

UDC 330.8

JEL classification: O25; Q18; L15; L66

## THE CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT OF MANAGEMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS BASED ON INSTITUTIONAL REFORMS

## КОНЦЕПЦИЯ РАЗВИТИЯ МЕНЕДЖМЕНТА МАЛОГО БИЗНЕСА НА ОСНОВЕ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНЫХ РЕФОРМ

©Umarhodjayeva M.,

Ph.D., Tashkent State University of Economics,

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

©Умарходжаева М. Г.,

канд. экон. наук,

Ташкентский государственный

экономический университет,

г. Ташкент, Узбекистан

*Abstract.* The development of small business management on the basis of theories based on theories of old institutionalism and new institutionalism, its theoretical and methodological analysis and its institutional framework for modern management.

From the point of view of contemporary management, the concept of the impact of institutional factors on the development of small business on the issues of organizational business structures, the impact of economic infrastructures on the basis of evolutionary theoretical considerations, the concept of government support for the central, territorial and local legal and regulatory frameworks.

*Аннотация.* В статье анализируется развитие управления малым бизнесом на основе теорий старого и нового институционализма, его методологии и институциональных рамках для современного управления.

Рассмотрены современный менеджмент, концепция влияния институциональных факторов на развитие малого бизнеса, вопросы организационных бизнес-структур, влияние экономических инфраструктур на основе эволюционных теоретических соображений, концепция государственной поддержки центральной, территориальной и местной нормативно-правовой базы.

*Keywords:* old institutionalism, neo-institutionalism, transformation, structured institutional basis, business, entrepreneurship, institutional relations, technocratic approach.

*Ключевые слова:* старый институционализм, неинституционализм, трансформация, структурированная институциональная основа, бизнес, предпринимательство, институциональные отношения, технократический подход.

### *Introduction*

Today, identifying the factors affecting the development of small business and its theoretical learning of its institutional framework, and the development of the concept of systematization and development become one of the priorities of the economy.

It is well known that in a transition period from the centralized system of economy to the market relations a number of laws and legal acts on the management of small business, its co-operative and equally beneficial activities were adopted. During this period, the gradual transformation of the country's economy into market relations has led to the reorganization of rational, institutional basis of its business activity from the point of view of modern management in the business of multidimensional changeable intensifying relations between small business entities and its institutions, the fundamental theoretical and methodological basis of its business environment there was a need for a reformulation.

#### *Literature review*

The essence of the business has been widely studied in theoretical and methodological terms [1], and business and entrepreneurship have been found in the scientific literature [2] and in linguistic terms [3]. Taking into consideration the current business environment in our country, Ulmasov A., Sharifhodjaev M., in the textbook of the theory of economics, — “Business is a permitted activity that benefits society members, earning money and earnings” [4]. Theoretical views and methodological approaches presented in this scientific literature suggest that the words “business” and “entrepreneurship” are synonymous with the synonym [5]. The size of the business, the market position, the amount of money circulation and the number of employees [6]. Particularly, small businesses are divided into small business and micro firms according to the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan (1).

B. Berkinov asserts that “small enterprise is a small enterprise with an enterprise that carries out various types of goods and services with a limited number of employees, regardless of the form of ownership of an independent business entity with the right of a legal entity” [7]. Micro firms include companies with relatively small businesses.

#### *Analyze results*

Relationships between small businesses and its institutional basis in the gradual transition of the economy to market relations have been shaped on the basis of a mutually beneficial approach in the legal, regulatory and regulatory documents of the Republic of Uzbekistan, as well as through the structural analysis, and to this day the need to create a concept of systemic and equitable development rotating. In addition, theoretical researchers on small business management development often require the creation of a theoretically institutionalized conception of fragmentary, functional and statistical information based on positive and normative analysis, which provides the basis for its medium and long-term development.

In general, the impact of institutions on the development of the economy and small businesses can be seen in several studies [8].

It is well known that, so far, the theoretical and methodological basis of the development of the institutional framework of small business and the development of its management mechanism have not been solved in our country adequately. It should be noted that the institutional basis of the small business entities formed as a result of the efforts of state bodies to achieve dominance in market relations during the first period of independence, did not adequately assist in the development of its activity and created a great disproportionate situation in the growth of the sector.

The failure to maintain equal rights of small business or alternative competitors, the occurrence of occurrence of some enterprises in the business sector oligopolistic, non-productions in production, increase in production costs, rise in prices and consumer benefit, the extent to which it is unable to ensure its rational proportional development due to the imbalance of cooperative ties on.

