IRSTI 06.71.05 DOI:https://doi.org/10.55871/2072-9847-2025-69-4-252-261

Bekmukhametova A.B.
PhD in Economics
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University
Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan
e-mail: sultasem@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-1540-6973

Chitanova S.O.
PhD in Economics, Associate Professor
Abylai Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages
Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan
e-mail: sister1979@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-5776-1666

Abzhatova A.K.*
Master of Economics
Rudny Industrial Institute
Rudny, Republic of Kazakhstan
e-mail: aida_8424@mail.ru
ORCID: 0009-0005-2213-9956

FOREIGN EXPERIENCE IN STIMULATING ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN THE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Abstract. The development of the manufacturing industry is a key focus of economic policy in many countries striving for technological independence and sustainable growth. Under current conditions, Kazakhstan is also implementing an industrialization strategy, with particular emphasis on supporting entrepreneurial entities in the production sector. The aim of this article is to analyze international experience in promoting entrepreneurial activity in the manufacturing industry and to identify the potential for adapting these approaches to the socio-economic context of Kazakhstan.

The study examines approaches applied in the United States, Canada, South Korea, and Russia. Special attention is given to such support instruments as tax incentives, concessional financing, subsidies, innovation and cluster programs, production digitalization, and infrastructure development for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). A comparative analysis of the effectiveness of these measures is conducted, and practices with potential applicability to the Kazakhstani context are highlighted. The article substantiates the need for institutional strengthening, regional differentiation of support measures, and enhanced cooperation among business, science, and government.

The findings of the study can be used in the development of state programs for entrepreneurship support, industrial development strategies, and import substitution mechanisms in the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Keywords: entrepreneurship, manufacturing industry, stimulation, support instruments, government support

INTRODUCTION

In the context of sustainable economic growth and technological advancement, the manufacturing industry plays a crucial role as a foundation for generating added value, ensuring employment, and enhancing a country's innovation potential. Accordingly, the support and stimulation of entrepreneurial entities in the manufacturing sector has become a priority area of government policy and assistance [1].

International experience in state stimulation of manufacturing enterprises is particularly valuable amid globalization and intensifying competition. Developed countries, for instance, successfully apply a variety of business support tools such as tax incentives, subsidies, special digitalization programs, and cluster initiatives.

This topic gains special relevance in the context of post-pandemic recovery, sanctions pressure, and the urgent need for import substitution. Under such conditions, the application of international experience can contribute to the development of effective measures to support entrepreneurship and accelerate the modernization of the industrial sector.

The academic significance of this study lies in its in-depth theoretical reflection and systematization of international approaches to stimulating entrepreneurship in the manufacturing industry. By analyzing the support instruments used in different countries, the article contributes to the development of theories related to state support for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and industrial modernization.

The purpose of this article is to analyze international experience in stimulating entrepreneurial activity in the manufacturing industry and to determine the possibilities for its adaptation to the socio-economic conditions of Kazakhstan.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on entrepreneurship and industrial policy in the post-Soviet space has coalesced around two complementary strands. The first – an institutional-evolutionary strand – emphasizes the role of the "rules of the game," conflicts of interest between the state and business, and the tax-legal architecture (classic works on post-Soviet economies: [4]; reviews of forms and methods of support: [5]; a comparative analysis of the German SME model: [3]). The second – an applied strand – focuses on sector-specific mechanisms for modernizing manufacturing through clusters, innovation, and targeted support instruments: the cluster approach and its adaptation in Kazakhstan [1]; systemic problems and prospects of state support for the manufacturing sector [2]. These two lenses converge on the conclusion that policy measures require careful fine-tuning that accounts for sectoral specificity, firm size, and performance requirements.

Recent international literature underscores that the effects of stimulative measures for SMEs in manufacturing are amplified when financial and tax instruments are bundled with programs of digital transformation and production modernization. Korean studies indicate that SMEs' adoption of "smart" technologies is determined by a combination of technological characteristics and institutional support (competence centers, subsidies, extension-type services) [11]; for smart manufacturing, key efficiency drivers and operational effects relevant to SMEs have been identified [12]. These findings align with broader assessments of the impact of government support on SMEs' innovative activity and firms' entrepreneurial orientation [22]. Comparative reviews likewise show that Industry 4.0 as a policy is effective where an implementation infrastructure for small producers exists (digital diagnostic services, standards, and advisory support) [11][12].

