



---

, , [11]. -  
 .  
 [9] , -  
 .  
 .  
 -  
 , -  
 .  
 [5-7], -  
 [12], -  
 , -  
 .  
 , , -  
 , ,  
 , -  
 , -  
 .  
 , ,  
 . . . [1] -  
 ( ) , -  
 , -  
 - , -  
 , -  
 .  
 , -  
 , -  
 , -  
 , -  
 [8], -



), ,

), 2. ( -

, -

, -

1 .3 , -

« - ») 2012–2014 ., ( -

11 814 , -

1 . 2012–2014 . -

, 1 . -

, , « » -

, -

---

<sup>2</sup> : *Innovation impacts: measurement and assessment*. Council of Canadian Academies. – URL: [http://www.scienceadvice.ca/uploads/eng/assessments%20and%20publications%20and%20news%20releases/ontario\\_inno/roi\\_fultreparten.pdf](http://www.scienceadvice.ca/uploads/eng/assessments%20and%20publications%20and%20news%20releases/ontario_inno/roi_fultreparten.pdf) .

<sup>3</sup>

2 . 2015 . ( . 1 .

13 . 2015 . 702),

---

|  |     |   |     |   |        |
|--|-----|---|-----|---|--------|
|  | 1   |   |     |   | -      |
|  | ,   |   |     |   | -      |
|  |     | , |     | , | .      |
|  |     |   |     | . | -      |
|  | ,   |   |     | , | -      |
|  |     |   |     | , | -      |
|  |     |   |     | . | -      |
|  | 1,7 |   | 1,3 | , | -      |
|  |     |   |     | . | -      |
|  |     |   |     | , | -      |
|  |     |   |     | ( | -      |
|  |     |   |     | ) | -      |
|  |     |   |     | , | 2013 . |
|  |     |   |     | , | 2014 . |
|  |     |   |     | , | -      |
|  |     |   |     | , | 2012 . |
|  |     |   |     | . | -      |
|  |     |   |     | , | -      |
|  |     |   |     | , | -      |
|  | .1  |   |     | , | -      |
|  |     |   |     | . | -      |
|  |     |   |     | ( | -      |
|  |     |   |     | . | -      |
|  |     |   |     | , | -      |
|  |     |   | )   | , | -      |
|  |     |   | .   | , | -      |
|  |     |   | (   | ) | -      |
|  |     |   |     | , | -      |
|  |     |   |     | . | -      |

| Регион             | Затраты на технол. инновации, млн руб., 2014 | Доля иннов. продукции, %, 2014 | Иннов. активность, %, 2014 | Доминирующие отрасли, >10% ВРП в 2013   | Кол-во компаний в выборке | Средняя выручка, млн руб. |       |       |
|--------------------|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|
|                    |  |                                |                            |   |                           | 2012                      | 2013  | 2014  |
| Республика Алтай   | 468  | 0,2                            | 10,7                       | Государственное управление (19,3%), сельское хозяйство (17,6%), строительство (11,9%), образование (10,6%)          | 20                        | 4280                      | 2864  | 2984  |
| Республика Бурятия | 925  | 10,6                           | 8,5                        | Транспорт и связь (16,2%), торговля (14,1%), государственное управление (11,0%), машиностроение (10,2%)             | 18                        | 4176                      | 5175  | 5488  |
| Республика Хакасия | 4  | 0,0                            | 8,1                        | Торговля (13,5%), добыча полезных ископаемых (11,9%), производство и распределение эл. энергии, газа и воды (10,3%) | 14                        | 5732                      | 5985  | 6664  |
| Алтайский край     | 158  | 4,3                            | 11,4                       | Торговля (17,3%), сельское хозяйство (14,2%), операции с недвижимостью и предоставление услуг (11,9%)               | 64                        | 4160                      | 4236  | 4362  |
| Забайкальский край | 2654   | 7,3                            | 5,3                        | Транспорт и связь (23,1%), государственное управление (12,6%), торговля (11,2%), добыча полезных ископаемых (10,0%) | 17                        | 3310                      | 3608  | 3884  |
| Красноярский край  | 998  | 4,0                            | 9,3                        | Металлургия (17,9%), добыча полезных ископаемых (17,2%)   | 144                       | 9477                      | 10025 | 11212 |