In the Republic of Uzbekistan, during the independence years, the law and the legal acts adopted by the subjects of small business have created a legal basis in a certain sense and, as a result of insufficient formation of institutional relations based on particular socioeconomic relationships in certain sectors of its activity, and monopolization in this area is a stagnation or inoffensive relationship in other sectors the waves are formed. Particularly S. N. Ubaydullaev [9] argues that as a result of the inadequate formation of public institutions in society, monopolization of entrepreneurship in certain industries and development of institutions that prevent it. Therefore, theoretical study of the conceptual institutional basis in the development of organizational management is of great importance.

At the end of the XIX — the beginning of the 20th century, the transition from a free-competitive economy to a monopoly economy began to dominate in leading countries. The strengthening of the monopoly profits in the large industrial enterprises has led to monopoly profits and has adversely affected economic development and the idea of antimonopoly action has been introduced and these measures have given rise to the development of small businesses in society.

Implementation of antitrust policy in the economies of the developed countries has led to the application of various forms of social control over the economy and the protection of small businesses' interests to small businesses by the large-scale monopoly enterprises.

In the 20–30th years of the 20th century, the direction of institutionalism was prevalent in the United States and then in European countries. The growth of capital transformation in the economies of the developed countries and the development of monopoly industries have weakened the scope of small businesses and could not be interpreted by the preceding doctrines of free market-based market relations. Institutionalism has emerged as a result of the fact that small businesses do not compete freely with monopolists in exchange for increased transaction costs and lower labor productivity. Institutionalism is explained by the fact that the Latin “institute” [10] — the origin of industrial and financial monopolies, the enlargement of enterprises, and so forth, from the customs, the textbook, the corporate world, and the gradual development of society.

The definition of institutes is described by B. Z. Milner as “Institutes — restrictions developed by these people and the factors of coercion that complement their interaction”. By doing so, he considers these factors to be the most important component of society and the economy.

“Institutions — a social organization that promotes long-term and sustainable behavioral patterns through tradition, traditionally restricted legality” [11].

Berkinov considers the institute “a system of informal norms and informal norms that characterize the relationships among members of society”.

In general, the term “institute” is termed “institute”, which translates from the Latin word institution to traditional traditions or traditions that are firmly rooted in the rule of law [12].

The concept of the institute is not a purely economical notion by Vinokurov S. S. et al, but in a series of sociological sciences: sociology — the unity of roles and statuses, the system of public rules in political philosophy and the subject of the subject, its rights and obligations, the form of prohibited activity [13].

Firstly, the scientific interpretation of the concept of “institutionalism” was published in 1918 by the American scientist economist U. Mitchel. It was founded by Hamilton and based on a scientifically justified set of verbal symbols that describe a set of social traditions as an “institution” [14]. He looks at the institute as a way of thinking and acting, which has become a tradition of popular social groups.

The concept of a widely recognized institution that is actively used in the institutional analysis. It is a unit of principles limiting the economic activity that has been provided by [15] and has its own enforcement mechanisms.

Institutionalism and institutional change in different countries vary from the essence of the many or most of the society's belonging to *Homo economicus* or *Homo institutional* (HI). In the short term, the proportion of these two agents in a particular country is relatively stable and is determined on the basis of fundamental socio-cultural, geopolitical and geographical factors of the state. Long-term periods are relatively unstable and depend on the state's long-term institutional reform strategy for small businesses [16].

The role of institutional basis in the management of small businesses has an evolutionary background and a period of its historical development. For example, we can see an example of the evolutionary institutional development of G. M. Hodgson [16]. There are great individuals who have used their experience in the management of art in the period from the point of view of governance in the context of state governance, improvement of management of the state treasury organization of its business and its financial relationship structure are still important.

The history of institutional approach in our country is based on Amir Temur's "Temur Orders" [18] on the management of Amir Temur, and the peculiarities of the time of his rule were the Amir Temur's system of state governance, its internal and external policies, the legal framework, we can see the effects of the habit of doing business. It should be noted that for the first time the traditions of the tradition became a rule and the orderly regulation of the entrepreneurship and the management of the zakyat was arranged for the first time in such works as "Temur Orders" and "City of Fazil" [19].

Our alumni study the legacy of Hoja Samandar Baqo Tirmidhi, Abu Nasr Farabi, Alisher Navoi and other great ancestors, and see that at that time, the ways of solving entrepreneurship issues were addressed through the influence of public institutions.

The works of the great thinkers of the above mentioned are reflected in the direction of development of economic, cultural, spiritual and educational science, as well as the development of social relations in the context of historical, evolution-based institutions, today plays an important role in the development of the national identity of the country's business environment.

It is well known that the theory of institutional economics, by American economists T. Veblen [20], is based on social-psychological methods of business, considering that U. Mitchel [21] considers economic and institutional trends as a dominant and standardized publicity tradition. Commons [22] has developed the concept of "institutionalism" on the legal basis of the economic system activity. Theoretical concepts and opinions, debates and scientific debates on the essence of the institutes have continued to this day.

