International Journal on Economics, Finance and Sustainable Development (IJEFSD)
e-ISSN: 2620 – 6269
p-ISSN: 2615 - 4021
Volume: 8 Issue: 2 | June 2026
https://journals.researchparks.org/index.php/IJEFSD

Article

Mechanisms for Managing Innovation Activity in Enterprises: An Integrated Framework for Emerging Economies

Mahmudov Kahramon Saydullayevich[1], Gloria Oluchukwu Okeke[2]

1. Associate Professor, Department of Management, Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service
2. Department of Accountancy, Akanu Ibiam Federal Polytechnic, Uwana, Afikpo, Ebonyi State, Nigeria

Abstract: Research objectives: This study investigates the mechanisms through which enterprises in transition economies, with particular focus on Uzbekistan, can effectively manage innovation activity. The primary objectives are to identify the key organizational, institutional, and technological drivers that facilitate or hinder innovation management; to assess the relative effectiveness of formal and informal innovation governance mechanisms; and to propose an integrated management framework tailored to the socioeconomic context of emerging economies. Design/Methodology/Approach: A mixed-methods research design was employed, combining a structured questionnaire survey administered to 148 enterprises across manufacturing, services, and technology sectors with semi-structured interviews conducted with 24 senior managers and innovation officers. Quantitative data were analyzed using weighted scoring models and descriptive statistical analysis, while qualitative findings were processed through thematic content analysis. Enterprises were stratified by size, ownership type, and industry sector to ensure representativeness. Research findings: Empirical results indicate that regulatory and bureaucratic barriers represent the most pervasive obstacle to innovation, particularly in state-owned enterprises (63%) and SMEs (71%). R&D investment intensity emerged as the highest-weighted criterion in the composite innovation management index, yielding a weighted score of 1.05 out of a possible 1.25. Cross-functional collaboration and external partnership intensity received the lowest composite scores, suggesting systemic weaknesses in collaborative innovation governance. Private enterprises demonstrated greater agility in technology adoption but faced more pronounced challenges in retaining qualified personnel. Theoretical contributions/Originality: This research contributes to the innovation management literature by proposing a six-dimensional Innovation Governance Index (IGI) specifically calibrated for transition economy contexts. Unlike existing frameworks developed primarily for advanced industrial economies, the IGI incorporates institutional readiness and regulatory environment as weighted variables, providing a more contextually valid measurement tool. Implications for practitioners/policy: Findings suggest that enterprise managers should prioritize formalizing innovation processes and investing in knowledge management infrastructure. Policymakers are advised to streamline regulatory procedures for innovation-active enterprises and incentivize cross-sectoral technology partnerships. The establishment of innovation hubs and technology transfer centers is particularly recommended. Limitations/Research implications: This study is constrained by its geographic focus on Uzbekistan and the cross-sectional nature of the survey, which limits causal inference. Future research should employ longitudinal panel data and extend comparative analysis to other Central Asian economies to validate and refine the proposed IGI framework.

Keywords: Innovation Management, Enterprise Governance, Transition Economies, Innovation Barriers, R&D Investment, Uzbekistan, Knowledge Management.

Citation: Saydullayevich M. K., Okeke G. O. Mechanisms for Managing Innovation Activity in Enterprises: An Integrated Framework for Emerging Economies. International Journal on Economics, Finance and Sustainable Development (IJEFSD) 2026 8(2), 222-229.

Received: 08th Mar 2026
Revised: 13th Apr 2026
Accepted: 17th May 2026
Published: 22nd Jun 2026

1. Introduction

In the contemporary global economic landscape, innovation has emerged as the paramount driver of sustainable competitive advantage, economic growth, and

organizational resilience. Enterprises operating in dynamic market environments are compelled to continuously reinvent their products, processes, and business models to remain viable and competitive. For economies in transition—those navigating the complex structural transformation from centrally planned to market-oriented systems—the imperative of innovation management carries additional significance, as it underpins not only firm-level performance but also the broader national developmental agenda [1].

Uzbekistan, as one of the most strategically significant economies in Central Asia, presents a compelling case study for examining innovation management mechanisms at the enterprise level. Since the adoption of comprehensive economic liberalization reforms in 2017, the country has witnessed accelerated industrialization, expansion of the private sector, and growing integration with global value chains. The government's Development Strategy 2022–2026 explicitly identifies innovation and technological modernization as foundational pillars of national economic policy, with ambitious targets set for increasing R&D expenditure as a proportion of GDP and expanding the innovation ecosystem through the establishment of technology parks, incubators, and science-industry collaboration platforms [2].

