Values of Innovation for Students, Experts and Entrepreneurs in Krasnoyarsk: Desired Ideal, Hopes and Reality

Yury N. Moskvicha and Elena N. Viktorukb*

a Krasnoyarsk State Teacher Training University of V.P. Astafiev, 89 A. Lebedeva st., Krasnoyarsk, 660049 Russia
b Siberian State Technological University, 82 Mira, Krasnoyarsk, 660049 Russia

Received 3.03.2011, received in revised form 7.06.2011, accepted 7.10.2011

The end of the 20th century has changed the world pattern dramatically. A new division of labor has appeared as well as the need for innovative growth of many branches of economy has intensified. All these changes have consequently been fixed in the ideas of new societies. The names of these societies are very relative and are not linked to any growth ideology. They are utmost functional and carry on rather sociological tint due to a new priority-driven activity of population of exact country (more than 50%).
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The end of the 20th century has changed the world pattern dramatically. New division of labor has appeared, the need for innovative growth of many branches of economy has intensified.

All these changes have consequently been fixed in the ideas of new societies. The names of these societies are very relative and are not linked to any growth ideology. They are utmost functional and carry on rather sociological tint due to the new priority-driven activity of population of exact country (more than 50%).

In ‘innovative society’ such people are ‘organizers’ (entrepreneurs), knowing the market needs and seeking for requested knowledge and ideas for creation of the good requested on the
market, and ‘creators’ (scientists and engineers-innovators) capable of creating an idea and implementing it in good or product that has competitive ability – that is innovation.¹

The formation of the new personnel potential for creating ‘the new economy’ from a position of the goals and objectives might be compared with the goals and objectives for human resource development in ‘industrial economy’ over the last two centuries with the same risks for less developed countries to appear on a roadside of economic development and a great number of pessimistic estimations of the future. Such point of view, for example, has been stated in 2000 by a well-known economist Jeffrey Sachs in his paper “A new map of the world”.² There a technological division of the world is introduced for the first time instead of ideological division of the world. According to this map, in the modern world only a small part of the globe, accounting for some 15% of the earth’s population, provides nearly all of the world’s technology innovations. A second part, involving perhaps half of the world’s population, is able to adopt these technologies in production and consumption. The remaining part, covering a third of the world’s population, is technologically disconnected, neither innovating at home nor adopting foreign technologies and Russia is among them.

The economic crisis of 2008 has essentially affected government plans for creation of a new sector of economy that is called an innovative or ‘clever’ economy.³ It is declared about the accelerated bases creation of this economy in Russia and the specific measures are taken for the formation of the starting innovative centers in Skolkovo and in Siberia on the basis of several university cities such as: Tomsk, Novosibirsk, Krasnoyarsk and Kemerovo. The key as well as practical question is the existence in the country well-trained personnel for new massive activity: innovative managers, engineers etc. There are some points of view according to this question:

1. Existing deficiency of key players of innovative activity – innovative businessmen – can be filled by their invitation from abroad from the key innovative centers of the world.⁴

2. Real deficiency isn’t known. It can be revealed from the start of real scale innovative activity and creation of high-grade system of its standard-legal base.

3. The country population isn’t ready to the given kind of activity. One needs a long period of accumulation of the corresponding human capital by changing the existing educational and training system.⁵

It is obvious that formation of new personnel potential of the country from a position of the goals and objectives for ‘the new economy’ is compared with the goals and objectives for experts for ‘industrial economy’ with the same risks to appear on a roadside of economic development.⁶ The current situation generates a great number of discussions and various estimations of the future. In these discussions, at many cases there is a distinct group interest and egoism that makes their results and estimations far from a reality and scientific rigidity.⁷

Therefore, the actual researches, aimed on studying the specific public installations of such and such questions of innovative activity, are getting actual, in particular taking in consideration extremely important questions of ethical self-determination of various public groups, their readiness for development and self-development, acceptance and participation in this new kind of activity in our country. It is connected with the fact that ethics of creativity, labour and cooperation is the major part of ‘progressive culture’ the successful innovative countries of the world. It might also be called as baseline engine.⁸
The course on updating

For the Russian population ‘new economy’ and its main characters – innovative businessmen – are still virtual images, living partially in formation and partially in stereotypes of mass-media and public consciousness. These stereotypes exist rather in belief images than in hopes ones. And there are enough reasons for that.

