ISSN 2224-5294

ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ
ҰЛТТЫҚ ҒЫЛЫМ АКАДЕМИЯСЫНЫҢ

Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университетінің

Х А Б А Р Л А Р Ы

ИЗВЕСТИЯ

НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ АКАДЕМИИ НАУК
РЕСПУБЛИКИ КАЗАХСТАН
Казахский национальный
педагогический университет им. Абая

NEWS

OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF CIENCES
OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN
Abay Kazakh National
Pedagogical University

SERIES
OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES

1 (329)

JANUARY – FEBRUARY 2020

PUBLISHED SINCE JANUARY 1962

PUBLISHED 6 TIMES A YEAR

ALMATY, NAS RK

«Қазақстан Республикасы Ұлттық ғылым академиясының Хабарлары. Қоғамдық және гуманитарлық ғылымдар сериясы».
ISSN 2224-5294
Меншіктенуші: «Қазақстан Республикасының Ұлттық ғылым академиясы» РҚБ (Алматы қ.)
Қазақстан республикасының Мәдениет пен ақпарат министрлігінің Ақпарат және мұрағат комитетінде 30.04.2010 ж. берілген **№ 10894-Ж** мерзімдік басылым тіркеуіне қойылу туралы куәлік

Мерзімділігі: жылына 6 рет.
Тиражы: 500 дана.

Редакцияның мекенжайы: 050010, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28; 219, 220 бөл.; тел.: 272-13-19, 272-13-18
http://soc-human.kz/index.php/en/arhiv

Типографияның мекенжайы: «NurNaz GRACE», Алматы қ., Рысқұлов көш., 103.

Известия Национальной академии наук Республики Казахстан. Серия общественных и гумани-тарных наук.
ISSN 2224-5294
Собственник: РОО «Национальная академия наук Республики Казахстан» (г. Алматы)
Свидетельство о постановке на учет периодического печатного издания в Комитете информации и архивов Министерства культуры и информации Республики Казахстан **№ 10894-Ж**, выданное 30.04.2010 г.

Периодичность 6 раз в год
Тираж: 500 экземпляров

Адрес редакции: 050010, г. Алматы, ул. Шевченко, 28; ком. 219, 220; тел. 272-13-19, 272-13-18
http://soc-human.kz/index.php/en/arhiv

Адрес типографии: «NurNaz GRACE», г. Алматы, ул. Рыскулова, 103.

News of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Series of Social and Humanities.
ISSN 2224-5294
Owner: RPA "National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan" (Almaty)
The certificate of registration of a periodic printed publication in the Committee of information and archives of the Ministry of culture and information of the Republic of Kazakhstan **N 10894-Ж**, issued 30.04.2010

Periodicity: 6 times a year
Circulation: 500 copies

Editorial address: 28, Shevchenko str., of. 219, 220, Almaty, 050010, tel. 272-13-19, 272-13-18
http://soc-human.kz/index.php/en/arhiv

Address of printing house: «NurNaz GRACE», 103, Ryskulov str, Almaty.

N E W S
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN
SERIES OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES
ISSN 2224-5294 **https://doi.org/10.32014/2020.2224-5294.11**
Volume 1, Number 329 (2020), 103 – 112

IRSTI 06.81
UDC 334.72

R.Zh. Kalgulova[1], K.M. Zhumaxanova [2], Z.K. Yessymkhanova [3]

[1,2]Kazakh Automobile and Road Institute named after L. B. Goncharov, Almaty, Kazakhstan;
[3]Turan-Astana University, Astana, Kazakhstan
kmuratovna2019@mail.ru, zeinegul@bk.ru

THE ECONOMIC ESSENCE OF THE INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL OF SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED ENTERPRISES

Abstract. The modern model of innovative activity indicates that one of the key factors for the success of enterprises innovative activities is the correct introduction of new solutions to the market. It is widely recognized that the ability to spread innovation is an important determinant of firms' potential. Analysis of companies' innovation activities very often indicates that innovations introduced to the market do not bring the expected benefits. This leads to the conclusion that very often the innovative activity of the enterprise is ineffective. This article attempts to study the relationship between the internal resources of a company and the effectiveness of innovation. To achieve the research goal, the author formulated a hypothesis: (H1) there is a relationship between the internal resources of the company and the effectiveness of innovation. The article presents the results of an empirical study conducted by the author among Kazakhstani SMEs in 2016-2018.

Key words: innovation, innovation potential, enterprises, entrepreneurship.

INTRODUCTION

In the modern economy, this is the generally accepted paradigm of innovation. Enterprises are encouraged to innovate, which by definition should be profitable and increase competitiveness. The innovation paradigm is supported by a number of studies. Based on these studies, recognized economic development strategies are also usually formulated. Meanwhile, innovation is often ineffective and does not bring the expected results. This problem is especially noticeable in the case of SMEs. Poland is currently at a special stage in its development. The former competitive advantages based on the cost of legal work are increasingly losing their significance.

There is a need to create new advantages on the basis of knowledge and innovations that form the main factor of long-term economic growth. From this point of view, it is fundamentally important to develop innovative activities of companies, including research and development, as the most important factor in competitiveness on a global scale. The innovation of a country economy is mainly determined by the innovation of companies that operate in the economy. Innovative activities of companies are influenced by internal factors (including, first of all, the potential and resources of the company, plus intellectual capital, material, financial and organizational resources)[1].