The distinctive feature of T. Veblen's teaching is that of the technological revolution that has attracted the attention of the society, which encompasses the role of scientific and technical specialists in the social change in society. This feature has led to a deeper institutional approach to sociology and parallel to the historical school.

It should be noted that, based on the technocratic approach in the activities of small businesses, we can see the development of the business environment, depending on the nature of the internal and external factors, by A. Fayol, G. Emerson, F. Taylor, G. Ford, and others [23]. The evolutionary theory of control theory and factors influencing it have been studied on the basis of technical and technological features of the engineering theory, and it is called a "classic" school. Frederick Taylor's service at the foundation of this school is great for organizing processes related to the expansion of technical and technological factors of production at all levels of the service and

applying a scientific approach to managing all enterprises — horizontal operations of enterprises, has paid great attention to improving the effectiveness of the administrative structure. At the same time, F. Taylor argued that the work processes needed a special, functional management and sought to demonstrate the physical structure of the organization of the production as well as the structural components of the organization of the production and its efficient functioning [24]. This approach has created an organizational framework for the establishment of small business institutionalism in which it has been possible to explore the institutional factor in organizational relationships.

The founder of social–psychological institutionalization, T. Veblen, and his adherents have developed psychological theories of economic development with a psychological approach to economic processes. The main works of T. Veblen are: “Theory of Disorder Class” (1899), “The Power of Competence” (1914), “The Role of Science in Modern Civilizations and Other Obstacles” (1919), “Engineers and Evaluation System” (1921) and “Modern Variable Systems” (1934), it appears from the social psychological approach that they gradually go to theoretical ideas based on technocratic ideas.

T. Veblen [20] distinguished engineering managers in the production process and viewed them as a socially objective, scientifically-articulated and effective masters. He criticizes the business world and rationalizes the economic foundation of society on the basis of technical and technological factors.

T. Veblen analyzes economic processes as traditions. Among such traditional driving forces are the parents’ emotions, the master instinct, the desire for good work, the thirst for knowledge, the pure curiosity. In his opinion, the initial instinct will first be in the care of the family, and then become the care of society and all mankind. Darwinism (biological) ideas are introduced to the economy. Veblen says in *The Book of Backsliding Class*, “The life of a human being is a struggle for the existence of another kind of life, and hence reflects the process of selection and adaptation. The evolution of the structure of society is a process of natural selection of institutions”. Small businesses are considered to be related to the functioning of institutions in the community.

In general, T. Veblen has developed modern industrial technocratic concepts specific to the small business, due to the nature of this period, the role of institutions in the society. Particular attention will be paid to the industry, with all producers and primarily engineers and workers involved in the process of reproduction and the share of GDP in the country, and the increase in productivity in the industry is a matter of institutional care, improving productivity and while increasing productivity is the main goal. When it comes to business, he understands financiers, trust organizers, and entrepreneurs. He is striving for the best possible business opportunity and, therefore, harshly criticizes him, because he believes that various financial and credit lines are subordinate to the industry because of the system of various joint–stock companies.

In the “Industry” and “Business” theory, the link between material content and its socioeconomic form is a serious contradiction between industry and business, and its impact on institutions and the development of business subjects is an important issue.

T. Veblen suggests that the effectiveness of small business is enhanced by the scientific and technological revolution, and that the power of technocratic institutions should be handed over to the technical intelligentsia. The business transformation is carried out by means of the “Techno–People’s Council”, in which the role of the intelligentsia in the modern society is emphasized, that the business world will be able to overcome engineering–technical intelligence, pointing out the theoretical basis of industrial development in 1950–1980.

U. Mitchel considers economic relations related to money circulation as irrational institutions and recognizes it as the best system.

Another representative of institutionalism is J. Commons considers it the basis of the legal institutional aspects of the “transaction” costs that arise in the transaction agreements. J. Common is the principal representative of the direction of social and legal institutionalism, and his doctrine is reforming and modernizing the existing system with the work of public institutions (family, production corporations, trade associations, trade unions, state and legal relations) to make the business system so effective, he says, that he is capable of self-defense. J. Commons Institutional Economics. His role in the political economy (1934), *The Economic Theory of Collective Labor* (1950), shows that relationships between businesses and institutions tend to be trendy.

He argues that the provisions of the law of higher interest and the legal concepts in the economy can be solved by means of the state-owned legal bodies to ensure fair exchange relations in the conditions of market relations, to eliminate the risk of competition. At the same time, taking into account the role of the organizational legal institutional framework, it emphasizes the importance of the role of judicial authorities in the activities of small businesses and the need to rely on the state law-enforcement bodies in the formation of fair and equitable business relations.