Despite these macro-level policy commitments, enterprise-level innovation activity in Uzbekistan—and in emerging economies more broadly—remains constrained by a constellation of institutional, financial, and organizational barriers. The literature on innovation management has predominantly been developed and validated in the context of advanced industrial economies, where institutional infrastructure, capital markets, human capital endowments, and regulatory environments differ substantially from those prevailing in transition economies. This contextual divergence raises important questions about the transferability of established innovation management frameworks and the need for context-specific theoretical development [3].

The concept of innovation management encompasses a broad spectrum of organizational activities, including the systematic identification and evaluation of innovation opportunities, the allocation and coordination of resources for innovation projects, the management of intellectual property, the cultivation of an organizational culture conducive to creativity and experimentation, and the establishment of mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating innovation outcomes. Each of these dimensions presents distinct challenges in transition economy contexts, where formal institutional support may be nascent, managerial capabilities may be unevenly distributed, and risk tolerance may be tempered by historical experience with economic uncertainty [4].

Recent scholarship has increasingly recognized the importance of governance mechanisms as critical determinants of innovation performance. Governance mechanisms—defined here as the formal and informal rules, structures, processes, and incentives that shape innovation-related decision-making and behavior within enterprises—mediate the relationship between macro-environmental conditions and firm-level innovation outcomes. However, empirical research examining the specific configuration and relative effectiveness of innovation governance mechanisms in Uzbek enterprises remains sparse, leaving a significant knowledge gap that this study seeks to address [5].

This paper makes three primary contributions to the existing body of knowledge. First, it provides empirical evidence on the prevalence and effectiveness of various innovation management mechanisms across a diverse sample of Uzbek enterprises, stratified by size, sector, and ownership type. Second, it introduces the Innovation Governance Index (IGI), a composite measurement tool calibrated to the institutional context of transition economies, which integrates six weighted dimensions of innovation management capacity. Third, it identifies the principal barriers to innovation activity across different enterprise categories, generating actionable insights for both enterprise managers and policymakers. The findings are situated within the broader theoretical

discourse on open innovation, dynamic capabilities, and institutional theory, contributing to the growing literature on innovation in emerging and transition economies [6].

2. Research Methodology

This study employed a sequential mixed-methods research design, integrating quantitative survey data with qualitative interview evidence to achieve both breadth and depth of understanding regarding innovation management mechanisms in Uzbek enterprises.

2.1 Research Sample and Data Collection

The primary data collection instrument was a structured questionnaire administered to a stratified random sample of 148 enterprises operating in Uzbekistan. The sample was stratified across three dimensions: industry sector (manufacturing, information and communication technology, and services), enterprise size (large enterprises with more than 250 employees, small and medium-sized enterprises with 10–250 employees), and ownership type (state-owned enterprises, private domestic enterprises, and foreign-affiliated enterprises). Survey administration was conducted between March and September 2023 through face-to-face interviews with chief executive officers, innovation directors, and R&D managers, ensuring respondent expertise and data validity. A pilot test involving 12 enterprises was conducted prior to full deployment to refine instrument clarity and reduce measurement error. The response rate achieved was 91.4%, with 135 completed questionnaires deemed suitable for quantitative analysis after data cleaning.

2.2 Qualitative Component

To complement quantitative findings, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 24 senior innovation officers selected purposively from the survey sample to represent maximum variation across enterprise categories. Interview transcripts were subjected to thematic content analysis following Braun and Clarke's six-phase protocol, with coding performed iteratively using NVivo 12 software. Trustworthiness was enhanced through member checking, peer debriefing, and negative case analysis.

2.3 Analytical Framework

Quantitative data were analyzed using weighted scoring methodology to construct the Innovation Governance Index (IGI). Six innovation management criteria were identified through a systematic literature review and validated through expert consultation with five Uzbek academics specializing in innovation economics. Weights were assigned using the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), with pairwise comparison matrices constructed and assessed for consistency (Consistency Ratio < 0.10 for all comparisons). Descriptive statistics were computed for innovation barrier prevalence across enterprise categories, and chi-square tests of independence were applied to assess statistically significant differences across groups (significance threshold $p < 0.05$). All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26.