The practice of leading development institutions confirms the importance of programs aimed at de-risking private investment and raising technological readiness. Canada's Strategic Innovation Fund consolidates large-scale projects to transform production chains and demonstrates economic and innovation effects according to recent evaluations and impact reports [8][12]. The South Korean ecosystem (KIAT) supports cooperative R&D and industrial projects, setting selection standards and parameters for grants/co-financing for enterprises, including SMEs [7]. In the United States, federal agency reports (SBA) document institutionalized support for the sector, including guarantee instruments and manufacturing extension services for small and medium manufacturers [6]. The Russian model, via the Industrial Development Fund, emphasizes concessional loans and industrial projects, which is important for comparing instrument design and performance metrics [9]. Taken together, these practices illustrate a shift away from simple subsidization toward programs that crowd in private investment, advance digitalization, and raise productivity.

Kazakhstan's agenda requires further empirical specification of the role of SMEs specifically within manufacturing. New studies show a statistically significant impact of SMEs' output on economic growth, strengthening the case for targeted measures for manufacturing SMEs [10]; sectoral work on innovation activity in industry and mechanical engineering clarifies the channels of effect – investment, capacity utilization, and technology adoption [13][24]. In this connection, clusters, quality infrastructure, and export services acquire particular importance as "soft" conduits for transferring technologies and managerial practices to small producers [1][2], alongside programs oriented toward SME sustainability and technological transformation [26][7][8].

Accordingly, the contemporary literature converges on the view that the effectiveness of state support for SMEs in manufacturing is ensured by a combination of: (i) financial and tax incentives tied to production outcomes; (ii) digitalization services and a finely grained implementation infrastructure for small business; and (iii) program-level impact and evaluation procedures that link budgetary outlays to indicators of productivity, innovation, and exports [11][12][8]. For Kazakhstan, this implies calibrating existing instruments to account for sectoral specificity, firm size, and the stages of technological upgrading, drawing on established practices from Canada and the Republic of Korea as well as domestic empirical evidence on the growth contribution of SMEs.

Contemporary empirical work further specifies the channels through which key policy instruments affect SMEs in the manufacturing sector. For credit guarantees, positive effects have been demonstrated for access to debt capital, investment, and firms' TFP (China, quasi-experiment; Turkey, firm-level) [11; 12]. For R&D tax incentives, additionality in expenditures and innovation outcomes has been confirmed using data for the United States and the United Kingdom [13; 20]. The export-promotion block has been reinforced by new cumulative assessments: a meta-analysis of the intensive export margin shows a statistically significant positive effect of programs, and firms' participation in EPP is associated with growth in export capabilities and productivity [14; 15]. For digital transformation and Industry 4.0 in manufacturing SMEs, the factors of successful adoption and sustainability – as well as their links to competitiveness and environmental objectives – have been clarified [16; 17; 18]. For transition economies, SME export intensity is shown to be strengthened through digitalization and firms' innovation capabilities [19]. These results complement Kazakhstani findings on the contribution of SMEs' output to economic growth and support the case for fine-tuning policy instruments specifically for the manufacturing segment.

METHODS

This study adopts a mixed comparative design that combines qualitative and quantitative procedures to compare models of government support for entrepreneurship in the manufacturing sectors of different countries and to assess the transferability of the identified practices to the Kazakhstani context. The choice of a mixed approach is driven by the need for triangulating sources – legal norms, program documentation, and statistical performance indicators – which makes it possible to align de jure instruments with their de facto effects on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

The empirical base was formed from three complementary blocks. First, regulatory legal acts and strategic documents governing SME support and industrial policy in the countries under review were collected. Second, official statistics from national statistical agencies and aggregated international databases (OECD, World Bank, UNIDO, UN Comtrade) were used to construct comparable time series. Third, analytical materials from peer-reviewed publications, reports of supreme audit institutions, and sectoral research centers were drawn upon, providing program evaluations and effectiveness metrics. For each document, metadata were recorded (issuing body, legal status, dates of adoption and amendment, target group, financing parameters), ensuring traceability of sources.