Coming out of a “social conflict” (conflict), business professionals do not fight with one another in the business relationship, and the conflicts that arise as a result of their collaboration are the driving force of society’s evolution, and the process of conflict resolution is a process that promotes social progress.

J. Common’s theory [22] offers a way to reform the existing system through reform. It emphasizes the need to improve the legal framework, to establish a legally binding agreement between business community members in business relationships, and to establish business community members as key institutions of society: the family, the business community, and even the state itself. The business solution consists of three moments: a conflict, a mutual influence, a solution as a structural model. In the business process, any internal conflict with legal and regulatory instruments indicates that all conflicts can be solved. Explains the social contradictions in business relationships and the lack of a mechanism to regulate the legalization of conflicts.

Common’s sees business entities as a combination of real and potentially conflicting confrontations between actors in the treaties and agreements, regardless of the factors that arise as a result of technological factors. Thus, institutional frameworks require the development of a mechanism for managing contracts through contracts and transactions through the introduction of a judicial law enforcement mechanism through the creation of special management structures to ensure the sustainability of small businesses. As it is known today, working with small businesses requires a revision of the economic mechanisms associated with its organizational governance relationships. In particular, transformational transformations in the agricultural sector of the Republic of Uzbekistan, namely, the transformation of agricultural producers from shirkats into farms and dekhkan farms did not allow them to improve sufficiently. The reason for this is that today, small businesses mainly operate on a contractual basis and require the improvement of organizational and institutional frameworks of partnership agreements with large businesses and foreign businesses [25–26].

Economists regard their economic relationship as the first issue in their traditional research, and the conflicts are a matter of secondary concern. In her research, Dommerson states that judges play a major role in dealing with conflict situations that are dominant in dealing with conflicts. In this context, he points out not only the circumstances that relate to his economic relationship, but the role of conflicts involving organizational governance. In this way, he assesses the role of institutions in the activities of small businesses.

In the post-business environment, business environment changes and industry-related approaches have created a new institutional relationship. Scholars such as Ronald Coase [27], Oliver Williamson [28], Douglas North [29] studied the role of institutions in business subjects on the basis of rationality principle and individual methodological approach as agents of new neo-institutionalism.

Unlike conventional institutionalism, G. M. Hodgson [30] calls for a radical institutional approach to a new methodological approach that clarifies the trajectories of small businesses in society, with organizational and management issues on the basis of new management logic of the practical economy and combines its contractual arrangements and transaction costs.

From the aforementioned theoretical institutional approach, we can conclude that the study of institutional foundations of small business allows the system to regulate its relationships with endogenous and exogenous factors and to predict risks associated with institutional factors in business activities and reduce transaction costs.

As a result of the reforms implemented on the basis of the privatization program of the state, the transformation of existing enterprises into a joint-stock company has created a complicated situation for the partner small businesses. At the same time, the issue of revising the existing partnership agreements or introducing the methods of economic integration into a market economy has become a pressing issue. In its turn, it is important to study its institutional framework for the establishment of a mutually beneficial partnership through the protection of the interests of small businesses or the balancing of interests in the relations with small businesses.

Scientific research and foreign experience in this area show that intensification of the activity of small businesses is an effective way to integrate its institutional basis with the exchange of news in interrelations with modern methods of management, innovation, the creation of regional techno-parks, the combination of production technologies and internal co-operation. that it can be achieved.

At the same time, small business entities are able to achieve a balance of business as a result of the relative specialization in the production chain of technology, as a result of cost-effective transaction costs, and the integration of small businesses into the rational organization of accounting, control and fixed costs. The role of organizing roles on the distribution of roles in effective coordination and coordination of these processes plays a major role.

In essence, the small business focusing on a chain of production technology enables the development of planning, organization, direction and coordination of activities on the basis of special technological chains, with a purpose of specializing on the basis of internal factors. Garrington Emerson (1853-1931), “Twelve Principles of Productivity”, the first is that human resources need to be optimized in enterprise activity and, as a result, Development of methods to achieve the provisions [31]. With the increase in labor productivity, it has been possible to expand production capacities and, consequently, to regulate human resources under the influence of different institutions.

The structure of the administrative structure and the ability to achieve maximum labor productivity based on available resources in the activities of small business entities are based on the general theoretical principles of the organization and management of Hamilton Church (1866–1936) in the “Basics of Production Management” principles of its organization through the general functions of management: design, equipment, tradition, accountability, and implementation a strong showing [32]. The development of these fundamental theoretical frameworks under the influence of their evolutionary development and society’s adequate governance institutions led to the formation of some institutional foundations in the activities of small businesses.