In addition, the development of the innovative potential of the enterprise is influenced by the particularities of the industry and sector in which the company operates, and external factors (including national conditions (for example, legal regulations regarding innovation support activities) and regional conditions (for example, legal, cultural, economic and technical factors).

An analysis of all modern models of innovative activity of enterprises and studies of innovative scope determinants show that the key innovative factor in the effectiveness of innovative processes is the internal innovative potential of enterprises. The theory of innovative potential is based on the concept of company resources. This concept, developed in the early 1990s, suggests that the company's ability to develop all aspects of its activities is closely related to available resources.

METHODS

The applied research method is based on the analysis of innovative processes occurring in companies - with particular regard to the nature of innovative processes occurring in companies SME sector. The author, using an online survey, conducted an empirical study of 200 companies in the SME sector (the choice of companies was deliberately layered. The layers were: company size, dominant type of business). The author applied a two-stage analysis to confirm the hypotheses. The first step was to analyze the innovative potential of the companies surveyed. This analysis made it possible to accurately determine the factors affecting the innovative activities of enterprises[2]. The second stage was the analysis of the innovation effectiveness of the companies surveyed. Summary of the study is aimed at analyzing the relationship between the internal resources of the company and the effectiveness of innovation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A detailed analysis of the factors determining the innovative potential of a company is the subject of numerous studies and scientific publications. It seems that the most global view of the factors determining the innovative potential of the company was proposed by Bircell and Armstrong, who created a model of innovative conditions that includes the following factors: external environment, internal environment, innovation process and development management. The most important include, in particular: visionary leadership, an appropriate organizational structure, recruitment, willingness to participate in the innovation process, the ability to work collectively or the willingness to learn and make new decisions.A comprehensive concept of innovation potential factors was presented by American economists. They noted, among other things: strategy, leadership, change, customer focus, innovative organizational culture, knowledge alliances, quality processes, training and innovative HR orientation. In foreign literature, the interpretation that the innovative potential of a company is determined by internal innovative potential, as well as access to external sources of information necessary for the innovation process, seems to be the most accurate.

In other words, innovative ability or potential determines a company's ability to create innovation. By analogy, it can be stated that the lack of innovative potential is an obstacle to effective innovation processes of companies. In addition to determining the nature and role of innovative potential in the innovation process, an urgent issue is the measurement of the individual determinants of innovative potential. A significant part of the factors that significantly affect the innovative potential of the company (especially in connection with external factors) is difficult to measure or quantify, which greatly complicates the analysis and evaluation of these issues.

The indicated multidimensionality and complexity of the phenomena forming the innovative potential of enterprises forces us to look for optimal methods of analysis and assessment of this area. This problem is especially relevant for enterprises in the SME sector. Various publications proposed new methods for measuring the innovative potential and potential of enterprises, which accurately take into account the special nature of the operations and the influence of regional conditions on the innovativeness of the enterprise. New proposals for measuring innovative potential very often involve different measurement methods for different sizes of companies or groups of companies, high-tech companies. The authors of these proposals indicated that when implementing the innovation process in companies belonging to different industries or sectors, there are so great differences that using one method of measuring innovative potential very often leads to incorrect results. This situation forces us to conduct in-depth studies aimed at identifying the actual innovative potential of companies.

The concept of effectiveness of actions is often applied especially in relation to economic science, where it acquires special significance in the context of evaluating and improving actions and decision-making processes. In the literature, efficiency is defined as the result of actions taken, characterized by the ratio of achieved results to costs[3].

The next step in the development of methods for assessing effectiveness was the introduction of stochastic border analysis, which allows one to describe relations in all sectors of the economy by comparing the costs and performance of individuals taking into account the appearance of two data components: a random factor and inefficiency.Implementation of innovative projects - regardless of the size of the company that introduces innovations and regardless of the type of innovation introduced, occurs according to a scheme that is defined in the subject literature as a model of the innovation process. Further studies of the essence of the implementation of innovative projects, the development of the theory

of innovation and practice in relation to innovative activities led to the creation of subsequent evolutionary models of innovative processes. The authors of new proposals integrated the implementation of the innovation process with almost every area of the company's activity, showing that the resources owned by the company determine its innovative potential - namely, the ability to effectively and efficiently implement innovative projects. Currently, mandatory models for the implementation of innovative projects are: "5th generation innovation process", spiral innovation process, effective innovation management. Analyzing modern models, we can clearly state that the authors of each of the new proposals emphasize the significance of the stage related to diffusion and popularization of the introduced innovation a number of indicators apply. This can be illustrated by an example:

1. The level of sales of innovation.
2. The success rate associated with the sale of innovation.
3. The innovative level of the studied companies.
4. The level of acceptance by customers of new products and services.
5. The level of efficiency of diffusion processes of new products and services[4].