The comparative analysis was carried out on a "country–instrument–year" panel covering 2010–2025. The case countries (the United States, Canada, the Republic of Korea, and Russia) were selected according to the sophistication of their SME support toolkits in manufacturing, the availability of verifiable documentation, and the relevance of their solutions for policy transfer. Where the origin of an instrument is critical (e.g., the evolution of R&D tax incentives), the analysis period was extended retrospectively to account for the measure's lineage.

Policy operationalization relied on a unified taxonomy of instruments: financial (guarantees, concessional and subsidized loans, co-financing, quasi-equity); tax (R&D credits and super-deductions, investment allowances, accelerated depreciation, special economic zone/technology-park regimes); institutional (industrial and technology parks, cluster and extension services, quality infrastructure, export promotion, digitalization/Lean/Industry 4.0, workforce development); and

procurement-based (quotas and preferences for SMEs in public procurement). For each measure, the implementation level (national/regional), target group (start-ups/established SMEs), intensity (benefit size, rates, maturities), coverage, conditions for reciprocal commitments (production, export, "green," and digital criteria), implementing agency (ministry/agency), and life cycle (launch, reform, completion) were recorded.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.

In countries with developed economies, the small and medium-sized enterprise (SME) sector is considered one of the fundamental drivers of sustainable economic growth. This sector not only contributes to the creation of a favorable institutional and market environment for the emergence and development of large business structures but also functions as an independent system that ensures high employment levels, promotes the implementation of innovative solutions, and enables rapid adaptation to changing market conditions. The economic resilience of such countries, as well as their relative social stability over extended periods, has largely been ensured through effective and balanced interaction between government authorities and the entrepreneurial community [2].

To create favorable conditions for SME development, a comprehensive system of support measures is implemented. These include tax and investment incentives, subsidies for specific areas of activity, simplified access to financial and credit resources, opportunities to participate in the privatization of state and municipal property, assistance in entering foreign markets, implementation of professional training and retraining programs, simplification of enterprise registration and liquidation procedures, and the provision of consulting services, including marketing support [3]. This integrated and strategically oriented support fosters the dynamic development of the entrepreneurial sector, which in turn positively impacts the overall economy. Specifically, it leads to a reduced burden on the state budget through lower social spending, improved quality of goods and services under competitive conditions, increased tax revenues, lower unemployment rates, and reduced social tensions due to the creation of new jobs [4].

In most countries around the world, entrepreneurial entities are among the highest-priority recipients of government support and stimulation. Russian researcher I.G. Lemeshko presented a summarized table of SME support instruments used in various countries (Table 1).

Table 1. Instruments for Supporting Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises

Direction of Government Support	Examples of Countries
1. Expansion of loan guarantee volumes for SME enterprises	Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Republic of Korea, Netherlands, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, USA
2. Provision of special guarantee conditions for startups	Canada, Denmark, Netherlands, Republic of Korea
3. Increase in government guarantees for export-oriented operations	Canada, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, United Kingdom, Czech Republic, Slovakia
4. Government co-financing (including participation of pension funds)	Switzerland, Ireland, Denmark
5. Increase in the volume of direct budget financing for the SME sector	Canada, Chile, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain
6. Compensation of interest rates on loans	Hungary, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom
7. Provision of tax benefits and deferrals on tax obligations	France, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Spain, United Kingdom, Russia (particularly for microenterprises)
8. Specialized SME lending programs through banks; use of negative key interest rates	Ireland, Denmark
9. Provision of funding to credit institutions by the central bank	United Kingdom
Note: compiled by the author based on Source 5.	

According to the data in the table, financial and tax instruments dominate, while targeted institutional and administrative measures are almost entirely absent. This can be explained by the fact that the institutions necessary for SME development had already been formed earlier – either as a result of natural historical processes or because the need for such institutions arose earlier and corresponding measures were taken in a timely manner to establish them.

