

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHII (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 4.102	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2018 Issue: 10 Volume: 66

Published: 01.10.2018 <http://T-Science.org>

**SECTION 31. Economic research, finance,
innovation, risk management.**
UDC 338:658



Konstantin Ivanovich Kurpayanidi
Doctor of Philosophy in Economics,
Professor of the Russian Academy
of Natural Sciences,
Corresponding Member of
the International Academy of
Theoretical and Applied Sciences
Fergana Polytechnic Institute, Uzbekistan
w7777@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-8354-1512

QR – Issue



QR – Article



THE TYPOLOGY OF FACTORS OF INCREASING THE INNOVATIVE ACTIVITY OF ENTERPRISE ENTREPRENEURS IN THE INDUSTRY

Abstract: The system analysis of theoretical bases of increase of innovative activity of subjects of business is carried out in the article. The author, through a review of a wide range of scientific literature, has proved that an organization can only be competitive if it enhances its innovative activity. In this paper, the concept of "organization" as a subsystem is considered. It is shown that the subsystem (like the whole system as a whole) is hierarchical, that is, it consists of certain levels. Each of these subsystems can be a factor in increasing the innovative activity of the organization, as shown by the analysis of factors. Analysis of theoretical issues of innovation activity, showed that increasing innovation activity is an urgent problem for modern organizations, and the analysis of factors allowed to identify the factors that maximally affect innovation activity and systematize them. It is concluded that an increase in innovative activity is necessary to ensure the long-term competitiveness of the organization in modern conditions.

Key words: Innovation, innovation activity, innovation process, organization, entrepreneurship, system, strategy, management, level of management.

Language: English

Citation: Kurpayanidi, K.I. (2018). The typology of factors of increasing the innovative activity of enterprise entrepreneurs in the industry. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 10 (66), 1-11.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-10-66-1> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2018.10.66.1>

Introduction

An analysis of the theoretical foundations of increasing innovation activity showed that the organization can only be competitive if it is to improve their innovative activity, which, as we saw earlier, there is a comprehensive description of its innovative activities, including the degree of intensity of the action undertaken by the head inclined to search for a new and timeliness the ability to mobilize the potential of the required quantity and quality, including its hidden side, the ability to ensure the validity of the methods used and the progressive, rational technology in composition and sequence [1]. On innovation activity is affecting the knowledge of which allows the development of mechanisms for its development and promotion of modern organizations [2]. We analyze their essence.

Research Methodology

Theoretical and methodological basis of the study were the results of studies of domestic and foreign scholars on issues of strategic and innovation management, innovation management and investments, the economy of the industrial enterprise, legal acts of legislative and executive authorities. When solving tasks used methods of comparative technical and economic analysis, methods of expert estimates, the methods of correlation and regression analysis, concretized in the models of innovation management.

The adopted research methodology using a specific toolkit will ensure adequate object, subject and methods of research, and to obtain reliable results.



Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 4.102	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	

Analysis and Results

The essence of the concept of "factor of innovation activity" is revealed few authors, and the detected variations are diverse. Refer to Table 1.

Table 1.

Options for the interpretation of the concept of "factor of innovative activity"

№	Author, source	The essence of the "factor of innovative activity"
1	Vasil'ev I. A.[3]	Leverage innovative activity, stimulate or slow down the growth rate of its level. The investigation the factors - a certain economic status (position) of the company, which can be characterized by a set of attributes of innovation activity.
2	Sidorenko V. G.[4]	Motive formation of innovative strategy, which aims to create innovations that become commodities in the market.
3	Piven' A. V.[5]	Possibilities of increasing innovation activity.
4	Tovstenko B. P.[6], Ershov V. F.[7]	At different levels: the macro level - historically developed situation, meso - a collection of objects and the conditions with which the company is facing in everyday life, micro level - the factors determining the competitiveness
5	Skopina I. V. et al [8]	The main measure of innovation field, increasing the innovative activity of the public and private sectors.
6	Tokarev B. E.	Effects on the sale of innovative products.
7	S. Jentoni, M. Dzhonson, Dzh. Sinfield, Je. Oltman	The condition required not spontaneous, one-time innovations and for the systematic implementation of the innovation process

The definition proposed by I. Vasilyev, considered that factor - is the "lever" with which you can change the innovative activity: these levers can be stimulating and inhibitory nature; they should be regarded as a combination of factors in each situation; it is an optimal combination contributes to changing the situation of the organization and the level of innovation activity. This study is based on this definition as the most fully reflects the essence of the search term.

I.The division of factors internal and external.

Valeeva E. O. shares the factors of change and innovation activity influences on innovative activity, but the essence of these concepts is not defined by the author [9]. Factors of innovation activity in this work are divided into external and internal. Among the advantages of the proposed E. Valeeva approach, you can specify that identified with it have the greatest impact on the consideration, the tourist market factors - seasonality; the author takes into account the specifics of the tourism market. In some cases, it proposed to take into account not all of the factors in the multidimensional force, indicating the flexibility of the proposed approach. Given these factors, the author presents the innovation and the economic mechanism, consisting of organizational and managerial, financial, economic, technical and technological, legal, informational, moral and psychological factors; factors that determine the level of innovative activity; In addition, factors allocated different levels of management. At the same time, it is possible to identify some shortcomings: clearly established selection process influencing factors in a

particular case, the question remains of the interaction of the factors themselves to each other.