There are several methodological approaches to the analysis of the essence of small business. According to one of the approaches suggested by V. Afanasiev and E. Krylova, the essence of small business relates to a competitive environment that is organic [33]. As you know, the competitive environment is proportionate to institutional factors and ensures its equitable benefit.

These approaches address the role of small business entities in the decision-making process: legal freedom, that is, R. Coase needs a “set of rights” in a small business, and that, in the second place, it is in the field of economic activity and maintains legal parity [27].

Such assertions are, in essence, the basis for accepting that a small firm works in the conditions of improved competition. However, in practice, many smaller firms also find their place in other markets and successfully develop. Therefore, it is possible to agree with experts that these firms do not feel very strong competition [34]. The interpretation is weakly linked to the small business administration. As a result, any kind of competition activity, even if their relationship is more complicated, is practically alienated from entrepreneurship. In fact, it can be seen as an external force that encourages the process of introducing competitive innovations [35].

The whole process of emergence of innovations in integration relations covers two parts: the objective process of change and the conscious process of people — i. e. entrepreneurship which accelerates the process of change. Recognizing that this point is justified, it is also important to recognize that competition and entrepreneurship are not the same at the same time.

V. Savchenko justified the need to link small business analysis with its content. As noted by V. Savchenko, “small entrepreneurship” not only covers the capacities and means of production and economic activity of enterprises with relatively small scale, but also the necessity of coverage of economic activity based on risk and innovation, full economic responsibility, transformation, and to get the maximum business profit from each of the capital spent on management and management [36].

Developing this point, Shulus connects the economic essence of small businesses with two factors:

–Firstly, it is objectively formulated as a branch of the economy and it is a small enterprise that demonstrates the formation of small-scale production in the marketplace in such a way;

–Secondly, it is a separate type of business. This creates organizational and technical aspects of small production and part of the production, in which it is part of the socio-economic dimension of small entrepreneurship. In our opinion, Shulus’s methodological position is more fundamental because both sides of the collective production are based on the identification of the institutional aspects of productive forces and production relations [37].

The economic substance of the concept of small business can be regarded as a set of economic relations between the subjects of public production in the smaller enterprises, in connection with self-reliant, independent, highly risky and innovative business activity. We can say that these relationships with different sectors of the economy and branches, with small businesses, are now a combination of institutions with institutions.

In an institutional approach, small businesses can be seen as complex subjective and objective systems. V. P. Smirnov [38], based on the general theory of entrepreneurial activity, leads to the following principles of organizing: hierarchy, integrity, communication, history, and adherence. These principles should be systematically distributed and not coincidental but must be characterized by a systemic characteristic. M. V. Eflova [39] considers entrepreneurship as a component and subject of macroeconomics as a form, method, and tool of business organization.

According to ideas of I. P. Dolgorukova [40] is a small business–social institution based on an institutional approach to small businesses, whose main characteristic is that the combination of



ownership and managerial operations is the ability of the business to cover its own costs for managing the property.

J. B. Tumunbayarova [41] small businesses operate in an institutional environment, characterize dualism and, consequently, change the essence of small business, and in turn, small businesses change the initiative of the institutional environment. Therefore, we can conclude that, on the basis of an institutional approach, small businesses always communicate with market institutions, resulting in the emergence of a new institutional relationship with the business environment. At the same time, the characteristics of social and economic relations with institutions involved in the organization and management of small business entities and their detailed study in different sectors and regions in static and dynamic processes.

According to the doctrines of this direction, institutes serve as a moving force for the development of society. This concept includes social events, such as family, state, monopoly, trade unions, and other institutions, that is, the manifestation of the spirit of the church, the way it behaves, and its way of thinking to traditional, traditional, and legal, ethical and other forms receives According to ideologists of this direction, the economic categories are private property, tax, money, credit, profit, trade, etc., and the formation of the spirit of society. Thus, they do not fully admit the existence of objective economic laws and analyze the evolution of the church spirit.

Wesley Kler Mitchell, a cyclical researcher in the economy, has developed the conjuncture — a stream of statistical institutionalism. Factors that determine the economic phenomenon are the reasons why people study societal psychology, traditions and traditions as a subject of research in society, and their differences in production and business, and differences in production and prices. It shows economic trends, figures, trends in the relationships between institutions and institutions that change these indicators, The structure of a role in the regulation of business relationships. He argued that the influence on the economy and business relationships through regulation of finance, money circulation and credit categories can even be prevented by shifting cyclical vibrations. It proposes that economics can be interconnected with the problems of culture and sociology, but mainly on the basis of the concepts of political and economic institutions based on the psychological analysis. He considers business relationships not as individual development, but as an improvement in the collective relationships of society members, and its perfection is an evolution of these institutions, the development of state institutions and their intervention in their economy. Mitchell calculated the duration of “small and big cycles” and created a project of a non-violent development model in business relations. Total indices and indices, based on the analysis of “dynamic rows”, play an important role in reflecting the real situation in the economy and in determining the impact of the conjuncture, especially the situation in certain industries and its impact on business relations. Because the subjects of small businesses are more resistant to tax and market conjuncture, reflecting the real state of the economy as indices, and evaluating the situation, especially in certain industries, determines its development in the country's economy.