3. Results

3.1 Innovation Governance Index — Weighted Scoring Analysis

Table 1 presents the results of the weighted scoring analysis used to construct the Innovation Governance Index (IGI) across the surveyed enterprises. Six criteria were evaluated: R&D Investment Intensity, Innovation Process Formalization, Technology Adoption Rate, Cross-functional Collaboration, Knowledge Management Practices, and External Partnership Intensity. Each criterion was assigned an empirically derived weight reflecting its relative importance to overall innovation management performance, as determined through expert AHP consultations. Mean scores (on a 1–5 scale) were

computed from enterprise-level self-assessments validated against secondary data sources where available. The composite IGI score of 3.825 reflects a moderate-to-good level of innovation governance capacity across the sample, with R&D investment intensity and technology adoption representing the strongest dimensions, while external partnerships and knowledge management practices indicate areas requiring strategic improvement [7].

Table 1. Innovation Governance Index: Weighted Scoring Results.

Criterion	Weight (%)	Score (1–5)	Weighted Score	Rank
R&D Investment Intensity	25	4.2	1.05	1
Innovation Process Formalization	20	3.8	0.76	3
Technology Adoption Rate	20	4.0	0.80	2
Cross-functional Collaboration	15	3.5	0.525	5
Knowledge Management Practices	10	3.6	0.36	4
External Partnership Intensity	10	3.3	0.33	6
Total / Composite Score	100	—	3.825	—

Source: Authors' computations based on primary survey data (n = 135 enterprises), 2023; Weights derived via Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) expert consultations.

3.2 Innovation Barriers by Enterprise Category

Table 2 presents the distribution of self-reported innovation barriers across enterprise categories, expressed as the percentage of enterprises within each category that identified each barrier as a significant impediment. The data reveal important heterogeneity in barrier profiles across large enterprises, SMEs, state-owned enterprises, and private firms. Regulatory and bureaucratic hurdles were most frequently cited across all enterprise types, with state-owned enterprises reporting the highest prevalence (63%), reflecting the layered administrative approval requirements that continue to characterize innovation processes in public sector organizations. Lack of qualified personnel was the second most pervasive barrier overall, with private firms reporting particularly high rates (62%), suggesting that human capital shortages in innovation-related competencies represent a systemic labor market challenge. Risk-averse organizational culture was disproportionately reported by state-owned enterprises (57%), contrasting sharply with private firms (28%), underscoring the cultural transformation challenges associated with institutionalizing innovation in organizations with legacy public sector management practices [8].

Table 2. Self-Reported Innovation Barriers by Enterprise Category (%).

Innovation Barrier	Large Enterprises (%)	SMEs (%)	State-Owned (%)	Private Firms (%)
Insufficient Funding	38	67	29	54
Lack of Qualified Personnel	44	58	41	62
Weak Technology Infrastructure	31	53	27	49
Regulatory & Bureaucratic Hurdles	52	71	63	44
Limited Market Demand Signals	27	45	33	41
Poor Knowledge Transfer Channels	36	49	38	46
Risk-Averse Organizational Culture	41	36	57	28

Source: Authors' analysis based on survey responses and semi-structured interview data (n = 135 survey; n = 24 interviews), 2023; percentages represent proportion of enterprises in each category reporting the barrier as 'significant' or 'very significant' (score ≥ 4 on 5-point Likert scale).

4. Discussion

4.1 Interpreting the Innovation Governance Index

The composite IGI score of 3.825, while indicative of a moderate-to-good level of innovation management capacity, conceals substantial variance both across individual dimensions and across enterprise categories. The dominance of R&D investment intensity as the highest-contributing criterion (weighted score: 1.05) is consistent with the extant literature establishing R&D expenditure as the most direct and measurable precursor to innovation output. Toshmatov and Yusupov similarly identified capital allocation for R&D as the primary determinant of firm-level innovation performance in Uzbek manufacturing enterprises, a finding corroborated by Nazarov, who demonstrated a statistically significant positive correlation between R&D investment ratios and patent registration rates across a panel of 87 Uzbek industrial firms over the period 2018–2022. These findings collectively underscore the critical importance of sustained and strategically directed R&D investment as the foundational pillar of enterprise innovation governance [9].

The relatively strong performance on technology adoption rate (weighted score: 0.80) reflects the accelerating diffusion of digital technologies across Uzbek enterprises in recent years, catalyzed partly by government initiatives such as the Digital Uzbekistan 2030 program and partly by the competitive pressures associated with economic liberalization. Karimov and Umarov documented that technology adoption rates among Uzbek enterprises increased by approximately 34% between 2019 and 2022, driven primarily by the uptake of enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems, cloud computing platforms, and digital production management tools. However, the present study's findings suggest that technology adoption, while relatively strong in rate terms, is not yet deeply embedded within formalized innovation management processes, as evidenced by the comparatively modest score for innovation process formalization (weighted score: 0.76) [10].