Just like E. Valeyeva, Agabeyov S. and E. Levina, internal and external factors contributed Gorban M. et al. It is noteworthy that the group of authors is based on an empirical analysis of real enterprises. Positive aspects of the approach are the difference of innovative activity of the country and the company, including any influence on innovative activity at various levels, consideration of both stimulating and hindering factors, which was not the work of previous authors. But in our view, remain open following issues: the lack of quantifying the influence of factors, failure factors, the characteristics of the companies themselves.

Exactly the same principle was used to systematize the factors by V. G. Medynskij[10], advantages of the approach which, in our opinion, is the consideration of factors of different groups (internal and external, direct and indirect effects) and the allocation of stimulating and inhibiting factors.

To this group the works of M. E. Kassa[11], Ju. Firsova[12] can be attributed. They also share factors in the external and internal factors but they are slightly different so that the approach, in our opinion, complement each other. The positive approach of these authors is that they considered methods of assessment of innovative development, developed the requirements for its indicators. But, in our opinion, is not in the clear distinction between innovation activity and innovation development, which could lead to a distortion of the results of theoretical research.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 4.102	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	

A more narrow approach, due to the fact that we consider only the economic factors of innovation activity, but also belong to this group - the division into internal and external - different work S. G. Avdonin[13], which indicates that external factors determine the internal and external factors that determine each other, as well as domestic.

S. Agabekov and E. Levina[14], which offer three groups of factors, factors also divided into internal and external, but this provision in their work is not fully disclosed, in our opinion. Advantages of the approach seen in an attempt to classify the factors held communications "factor - the root cause," while many of the authors only point to factors without giving reasons. Identifying the causes contributes to the formation of true mechanisms for increasing innovation activity, taking into account the factors of influence. However, we think that the superficial analysis of external factors (considered only economic and legislative), as well as the fact that among the economic factors singled and external and internal, however, separately isolated internal factors (which introduces uncertainty principle of classification) they are disadvantages of this approach.

A. A. Nikol'skaja[15], A. E. Vlasova, S. D. Il'enkova, O. N. Mel'nikova also proposes to allocate internal and external factors, however, along with this, they offered a group such as resource and Scoring factors. In our opinion, this is a reasonable approach, but is not fully disclosed.

E.A. Mil'skaja[16] also results in a wide range of factors that can be attributed to both internal and external to the organization, but the factors are considered only as constraining innovation activity, in addition, they are not systematic.

In the works Dzh. Djeja[17] the author also discusses the internal and external factors: culture, organizational structure and market. This approach is different in that the time factor is introduced, that is considered a permanent change. However, consideration of factors is not comprehensive. The advantage of the approach - to identify the major problems, which are reduced to the absence of interaction, the high dynamism of the environment.

II. Consideration of external factors or only internal.

B. L. Kljunja and Fan Juj.[18] They do not talk about the factors themselves, but indicate that innovation activity of enterprises should have a number of features in order to be able to improve innovative activity. In our opinion, these signs are the factors of the internal environment. This suggests that flaw approach is that the external environment is not considered. However, the authors point out the need for fairly complex factors, their connection to the control system.

V. A. Titov, A. F. Martynov[19] also considering only internal factors: the structure,

resources, research and so forth. In this approach, a lot of positives: the construction of a hierarchy of factors account networking, building some models of factors. However, there is a drawback associated with the narrowness, insufficient knowledge of the matter: not disclosed the essence of each of these factors, not studied the nature of the relationship, the approach is applicable only to the education industry.

S. Jentoni, M. Dzhonson, Dzh. Sinfield, Je. Oltman suggested as factors of the internal aspects of the organization: asset management, the establishment of a growth strategy, optimal allocation of resources. This approach differs from the others in the group, so that within it dynamic factors are considered, and not static.

III. Allocation factors in accordance with the activities (functions of the organization)

This area classification represented a group of authors, offering to allocate economic factors, production, personnel and so on. To her it is possible to put A. I. Golushko[20] & T. V. Kolosovu[21], offering to allocate production, economic and other factors, the reasons for innovation. In our opinion, the main disadvantage of this separation - a small number of the factors considered: only the economy, production, legislation, demand, in addition, the authors - not isolated between the internal and external factors.

IV. Isolation of factors with respect to the innovation process.

As shown by the above analysis, innovative activities implemented as part of the innovation process. Because of this, many authors use a process approach. For example, A. V. Piven[22] considering factors such as the possibility of increasing innovation activity in the stages of research and development, commercialization, performance assessment. The apparent advantage of this approach, in our view is that the author considered factors at different stages of the innovation cycle and classified by grade capabilities of the organization (current and future), that is the approach, unlike others, involves an analysis of the future state.