To study the relationship between the internal resources of the company, which form the innovative potential, and the effectiveness of innovative activity, the above indicators should be correlated with the indicator of the effectiveness of innovative activity. The analysis of the relationship between the internal resources of the company and the effectiveness of innovative activities of SMEs in Kazakhstan. The method of research and data on the study of the causes of low innovation activity of companies in the sector of small and medium-sized businesses, the author paid special attention to the barriers associated with the effectiveness of the implementation of the innovation process.The author carried out a detailed analysis of the relationship between the innovative level of the company, the sale of innovative products and services, an indicator of success and the relationship between the adoption of a new product or service by customers and the possibility of its market commercialization.Based on the analysis of the above features, the author has formulated the following research hypotheses: there is a relationship between the internal resources of the company and the effectiveness of innovation.

The goal of the study is implemented on the basis of the method of logical induction, based on the analysis of diffusion of innovations in companies in the sector of small and medium-sized businesses. The study includes an assessment of the relationship between the internal resources of the company and the effectiveness of innovative activities of SMEs in Kazakhstan. The study was conducted using a questionnaire consisting of 43 questions, divided into eight categories - the stages of the innovation process implemented by the company. This research hypothesis has a research goal, which is to analyze and evaluate the internal innovative potential of small and medium-sized businesses in Kazakhstan to identify barriers to the effective implementation of innovative processes.

The aim of the study was achieved in these studies on the basis of logical induction and analysis of all the most important internal determinants that affect the innovative abilities of the enterprise, as well as classical static analysis.To confirm the hypotheses, the author applied a two-stage analysis. The first step was to analyze the innovative potential of the companies surveyed. This analysis made it possible to accurately determine the factors affecting the innovative activities of enterprises. The second stage was the analysis of the innovation effectiveness of the companies surveyed. The research summary is an analysis of the relationship between the internal resources of the company and the effectiveness of innovation. The author examined in detail, in particular, the following characteristics characterizing the innovative potential of the companies surveyed and the diffusion process of innovations[5]:

1. Analysis of the internal and external situation of the company
2. Matters relating to the search for ideas on innovation
3. Matters relating to the planning of innovation projects
4. Financing of innovative projects
5. Innovative culture and human resources development strategy
6. Internal communication of the company and its organization
7. Matters relating to the diffusion and transfer of innovation to the market:

a. Sales level of innovation;
b. A measure of success associated with sales of innovation;
c. The level of innovation of the studied companies;
d. Level of customer acceptance regarding new products and services;

e. The level of efficiency of diffusion processes for new products and services.

8. Issues of implementing innovative projects.

Table 1 shows the aggregated values of the innovative potential of enterprises surveyed in the analyzed areas. An analysis of the results allows us to conclude that the studied companies demonstrate the smallest internal innovative potential in relation to innovation culture (the entire sample is 2.35), assessment and planning of innovative activities (the entire sample is 2.05), as well as communication and organization. Such a low result in these categories can be caused by the lack of experience of the companies studied related to innovation, the historical lack of innovation culture in Kazakhstan's SMEs and the continuous transition of the Kazakhstan economy (from central planning to a free market). It should be noted that, despite the low innovation potential in the majority of the studied categories, the analyzed companies very highly rated their own potential in terms of transferring the results of innovation activity to the market.

Table 1–The total value of the innovative potential of the surveyed enterprises

Type of business / stages of the innovation process	Type of operations						Business size					
	Production			Services			Small			Medium		
	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018
Culture of Innovation and Human Resource Development Strategy	2	2,1	2,4	2	2,2	2,3	2,1	2,3	2,3	2,5	2,9	2,9
Internal communication within the company and its organization	2,2	2,3	2,4	2,5	2,5	2,5	2,2	2,4	2,3	3,1	3	2,9
Spreading innovation and commercialization	1,9	2,1	3,2	1,9	2	3,1	1,6	1,9	3,8	3,6	3,6	3,8
The issue of introducing innovative projects	3	2,9	2	2,9	2,7	2,8	2,9	3	3,3	4,1	3,5	3,4
Innovation Project Financing	2	2,1	1,8	2,1	2,2	1,9	3,1	3	2,7	4	3,6	3,5
The issue of project planning in the field of innovation	1,9	2,1	2	2	2	2,1	2	2	2,1	3,7	3,5	3,5
The problem of finding ideas for innovation	3,2	2,9	2	3,1	3	3	3	3,1	3,3	3,5	3,7	3,8
Situation and environmental analysis	2,1	2,3	2,3	1,9	2	2	3	3	4,2	3,9	4	4,1
innovative potential	2,29	2,35	2,26	2,30	2,33	2,46	2,49	2,59	3,00	3,55	3,48	3,49

Source: authoring

On the positive side, for the three analyzed years, the companies under study increased their innovative potential in most of the categories being evaluated, and the total innovation potential of the companies under study was 3.00%. The companies studied over the analyzed period (2015-2017) increased their innovative potential most in relation to the innovation culture (15.01% change between the first and third research) and in relation to the analysis of the situation and the environment (7.51% change between the first and third research). On the other hand, the greatest decrease in the potential of the companies under study occurred in the financing category (-12.42% change between the first and third research) and the Communication and organization category (-2.25% change between the first and third

research), which also can be explained by a decrease in the availability of financial resources for innovation. The unit's level of innovation is defined as the proportion of new products or services in its offering over the past three years, regardless of whether they have been successful in the market. The concept of "success indicator", on the other hand, should be understood as the share of new products or services in the company's offer over the past five years, which, after implementation, has received market approval. The assessment here is supplemented by indicators relating to the ratio of revenue and profits from the sale of new products / services compared with the company's turnover over the past three years. Distinctive in this regard should be considered those companies for which the values of the above indicators exceeded the level of 30%. If, on the other hand, they fluctuate within 1%, these entities are in the weakest group of patients. This range description is commonly used in studies of company innovation or innovation audits. Aggregated results are presented in table. 2.