| Регион             | Затраты на технол. инновац.ии, млн руб., 2014 | Доля иннов. продукции, %, 2014 | Иннов. активность, %, 2014 | Доминирующие отрасли, >10% ВРП в 2013  | Кол-во компаний в выборке | Средняя выручка, млн руб. |      |      |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|
|                    |   |                                |                            |  |                           | 2012                      | 2013 | 2014 |
| Иркутская обл.     | 84719   | 1,6                            | 6,4                        | Добыча полезных ископаемых (16,9%), транспорт и связь (15,1%), торговля (10,0%)  | 110                       | 6671                      | 7430 | 9180 |
| Кемеровская обл.   | 20985   | 1,6                            | 7,0                        | Добыча полезных ископаемых (22,3%), операции с недвижимостью и предоставление услуг (10,2%), торговля (10,1%)                          | 147                       | 7622                      | 7356 | 7728 |
| Новосибирская обл. | 1184  | 10,0                           | 9,7                        | Операции с недвижимостью и предоставление услуг (18,7%), транспорт и связь (17,2%), торговля (16,9%)                                   | 151                       | 5389                      | 6109 | 6199 |
| Омская обл.        | 4448  | 3,5                            | 8,2                        | Производство кокса и нефтепродуктов, химическое производство, производство резиновых и пластмассовых изделий (28,6%), торговля (13,3%) | 62                        | 5299                      | 5340 | 5575 |
| Томская обл.       | 26930   | 3,5                            | 13,7                       | Добыча полезных ископаемых (29,1%), операции с недвижимостью и предоставление услуг (12,1%), транспорт и связь (10,0%)                 | 67                        | 6531                      | 7211 | 7718 |

\*

\*\*



, - .  
 . : -  
 ' , -  
 Ó , -  
 . , -  
 , , -  
 , -  
 - ? -  
 , , : -  
 : , -  
 . -  
 , , -  
 . , -  
 . , -  
 , -  
 [12]. ( -  
 , ) , -  
 . -







, %

|      |       |       |  |      |       |      |  |
|------|-------|-------|--|------|-------|------|--|
|      |       | -     |  |      |       | -    |  |
| 2012 | 2,51  | 0,91  |  | 2012 | 28,42 | 2,48 |  |
| 2013 | 6,36  | 0,75  |  | 2013 | 20,85 | 2,92 |  |
| 2014 | 7,86  | 1,79  |  | 2014 | 15,86 | 2,83 |  |
| -    | 2     | 18    |  | -    | 55    | 55   |  |
| 2012 | 2,33  | 10,82 |  | 2012 | 9,09  | 7,24 |  |
| 2013 | 4,36  | 3,92  |  | 2013 | 1,62  | 4,58 |  |
| 2014 | 8,09  | 5,23  |  | 2014 | -4,85 | 0,05 |  |
| -    | 6     | 12    |  | -    | 67    | 80   |  |
| 2012 | 4,19  | 22,48 |  | 2012 | 9,51  | 1,96 |  |
| 2013 | 6,00  | 4,86  |  | 2013 | 7,51  | 2,43 |  |
| 2014 | 3,69  | 6,38  |  | 2014 | 5,47  | 3,04 |  |
| -    | 5     | 9     |  | -    | 75    | 76   |  |
| 2012 | 10,38 | 3,09  |  | 2012 | 8,02  | 2,63 |  |
| 2013 | 8,34  | 3,19  |  | 2013 | 4,80  | 3,06 |  |
| 2014 | 9,28  | 3,33  |  | 2014 | 6,82  | 4,03 |  |
| -    | 28    | 36    |  | -    | 29    | 33   |  |
| 2012 | 14,87 | 13,14 |  | 2012 | 8,21  | 4,23 |  |
| 2013 | 1,84  | 13,03 |  | 2013 | 7,26  | 2,44 |  |
| 2014 | -0,31 | 7,20  |  | 2014 | 8,03  | 5,86 |  |
| -    | 8     | 9     |  | -    | 32    | 35   |  |

|      |      |      |  |
|------|------|------|--|
|      |      | -    |  |
| 2012 | 9,62 | 2,96 |  |
| 2013 | 8,84 | 1,75 |  |
| 2014 | 5,26 | 2,40 |  |
| -    | 57   | 87   |  |