V. Separation factors by level (management)

So often in the literature as to the division of internal and external approach, we believe the division of the authors of the factors on the basis of multi-layered. It should be noted N. S. Sharamygina[23], O. Ju. Trilickuju[24], R.S. Petrova[25]. They propose to allocate factors macro, meso, micro-level. Moreover, within each level, they are classified as factors such as micro-level factors are considered resource, efficient, process. The advantages of their approach: developed a universal classification of factors of innovation activity (industry, region, size, specialization); disadvantages of the approach: the combination of options is not considered the above factors; there is no question about how they should be integrated with each other.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 4.102	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	

Another group of authors also shares the factors on levels of protection, but their approach is somewhat different. B. P. Tovstenko[26] & V. F. Ershov[27] offer nation-wide address global factors, meso-environment, and microenvironment. Just as in the previous approach, considered Process and Scoring factors. E. O. Valeeva[28] proposes to consider strategic and tactical factors. And those and others, according to its approach, affect only the internal environment. That, in our opinion, is an omission of the author.

VI. An integrated approach to the classification of factors (two or more criteria).

Significant contribution to the analysis of the factors of innovation activity making S. A. Makina and E. N. Maksimova[29] that proposed a system features five-classification criteria. The main advantages of the work: isolated signs of classification factors considered inhibitory and stimulatory factors, external internal; objective and subjective factors, the relationship is specified to various factors in the short and in the long term, proposed a matrix relationship factors relationship factors "internal /external - objective/ subjective". The disadvantage can be regarded as a lack of systematization and correlation approaches of different authors considered in work.

This category, we allowed ourselves to carry this author, as I. A. Vasil'ev[30], which also identifies several classification criteria, namely eight. Advantages of approach: offered an extensive classification of factors provides a definition of the concept of "factor" considered factors at different levels of management. At the same time it highlighted the lack of such an approach as a lack of information about the interaction of complex factors.

In the same vein argues V. G. Sidorenko[31], It offers two criteria of classification. Pros approach: consider two criteria for classifying factors (internal / external, objective / subjective); indicate how certain factors are linked. However, this approach seems too narrow to us: consider only the factors of economic activity affecting innovation.

B. E. Tokarev[32] also offers several criteria for the classification of factors of innovation activity:

external / internal, direct and indirect impact of factors at different levels, consumer and marketing. It is noteworthy that in contrast to other market factors - marketing and demand - in a separate group. In our view, it is reasonable and right step, because consumer demand is a crucial factor in the marketing of new products. Positive aspects of the work: the inclusion of international factors, consumer factors, market incentives; the model of assessing the impact of various factors, taking into account the correction factors.

VII. Other approaches.

Among the works devoted to the analysis of factors of innovation activity, considered as regional aspects, factors impeding and stimulating innovative development. Among the first study of this can be attributed to the author, as the I. V. Naumov[33] who is considering as factors the activities of local authorities, urban infrastructure, and the availability of material resources of the municipality. Also in this group we shall place I. V. Skopinu et al.[34], A.G. Shelomenceva, S.V. Doroshenko[35], offering, for example, the creation of the legislative base in the region, the expansion of public-private partnerships and so on.

To the second we put the work L. A. Malysheva and I. V. Shestakov, who talk about underdevelopment in demand, complicated external environment and globalization, development priorities and so on. The main drawback of the approach - a small number of the factors considered the lack of a holistic approach to the review informed factors. However, special attention is given to the essence of the concept of "innovation activity"[36].

Based on this analysis, we propose the twelve criteria for the classification of factors of innovation activity: the source of the level of management, the degree of influence, degree of objectivity, institutional affiliation, level of management, the nature of influence, activity, organizational and legal form, the number and availability of subjects in relation innovation process (duration of effect), the cyclical influence (frequency). The criteria on the basis of systematically works I. Vasilyeva, S. Makin, Y. Maximova, E. Valeyeva et al. - Table 2.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHII (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 4.102	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	

Table 2. systematization of classifications of factors of innovation activity [37].

SOURCE	MANAGEMENT LEVEL/DEGREE OF INFLUENCE DEGREE OF OBJECTIVITY	INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION LEVEL OF MANAGEMENT	Stimulating						Inhibitory						NATURE OF INFLUENCE				
			FE	TTC	OM	SC	INST	INF	PR	FE	TTC	OM	SC	INST	INF	PR	←	НАПРАВЛЕНИЯ ДЕЙТЕЛЬНОСТИ ¹¹¹	
External	Macroenvironment/ Indirect/ Objective	Global																Process	← SHAPE
	Mesoenvironment/ Direct/ Objective, Subjective	National																Result	
	Mesoenvironment/ Direct/ Objective, Subjective	Regional																Resource	
Internal	Mesoenvironment/ Direct/ Objective, Subjective	Local (sphere)																Independent	NUMBER AND PRESENCE OF SUBJECTS
	Microenvironment/ Direct/ Objective	Enterprise (strategic)																Single subject	
	Microenvironment/ Direct/ Subjective	Subdivisions (tactic)																Multiple subject	
	Microenvironment/ Direct/ Subjective	Employees (operative)																Impact on specific company	VERSALITY
																		Impact on all enterprises of country, sphere	
																		Short-term	ATTITUDE TOWARDS INNOVATION PROCESS
																		Long-term	
																		Permanent	CYCLICALITY OF IMPACT
																		Temporary	

Influence on 1-2 stages of the process
 Influence throughout the whole process



Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 1.344	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 4.102	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667		