Table 2 – Key indicators characterizing the effectiveness of the implementation of innovative diffusion in the studied companies

Groups	Category	< 1% 2% - 10%	< 1% 2% - 10%	< 1% 2% - 10%	< 1% 2% - 10%	< 1% 2% - 10%
Services	Selling Innovation	24%	25%	25%	18%	6%
	Success rate	30%	29%	19%	17%	5%
	Level of innovation	28%	24%	23%	19%	5%
Production	Selling Innovation	25%	30%	22%	14%	9%
	Success rate	15%	23%	27%	25%	10%
	Level of innovation	24%	22%	26%	20%	8%
All	Selling Innovation	26%	28%	22%	16%	8%
	Success rate	23%	26%	23%	21%	7%
	Level of innovation	27%	23%	25%	19%	6%

Source: authoring

The results obtained indicate that half of the companies surveyed (50%) have a low innovation level (innovation level <10%), which classifies them into the category of non-traditional companies. Only 6% of the companies surveyed can be considered innovative, namely those that have introduced new products or services over the past three years (level of innovation>10%). These results show that the companies studied do not have sufficient innovative potential to implement innovative projects. Another study by the author confirms this thesis and indicates that the studied companies demonstrate the least innovative potential in the following areas: evaluation and planning of innovative activities, communication and organization or financing of innovative operations.

The above results can be supplemented by an indicator characterizing the market acceptability of the introduced innovations, namely, actually characterizing the efficiency of the diffusion process. This indicator is very unfavorable for the studied companies. As many as 49% of the companies surveyed appreciate success rate below 10%. On the other hand, only 7% of implemented innovations have received market recognition - a success rate above 30%. The obtained values should be considered as clear evidence of the low efficiency of the processes for introducing the diffusion of innovations in the studied companies as a result of insufficient capacity in this aspect.

The financial component of the weaknesses in the implementation of innovation diffusion processes is characterized by the indicator of innovation sales. Up to 54% of the companies surveyed claim that profits from the sale of innovations account for less than 10% of total profits, and only 8% of the companies surveyed claim more than 30% of profits from the sale of innovations. The results obtained indicate that manufacturing companies achieve slightly better results than companies, but this difference is small. Another category that has been analyzed in detail is the relationship between the customer's acceptance of a new product or service and the effectiveness of its distribution. The results obtained made it possible to clearly assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the diffusion of innovations in the studied SMEs. The generalized results are presented in the table. 3.

Table 3 – Dependence of customer acceptance of implemented innovations and diffusion efficiency

Groups	Category	No	Sometimes	Often	Usually	Always
Services	The spread of innovation	24%	25%	25%	18%	6%
	Customer reception	30%	29%	19%	17%	5%
Production	The spread of innovation	25%	30%	22%	14%	9%
	Customer reception	15%	23%	27%	25%	10%
All	The spread of innovation	26%	28%	22%	16%	8%
	Customer reception	23%	26%	23%	21%	7%

Source: authoring

As can be seen from the data obtained, despite the fact that 29% of innovations introduced have always received customer recognition, the distribution of only 8% of them ended in complete market success. These results clearly indicate that the companies under study, despite the fact that they often have valuable, new products and services that receive a positive rating from customers, are very rarely able to carry out an effective process of their market diffusion. This is another confirmation of the thesis presented in the article that the companies under study have insufficient potential for diffusion of innovations. Detailed results that provide a percentage of the profit from the sale of innovative products in the total profit of the studied companies are presented in Table No. 4.

Table 4 – Average % share of profits from the implementation of innovations

The sizeof companies	Type of activity		General Average	The expected value of the average	The difference between the research sample and the expected value	Normative averages	The difference between the study sample and the normative averages
	Production	Service					
SB	11,20%	9,45%	10,33%	31,00%	20,68%	27,00%	16,68%
MSB	14,10%	13,34%	13,72%	42,00%	28,28%	35,00%	21,28%
General Average	11,58%	9,85%	10,71%	32,67%	21,95%	27,33%	16,62%

Source: authoring

The table includes the values of the profit of the studied companies obtained from the sale of innovative goods and services. The author compared the actual profit with the declared profit level expected by the studied companies and with the reference profit level indicated in other studies. The results also indicate that the companies under study receive significantly lower profits from the implementation of innovations both in relation to the expected level (21.95%) and in relation to the reference level (16.62%). The difference between the actual level of profit and the expected level is understandable - company owners would like to get the highest possible profit. Unfortunately, the difference between the actual profit from the implementation of innovations in the studied group of companies and the reference profit clearly confirms the connection between the low innovative potential of the studied companies and the profit from the implementation of innovations.

In connection with the results obtained, the author divided the companies surveyed into two groups:

1. Not innovative companies,
2. Advanced company.

The author classified the company as a group of innovative companies, which at the first stage of the analysis received 10% of the best average results.