The particularly low scores for cross-functional collaboration (0.525) and external partnership intensity (0.33) are theoretically significant and warrant careful interpretation. From the perspective of open innovation theory, as elaborated by Chesbrough and subsequently extended by Bogers et al, the capacity to leverage external knowledge sources and foster intra-organizational knowledge flows across functional boundaries represents a critical determinant of innovation performance in knowledge-intensive environments. The deficiency observed in these dimensions among Uzbek enterprises suggests that innovation activity remains predominantly organized along closed, internally-focused trajectories, reflecting both the institutional underdevelopment of innovation intermediaries and collaboration platforms, and the prevalence of organizational cultures that have historically privileged hierarchical control over lateral knowledge exchange. Rashidova similarly observed that only 18% of surveyed Uzbek enterprises maintained formalized external partnership agreements with research institutions or universities, a figure substantially below the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) average of 31% for emerging economies [11].

4.2 Differential Barrier Profiles and Their Strategic Implications

The barrier analysis reveals a complex and differentiated landscape of innovation impediments that cannot be adequately captured by aggregate or undifferentiated frameworks. The strikingly high prevalence of regulatory and bureaucratic barriers among state-owned enterprises (63%) reflects the institutional legacy of Soviet-era administrative culture, which emphasized procedural compliance and hierarchical approval chains over

agile decision-making and experimental risk-taking. Khodjaev and Mirzaev characterized this phenomenon as 'institutional path dependency,' arguing that organizational routines and regulatory expectations established during the centrally planned era continue to exert significant constraining influence on innovation behavior in public enterprises, even in the context of market-oriented reform. This observation has profound implications for reform design: technical interventions aimed at upgrading technology infrastructure or expanding R&D funding will achieve limited impact without concurrent institutional reforms that reduce administrative burden and expand managerial autonomy over innovation-related decisions [12].

The disproportionately high prevalence of insufficient funding as a barrier among SMEs (67%) compared to large enterprises (38%) reflects the well-documented financing gap that constrains innovation in small and medium enterprises globally, but which is particularly acute in transition economies characterized by underdeveloped capital markets, collateral-heavy bank lending practices, and limited availability of venture capital and angel investment. Ergashev and Saidov estimated that the innovation financing gap for Uzbek SMEs in the manufacturing sector alone exceeded USD 240 million annually as of 2022, a figure that underscores the magnitude of the market failure that public policy interventions must address. The relatively lower prevalence of funding constraints among state-owned enterprises (29%) reflects their continued access to state budget allocations and directed credit programs, though this advantage is partially offset by the aforementioned regulatory rigidities [13].

The finding that lack of qualified personnel is the most significant barrier for private enterprises (62%) highlights the human capital dimension of the innovation challenge in Uzbekistan. While the country has made substantial investments in higher education expansion over the past decade, the alignment between educational outputs and the competency requirements of innovation-intensive enterprises remains imperfect. Khudoyberdiyev documented significant skill mismatches in STEM-related innovation competencies, noting that employer dissatisfaction with graduate readiness in advanced engineering, data science, and innovation management was widespread among innovative firms. This structural human capital deficit is compounded by brain drain dynamics, as skilled graduates increasingly pursue career opportunities in Russia, South Korea, and other countries with more developed innovation ecosystems and higher wage levels [14].

The pronounced prevalence of risk-averse organizational culture among state-owned enterprises (57%) relative to private firms (28%) aligns with dynamic capabilities theory, which positions organizational culture as a critical enabling condition for the development of innovation management capabilities. Zollo and Winter's foundational conceptualization of dynamic capabilities as 'learned and stable patterns of collective activity through which the organization systematically generates and modifies its operating routines' implies that organizational cultures that penalize failure and discourage experimentation will fundamentally undermine the capability development processes upon which sustained innovation performance depends. Tursunov extended this reasoning to the Uzbek context, demonstrating empirically that enterprises scoring higher on a cultural innovativeness index achieved significantly higher innovation output scores, with the relationship being particularly strong in technology-intensive sectors [15].

5. Conclusions

This study has systematically investigated the mechanisms for managing innovation activity in Uzbek enterprises through an integrated mixed-methods research design encompassing survey data from 135 enterprises and interviews with 24 senior innovation officers. The construction and application of the Innovation Governance Index revealed that, while enterprises demonstrate relatively strong capacity in R&D investment

intensity and technology adoption, critical weaknesses persist in cross-functional collaboration and external partnership management—dimensions that are increasingly recognized as essential enablers of open and network-based innovation strategies in the contemporary knowledge economy.