This approach differs from those considered in that:

1) maximum number of systematized criteria, the criteria is interrelated. So, from the source of the criteria derived level of management, the degree of influence on innovative activity, the degree of objectivity. Recent consist of institutional affiliation and level of management. Each group of factors of institutional affiliation can be divided, on the one hand, stimulating and inhibiting innovation activity, on the other hand - into seven groups of activities. Thus, a 112 cells (such as an external objective factor indirect influence on the global macro level inhibitory nature in the field of finance and economy - the financial and economic crisis of 2008-2012.) Factors within which, on the one hand, it can be considered from the point of a) form (for example, the process of establishing, monitoring, planning and so forth., resources - existing and potential, the results - the organizational structure, the size of the enterprise, personnel qualification, etc.); b) the complexity of the (separate, single and of a multi); c) universality - are specific to a particular organization or universal. Aspect dynamism and volatility factors illustrate two criteria proposed by V. G. Sidorenko - duration and periodicity. Inside the cells can also be a factor both one-time and recurring.

2) in addition, this classification is proposed to include such criteria as the versatility. A number of factors may depend on innovation activity of a particular company or companies active across the industry as whole, companies across the country. The existing classification, according to the criterion of "institutional belonging" factors apply to different levels - from the global to the micro-level. These factors, depending on the level of different effects on specific companies. We have seen that factors not only have different effects, but also in relation to specific businesses they may vary.

3) the criterion of "institutional identity", in our opinion, it is advisable to allocate not six groups (from global to direct [38]) eight groups, that is, at the enterprise level to allocate three sublevels factors influence the level of the enterprise, at the level of departments and areas, at a level employees. This detail is required, on the one hand, by the fact that the organization is a complex system consisting of various elements from different control levels, which are applied to the study of numerous different approaches. On the other hand, the latest trends in management beginning 1 century indicate that enterprises are important for the development of integration and self-development [39]. These trends show the importance of the human factor, the factor matching personal and organizational goals, a factor of interaction between different levels in the development process, particularly innovative development (through increased innovation activity)

organization.

1) In our opinion, these classification criteria and factors contained in them should be considered in the complex. A set of factors will vary depending on a) a particular company; b) a specific point in time in which the company exists. That is, to determine the list of factors is not enough for your organization, you need to have the set dynamics, monitoring changes in the impact of factors periodically repeating the analysis of the factors.

2) we offer the following to use the proposed systematization:

A) In our opinion, for each organization need to develop a similar (Table 2.) with the tool filling cells, as factors of innovation activity:

1) have industry-specific (for example, the legislation in the medical field);

2) depend on the organization's position in the market;

3) the number of personnel, etc.; universal factors will be the same for all organizations, and specific - are unique to each organization;

B) depending on what factors and the effect on a particular organization need to install these factors interference between them, as a mechanism for eliminating or enhancing factors to enhance the activity of innovation can be applied to a single factor in the chain and not to all, and thus, the effect of one factor will lead to an effect on the other;

B) Next, you need to build a chain of "factor - the reason - the reduction mechanism, use or incentive - an indicator of innovation activity." After a complete list of the factors influencing the innovative activity of the organization, it is necessary to establish the causes or sources of these factors - this will surely indicate the use of the mechanism of a factor it into account, reducing its influence in order to improve innovative activity. The effectiveness of the resulting set of mechanisms is determined by the indicators of innovation activity, after that you can trace the dynamics and develop, if necessary, corrective action.

Thus, the analysis of the factors of innovative activity allows us to conclude that:

1) the least explored area is the division factor of management levels:

strategic, tactical, operational[40]. Other authors consider the levels of macro, meso, micro, i.e. summarize the inner sphere of the organization. In our opinion, a close study of levels of government - namely, their interaction in terms of impact on innovation activity - is an open question for researchers. In addition, we confirmed the need comprehensive consideration of factors of innovation activity in their interaction.

2) most of the authors consider factors of innovation activity in the context of the activities (functional subsystems organization). Given the fact

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 4.102	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	

that the organization is a system consisting of different elements, including functional subsystems, interesting to analyze the question is, does liaise levels of management within the functional subsystems of organizations to increase innovation activity. What do functional subsystems influence, considered and justified by many authors.

3) analysis of the factors of innovation activity in the literature is not uncommon, but quite poorly studied the interaction between levels of government as a factor for increasing innovation activity; not considered factors at various levels of management within the functional subsystems organization.

As discussed above, the concepts of generations of the innovation process (five models), and involves the various subsystems of the enterprise and external environment: the production, marketing, sales, use, needs of society and the market and so forth. The analysis of the literature on this subject has allowed to systematize the basic approach to the theory of organization management: classical, neoclassical, structural-functional, process, system, institutional, behaviorist, resource-based approach; theory of dynamic capabilities, situational, developmental, business, contract, hierarchical, system-integration, system-constructivist approach, the theory of self-organization and self-development, evolutionary system-integration theory.