At the same time, it should be noted that the stimulation of small and medium-sized enterprises has its own specific characteristics across different industries and sectors of the economy.

United States. The policy of stimulating and supporting entrepreneurship in the U.S. manufacturing sector is aimed at fostering innovation, developing production capacity, creating jobs, and enhancing global competitiveness. It is worth noting that the United States has several institutions that support entrepreneurship in the manufacturing industry, each of which operates in specific areas (see Table 2).

Table 2. Institutions and Measures for Stimulating the Development of Entrepreneurship in the Manufacturing Industry

No.	Key Institutions	Area of Stimulation
1.	Small Business Administration (SBA)	A federal agency providing loan guarantees, consulting services, and funding programs for small and medium-sized businesses, including manufacturing enterprises.
2.	U.S. Department of Commerce and its Economic Development Administration (EDA)	Support industrial development through infrastructure investments, innovation grants, and regional programs.
3.	Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP)	A national network of support centers for small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises under the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Offers consulting, digitalization services, sustainability programs, and lean manufacturing implementation.
Note: compiled by the author based on Source 6.		

He U.S. policy framework provides financial and economic incentives to support entrepreneurship in the manufacturing sector by offering research and development (R&D) tax credits, which allow manufacturing companies to reduce their taxable income through expenses related to innovation and technological development [6].

Additionally, investment loans and grants are used to modernize production processes and implement clean technologies. The government also applies a support mechanism through the preferential allocation of contracts to small manufacturing enterprises, implemented via the public procurement system.

The U.S. experience in supporting entrepreneurship in the manufacturing sector demonstrates the effectiveness of a comprehensive approach based on close coordination between federal and regional levels, active participation of the private sector, prioritization of innovation and technology, and the recognition of SMEs as key drivers of technological development.

This experience serves as a model for the integration of financial, institutional, and technological instruments to stimulate entrepreneurship in industry.

South Korea. South Korea's industrial policy is characterized by active government involvement in shaping the country's industrial structure. The South Korean government has made significant investments in strategic sectors, thereby creating a favorable environment for the private sector and fostering the development of robust manufacturing clusters.

South Korea's policy for supporting and stimulating entrepreneurship in the manufacturing industry is comparable to the U.S. model. The country also has several dedicated institutions whose activities are aimed at supporting the manufacturing sector across various dimensions (see Table 3).

Table 3. Institutions and Measures for Supporting Entrepreneurship in the Manufacturing Industry in South Korea

No.	Key Institutions	Area of Stimulation
1.	Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy (MOTIE)	Coordinates the implementation of industrial programs, including subsidies, investment incentives, and production digitalization.
2.	KOTRA (Korea Trade-Investment Promotion Agency)	Provides assistance to export-oriented enterprises.
3.	KIAT (Korea Institute for Advancement of Technology)	Manages technology programs, grants, R&D support, and technology transfer.
4.	Ministry of SMEs and Startups	Specializes in supporting small manufacturing enterprises.
Note: compiled by the author based on Source 7.		

South Korea's industrial policy encompasses key elements such as support for high-tech manufacturing, the development of SMEs as suppliers for large corporations, and a strong focus on export orientation.

The South Korean government provides state subsidies and grants aimed at modernizing production facilities, implementing green and digital technologies, and improving productivity. It also offers tax incentives for R&D activities and capital investment, as well as preferential financing and loans through state-owned banks. Additionally, it implements export insurance programs and supports SME participation in global value chains.

South Korea's experience in government support for entrepreneurship in the manufacturing sector demonstrates high effectiveness, particularly due to its clear strategic focus, systematic support for SMEs, and state investment in innovation and digital manufacturing [7].

The South Korean model can serve as an example for countries seeking to modernize their manufacturing industries, raise the technological level of production, and ensure sustainable growth of entrepreneurship within the industrial sector.