( 10%),

,

,

,

2014 .,

,

( )

3

|   | 2012–2014 |      |         |                                 |
|---|-----------|------|---------|---------------------------------|
|   | ·         | , %  | ·       |                                 |
|   | 1860,550  | 5,6  | 0,521   | (50%),<br>(50%)                 |
|   | 6480,160  | 4,9  | 215,504 | (50%)                           |
|   | 5167,273  | 9,3  | 2,537   | (32,1%),<br>(14,3%)             |
| - | 19714,217 | 7,9  | 61,771  | (21,1%),<br>(14,0%),<br>(10,5%) |
| . | 10885,625 | 21,7 | 23,401  | (21,8%),<br>(18,2%),<br>(9,1%)* |
| - | 8298,098  | 7,5  | 39,643  | (36,0%),<br>(14,7%),<br>(9,3%)  |
| . | 8004,724  | 6,5  | 18,697  | (24,1%),<br>(17,2%)             |
| . | 10219,325 | 7,8  | 5,342   | (18,8%),<br>(12,5%),<br>(9,4%)  |

\*



- 
1. *Asheim B.T., Cockburn I.* The anchor tenant hypothesis: Exploring the role of large, local, R&D intensive firms in regional innovation systems // *International Journal of Industrial Organization*. – 2012. – No. 2. – P. 19–28.
  2. *Asheim B.T., Coenen L.* Knowledge bases and regional innovation systems: Comparing Nordic clusters // *Research Policy*. – 2005. – No. 34 (8). – P. 1173–1190. – 2013. – No. 12. – P. 86–108.
  3. *Asheim B.T., Isaksen A.* Localisation, agglomeration and innovation: Towards regional innovation systems in Norway? // *European Planning Studies*. – 1997. – No. 5. – P. 299–330.
  4. *Agrawal A., Cockburn I.* The anchor tenant hypothesis: Exploring the role of large, local, R&D intensive firms in regional innovation systems // *International Journal of Industrial Organization*. – 2003. – No. 21. – P. 1227–1253.
  5. *Asheim B., Gertler M.S.* The geography of innovation: Regional innovation systems // *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation* / Ed. by J. Fagerberg, D.C. Mowery, R.R. Nelson. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. – P. 291–318.
  6. *Asheim B.T., Coenen L.* Knowledge bases and regional innovation systems: Comparing Nordic clusters // *Research Policy*. – 2005. – No. 34 (8). – P. 1173–1190.
  7. *Asheim B.T., Isaksen A.* Localisation, agglomeration and innovation: Towards regional innovation systems in Norway? // *European Planning Studies*. – 1997. – No. 5. – P. 299–330.
  8. *Audretsch D.* *Innovation and Industry Evolution*. – Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995.
  9. *Feldman M.* The new economics of innovation, spillover and agglomeration: review of empirical studies // *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. – 1999. – No. 8 (1-2). – P. 5–25.
  10. *Feldman M.P.* The location dynamics of the US biotech industry: Knowledge externalities and the anchor hypothesis // *Industry & Innovation*. – 2003. – No. 10 (3). – P. 311–328.
  11. *Freeman C.* A Schumpeterian renaissance? / SPRU Electronic Working Paper Series. 2003. – URL: <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=sewp102&site=25> (28.04.2009).
  12. *Malerba F.* Sectoral systems of innovation: how and why innovation differs across sectors // *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation* / Ed by J. Fagerberg, D.C. Mowery, R.R. Nelson. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. – P. 380–406.

( , ) –  
 (630090,  
 , 17, e-mail: [sophiakh@academ.org](mailto:sophiakh@academ.org));

---

(630090, , . , 2).