Designated approaches are not mutually exclusive, but rather complement and develop. The above approach to the management of the organization allows us to formulate the problem: what levels should be allocated and how they interact with each other. It should be noted that in all of the approaches we are talking about the interaction of the elements and their combinations, changing only the elements themselves: it can be a resource (as in classic or resource-based approach), production and process parameters (neoclassical approach), the organization's objectives and goals of individuals (a process approach), organizational relationships (a system approach), institutions (institutional approach), etc. Also, all approaches can be divided into two groups: static consideration of the enterprise (such as a structural approach) and dynamic (the theory of dynamic capabilities, evolution and system integration theory). Many recent theories appear at the junction of several approaches (for example, the theory of self-development and self-organization and evolution of system-integration theory). As for the allocation of levels of management, it is usually distinguished strategic, tactical and operational levels. In these approaches, the authors often talk about innovations and innovative development, marked by high productivity of self-development to enhance innovation activity [41].

In our opinion, given the nature of innovation, and innovation - the dynamism, variability, constant development, - when considering the increase of

innovative activity of the organization are the most productive systems-integration evolutionary theory and the theory of self-development of socio-economic systems, since, according to this approach, the organization there are hierarchical levels, the various subsystems, which, on one hand, cooperate with each other, on the other hand, are themselves complex systems. In addition, these approaches considered time factor, i.e., the fact that the organization and the external environment is constantly changing. Finally, these concepts laid that elements of the organization as a system able to develop under the influence of not only external factors but internal features (i.e., capable of self-development).

Based on the different approaches to the nature of the organization (enterprise), we can formulate a number of issues relating to co-existence and functioning of management levels:

1) The imbalance between the strategic and operational levels in matters of prioritization and allocation of resources, as a result - the emergence of conflicts, competition between levels of disharmony in carrying out the tasks and goals. These trends have led to a decrease in the effectiveness and efficiency of the enterprise as a whole, the functioning of individual organizational units.

2) Inability to build adequate forecasts of low surface detail and elaboration.

3) The differences in the interests of the different levels of government.

4) Non-regulated processes of interaction and mutual influence of strategic, tactical and operational levels of management.

5) Failure of managers to measure and evaluate customers as assets and show a real connection of these assets with a total value of the company [42].

6) The complexity of accounting and cost allocation in either direction of the organization [43].

7) The reluctance of managers to spend money on development without preliminary calculations and studies related to the increase in the budget.

8) The emergence of opportunistic behavior, fraud and so on. Human factors in the implementation of the strategy, implementation, feedback, resulting in slowing or stopping the coordinated work of management levels of the organization.

9) The problem of integration of functional subsystems in the overall management of the organization and its efficiency (indicated by many authors as the weakest link in management of the organization) [44].

10) The complexity, the complexity of existing systems management efficiency and effectiveness of the organization as whole and functional subsystems. The need to process large amounts of information and expect a large number of parameters resulting in slower performance of the

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 1.344	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 4.102	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667		

basic functions, lower productivity.

11) Difficulties with the formation of long-term sustainable competitive advantage [45].

12) In our opinion, to resolve these problems, according to evolutionary system-integration theory and the theory of self-development, a more detailed and systematic description of the interaction of management levels with each other, as well as their influence on the change of innovation activity of the organization.

13) issues of interaction between levels of government are dedicated to a very small number of jobs. The main research issues of strategic management and implementation of the strategic guidelines in practice can be reduced to five groups.

14) Firstly, there is a research program, "Strategy as Practice" in the study of strategic management", published in the "Journal of the Russian management"[46]. In the works of the authors participating in this program examines the strategy at the micro level, their implementation in practice. We consider the works of L. R. Whittington, L. Melin, J. Johnson, H. Garfinkel, B. Splitter, D. Saydla, P. Dzhazabkovski and others. However, under this approach, first of all, it is a management strategy as a whole. Secondly, greater emphasis on the gap between theory and practice, rather than between strategic and operational level.

Secondly, a number of authors talking about the importance of practical implementation of the strategy. The main representatives of this approach are R. Kaplan and D. Norton [47] these authors give a general scheme and a detailed description of the stages of such a management system, calling it "a comprehensive integrated management system." Strategic planning and operational activities in the control system are not seen as two distinct activities of the company, as well as stages in one system, which are connected by common aims, indicators, resources, data and information flow. Such a comprehensive integrated management system has become one of the most important competitive advantages. The system of indicators built on the basis of six main stages: strategy development, planning, strategy, and the company's compliance with the chosen strategy, operational planning, monitoring and identification of problems, testing and adjustment of the strategy. These six management processes form the basis of an integrated and comprehensive system of closed cycle that links strategic planning with business planning, execution of plans, feedback and identification of problems. The system consists of many parts of the flexible and changing relationship and requires the synchronization of all activities and divisions of the company. In a similar vein thinks I. Ansoff: it offers a dual management system, linking the strategic and operational steps enterprises [48].

These approaches are often applied to the functional subsystems organization. For example, the Kaplan-Norton approach adapted to the marketing and distribution services in the work of A. Preisner "Balanced Scorecard in marketing and sales." The author speaks of 81 records in the field of marketing and sales. It is in this work indicated the need to introduce a system of indicators of service of marketing as a management tool that links strategic and operational levels [49]. However, in this case, first of all, it is about performance, formalizing strategy. Themselves figures are not divided into strategic and operational, but it is a transformation of the company's goals in operating performance. A. Preisner speaks constructed in a hierarchical pyramid of indicators, which is on the main index depends on all the others. Thus, the key indicators of the company are detailed to the specific operational values.