Canada. Canada has a diversified economy in which the manufacturing industry plays a significant role, contributing substantially to GDP, exports, and employment. The government's policy is focused on supporting the sustainable development of the manufacturing sector through innovation, modernization, digitalization, and the growth of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

The Canadian support model is characterized by a multi-level system of assistance: federal, provincial, and municipal levels each develop their own programs within a unified national strategy. Canada's support policy places primary emphasis on technological advancement, economic resilience, export orientation, and inclusive regional development.

The implementation of Canada's policy to support entrepreneurship in the manufacturing sector is carried out through several key support institutions (see Table 4).

Table 4. Institutions and Measures for Supporting Entrepreneurship in the Manufacturing Industry in Canada

No.	Key Institutions	Area of Stimulation
1.	Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED)	Coordinates industrial and innovation policy; implements digitalization strategies and sustainable growth initiatives.
2.	Business Development Bank of Canada (BDC)	A specialized state bank providing financing, venture capital, and consulting services to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).
3.	Canada Economic Development Agencies	Regional agencies (e.g., FedDev Ontario, Western Economic Diversification Canada) focused on developing the manufacturing sector in specific geographic areas.
4.	National Research Council (NRC)	Supports applied research and the implementation of technological solutions in manufacturing.
Note: compiled by the author based on Source 8.		

The Government of Canada, as part of its support for entrepreneurship in the manufacturing sector, provides R&D tax credits, as well as grants and interest-free loans to companies engaged in production modernization, automation, and the adoption of green technologies. In addition, within the framework of regional support, individual provinces implement their own industrial subsidy programs [8].

Thus, Canada is building a flexible and adaptive model for stimulating entrepreneurship in the manufacturing industry. This model is based on the active role of the state in financing modernization and innovation, strong tax incentives for R&D, and broad regional differentiation of support programs.

Russia. In the context of advancing technological sovereignty, import substitution, and the urgent need to modernize the real sector of the economy, Russia is actively developing state support instruments for the manufacturing industry. Special attention is given to stimulating entrepreneurship, particularly among small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), as a key element in fostering innovation-driven growth and economic diversification.

The Russian government implements support measures through preferential financing, which includes subsidizing interest rates on investment loans. In terms of tax incentives, benefits are provided to residents of special economic zones, industrial parks, and territories of advanced socio-economic development. In addition, Russia's policy includes infrastructure support aimed at establishing industrial parks, techno parks, and special economic zones that offer preferential terms and ready-to-use infrastructure for manufacturing businesses [9].

Russia's model for stimulating entrepreneurship in the manufacturing sector combines financial, infrastructural, and institutional support. It includes active participation from development institutions and regional authorities. However, challenges remain, such as limited access to long-term financing for SMEs, and low SME involvement in innovation and in the supply chains of large corporations [10].

Thus, the Russian experience reflects an effort to establish a systematic approach to industrial policy, with a focus on supporting entrepreneurship, modernizing production capacities, and developing new manufacturing value chains.

CONCLUSION

The conducted analysis of international practices for stimulating entrepreneurship in the manufacturing sector has revealed several key insights. The experience of countries such as the United States, South Korea, Canada, and Russia demonstrates the effectiveness of combining institutional, financial, and human capital development mechanisms to enhance the competitiveness of industrial enterprises.

The novelty of this study lies in identifying adaptable policy tools that can be successfully implemented in Kazakhstan, taking into account its socio-economic context, institutional framework, and technological development priorities. Among the most relevant measures are:

– Institutional strengthening – improving the efficiency of development institutions, ensuring transparency, and reducing administrative barriers;

– Human capital development – expanding engineering education and digital manufacturing competencies to meet the needs of Industry 4.0;

– Financial accessibility – introducing blended financing instruments, concessional lending, and venture capital support for innovative industrial projects.

At the same time, the successful adaptation of foreign experience requires a flexible transformation of international approaches, rather than their direct replication. Implementing modern support mechanisms for entrepreneurship in the manufacturing sector is essential for building a sustainable, competitive, and technologically advanced economy in Kazakhstan. Future research should focus on assessing the effectiveness of these instruments and developing digital policy frameworks tailored to the country's industrial priorities.