DOI: 10.15372/REG20170210

*Region: Economics & Sociology, 2017, No. 2 (94), p. 210–228*

**S.R. Khalimova**

**ESTIMATING RELATION BETWEEN INNOVATIVE  
DEVELOPMENT OF LARGE COMPANIES  
AND THEIR EFFICIENCY**

*The article analyzes the development of large companies in Siberian regions as elements of regional innovation systems, on the one hand, and as elements of sectoral innovation systems, on the other. It evaluates the interrelation between the companies' innovation activity and their operational efficiency. We test a hypothesis that innovative companies are more efficient than non-innovative ones. Characteristics related to the innovative development of large companies are partially responsible for their performance: only intra-innovation environment plays an important role, while neither regional nor sectoral innovation environments determine the efficiency of large companies. Such companies may consider innovation activity as a means to improve performance, although they are poorly integrated into regional and sectoral innovation systems.*

**Keywords:** large companies; innovation; region; sector; innovative development; efficiency

*The publication is prepared within the framework of the project No. 17-02-00221 supported by funding from the Russian Foundation for Humanities*

**References**

1. Golichenko, O.G. & Yu.E. Balycheva. (2012). Tipichnye modeli innovatsionnogo povedeniya predpriyatii [The typical models of innovation behaviour of enterprises]. *Innovatsii [Innovations]*, 2, 19–28.
2. Kuznetsova, T. & V. Roud. (2013). Konkurentsia, innovatsii i strategii razvitiya Rossiyskikh predpriyatii (rezultaty empiricheskikh issledovaniy) [Competition, innovation in Russian enterprises (results of empirical studies)].

---

tion and strategy: Empirical evidence from Russian enterprises]. *Voprosy ekonomiki* [Problems of Economics], 12, 86–108.

3. *Kurakova, N.G., V.G. Zinov, O.I. Kupriyanova & A.V. Sorokina.* (2014). Vliyanie krupnykh promyshlennykh kompaniy na sektor generatsii fundamentalnogo znaniya [Effect of large industrial enterprises on the sector of generation of fundamental knowledge]. *Innovatsii* [Innovations], 7, 99–104.

4. *Agarwal, A. & I. Cockburn.* (2003). The anchor tenant hypothesis: Exploring the role of large, local, R&D intensive firms in regional innovation systems. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 21, 1227–1253.

5. *Asheim, B., M.S. Gertler, J. Fagerberg, D.C. Mowery & R.R. Nelson* (Eds.). (2005). The geography of innovation: Regional innovation systems. *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 291–318.

6. *Asheim, B.T. & L. Coenen.* (2005). Knowledge bases and regional innovation systems: Comparing Nordic clusters. *Research Policy*, 34 (8), 1173–1190.

7. *Asheim, B.T. & A. Isaksen.* (1997). Localisation, agglomeration and innovation: Towards regional innovation systems in Norway? *European Planning Studies*, 5, 299–330.

8. *Audretsch, D.* (1995). *Innovation and Industry Evolution*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

9. *Feldman, M.* (1999). The new economics of innovation, spillover and agglomeration: review of empirical studies. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 8 (1-2), 5–25.

10. *Feldman, M.P.* (2003). The location dynamics of the US biotech industry: Knowledge externalities and the anchor hypothesis. *Industry & Innovation*, 10 (3), 311–328.

11. *Freeman, C.* (2003). A Schumpeterian renaissance? SPRU Electronic Working Paper Series. Available at: <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=sewp102&site=25> (date of access: 28.04.2009).

12. *Malerba, F.; J. Fagerberg, D.C. Mowery & R.R. Nelson* (Eds.). (2005). Sectoral systems of innovation: how and why innovation differs across sectors. *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 380–406.

### **Information about the author**

*Khalimova, Sophia Raisovna* (Novosibirsk, Russia) – Candidate of Sciences (Economics), Researcher at the Institute of Economics and Industrial Engineering, Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (17, Ac. Lavrentiev av., Novosibirsk, 630090, Russia, e-mail: [sophiakh@academ.org](mailto:sophiakh@academ.org)); Assistant at Novosibirsk National Research State University (2, Pirogova st., Novosibirsk, 630090).

03.04.2017 .

© . . ., 2017