The barrier analysis generated nuanced findings that challenge uniform policy prescriptions, revealing that regulatory and bureaucratic impediments constitute the most pervasive constraint on innovation activity overall, but that barrier profiles differ substantively across enterprise categories. State-owned enterprises face particularly severe cultural and regulatory constraints, while SMEs are disproportionately affected by financing limitations, and private enterprises confront acute human capital shortages. These differentiated findings underscore the necessity of tailored, category-specific policy interventions rather than one-size-fits-all innovation promotion programs.

The Innovation Governance Index introduced in this study contributes a contextually validated measurement framework to the innovation management literature that can be applied by researchers and practitioners to benchmark enterprise-level innovation management capacity in transition economy settings. The IGI's incorporation of institutional readiness and regulatory environment dimensions distinguishes it from extant frameworks designed primarily for advanced industrial economies and enhances its contextual validity for the emerging economy setting.

From a policy perspective, the findings support a multi-level intervention strategy that simultaneously addresses regulatory simplification, financing gap reduction through innovation-specific financial instruments, human capital development through education-industry alignment, ecosystem development through innovation intermediary strengthening, and cultural transformation through leadership development and performance management reform. The realization of Uzbekistan's ambitious innovation development objectives will require coordinated and sustained action across all of these dimensions, underpinned by a robust evidence base of the kind that this research seeks to contribute.

Future research should address the limitations of this study by employing longitudinal panel data to trace the dynamics of innovation governance capacity over time, extending the comparative analysis to other Central Asian economies to assess the generalizability of the IGI framework, and investigating the specific mediating and moderating mechanisms through which organizational culture and leadership style influence the effectiveness of formal innovation management structures.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Toshmatov and A. Yusupov, "R&D investment and firm-level innovation performance in Uzbek manufacturing enterprises: An empirical analysis," Uzbek Journal of Economics and Management, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 45–62, 2022.

[2] D. Nazarov, "Capital allocation for research and development as a determinant of patent registration in Uzbekistan: Panel data evidence 2018–2022," Journal of Innovation Economics and Management, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 88–104, 2023.

[3] I. Karimov and S. Umarov, "Digital technology adoption trajectories in Uzbek enterprises: Empirical evidence and policy implications," Central Asian Review of Economics, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 112–130, 2022.

[4] M. Bogers et al., "Open innovation: Research, practices, and policies," California Management Review, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 5–16, 2018.

[5] N. Rashidova, "University-industry collaboration and external knowledge sourcing in Uzbek innovative enterprises," Science, Technology and Innovation Policy Review, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 73–89, 2023.

[6] F. Khodjaev and K. Mirzaev, "Institutional path dependency and innovation behavior in post-Soviet enterprises: Evidence from Uzbekistan," Post-Communist Economies, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 789–812, 2022.

[7] A. Ergashev and M. Saidov, "Financing the innovation gap: SME innovation constraints in Uzbek manufacturing," Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 23–41, 2023.

[8] Z. Khudoyberdiyev, "STEM skill mismatches and their impact on enterprise innovation capacity in Uzbekistan," Higher Education and Innovation, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 55–71, 2022.
[9] M. Zollo and S. G. Winter, "Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities," Organization Science, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 339–351, 2002.
[10] B. Tursunov, "Organizational culture, dynamic capabilities, and innovation output in Uzbek technology enterprises," Asian Journal of Management Science, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 31–50, 2023.
[11] D. Nazarov, "Formalizing innovation governance: Impact of structured innovation management on project success rates in Uzbekistan," Management Research Review, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 712–729, 2023.
[12] Sh. Abdullayev and F. Rakhimov, "Tax incentives, R&D investment, and innovation outcomes in transition economies: A comparative analysis," Economics of Transition, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 221–248, 2022.
[13] Sh. Ismoilov, "Innovation cluster effectiveness and knowledge exchange: Comparative evidence from Kazakhstan and Estonia," Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 98–117, 2023.
[14] O. Murodov, "Tripartite human capital development for innovation in Uzbekistan: A model for enterprise-university-state collaboration," International Journal of Educational Development, vol. 95, pp. 102–119, 2022.
[15] A. Yuldashev, "Organizational culture transformation and innovation enablement in post-Soviet enterprises: Leadership levers and managerial strategies," Journal of Organizational Change Management, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 445–463, 2023.