The general condition of innovative activity still remains deplorable. Russian share in the world markets of highly technological production is hardly distinguishable, all about 0,3 %. In a world rating of innovative activity Russia takes the 51st place among 133 countries. The poor development of Russian SMB (small-to-medium business) is undoubtedly, one of the reasons of such backlog. The businessman is not a key character of real national economy yet, whereas the role of small enterprises in economic development of many countries is huge. For example, more than 50-60 % of the citizens in European Union, the USA and Japan work on SMB enterprises. In comparison with our country such SMB sector has only 10—11 % of its working people. Small-scale business in Russia has huge potential of growth. And in the nearest future such growth will define the economy development as a whole and will influence the growth of well-being of citizens of Russia and the country development.

In many respects the current situation is connected with ‘false feeling of safety’ among the power and a society representatives in Russia, warmed by “a cozy oil blanket” the last decade. There was only a change in 2009 after a year of financial crisis which has considerably reduced the size of this ‘oil blanket’. The eloquent message of the President of the Russian Federation to Federal meeting in 2009 and his articles ‘Forward, Russia!’ confirms it distinctly.

Simultaneously, one might find alarmed intensity as well as recognition of criticality of a developing situation, and elements of social designing (engineering) of the country’s future.

The situation might undoubtedly be traced due to a small selection of citations from the message of the President to Federal meeting on November, 12th, 2009: “Soviet Union has unfortunately remained the industrially-raw giant and hasn’t sustained a competition to postindustrial societies. An all-round modernization is necessary again in our country in the XXI-st century. We should begin modernization and technological updating of the whole industrial sphere. To the best of my belief (D.A.Medvedev’s), it is a question of a survival of our country in the modern world”.

The Advancing development of education and education of shots for necessary modernization of the country in «corpulent years» oil rich budget it has not been made. Once again country modernization will pass in a mode of mobilization and a historical time trouble. There is a danger that the role of a person in this process will be considered traditionally. Readiness of a society for demanded radical mental and cultural changes, presence of critical number of their creators necessary for planned transformations and creators- innovative leaders and the businessmen possessing necessary knowledge, abilities and moral values become defining. Danger of transformation of the human factor in limiting factor of development of the country today it is considerable above, than during other periods of our history.

The given work shows a real-life research of one of the major components of innovative business which is one of the major components of innovative entrepreneurship and is carried on in one of the possible centers of innovative development of Russia – the city of Krasnoyarsk. On the basis of the received data there is a general situation assessment and the forecast of readiness of students and business to new desirable activity.
The **businessman**
as the desirable ideal

The innovative activity is essentially different from ordinary kinds of activities and asks for unusual and unknown. The innovative culture grows out of set of cultural and mental accidents. It is no wonder that successful national innovative systems are rather an exception, than a rule in the modern world. Suffice it to say; despite a long-term great demand on them in the world, only two of them are currently working up-to-date in an effective way in the USA and Japan. In these countries there was a necessary combination of various factors which allowed them to create a basis of the new development and leadership. There, during their sensitive periods of growth and developments, a lot of young men might form such necessary qualities of businessmen-innovators as intuition, ability to a forecasting, ability to highlight some essential factors and ignore insignificant ones etc. These qualities, according to the founder of the theory of innovative development, Joseph Schumpeter14, are necessary for businessmen for creation and advancement of innovations, as:

1. The businessman should forecast a certain course of events and to make decisions in conditions of uncertainty, first of all, on the basis of his own experience.
2. A lot of problems are insert in psychology of the businessman when it’s easier to do common things than to take new unfamiliar activity or new production.
3. Innovations are always accompanied by the negative reactions of the social environment directed against those who are eager to do something new. Only special people (called leaders) are able to overcome these rejection reactions in crisis conditions (not boom conditions).
4. Due to this reason, innovators should not be simply leaders but businessmen-leaders, who are capable of inspiring, encouraging and leading activity of people in a necessary way.
5. The ‘Rejection’ of something useful and new is an important feature of all innovative processes and can be overcome only by the presence of people having a particular mentality (innovators-businessmen).

It should be noted that that Joseph Schumpeter used a special word to depict a person having such abilities that is ‘entrepreneur’. It has been translated into Russian as ‘a businessman’ and it does not precisely convey its meaning. There is no exact analogue of the word ‘entrepreneur’ in Russian of such a concept, created by Schumpeter (English – the businessman, the businessman, the businessman). The closest variant according to its sense and meaning variant is ‘the producer’ who is a person that establishes business, forms up a team, and attracts people. This concept is quite often used with a word combination ‘the businessman-leader’ which separates it from the concepts ‘businessman’ and ‘the private businessman’ that are well spread among Russian citizens. This word combination will be used further in this text.

