of business. In the researcher's view, the situation has been further exacerbated by military hostilities, the temporary occupation by the Russian Federation of certain territories of Ukraine, the destruction of economic infrastructure, and restrictions on the ability to conduct economic activity in the regions affected by the armed aggression (Blikhar, 2024, p. 20).

**Conclusions.** From a historiographical perspective, the studies of extra-judicial oversight of public administration bodies in the field of business in Ukraine during the 20th and early 21st centuries demonstrate a close link between the evolution of oversight institutions and the processes of state-building, the transformation of political regimes. The authors

emphasize that prior to 1917, the Ukrainian lands did not have their own system of state control, as control functions were exercised by the pan-imperial bodies of the Russian Empire. At the same time, in the studies on the period of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 – 1921, a chief focus is on the attempts to establish national control institutions, notably the State Control and the Secretariat of State Control, which became important elements in the formation of the financial and administrative apparatus of the Ukrainian statehood. In the studies concerning the Soviet period, the prevailing conclusion is that control bodies gradually transformed from a means of financial and administrative oversight into an instrument of centralized management and political control. The historians note that the reorganization of the People's Commissariat of State Control, the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, the financial control departments, and the control and audit bodies was primarily driven by the needs of the command-administrative system. The academic literature emphasizes that the main functions of these structures became monitoring the implementation of state plans, combating bureaucracy, and ensuring the implementation of decisions by the party and state leadership, which contributed to the formation of a system of comprehensive state supervision.

Contemporary Ukrainian historiography generally views the Soviet model of control critically, emphasizing its excessive centralization, politicization and the formal nature of many control procedures. The researchers emphasize that following Ukraine's declaration of independence, there arose a need to establish a new control system based on the principles of democratic governance, transparency and public accountability. In this regard, a chief focus is on the creation of new state financial control institutions, the improvement of the legislative framework and the gradual alignment of the national control system with European standards.

**Acknowledgement.** We express sincere gratitude to all editorial board members for the consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing

**Funding.** The authors received no funding for the research and publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Artymyshyn, P., & Yaromiy, I.** (2025). Customs Service during the Ukrainian Revolution (1917 – 1923) in Ukrainian historiography. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 35, 36–47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058X.35.332650> [in English].

**Averianov, V.** (Ed.). (2003). *Derzhavne upravlinnia: problemy administratyvno-pravovoi teorii ta praktyky* [Public administration: Problems of administrative-legal theory and practice]. Kyiv: Fakt. [in Ukrainian].

**Averianov, V.** (Ed.). (2004). *Administratyvne pravo Ukrainy: Akademichnyi kurs* [Administrative law of Ukraine: Academic course]. Vol. 1. Kyiv: Yurydychna dumka. [in Ukrainian].

**Blikhar, M.** (2024). Derzhavnyi kontrol za subiektamy pidpriemnytskoi diialnosti: administratyvno-pravovi zasady orhanizatsii ta funktsionuvannia [State control over business entities: Administrative and legal principles of organization and functioning]. *Naukovyi visnyk KhDU. Serii Yurydychni nauky – Kherson State University Scientific Bulletin. Legal Sciences Series*, (5), 17–20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2307-8049/2024-5-3> [in Ukrainian].

**Bondarenko, D.** (2020). The Downfall of the Russian and the Austro-Hungarian Empires, Bolshevism, The Monarchist Counter-revolution, and the Formation of the New Systems of International Relations in Central and Eastern Europe, 1918 – 1920. *Shidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 15, 93–103. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.15.204964> [in English].

**Bortniak, K., Merdova, O., Tsomra, V., Daraganova, N., & Mykhailov, R.** (2023). Experience of administrative and legal support for control and supervision. *Amazonia Investiga*, 12(63), 289–298. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2023.63.03.27> [in English].

**Bortniak, V. A.** (2020). Formuvannia ta stanovlennia systemy derzhavnogo finansovoho kontroliu v Ukraini [Formation and development of the state financial control system in Ukraine]. *Zhurnal skhidnoevropeiskoho prava – Journal of Eastern European Law*, (72), 32–37. [in Ukrainian].

**Chubata, M.** (2024). Osoblyvosti podatkovoi ta mytnoi polityky v Ukrainiskii derzhavi (1918 r.) u vysvitleni vitchyznianskykh pravoznavstiv [Peculiarities of Tax and Customs Policy in the Ukrainian State (1918) in the Coverage of Domestic Legal Scholars]. *Aktualni problemy vitchyzniansoi yurysprudentsii – Actual problems of native jurisprudence*, 22, 22–29. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2408-9257-2024-5-4> [in Ukrainian].

**Denysova, A.** (2010). Pravovi zasoby: poniattia ta vydy [Legal means: Concept and types]. *Pravo Ukrainy – Law of Ukraine*, (7), 190–195. [in Ukrainian]

**Dikan, L.** (2006). *Kontrol i reviziia* [Control and audit]. (2nd ed.). Kharkiv: KhNEU. [in Ukrainian].

**Hai-Nyzhnyk, P.** (2006). *Podatkova polityka Tsentralnoi Rady, uriadiv UNR, Ukrainiskoi Derzhavy, USRR (1917 – 1930 rr.)* [Tax policy of the Central Rada, governments of the UPR, the Ukrainian State, the Ukrainian SSR]. Kyiv: Tsyfra-druk. [in Ukrainian].

**Halachenko, T.** (2023). Poniattia ta sutnist kontroliu za pidpriemnytskoiu diialnistiu [The concept and essence of control over entrepreneurial activity]. *Pravo i suspilstvo – Law and Society*, (6), 697–702. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32842/2078-3736/2023.6.104> [in Ukrainian].