Table 5 – Claster Analisis Results for 2018

Type of business / stages of the innovation process.	Without innovative companies	Advanced company
Culture of Innovation and Human Resource Development Strategy	2,5	4,2
Internal communication within the company and its organization	2,1	4,3
Spreading innovation and commercialization	1,8	4
The issue of innovation	2,4	4,2
Innovation Project Financing	2,6	4,1
The issue of project planning in the field of innovation	2,1	4,3
The problem of finding ideas for innovation	2,4	4,1
Situation and environmental analysis	2,8	4
Total Innovation Potential	2,2	4,3
Average% share of profits from the implementation of innovations	9,81%	14,52%
The number of companies in the group	167	33

Source: authoring

The data presented indicate that innovative companies have a very low innovation efficiency. The effectiveness of innovation for companies with strong internal resources is much higher than for companies with low resources. In addition, the table shows the difference between the average profit received from the implementation of innovations for innovative and non-traditional companies. The results show that companies with large innovative potential as a result of their internal resources receive significantly higher (48.01%) profit from the sale of innovations than companies with lower innovative potential. This is another argument supporting the hypothesis.

The author of this article has formulated the thesis that there is a relationship between the internal resources of the company and the effectiveness of innovation. The presented results confirm the research hypothesis formulated by the author. Companies with low innovation potential have also shown very low efficiency in terms of innovation. This low potential in the field of the effective implementation of diffusion processes is one (not the only thing that others mentioned by the author of the research indicate) the determinant of low innovative activity of Kazakhstani companies in the small and medium-sized business sector.

Despite the fact that 29% of innovations introduced have always been recognized by customers, the distribution of only 8% of them has ended in complete market success. Up to 54% of the companies surveyed claim that profits from the sale of innovations account for less than 10% of total profits, and only 8% of the companies surveyed claim more than 30% of profits from the sale of innovations. The results also indicate that the companies under study receive significantly less profit from the implementation of innovations both in relation to the expected level (21.95%) and in relation to the initial level (16.62%).In addition, the table shows the difference between the average profit received from the implementation of innovations for innovative companies and non-innovative companies. The results show that companies with large innovative potential as a result of their internal resources receive significantly higher (48.01%) profit from the sale of innovations than companies with lower innovative potential. The results should encourage in-depth research in this direction. An in-depth study, a typical case study will be important in terms of evaluating the effectiveness of innovative processes. The dissemination processes of specific innovations should be subjected to a detailed and thorough analysis as part of this study. Such a search can help identify specific errors made by companies in the implementation of diffusion processes[6]. No less valuable information could be obtained from studies of the dynamics of changes in the efficiency of the diffusion process over a long period of time, which would lead to conclusions and assessments about whether SMEs are increasing their competence in this area.

CONCLUSION

The author has information on the implementation of the innovation process in companies for the period 2016-2018. This range of data will allow in-depth study of the dynamics of this phenomenon. A comparison of the effectiveness of innovative activities of Kazakhstani companies with the activities of companies from other countries would be another additional study and would help to identify the innovation gap between the compared countries. Another area of research on the effectiveness of the implementation of innovative processes may be the idea proposed by N. Rozbush, J. Brinkmann and A.

Bausch, combining the effectiveness of innovative processes with the size of the company, the duration of the market or the culture of the organization - one of the resources that make up the innovative potential of the company. The author advocates the idea of creating a comprehensive model for assessing the effectiveness of innovative processes implemented by SMEs, which would most accurately describe the nature and complexity of innovative processes.

Р.Ж. Калгулова[1], К.М. Жумаксанова[2], З.К. Есымханова[3]

[1,2] Л.Б.Гончаров атындағы Қазақ автомобиль-жол институты, Алматы қ., Қазақстан;
[3]Тұран-Астана университеті, Астана қ., Қазақстан

ШАҒЫН ЖӘНЕ ОРТА КӘСІПКЕРЛІК КӘСІПОРЫНДАРЫНЫҢ ИННОВАЦИЯЛЫҚ ӘЛЕУЕТІНІҢ ЭКОНОМИКАЛЫҚ МӘНІ

Аннотация. Инновациялық қызметтің қазіргі заманғы моделі кәсіпорындардың инновациялық қызметі жетістігінің негізгі факторларының бірі нарыққа жаңа шешімдерді дұрыс енгізу болып табылатынын куәландырады. Инновацияларды тарату қабілеті фирмалардың әлеуетін айқындайтын маңызды фактор болып табылады. Компаниялардың инновациялық қызметін талдау нарыққа енгізілетін инновациялар күтілетін пайда әкелмейтіндігін жиі куәландырады. Бұл кәсіпорынның инновациялық қызметі өте жиі тиімсіз деген қорытындыға әкеледі. Бұл мақалада компанияның ішкі ресурстары мен инновациялық қызметтің тиімділігі арасындағы өзара байланысты зерттеуге әрекет жасалды. Зерттеудің қойылған мақсатына жету үшін автор гипотезаны тұжырымдады: (H1) компанияның ішкі ресурстары мен инновациялық қызметтің тиімділігі арасында өзара байланыс бар. Мақалада авторлармен 2016-2018 жылдары қазақстандық ШОК арасында жүргізілген эмпирикалық зерттеудің нәтижелері берілген. Қолданбалы зерттеулер әдісі ШОК секторының компанияларында болып жатқан инновациялық үдерістердің сипатын ерекше ескере отырып, компанияларда болып жатқан инновациялық үдерістерді талдауға негізделген. Авторлар онлайн-сауалнаманы пайдалана отырып, ШОК секторының 200 компаниясына эмпирикалық зерттеу жүргізді. Гипотезаны растау үшін авторлар екі кезеңді талдауды қолданды. Зерттелген компаниялардың инновациялық әлеуетін талдау бірінші қадам болды. Бұл талдау кәсіпорындардың инновациялық қызметіне әсер ететін факторларды нақты анықтауға мүмкіндік берді. Екінші кезең зерттелген компаниялардың инновациялық қызметінің тиімділігін талдау болды. Зерттеу түйіндемесі компанияның ішкі ресурстары мен инновациялық қызметтің тиімділігі арасындағы өзара байланысты талдауға бағытталған.