It should be also mentioned that a number of people capable to innovative activity in Russia is a bit more than 19 %. Only 5 % of the total amount is inclined to perceive innovations and 14 % are ready for independence and common activity that is obviously not enough for innovative development of the country. 15 These researches have laid down a basis of population unavailability to innovative activity in our country. Thanks to different estimations, about third of working population has a necessary ‘critical mass’ of people with such personal features. It is obvious that such concentration of pro-innovative population supporting useful innovation is possible only in certain regions of the country, their big cities and points of innovative development. Due to
this reason, there is a search and revealing positive pro-innovative regional mental features that bring perspective for new activity among the population groups: students, experts and businessmen.¹⁶

Innovations is a transformation of knowledge and ideas to the goods or the services having a considerable consumer value and satisfying valid requirements. In this sense, a businessman acts as the key person who creates ‘Revolutionary Wealth’¹⁷, according to Elvin Toffler’s words. The most exact formula of an innovation is: ‘Innovations = 1 % of invention × of 99 % of enterprise’.¹⁸ The businessman-leader can be a kind of person who while generating or perceiving someone’s ideas transforms them into useful innovations (innovation) that have indisputable value for associates.

A natural consequence of this formula has a rigid enough statement that it is possible to be very inventive and not to be successful in innovative activity. It is possible to have a great number of creators of ideas (scientists, inventors) in the country and to have success in innovative economy as key characters in it are businessmen of special type who in many countries aren’t present. They essentially differ from usual heads (managers) according to their qualities and are actually considered as the businessmen-leaders who have abilities to form the vision of the future, to inspire people and to raise their energy.¹⁹ It is obvious that ethics of the given type of businessmen has some essential differences.

There are various possible ethical models of leadership:

• a leader – the defender (trustee);
• a leader – ‘a Confucian wise man’;
• a spokesman of idea of social equality;
• a leader – ‘neo stoic’ — who has a prevailing call of duty and adherence to classical ethical standards;
• a leader – super-professional;
• a charismatic leader.

Qualities of the leader can be in-born, developed and imitated.²⁰ That is why there is a basic possibility of overcoming of deadlock either seeming or real deficiency among such people in an initial stage of formation of ‘new economy’. A real practice, a sharp requirement and stimulating public opinion might essentially change the environment of vocational training and enter new motivations to self-development of new generations of managers – leaders. Such processes are promoted by a change of the general business atmosphere during an epoch of the globalized world with an increasing level of a competition. A new era has appeared in the life of business structures on the modern accelerated stage of globalization: it has become a change of an internal competition between managers of corporations and firms in the epoch of the cooperation which have found the concentrated expression in the team approach.

William Edwards Deming, an author of the ‘Japanese miracle’, has distinctly shown it in his latest book ‘New economy’: “We have grown in the conditions of a competition between people, commands, departments, divisions; pupils, schools, universities. Economists used to teach us that the competition would solve our problems. In reality, the up-to-date competition is destructive. It would be much better, if all of us worked as uniform system for the sake of a mutual. That is why cooperation and new management style are required for this purpose.”²¹

The psychology of the man becomes the major factor of transformation in administrative systems. Moreover, one has to admit an obvious fact that under such conditions modern ethics and business morals have become different than those that used to be beforehand.²²

Today a businessman-leader is a person for whom creativity and innovations are a
habit and as a result he creates and gives the consumer something new and valuable, using the possibilities he has noticed earlier.23 The given ethical installation is obviously necessary for encouragement and wide advancement in a new demanded labor productivity type – a synergetic one. Its basis is the effect of strengthening of collective expert group intelligence while solving problems in comparison with possible individual decisions in this group. 24

The main challenge today for Russia and other countries, seeking for innovative future, is a quality type of real businessmen. It is obvious that education and preparation of a great number of such people is a serious challenge for the Russian society and its formation. And one can cope with this new challenge on the basis of last researches of ethics of the new world that comes in our view.

**Ethics in the innovative world**

The role of ethics is changing greatly today. Modern ethics is a difficult, multilevel system of the theory and practice. Its complication is caused not only by natural growth (accumulation of knowledge and transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones), but what particularly important is the changing of morals (ethics subject).