References

1. Smagulova G.B. Klasternyi podkhod v razvitii obrabatyvayushchei promyshlennosti: mirovoi opyt i Kazakhstan [Cluster approach in the development of the manufacturing industry: global experience and Kazakhstan]. Vestnik KazNU. Seriya ekonomicheskaya. 2022; 6(140): 92–99.
2. Nurymbetov M.B., Akhmetov A.N. Gosudarstvennaya podderzhka obrabatyvayushchei promyshlennosti Kazakhstana: problemy i perspektivy [State support for Kazakhstan's manufacturing industry: problems and prospects]. Ekonomika i statistika. 2023; 2(150): 47–55.
3. Zverev A. Mery gosudarstvennoi podderzhki malykh i srednikh predpriyatii v Germanii [Measures of state support for SMEs in Germany]. Ekonomist. 2009; (9): 34–40.
4. Libman A. Konflikty gosudarstva i biznesa: postsovetskii opyt [Conflicts between the state and business: post-Soviet experience]. Svobodnaya mysl' XXI. 2005; (9): 53–63.
5. Lemeshko I.G. Sovremennye formy i metody podderzhki malogo predprinimatel'stva v Rossii i zarubezhnykh stranakh [Modern forms and methods of supporting small entrepreneurship in Russia and abroad]. Aktual'nye problemy gumanitarnykh i estestvennykh nauk. 2014; 12–1: 161–169.
6. Small Business Administration (SBA). Annual Report 2022. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Publishing Office; 2023. 134 p.
7. Korea Institute for Advancement of Technology (KIAT). Annual Report. Seoul: KIAT; 2023. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://www.kiat.or.kr/ (accessed: 25.07.2025).
8. Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED). Strategic Innovation Fund. Ottawa; 2023–2025. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://ised-isde.canada.ca/ (accessed: 25.07.2025).
9. Fond razvitiya promyshlennosti RF. Otchet o deyatel'nosti za 2022 god [Industrial Development Fund of the Russian Federation: activity report for 2022]. Moscow: FRP; 2023. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://frprf.ru/ (accessed: 25.07.2025).
10. Syzdykova A., Azretbergenova G. Analysis of the Impact of SMEs' Production Output on Kazakhstan's Economic Growth Using the ARDL Method. Economies. 2025; 13(2):38. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies13020038 .
11. Yu J. Impact of Credit Guarantee on Firm Performance: Evidence from China's SMEs. Economic Analysis and Policy. 2022; 75:624–636.
12. Akcigit U., et al. Firm-level Impact of Public Credit Guarantees. European Economic Review. 2024.
13. Melnik W., et al. R&D Tax Credits and Innovation. Journal of Public Economics. 2024.
14. Demena B.A., et al. Does Export Promotion Enhance Firm-level Intensive Margin of Exports? A Meta-analysis. Journal of Asian Business and Economic Studies. 2024.
15. Heriqbaldi U., et al. Export Promotion Programs and Firm Performance: Linking Knowledge, Commitment and Perception. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge. 2025.
16. Sharma N.K., et al. Industry 4.0 Factors Affecting SMEs towards Sustainable Manufacturing. Technology in Society. 2024.
17. Jamwal A., et al. A Decision Framework for SMEs to Address Sustainability via Industry 4.0. Annals of Operations Research. 2025.
18. Gold K.L., Baptista R. Effects of Industry 4.0 on SMEs: An Analytical and Bibliometric Review (2013–2023). SAGE Open. 2025.
19. Edeh J., et al. What Drives SME Export Intensity in Transition Economies? Technological Forecasting & Social Change. 2025.
20. OECD. The Impact of R&D Tax Incentives. Paris: OECD; 2023.