Қазіргі экономикада бұл инновациялардың жалпы қабылданған парадигмасы. Кәсіпорындарға анықтау бойынша пайда әкелуі және бәсекеге қабілеттілікті арттыруы тиіс инновациялық қызмет жүргізу ұсынылады. Инновациялар парадигмасы бірқатар зерттеулермен расталады. Осы зерттеулердің негізінде әдетте танылған Экономикалық даму стратегиялары тұжырымдалады. Сонымен қатар, инновациялық қызмет көбінесе тиімсіз және күтілетін нәтижелер әкелмейді. Бұл мәселе әсіресе ШОК жағдайында байқалады. Заң жұмысының құнына негізделген бұрынғы бәсекелестік артықшылықтары өзінің маңыздылығын одан әрі жоғалтады. Ұзақ мерзімді экономикалық өсудің негізгі факторын қалыптастыратын білім мен инновациялар негізінде жаңа артықшылықтар жасау қажеттілігі туындайды. Осы тұрғыдан алғанда, компаниялардың инновациялық қызметін, оның ішінде әлемдік ауқымдағы бәсекеге қабілеттіліктің маңызды факторы ретінде ғылыми-зерттеу және тәжірибелік-конструкторлық қызметті дамыту қағидатты түрде маңызды. Ел экономикасының инновациясы негізінен экономикада жұмыс істейтін компаниялардың инновацияларымен айқындалады. Компанияның инновациялық қызметіне ішкі факторлар әсер етеді (оның ішінде, ең алдымен, компанияның әлеуеті мен ресурстары, зияткерлік капитал, материалдық, қаржылық және ұйымдастырушылық ресурстар). Бұдан басқа, кәсіпорынның инновациялық әлеуетін дамытуға компания жұмыс істейтін сала мен сектордың ерекшеліктері және сыртқы факторлар (ұлттық шарттарды мысалы, инновацияларды қолдау жөніндегі қызметке қатысты құқықтық нормаларды және өңірлік шарттарды мысалы, құқықтық,мәдени, экономикалық және техникалық қоса алғанда) әсер етеді.

Түйін сөздер: инновация, инновациялық әлеует, кәсіпорындар, кәсіпкерлік.

Р.Ж. Калгулова[1], К.М. Жумаксанова[*2], З.К. Есымханова [3]

[1,2]Казахский автомобильно-дорожный институт имени Л.Б.Гончарова, г.Алматы, Казахстан;
[3] Университет «Туран-Астана», г.Астана, Казахстан

ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКАЯ СУЩНОСТЬ ИННОВАЦИОННОГО ПОТЕНЦИАЛА ПРЕДПРИЯТИЙ МАЛОГО И СРЕДНЕГО ПРЕДПРИНИМАТЕЛЬСТВА

Аннотация. Современная модель инновационной деятельности свидетельствует о том, что одним из ключевых факторов успеха инновационной деятельности предприятий является правильное внедрение на рынок новых решений. Широко признается, что способность к распространению инноваций является важным фактором, определяющим потенциал фирм. Анализ инновационной деятельности компаний очень часто свидетельствует о том, что внедряемые на рынок инновации не приносят ожидаемой выгоды. Это приводит к выводу, что очень часто инновационная деятельность предприятия неэффективна. В данной статье предпринята попытка изучить взаимосвязь между внутренними ресурсами компании и эффективностью инновационной деятельности. Для достижения поставленной цели исследования автором сформулирована гипотеза: (H1) существует взаимосвязь между внутренними ресурсами компании и эффективностью инновационной деятельности. В статье представлены результаты эмпирического исследования, проведенного автором среди казахстанских МСП в 2015 – 2017 годы. Метод прикладных исследований основан на анализе инновационных процессов, происходящих в компаниях - с особым учетом характера инновационных процессов, происходящих в компаниях сектора МСП.Автор, используя онлайн-опрос, провел эмпирическое исследование 200 компаний сектора МСП (выбор компаний был намеренно-слоистый. Слои были: размер компании, доминирующий тип бизнеса).Для подтверждения гипотез автор применил двухэтапный анализ. Первым шагом стал анализ инновационного потенциала обследованных компаний. Этот анализ позволил точно определить факторы, влияющие на инновационную деятельность предприятий. Вторым этапом стал анализ эффективности инновационной деятельности обследованных компаний. Резюме исследование направлено на анализ взаимосвязи между внутренними ресурсами компании и эффективностью инновационной деятельности.