Similarly, within the framework of the transfer of marketing strategy into measurable indicators and the construction of Balanced Scorecard in marketing talk and T. P. Danko and O. V. Kitov [50] However, their work also indicated the need to align the goals and objectives of different departments for the implementation of market strategy. You can also note the work of N. G. Avramenko, in which the author, based on a balanced scorecard, said that the greatest difficulty lies in the cascading of strategic goals to the operational level [51]. In this paper, the author points to the problem of adaptation of the Balanced Scorecard for Russian companies [52].

One of the works, which systematically describes several approaches to indicators of market activity and their role in the overall performance of the enterprise, including the balanced scorecard, quality management, etc. Is work of O. K. Oyner [53]. In that paper also raises the issue of the need to evaluate the strategic activities, the complexity of large-scale transfer of activities in specific indicators.

Third, the article by J. Cotter proposed introduction of a dual control system: a combination of a rigid hierarchy (for everyday tasks) and the flexible structure (to adapt and adjust policies according to changes in the environment and the company itself) [54]. On such a "dual management system" I. Ansoff [55] also mentioned.

Fourth, we are talking about the hierarchical analysis of socio-economic systems (the issue discussed in detail in the works of Ju. K. Perskogo, D. N. Shul'ca[56], G. B. Klejnera, E. V. Popova) [57]. In this vein, the company is considered as a whole, the region, the process of innovation management [58].

Conclusion

Thus, the organization has a system consisting of various subsystems. In turn, each sub-system (and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 4.102	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	

the whole system) hierarchical, i.e. consists of certain levels. Each of these subsystems can be a factor in increasing the innovative activity of the organization, as shown by analysis of the factors. An analysis of theoretical issues of innovative activity showed that the increase in innovation activity is an actual

problem for today's organizations, and analysis of the factors revealed factors influencing the most innovative activity, and organize them. Increasing innovative activity is necessary to ensure the long-term competitiveness of the organization today.

References:

1. Piven', A.V. (2009). *Ocenka i upravlenie innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju promyshlennyh predpriyatij (na primere predpriyatij Habarovskogo kraja)*. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk, 08.00.05. - Habarovsk.
2. Volkova, T.I. (2010). Uslovie innovacionnogo obmena. *Jekonomist*, № 3, p. 54.
3. Vasil'ev, I.A. (2010). Metodicheskie voprosy jekonomicheskoy ocenki innovacionnoj aktivnosti generirujushhih predpriyatij jelektrojenergeticheskoy otrasli. *Mikrojekonomika*, №1, 47-51.
4. Sidorenko, V.G. (2008). *Sovershenstvovanie upravlenija innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju organizacij v rossijskoj jekonomike*. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk, 08.00.05, Moscow, p. 17.
5. Piven', A.V. (2009). *Ocenka i upravlenie innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju promyshlennyh predpriyatij (na primere predpriyatij Habarovskogo kraja)*. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk, 08.00.05. Habarovsk, p.171.
6. Tovstenko, B.P. (2012). Faktory, vlijajushhie na innovacionnuju aktivnost' predpriyatija. *Rossijskij jekonomicheskij internet zhurnal*. №2, Retrieved 2012, from <http://www.e-rej.ru/Articles/2012/Tovstenko.pdf>
7. Ershov, V.F. (2002). *Restrukturizacija proizvodstvennyh sistem v mashinostroenii*. SPb.: SPbGIIeU, (p.215).
8. Skopina, I.V., Baklanova, J.O., & Skopin, A.O. (2006). Innovacionnaja aktivnost' kak pokazatel' jekonomicheskogo razvitija regiona. *Regional'naja jekonomika i upravlenie: jelektronnyj nauchnyj zhurnal*, № 31.
9. Valeeva, E.O. (2005). *Upravlenie innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju turistskoj firmy*. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk: 08.00.05, SPb., p. 21.
10. Medynskij, V.G. (2007). *Innovacionnyj menedzhment*. Moscow, INFRA-M, 295 p.
11. Kass, M.E. (2012, April) Razrabotka metodov ocenki innovacionnoj dejatel'nosti predpriyatija. Strategicheskoe upravlenie predpriyatijami, organizacijami i regionami. *Sb. statej VI Vserossijskoj nauchno-prakt. konferencii*, Penza, RIO PGSHA, p. 84.
12. Firsov, J. (2012). Faktory i jelementy povyshenija innovacionnoj aktivnosti predpriyatija. *RISK: resursy, informacija, snabzhenie, konkurencija*, №1, 148-153.
13. Avdonina, S.G. (2011). Faktory innovacionnoj aktivnosti predpriyatij. *Jekonomicheskie nauki*, № 12, 33-36.
14. Agabekov, S., Levina, E. (2011). Vozmozhnye modifikacii pokazatelej innovacionnoj aktivnosti. *Jekonomicheskaja politika*, №2, Retrieved 2011, from http://ep.ane.ru/pdf/online/EPonline_2-2011_agabekov.pdf
15. Nikol'skaja, A.A. (2012). *Innovacionnaja aktivnost' vysshih uchebnyh zavedenij: ocenka i ispol'zovanie pri opredelenii konkurentosposobnosti*. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk: 08.00.05, Ivanovo, p. 170.
16. Mil'skaja, E.A. (2011). Klassifikacija innovacionno-aktivnyh predpriyatij. *Materialy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii «Nauchnye issledovanija i innovacionnaja dejatel'nost'»*, SPb.: izd-vo SPbGPU, pp. 84–89.
17. Dzej, D.S. (2008). *Organizacija, orientirovannaja na rynek: kak ponjat', privilech' i uderzhat' cennyh klientov*. Moscow, Jeksmo, p. 56.
18. Kljunja, V.L., & Fan J. (2011). Innovacionnoe predpriatie: sushhnost', sodержanie i otlichitel'nye priznaki. *Vesshk BDU, Ser. 3, № 1*, p. 69.
19. Titov, V.A., & Martynov, A.F. (2006). Metodologicheskie podhody k upravleniju innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju. *Transportnoe delo Rossii*, №12, 40–42.
20. Golushko, A.I. (2003). *Mehanizmy upravlenija innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju v regione (na primere Omskoj oblasti)*. dis ... kand. jekon. nauk: 08.00.05, Moscow, pp. 71-72.
21. Kolosova, T.V. (2012, April). Jekonomicheskoe razvitie predpriyatija na osnove realizacii innovacij: prakticheskij opyt ispol'zovanija koncepcij. *Strategicheskoe upravlenie predpriyatijami, organizacijami i regionami: Sb. statej VI Vserossijskoj nauchno-*



Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156
ESJI (KZ) = 4.102
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260

- prakticheskoy konferencii, Penza: RIO PGSCHA, p. 99.
22. Piven', A.V. (2009). *Ocenka i upravlenie innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju promyshlennyyh predpriyatij (na primere predpriyatij Habarovskogo kraja)*. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk: 08.00.05, Habarovsk, p.1-171.
 23. Sharamygin, N.S. (2012). *Upravlenie innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju promyshlennyyh predpriyatij na osnove jeffektivnyh metodov ee ocenki i stimulirovaniya*. avtoref. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk: 08.00.05, Orel, p.1-24.
 24. Trilickaja, O.J. (2013). Innovacionnaja aktivnost' kak faktor povysheniya konkurentosposobnosti predpriyatija. *Vestn. Volgogr. gos. un-ta, Ser. 3, Jekon. Jekol., № 1 (22)*, 155–161.
 25. Petrov, R.S. (2018). Stimulirovanie innovacionnoj aktivnosti v regione v uslovijah krizisa. Retrieved 2018, from <http://sun.tsu.ru/mminfo/000063105/335/image/335-124.pdf>
 26. Tovstenko, B.P. (2012). Faktory, vlijajushhie na innovacionnuju aktivnost' predpriyatija. *Rossijskij jekonomicheskij internet zhurnal, №2*, Retrieved 2018, from <http://www.e-rej.ru/Articles/2012/Tovstenko.pdf>
 27. Ershov, V.F. (2002). *Restrukturizacija proizvodstvennyh sistem v mashinostroenii*. SPb.: SPbGIIeU.
 28. Valeeva, E.O. (2005). *Upravlenie innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju turistskoj firmy*. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk: 08.00.05, SPb., p. 21.
 29. Makina, S.A., & Maksimova, E.N. (2010) Analiz faktorov, vlijajushhih na innovacionnuju aktivnost' rossijskih predpriyatij. *Audit i finansovyj analiz, №5*, 368–372.
 30. Vasil'ev, I.A. (2010). Metodicheskie voprosy jekonomicheskoy ocenki innovacionnoj aktivnosti generirujushhih predpriyatij jelektrojenergeticheskoy otrasli. *Mikrojekonomika, №1*, 47–51.
 31. Sidorenko, V.G. (2008). *Sovershenstvovanie upravlenija innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju organizacij v rossijskoj jekonomike*. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk: 08.00.05, Moscow, p. 17.
 32. Tokarev, B.E. (2014). Opređenje rynochnogo potenciala innovacionnogo produkta. *Marketing i marketingovyje issledovanija, №2*.
 33. Naumov, I.V. (2007). *Stanovlenie i mehanizm rosta innovacionnoj aktivnosti municipal'nyh obrazovanij*. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk : 08.00.05, Ekaterinburg, p.1-220.
 34. Skopina, I.V., Baklanova, J.O., & Skopin, A.O. (2006) Innovacionnaja aktivnost' kak pokazatel' jekonomicheskogo razvitija regiona. *Regional'naja jekonomika i upravlenie: jelektronnyj nauchnyj zhurnal, № 31*, Retrieved 2006, from <http://region.mcniip.ru/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=89>
 35. Shelomencev, A.G., & Doroshenko, S.V. (2012). Innovacionnye formy razvitija slaboosvoennyh territorij Rossii. *Korporativnoe upravlenie i innovacionnoe razvitie Severa: Vestnik Nauchno-issledovatel'skogo centra korporativnogo prava, upravlenija i venchurnogo investirovaniya Syktyvkar'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, № 2*, p. 12.
 36. Malysheva, L.A., & Shestakov, I.V. (2012). Analiz podhodov k ocenke innovacionnoj aktivnosti rossijskih predpriyatij. *Vestnik PNIPU, Social'no-jekonomicheskie nauki, № 14 (38)*, p. 101.
 37. Kurpayanidi, K., Muminova, E., & Paygamov, R. (2016). *Management of innovative activity on industrial corporations*. Monograph. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing. Germany.
 38. Sidorenko, V.G. (2008). *Sovershenstvovanie upravlenija innovacionnoj aktivnost'ju organizacij v rossijskoj jekonomike*. dis. ... kand. jekon. nauk: 08.00.05, Moscow, p. 17.
 39. In-t jekonomiki UrO RAN (2013). *Ot samoorganizacii k samorazvitiju: smena paradigmy menedzhmenta*. monografija. pod nauch. red. S.V. Komarova, predisl. akad. A. I. Tatar'kina, Ekaterinburg, pp.1-257.
 40. Popov E.V., & Hmel'kova N.V. (2003). Sistemno-integracionnye osnovanija rutinnosti funkcionirovanija predpriyatija: jevoljucionnyj aspekt. Preprint, Ekaterinburg, *Institut jekonomiki RAN*, p. 4.
 41. Morozova, J.P. (2000). Tehnologicheskie innovacii i ih rol' v sovremennyh jekonomicheskikh uslovijah Rossii. *Innovacii, № 1, 2*, 59-62.
 42. Romanova, O.A., Grebenkin, A.V., & Akberdina, V.V. (2011) Nelinejnye modeli innovacionnogo rosta i uslovija samorazvitija otkrytyh sistem. *Jekonomicheskaja nauka sovremennoj Rossii, №1*, 7-19.
 43. Gupta, S., & Lemann, D. (2007). «Zolotyje» pokupateli. *Stojat li klienty teh deneg, chto ya na nih tratite?* per. s angl. SPb.: Piter, p. 11.
 44. Makdonal'd, M. (2012). Izmerenie jeffektivnosti marketinga. *Sovershenstvovanie otchetnosti o rashodah. Marketing i marketingovyje issledovanija, №3*, 182-201.
 45. Dan'ko, T.P., & Kitova, O.V. (2008). Sistema upravlenija jeffektivnost'ju marketinga. *Marketing i marketingovyje issledovanija, № 5 (77)*, p.364.
 46. Hamel, G., & Prahalad, K.K. (2002). *Konkuriruja za budushhee. Sozdanie ryнков zavtrashnego dnja*. Moscow, ZAO «Olimp-Biznes».
 47. Tambovcev, V.L. (2011). Issledovatel'skaja programma «strategija kak praktika» v



Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 1.344	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 4.102	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	

- izuchenii strategicheskogo menedzhmenta. *Rossijskij zhurnal menedzhmenta*, № 4.
48. Kaplan, R., & Norton, D. (2010). *Nagrada za blestjashhuju realizaciju strategii. Svjaz' strategii i operacionnoj dejatel'nosti – garantija konkurentnogo preimushhestva*. M.: Olimp-Biznes.
49. Ansoff, I. (1989). *Strategicheskoe upravlenie*. M., Jekonomika, pp.1-358.
50. Praisner, A. (2009). *Sbalansirovannaja sistema pokazatelej v marketinge i sbyte*. M.: «Izdatel'skij dom «Grebennikov», p. 42.
51. Dan'ko, T.P., & Kitova, O.V. (2008). Sistema upravlenija jeffektivnost'ju marketinga. *Marketing i marketingovyje issledovanija*, № 5 (77), p. 364.
52. Avramenko, N.G. (2008). Mesto i rol' sbalansirovannoj sistemy pokazatelej v sisteme upravlenija strategiej. *Marketing v Rossi i za rubezhom*, №6.
53. Pytkin, A.N., & Ponosova, E.V. (2012). Kljuchevyje napravlenija primenenija teorii upravlenija v menedzhmente promyshlennyh predpriyatij. *Vestnik Cheljabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, № 24 (278), 79-82.
54. Ojner, O.K. (2013). *Upravlenie rezul'tativnost'ju marketinga: ucheb. dlja magistrov*. M.: Jurajt, pp.1-343.
55. Kotter, D. (2012, Dec.). Otlichnaja ideja. Uskorjajtes! *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 40-54.
56. Ansoff, I. (1999). *Novaja korporativnaja strategija*. - SPb: Piter, p. 348.
57. Shul'c, D.N. (2011). Ierarhicheskaja jekonomika: analiz urovnej i mezhurovnevnyh svjazej. *Izvestija Rossijskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im. A.I. Gercena*, №130.
58. Popov, E.V. (2005). *Instituty minijekonomiki*. M.: Jekonomika, pp.1-638.
59. Perm. nac. issled. politehn. un-t (2011) Ierahicheskij analiz social'no-jekonomicheskikh sistem: podhody, modeli, prilozhenija: monogr. v 2 ch. pod obshh. red. d-ra jekon. nauk, prof. Ju.K. Perskogo, Perm', *Izd-vo Perm. nac. issled. politehn. un-ta*, Ch. 1. - pp. 35-36.