### *Conclusion*

Theoretical analysis shows that the main ideas and theoretical approaches of institutional orientation remain relevant today. The definitions for the concept of the institutional economy described above describe the general features of the institutions, together with the social change in the society, the developmental laws and emphasizes the importance of institutions for their development. However, it does not fully cover the specific aspects of business relations and the features of the small business. Taking into account the characteristics of the institutional and

institutional context in the economy, taking into account the characteristics of the small business and the present business environment, it can be described as follows:

–the institute is a system that carries out systematic relationships with business entities in the business environment, subject to formal and informal ethical and normative considerations.

–the theoretical analysis of the features of small businesses shows that the impact of institutional factors on the development of small business in the issues of organizational business structures, the influence of economic infrastructure, central government, regional and local authorities in the sphere of supporting small businesses in legal and regulatory areas.

We can conclude that the social contradictions in the society in the context of market relations have diminished social contradictions, contradictory development of society, its intensification of industrial society from its high formats, in the development of information society, the activity of small businesses in the event of institutional factors and business processes promoting the theory and methodology of its functioning is crucial for its perspective.

*Sources:*

(1). UZBEKISTAN. (2005). The Strategy of Welfare Improvement of the Population of the Republic of Uzbekistan for 2005-2010. Interim Document (FAPP). Tashkent.

*References:*

1. Ignatova, I. V. (2014). Predprinimatelstvo i biznes: terminologicheskaya differentsiatsiya // *Nauchnyi internet-zhurnal*, (6). (in Russian)

2. Kolesnikov, A., & Kolesnikova, L. (1996). Malyye i sredniy biznes: evolyutsiya ponyatii i problema opredeleniya. *Voprosy ekonomiki*, (11). (in Russian)

3. European Commission (2003-05-06). Recommendation 2003/361 / EC: SME Definition

4. Ulmasov, A., & Sharifhodjaev, M. (1995). Economy Theory. Tashkent, Employment, 192. (in Uzbek).

5. Ignatova, I. V. (2011). Teoreticheskoe issledovanie kontseptsii predprinimatelstva. *Evropeiskii zhurnal sotsialnykh nauk*, (8), 321-329. (in Russian)

6. Pomfret, R., & Anderson, K. H. (1997). Uzbekistan: Welfare impact of slow transition.

7. Berkinov, B. (1999) Basics of organization and operation of small businesses. Tashkent, Teacher. 9-10. (in Uzbek)

8. Amoros, J. (2009). Entrepreneurship and Quality of Institutions. A Developing-Country Approach. World Institute for Economic Research (UNU-WIDER), *Research Paper*, 23

9. Ubaydullaev, S. N. (2007). Economic institutions: the emergence and development. Tashkent, Istiqlol. (in Uzbek)

10. Veblen, T. (2017). The Place of Science in Modern Civilization. New York, Routledge.

11. Hodgson, G. M. (1988). Economics and Institutions: A Manifesto for a Modern Institutional Economics. Cambridge, Polity Press

12. Lemeshchenko, P. P. (2003). Institutsionalnaya ekonomika. Minsk, Bestprint. (in Russian)

13. Vinokurov, S. S., et al. (2014). Institutsionalnaya ekonomika: uchebnoe posobie / pod red. V. A. Grosheva, L. A. Mierin. St. Petersburg, SPbGEU, 125. (in Russian)

14. Sumroev, A. V. (2010). Zarubezhnyi opyt podderzhki i razvitiya malogo i srednego biznesa. *Investitsii v Rossiyu*, (4), 87