Список использованных источников

1. Смагулова Г.Б. Кластерный подход в развитии обрабатывающей промышленности: мировой опыт и Казахстан // Вестник КазНУ. Серия экономическая. – 2022. – № 6(140). – С. 92–99.
2. Нурымбетов М.Б., Ахметов А.Н. Государственная поддержка обрабатывающей промышленности Казахстана: проблемы и перспективы // Экономика и статистика. – 2023. – № 2(150). – С. 47–55.
3. Зверев А. Меры государственной поддержки малых и средних предприятий в Германии // Экономист. – 2009. – № 9. – С. 34–40.
4. Либман А. Конфликты государства и бизнеса: постсоветский опыт // Свободная мысль XXI. – 2005. – № 9. – С. 53–63.
5. Лемешко И.Г. Современные формы и методы поддержки малого предпринимательства в России и зарубежных странах // Актуальные проблемы гуманитарных и естественных наук. – 2014. – № 12–1. – С. 161–169.

6. Small Business Administration (SBA). Annual Report 2022. – Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Publishing Office, 2023. – 134 p.
7. Korea Institute for Advancement of Technology (KIAT). Annual Report. – Seoul: KIAT, 2023. – [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://www.kiat.or.kr/ (дата обращения: 25.07.2025).
8. Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED). Strategic Innovation Fund. – Ottawa, 2023–2025. – [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://ised-isde.canada.ca/ (дата обращения: 25.07.2025).
9. Фонд развития промышленности РФ. Отчёт о деятельности за 2022 год. – М.: ФРП, 2023. – 64 с. – [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://frprf.ru/ (дата обращения: 25.07.2025).
10. Syzdykova A., Azretbergenova G. Analysis of the Impact of SMEs' Production Output on Kazakhstan's Economic Growth Using the ARDL Method // Economies. – 2025. – 13(2):38. – DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/economies13020038
11. Yu J. Impact of Credit Guarantee on Firm Performance: Evidence from China's SMEs // Economic Analysis and Policy. – 2022. – 75:624–636.
12. Akcigit U., et al. Firm-level Impact of Public Credit Guarantees // European Economic Review. – 2024.
13. Melnik W., et al. R&D Tax Credits and Innovation // Journal of Public Economics. – 2024.
14. Demena B.A., et al. Does Export Promotion Enhance Firm-level Intensive Margin of Exports? A Meta-analysis // Journal of Asian Business and Economic Studies. – 2024.
15. Heriqbaldi U., et al. Export Promotion Programs and Firm Performance: Linking Knowledge, Commitment and Perception // Journal of Innovation & Knowledge. – 2025.
16. Sharma N.K., et al. Industry 4.0 Factors Affecting SMEs towards Sustainable Manufacturing // Technology in Society. – 2024.
17. Jamwal A., et al. A Decision Framework for SMEs to Address Sustainability via Industry 4.0 // Annals of Operations Research. – 2025.
18. Gold K.L., Baptista R. Effects of Industry 4.0 on SMEs: An Analytical and Bibliometric Review (2013–2023) // SAGE Open. – 2025.
19. Edeh J., et al. What Drives SME Export Intensity in Transition Economies? // Technological Forecasting & Social Change. – 2025.
20. OECD. The Impact of R&D Tax Incentives. – Paris: OECD, 2023.

ШЕТ МЕМЛЕКЕТТЕРДІҢ ӨҢДЕУШІ ӨНЕРКӘСІПТЕГІ КӘСІПКЕРЛІК СУБЪЕКТІЛЕРІН ЫНТАЛАНДЫРУ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ

Бекмухаметова А. Б.
экономика ғылымдарының кандидаты
әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті
Алматы, Қазақстан
e-mail: sultasem@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-1540-6973

Читанова С. О.
э.ғ.к., қауымдастырылған профессор
Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті
Алматы, Қазақстан
e-mail: sister1979@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-5776-1666

Абжатова А. К.*
Магистр
Рудный индустриалдық университеті
Рудный, Қазақстан
e-mail: aida_8424@mail.ru
ORCID: 0009-0005-2213-9956

Аңдатпа. Өңдеуші өнеркәсіпті дамыту – технологиялық дербестікке және тұрақты экономикалық өсуге ұмтылатын көптеген елдердің экономикалық саясатының негізгі бағыттарының бірі болып табылады. Қазіргі жағдайда Қазақстан да индустрияландыру стратегиясын жүзеге асырып жатыр, оның аясында өндірістік сектордағы кәсіпкерлік субъектілерін қолдауға ерекше көңіл бөлінеді. Осы мақаладағы мақсат – өңдеуші өнеркәсіп саласындағы кәсіпкерлік белсенділікті ынталандыруға бағытталған шетелдік тәжірибені талдап, оны Қазақстанның әлеуметтік-экономикалық жағдайларына бейімдеу мүмкіндіктерін анықтау.