В современной экономике это общепринятая парадигма инноваций. Предприятиям рекомендуется вести инновационную деятельность, которая по определению должна приносить прибыль и повышать конкурентоспособность. Парадигма инноваций подтверждается рядом исследований. На основе этих исследований также обычно формулируются признанные стратегии экономического развития. Между тем инновационная деятельность зачастую неэффективна и не приносит ожидаемых результатов. Эта проблема особенно заметна в случае МСП. Польша в настоящее время находится в особом этапе своего развития. Прежние конкурентные преимущества, основанные на стоимости юридической работы, все более и более теряют свою значимость. Возникает необходимость создания новых преимуществ на основе знаний и инноваций, формирующих основной фактор долгосрочного экономического роста. С этой точки зрения принципиально важно развивать инновационную деятельность компаний, в том числе научно-исследовательскую и опытно-конструкторскую, как важнейший фактор конкурентоспособности в мировом масштабе. Инновация экономики страны в основном определяется инновациями компаний, которые работают в экономике. На инновационную деятельность компаний влияют внутренние факторы (в том числе, прежде всего, потенциал и ресурсы компании, плюс интеллектуальный капитал, материальные, финансовые и организационные ресурсы). Кроме того, на развитие инновационного потенциала предприятия влияют особенности отрасли и сектора, в которых работает компания, и внешние факторы (включая национальные условия [например, правовые нормы, касающиеся деятельности по поддержке инноваций и региональные условия например, правовые, культурные, экономические и технические факторы).

Ключевые слова: инновация, инновационный потенциал, предприятия, предпринимательства.

Information about authors:

Karlgulova Roza Zhumahmetovna – Candidate of Science in Economics, Professor of the Kazakh Automobile and Road Institute named after L. B. Goncharov, https://orcid.org0000-0002-3636-4688;

Zhumaxanova Karlygash Muratovna – Candidate of Science in Economics, associate Professor, Kazakh Automobile and Road Institute named after L. B. Goncharov, kmuratovna2019@mail.ru, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8696-5027;

Yessymkhanova Zeinegul Klyshbekovna – Candidate of Science in Economics, Associate Professor, Turan-Astana University, e-mail:zeinegul@bk.ru, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5552-5849

REFERENCES

[1] Angel H., Van de Ven A. H. (2016) Research on a management by innovations, Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

[2] Birchall D. W., & Armstrong M. S. (2011). Innovative Management: Achievement of A few Aims, /Henley Management College. Bloch C Measuring of innovations: present and future tasks, working document,2015.

[3] Vostrova A.P.(2015) Development of small innovative business in Russia through forming of territorial business-incubators. Dissertation. Vladimirskiy institute of business. Yaroslavl.

[4] Mantaeva E.I., Kurkudinova E.V.(2016) World experience of classic model of development [world experience of cluster development]. Economic Systems Management: an electronic scientific journal, 2 (38), 56.

[5] MilnerB. Z. (2017) Knowledge management in the modern economy [knowledge management in the modern economy]. M.: Institute of economics. C.8.

[6] Nogin V.A., Homenko I.A.(2015) Foreign experience of innovation activities of small and medium enterprises.

[7] Akberdina V.V., Grebenkin A.V., Bukhvalov N.Yu. Modeling of innovative resonance in industrial regions / // Regional Economy. 2015. No. 4. P. 289-308. doi 10.17059 / 2015-4-23

[8] Alexandrin Yu.N. Innovative economy and optimization of the institutional environment of small business // National interests: priorities and security. 2010. No. 25 P.17-23.

[9] Alexandrin Yu.N. Institutions and tools for the formation of an effective system of state stimulation of small business: US experience // Society: politics, economics, law. 2012. No1 S. 101-109.

[10] Bondarenko S.V. Institutional climate of small business in Russia / S.V. Bondarenko, T.I. Bondarenko // Political Mathematical Network Electronic Scientific Journal of the Kuban State Agrarian University (Scientific journal KubSAU) [Electronic resource]. Krasnodar: KubSAU, 2014. No. 07 (101). S. 1357-1366. IDA [article ID]: 1011407089. URL: http://ej.kubagro.ru/2014/07/pdf/89.pdf (accessed 10.25.2016).

[11] Volchik V.V. State regulation of entrepreneurial activity: the problem of institutional barriers // JOURNALOFECONOMICREGULATION (Issues of economic regulation). 2012. Volume 3. No. 3. P. 52-62.

[12] Gainullina G. A. Infrastructure of small business: analysis of the state and development prospects in the city of Omsk // Bulletin of Omsk State University. Series: Economics. 2014. No. 2 P.166-173.

[13] Ganicheva E.V., Mikhalchenkov N.V. Small innovative entrepreneurship of typical regions of Central Russia: state and development // Vector of science of TSU. 2014. No. 3. S. 109-112. [14] Institutional Economics: Textbook. allowance / under the general. ed. G.N. Makarova, V.A. Rudyakova. Irkutsk: Publishing House of BSUEP, 2014.316 s.

[15] Kezhun L.A., Nilova A.S. Tax incentives for innovation in the Russian economy as exemplified by the Sverdlovsk region // Bulletin of the Ural Institute of Economics, Management and Law. S. 43-49, cit. C 49.