15. North, D. (1990). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 164

16. Kleiner, G. B. (2004). Evolyutsionnaya institutsionalnaya sistema. Moscow, Nauka, 240. (in Russian)
16. Hodgson, G. M. (2012). Toward an Evolutionary and Moral Science Remarks upon Receipt of the Veblen-Commons Award. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 46, (2), 265-275.
18. Temur's Orders. (1999). Tashkent, G. Gulom. (in Uzbek)
19. Forobi, A. N. (1993). City of Fazil people. Tashkent: Publication of Abdulla Qadyri Folk Heritage, 222. (in Uzbek)
20. Veblen, T. (1991). The theory of the leisure class. New York, Routledge, 282
21. Neiman, A. M. (2001) Institutsionalnaya ekonomicheskaya teoriya. N. Novgorod, NIK.
22. Commons, J. R. (1934). Institutional Economics; Its Place Political Economy. New York, The Macmillan Company, 921
23. Faiol, A., Teilor, F. U., Ford, G., & Emerson, G. (1992). Upravlenie - eto nauka i iskusstvo. Moscow, Respublika, 349. (in Russian)
24. Taylor, F. W. (2003). The Principles of Scientific Management. Mineola, Dover Publications Inc., 80
25. Fink, T. A. (2012). Malyy i sredniy biznes: zarubezhnyi opyt. *Molodoi uchenyi*, (4), 177-181. (in Russian)
26. Talypova, D. N. (2010). Institutsionalnaya ekologicheskaya transformatsiya ekonomiki i ekonomicheskikh otnoshenii v selskokhozyaistvennom sektore. Moscow, MGU, 371. (in Russian)
27. Kouz, R. (1993) Firma, rynek i pravo / per. s angl. B. Pinsker. Moscow, Delo LTD, 192. (in Russian)
28. Williamson, O. E. (1998). The Economic Institutions of Capitalism: Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting. New York, The Free Press, 468
29. North, D. (1997). Institutionalized researches: Framework analysis. *Economics questions*, (7). 6-17
30. Hodgson, G. M. (2000). What is the Essence of Institutional Economics? *Journal of Economic Issues*, (34), 317-329
31. Emerson, H. (1912). The twelve principles of efficiency. New York, Engineering Magazine, 1912.
32. Daniel, A. W. (2005). The History of Management Thought. 354
33. Afanasiev, V., & Krylova, E. (1996). Maloe predprinimatelstvo v reshenii problem zanyatosti. *Rossiiskii ekonomicheskii zhurnal*, (10). 40-47. (in Russian)
34. Kolesnikov, A., & Kolesnikov, L. (1996). Malyy i sredniy biznes: evolyutsionnye kontseptsii i issledovaniya. *Voprosy ekonomiki*, (7), 57. (in Russian)
35. Abalkin, L. I. (1994). Ekonomicheskaya bezopasnost Rossii: ugrozy i ikh otrazhenie. *Voprosy ekonomiki*, (12), 4-16. (in Russian)
36. Savchenko, V. (1995). Fenomen predprinimatelstva. Formalnye predprinimatelstva. *Rossiiskii ekonomicheskii zhurnal*, (10), 59. (in Russian)
37. Shulus, A. (1997). Formirovanie sistemy podkhodov k mazhorirovaniyu predprinimatelstva v Rossii. *Rossiiskii ekonomicheskii zhurnal*, (5-6), 85. (in Russian)
38. Smirnov, V. P. (2011). Obnaruzhenie metodologicheskikh osnov predprinimatelskoi deyatel'nosti. *Problema ekonomiki*, (2). (in Russian)
39. Eflova, M. V. (1999). Predprinimatelstvo v sovremennom rossiiskom obshchestve: avtoref. diss. ... kand. sotsiol. nauk. Kazan, 135. (in Russian)
40. Dolgorukova, I. V. (2007). Malyy i sredniy biznes v Rossii: formirovanie novogo sotsialnogo obespecheniya. Moscow, Nauchnaya kniga, 154. (in Russian)

41. Tumunbayarova, J. B. (2013). Transformatsiya institutsionalnoi sredy malogo predprinimatelstva v Rossii: avtoref. diss. ... kand. ekon. nauk. Ulan-Ude, 20. (in Russian)