**Halachenko, T.** (2024). Struktura pravovykh vidnosyn iz zdiisnennia kontroliu za pidpriemnytskoiu diialnistiu [The structure of legal relations in exercising control over entrepreneurial activity]. *Pravo i suspilstvo – Law and Society*, (4), 823–831. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32842/2078-3736/2024.4.117> [in Ukrainian].

**Hanzenko, O. O.** (2016). Teoriia pravovykh zasobiv u konteksti instrumentalnoi teorii prava [Theory of legal means in the context of the instrumental theory of law]. *Visnyk Zaporizkoho natsionalnogo universytetu. Yurydychni nauky – Bulletin of Zaporizhzhia National University. Law Sciences*, (3), 36–42. [in Ukrainian].

**Ilytskyi, V., & Haliv, M.** (2022). Theoretical Argumentation in the Historical Narrative of Ukraine of the Second Half of the 19th – First Half of the 20th century (on the Example of Research in the History of Education). *Eminak*, 3(39), 66–80. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2022.3\(39\).591](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2022.3(39).591) [in English].

**Iniakhin, V.** (2023). *Administratyvno-pravove zabezpechennia vzaiemodii mizh orhanamy publichnogo administruvannia ta subiektamy pidpriemnytskoi diialnosti v Ukraini* [Administrative and legal support of interaction between public administration bodies and business entities in Ukraine]. (Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis). Kharkiv: National University of Internal Affairs. [in Ukrainian].

**Khomko, L., & Kulhavets, Kh.** (2016). *Pravove rehuliuвання pidpriemnytskoi diialnosti* [Legal regulation of entrepreneurial activity]. Lviv: Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. [in Ukrainian].

**Kozachok, I.** (2020). Istoriohrafia vynykennia i rozvytku derzhavnogo ta munitsypalnogo kontroliu [Historiography of the emergence and development of state and municipal control]. In *Abstracts of the XIII International Scientific and Practical Conference*, (pp. 149–154). Vancouver, Canada. [in Ukrainian].

**Leonov, O.** (2023). Subiekt zabezpechennia realizatsii prav hromadian u sferi pidpriemnytskoi diialnosti v Ukraini [The subject ensuring the realization of citizens' rights in the sphere of entrepreneurial activity in Ukraine]. In *Teoretychni pytannia yurysprudentsii i problemy pravozastosuvannia: vyklyky XXI stolittia* [Theoretical issues of jurisprudence and problems of law enforcement: Challenges of the 21st century], (pp. 108–111). Kharkiv. [in Ukrainian].

**Nadieiko, M.** (2024). Vydy ta pravovi zasoby pozasadovoho kontroliu za diialnistiu subiektiv publichnogo administruvannia u sferi pidpriemnytskoi diialnosti [Types and legal means of extrajudicial control over the activities of public administration entities in the field of entrepreneurial activity]. *Pravo i suspilstvo – Law and Society*, (4), 901–908. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32842/2078-3736/2024.4.129> [in Ukrainian].

**Onufriienko, O. V.** (2004). *Pravovi zasoby u konteksti instrumentalnoi teorii prava* [Legal means in the context of the instrumental theory of law]. (Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis). Kharkiv: National University of Internal Affairs. [in Ukrainian].

**Punda, O.** (2023). Zdiisnennia administratyvno-pravovoho nahliadu ta kontroliu u sferi korporatyvnykh ta trudovykh vidnosyn [Implementation of administrative supervision and control in the sphere of corporate and labor relations]. *Nove ukrainske pravo – New Ukrainian Law*, 3, 115–119. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51989/NUL.2023.3.16> [in Ukrainian].

**Soroka, L.** (2020). Derzhavnyi nahliad i kontrol yak osnova administratyvno-pravovoho zabezpechennia ta realizatsii derzhavnykh harantii [State supervision and control as the basis of administrative and legal support and implementation of state guarantees]. *Vcheni zapysky Tavriiskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni V. I. Vernadskoho. Serii: Yurydychni nauky – Scientific Notes of V. I. Vernadsky Taurida National University. Series: Legal Sciences*, 34(70), (4), 173–177. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32838/1606-3716/2020.4/28> [in Ukrainian].

**Vasyliev, V.** (2019). *Administratyvno-pravovi mekhanizm protydiv pravoporushenniam u sferi pidpriemnytskoi diialnosti v Ukraini* [Administrative and legal mechanism for combating offenses in the field of entrepreneurial activity in Ukraine]. (*Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis*). Kharkiv: National University of Internal Affairs. [in Ukrainian].

**Voiutska, V.** (2024). *Administratyvno-pravove zabezpechennia kontrolno-nahliadovoi diialnosti za pidpriemnytskoiu diialnistiu v Ukraini* [Administrative and legal support of supervisory and control activities over entrepreneurial activity in Ukraine]. (*PhD dissertation*). Kharkiv: National University of Internal Affairs. [in Ukrainian].

**Yarema, O.** (2021). Pryntsypy derzhavnogo kontroliu (nahliadu) v konteksti protsesualnoi diialnosti kontrolnykh orhaniv [Principles of state control (supervision) in the context of procedural activities of control bodies]. *Yurydychnyi naukovyi elektronnyi zhurnal – Juridical Scientific Electronic Journal*, (11), 548–551. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0374/2021-11/142> [in Ukrainian].

*The article was received May 16, 2025.*

*Article recommended for publishing 30/05/2026.*

**This article is available under the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license**