[16] Kolmakova E.M. Factors of activation of innovative activity of the Russian regions // Bulletin of ChelSU. 2012. No. 3 (257) C.6-8.

[17] Komarova O.V. State support of small business: theoretical aspect // Journal of Economic Theory. 2010. No. 4. P.48-56.

[18] Kruzhkova T.I. The business world as a sociocultural and socio-economic phenomenon / T.I. Kruzhkova, O.V. Komarova // Bulletin of the Kostroma State University. ON THE. Nekrasov. 2011. Volume 17. No. 3. P. 383-387.

[19] Komissarov A. G. State support of innovative entrepreneurship: European and American experience // MIR (Modernization. Innovations. Development). 2011. No. 7 P.66-68.

[20] Kosheleva T.N. Innovation infrastructure as a condition for the development of small business and the basis for the formation of a national innovation system // Problems of the modern economy. 2013. No. 2 (46) S.342-344.

[21] Krutchankova K.A., Bukhtiyarova T.I. Innovation activity of entrepreneurship in the Kurgan region // AVU. 2013. No. 10 (116) S. 79-86.

[22] Kurpayanidi K.I. Institutional foundations of the state support system for small business: US experience // National interests: priorities and security. 2012. No. 41 S. 54-60.

[23] Laricheva E.A. Analysis of the innovative potential of the Bryansk region and ways to increase it // Innovations. 2010. No. 12 P.84-88.

[24] Makasheva N.P. State support and financing of innovation in Russia and the world // Tomsk State University Journal. Tom. state un-that. Economy. 2013. No. 3 (23) S. 161-172.

[25] Minakova E.I., Orlova S.A., Lazarenko L.E. Development of the infrastructure for state support of small and medium enterprises in Russia and abroad // Fundamental Research. 2015. No. 2-13 C.2925-2929.

[26] Mikhaleva O. M., Matyushkina I. A., Gerasimenkova S. V. The current state and directions of development of innovative activity in the Bryansk region // Bulletin of the Bryansk State University. 2012. No. 3 (2) S.224-227.

[27] Stepanenko D.M. The term "innovation" as a categorical basis for a set of interrelated concepts // Science of Krasnoyarsk. 2012. No. 1 (01). S. 65-74, S. 68.

[28] Fedorov OV, Nemtsev S.G. Innovative activity of the regions of the Volga Federal District // Bulletin of ChSU. 2013. No. 2 S. 324-327.

[29] Carree M., van Stel A., Thurik R. et al. Economic Development and Business Ownership: an Analysis using Data of 23 OECD Countries in the Period 1976-1996 // Small Business Economics (2002) 19: 271-290. doi:10.1023/A:1019604426387

[30] Abzhalelova S.R., Zhumaxanova K.M., AbdrakhmanovaA.Zh. (2019) Management system of innovative activity development in the Republic of Kazakhstan. News of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Series of Social Sciences and Humanities. ISSN 2224-5294, 5(327) september-october. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8696-5027

PUBLICATION ETHICS AND PUBLICATION MALPRACTICE IN THE JOURNALS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

For information on Ethics in publishing and Ethical guidelines for journal publication see http://www.elsevier.com/publishingethics and http://www.elsevier.com/journal-authors/ethics.

Submission of an article to the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan implies that the work described has not been published previously (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture or academic thesis or as an electronic preprint, see http://www.elsevier.com/postingpolicy), that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, that its publication is approved by all authors and tacitly or explicitly by the responsible authorities where the work was carried out, and that, if accepted, it will not be published elsewhere in the same form, in English or in any other language, including electronically without the written consent of the copyright-holder. In particular, translations into English of papers already published in another language are not accepted.

No other forms of scientific misconduct are allowed, such as plagiarism, falsification, fraudulent data, incorrect interpretation of other works, incorrect citations, etc. The National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan follows the Code of Conduct of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), and follows the COPE Flowcharts for Resolving Cases of Suspected Misconduct (http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/New_Code.pdf). To verify originality, your article may be checked by the originality detection service Cross Check http://www.elsevier.com/editors/plagdetect.

The authors are obliged to participate in peer review process and be ready to provide corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. All authors of a paper should have significantly contributed to the research.

The reviewers should provide objective judgments and should point out relevant published works which are not yet cited. Reviewed articles should be treated confidentially. The reviewers will be chosen in such a way that there is no conflict of interests with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders.

The editors have complete responsibility and authority to reject or accept a paper, and they will only accept a paper when reasonably certain. They will preserve anonymity of reviewers and promote publication of corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. The acceptance of a paper automatically implies the copyright transfer to the National Academy of sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The Editorial Board of the National Academy of sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan will monitor and safeguard publishing ethics.

Правила оформления статьи для публикации в журнале смотреть на сайте:

www:nauka-nanrk.kz

http://soc-human.kz/index.php/en/arhiv

Редакторы: *М. С. Ахметова, Г. Б. Халидуллаева, Д. С. Аленов*
Верстка на компьютере *А.М. Кульгинбаевой*

Подписано в печать 10.02.2020
Формат 60x881/8. Бумага офсетная. Печать – ризограф.
16,5 п.л. Тираж 500. Заказ 1.