Зерттеуде АҚШ, Канада, Оңтүстік Корея және Ресей елдерінде қолданылатын тәсілдер қарастырылады. Негізгі назар салықтық жеңілдіктер, жеңілдетілген қаржыландыру, субсидиялау, инновациялық және кластерлік бағдарламалар, өндірісті цифрландыру, сондай-ақ шағын және орта бизнесті қолдауға бағытталған инфрақұрылымды дамыту сияқты қолдау құралдарына аударылады. Аталған шаралардың тиімділігіне салыстырмалы талдау жүргізіліп, Қазақстан жағдайында қолдануға болатын тәжірибелер анықталды. Мақалада институционалдық әлеуетті күшейту, қолдаудың өңірлік сараланuы және бизнес, ғылым мен мемлекет арасындағы өзара байланысты нығайту қажеттілігі негізделеді.
Зерттеу нәтижелері Қазақстан Республикасында кәсіпкерлікті қолдау жөніндегі мемлекеттік бағдарламаларды, өнеркәсіпті дамыту стратегияларын және импортты алмастыру механизмдерін әзірлеуде пайдаланылуы мүмкін.
Түйін сөздер: кәсіпкерлік, өңдеуші өнеркәсіп, ынталандыру, қолдау құралдары, мемлекеттік қолдау.

ЗАРУБЕЖНЫЙ ОПЫТ СТИМУЛИРОВАНИЯ СУБЪЕТОВ ПРЕДПРИНИМАТЕЛЬСТВА ОБРАБАТЫВАЮЩЕЙ ПРОМЫШЛЕННОСТИ

Бекмухаметова А.Б.
Кандидат экономических наук
КазНУ им. Аль-Фараби
Алматы, Республика Казахстан
e-mail: sultasem@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-1540-6973

Читанова С.О.
Кандидат экономических наук,
ассоциированный профессор
Казахский университет международных
отношении и мировых языков им. Абылай хана
Алматы, Республика Казахстан
e-mail: sister1979@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-5776-1666

Абжатова А.К.*
Магистр
Рудненский индустриальный университет
Рудный, Республика Казахстан
e-mail: aida_8424@mail.ru
ORCID: 0009-0005-2213-9956

Аннотация. Развитие обрабатывающей промышленности является ключевым направлением экономической политики многих стран, стремящихся к технологической независимости и устойчивому росту. В современных условиях Казахстан также реализует стратегию индустриализации, в которой особое внимание уделяется поддержке субъектов предпринимательства в производственном секторе. Цель настоящей статьи – проанализировать зарубежный опыт стимулирования предпринимательской активности в обрабатывающей промышленности и определить возможности его адаптации к социально-экономическим условиям Казахстана.
В исследовании рассматриваются подходы, применяемые в США, Канаде, Южной Корее и России. Особое внимание уделяется таким инструментам поддержки, как налоговые льготы, льготное финансирование, субсидирование, инновационные и кластерные программы, цифровизация производств, а также развитию инфраструктуры для малого и среднего бизнеса. Проведён сравнительный анализ эффективности данных мер и выделены практики, обладающие потенциалом для применения в казахстанском контексте. В данной статье обоснована необходимость институционального укрепления, региональной дифференциации поддержки и усиления связей между бизнесом, наукой и государством.
Полученные результаты могут быть использованы при разработке государственных программ поддержки предпринимательства, стратегии развития промышленности и механизмов импортозамещения в Республике Казахстан.
Ключевые слова: предпринимательство, обрабатывающая промышленность, стимулирование, инструменты поддержки, государственная поддержка.