*Список литературы:*

1. Игнатова И. В. Предпринимательство и бизнес: терминологическая дифференциация // Научный интернет-журнал. 2014. №6 (25).
2. Колесников А., Колесникова Л. Малый и средний бизнес: эволюция понятий и проблема определения // Вопросы экономики. 1996. №11.
3. European Commission (2003-05-06). Recommendation 2003/361 / EC: SME Definition
4. Ульмасов А. У., Шарифходжаев М. Ш. Теория экономики. Ташкент: Занятость, 1995. 192 с. (на узб. яз.).
5. Игнатова И. В. Теоретическое исследование концепции предпринимательства // Европейский журнал социальных наук. 2011. №8. С. 321-329.
6. Pomfret R., Anderson K. H. Uzbekistan: Welfare impact of slow transition, 1997.
7. Беркинов Б. Б. Основы организации и функционирования малого бизнеса. Ташкент: Учитель. 1999. (на узб. яз.).
8. Amoros, J. Entrepreneurship and Quality of Institutions. A Developing-Country Approach. World Institute for Economic Research (UNU-WIDER) // Research Paper, 2009. P. 23.
9. Убайдуллаев С. Н. Экономические институты: возникновение и развитие. Ташкент: Истиклол, 2007. (на узб. яз.).
10. Veblen T. The Place of Science in Modern Civilization. New York, Routledge, 2017.
11. Hodgson G. M. Economics and Institutions: A Manifesto for a Modern Institutional Economics. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.
12. Лемешенко П. П. Институциональная экономика. Минск: Бестпринт, 2003.
13. Винокуров С. С. и др. Институциональная экономика: учебное пособие / под ред. В. А. Грошева, Л. А. Миэринь. СПб.: Изд-во СПбГЭУ, 2014. 125 с.
14. Сумроев А. В. Зарубежный опыт поддержки и развития малого и среднего бизнеса // Инвестиции в Россию. 2010. №4. С. 87.
15. North D. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 164 p.
16. Клейнер Г. Б. Эволюционная институциональная система. М.: Наука, 2004. 240 с.
17. Hodgson G. M. Toward an Evolutionary and Moral Science Remarks upon Receipt of the Veblen-Commons Award // Journal of Economic Issues. 2012. V. 46. №2. P. 265-275.
18. Уложение Темура. Ташкент: Изд. лит. и искусства им. Гафура Гуляма. 1999. (на узб. яз.)
19. Фороби, А. Н. Город Фазиль. Ташкент: Публикация народного наследия Абдуллы Кадыри, 1993. 222 с.
20. Veblen T. The theory of the leisure class. New York: Routledge, 1991. 282 p.
21. Нейман А. М. Институциональная экономическая теория. Н. Новгород: НИК. 2001.
22. Commons J. R. Institutional Economics; Its Place Political Economy. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934, 921 p.
23. Файоль А., Тэйлор Ф. У., Форд Г., Эмерсон Г. Управление - это наука и искусство М.: Республика, 1992. 349 с.
24. Taylor F. W. The Principles of Scientific Management. Mineola, Dover Publications Inc., 2003. 80 p.

25. Финк Т. А. Малый и средний бизнес: зарубежный опыт // Молодой ученый. 2012. №4. С. 177-181.
26. Талыпова Д. Н. Институциональная экологическая трансформация экономики и экономических отношений в сельскохозяйственном секторе. М.: Изд-во МГУ. 2010. 371 с.
27. Коуз Р. Фирма, рынок и право / пер. с англ. Б. Пинскера. М.: Дело ЛТД, 1993. 192 с.
28. Williamson O. E. *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism: Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting*. New York, The Free Press, 1998. 468 p.
29. North D. Institutionalized researches: Framework analysis // *Economics questions*, 1997. №7. P. 6-17.
30. Hodgson G. M. What is the Essence of Institutional Economics? // *Journal of Economic Issues*. 2000. №34. P. 317-329.
31. Emerson H. *The twelve principles of efficiency*. New York: Engineering Magazine, 1912.
32. Daniel A. W. *The History of Management Thought*. 2005. 354.
33. Афанасьев В., Крылова Е. Малое предпринимательство в решении проблем занятости // *Российский экономический журнал*. 1996. №10. С. 40-47.
34. Колесников А., Колесников Л. Малый и средний бизнес: эволюционные концепции и исследования // *Вопросы экономики*. 1996. №7. С. 57.
35. Абалкин Л. И. Экономическая безопасность России: угрозы и их отражение // *Вопросы экономики*. 1994. №12. С. 4-16.
36. Савченко В. Феномен предпринимательства. Формальные предпринимательства // *Российский экономический журнал*. 1995. №10. С. 59.
37. Шурус А. Формирование системы подходов к мажорированию предпринимательства в России // *Российский экономический журнал*. 1997. №5-6. С. 85.
38. Смирнов В. П. Обнаружение методологических основ предпринимательской деятельности // *Проблема экономики*. 2011. №2.
39. Ефлова М. В. *Предпринимательство в современном российском обществе: автореф. дисс. ... канд. социол. наук*. Казань, 1999. 135 с.
40. Долгорукова И. В. *Малый и средний бизнес в России: формирование нового социального обеспечения*. М.: Научная книга, 2007. 154 с.
41. Тумунбаярова Ж. Б. *Трансформация институциональной среды малого предпринимательства в России: автореф. дисс. ... канд. экон. наук*. Улан-Удэ, 2013. 20 с.

*Работа поступила  
в редакцию 11.03.2018 г.*

*Принята к публикации  
15.03.2018 г.*

---

*Cite as (APA):*

Umarhodjayeva, M. (2018). The concept of development of management of small business based on institutional reforms. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, 4, (4), 416-428

*Ссылка для цитирования:*

Umarhodjayeva M. The concept of development of management of small business based on institutional reforms // *Бюллетень науки и практики*. 2018. Т. 4. №4. С. 416-428. Режим доступа: <http://www.bulletennauki.com/umarhodjayeva> (дата обращения 15.04.2018).