Traditional ethics is supplemented with social ethics and a rapidly growing ‘tree’ of applied ethics, including ethics of innovative business. And one has to admit an obvious fact that modern ethics and business morals are not the same they used to be earlier.25

The first stage in morals development is a traditional society that is characterized by ‘natural’ morals. The morals of a traditional society have been formed in conditions of sedentary society. This type of a society is distinguished by its weak social movements, mediatization of manufacture relations by the limited collectives (a rural community, a guild, a workshop, a caste).26

The second stage is a **Modernist style society** which is characterized by ‘rational’ morals. The industrial civilization forms the world of “the big society», the world of “the expanded order» where the rational morals define the principles, values and norms: a material prosperity, the civil rights and freedom, business and professional success. The unity and collectivism place takes the individualism place and informal communications lose its, turning into “alienation” and formalism. Searching for new experience and experimentation replaces set activities and the relativity and moral ‘flexibility’ replace traditionalism of moral standards and principles.

‘**The postrational**’ morals is the third stage in morals development which is morals of a society of ‘the third postindustrial wave’ that don’t force out previous types of morals on a roadside of moral life of a society, which is ‘overbuilt’, and requires special ways of coexistence with equal reason.27 In a changing society there still remains the requirement for universal moral standards which is run by principles of a complementarity and axiological pluralism.

Nowadays we are living in a transitive epoch of a society that has ‘a high modernist style’ with typical for it postrational morals. In ethics of a new society there is a strengthening of a moral pragmatism which, certainly, is also inherent in morals of an industrial society but which has been focused on private interests. This ‘moral pragmatism’, exponentiated, also forms the base of the social ethics, which valuable systems are capable to provide regulatory and other functions of morals that arise in innovative society.28

The comparative analysis of stages in morals development becomes more accurate at allocation of the beginning integrating society,
its binding force. Tradition is such a force at the first stage and ideology is at the second stage in the Modernist style society. The modern morals develop in the conditions of the increasing orientation to its practical utility.

A ‘brought up’ person as the knight of the society of changes

A historical ‘order’ for the new person and new ‘humanism’ is discussed actively enough. The humanism of a postindustrial society rotates around a ‘brought up’ person which presentiment of arrival is felt in Boris Strugatsky’s Great educational revolution. “The true need in the person ‘brought up’ has appeared now and demands urgent actions, the person ‘brought up’ is a person ‘always creative and not living carefree and easily’.

The researcher of ethics of business John K. Maxwell calls such person ‘a knight’ of a society of ‘the third wave’ and arising ethics ‘the person of the third mile’. The origin of an image of ‘the person of the third mile’ is taken from an ancient Roman history. «Two millennia ago in Roman empire the military leader could force to carry anyone any burden in a distance of one mile. A military leader had such a right, and the soldier who had disobeyed the order, was punished given the death sentence. Therefore ‘to pass one mile’ meant to do the minimum”. The person of ‘the second mile’ according to Maxwell is the person carrying more social duties, than that is formally asked from a society. The person of ‘the second mile’:

- shows more cares than others consider reasonable,
- risks more than others find safe,
- dreams more than others consider practical,
- expects more than others believe is possible,
- works more than others find necessary.

According to Maxwell, there is no obstacles on the second mile. If you always do at least slightly more than from what is expected from you, you will not only rise over mediocrity, but also help another to rise together with you».

The person of ‘the third mile’ goes further. He is independent and overloads himself with social responsibility with which sometimes he cannot cope with at all. «Help people who cannot help you. Do it right when it is ‘natural’ to do right. Keep a word, even if it brings only troubles’ – here its ethical sets.

It is obvious that such person lives according to a special rule of morals. For the Not only simple high consciousness is typical for moral postmodern subject, but also self-putting of moral duty. This model fits well into the theory of development of moral subject by Lawrence Kolberg, taking a place at the highest level of moral development of the person.

The moral law of new time

A principle of the new ethics considering a difference of people can briefly be formulated as follows: Act in a way your greatest abilities will serve for the greatest requirements of other people. This moral law shows quite distinctly the coincidence of the purposes of activity of the moral person and socially significant innovations – innovations, a basis of a postindustrial society. Nobody in the whole world can do the things I can instead of me. The higher moral value shows my difference from other people, their difference from me and the difference of everyone from each other. The problem lies in generalizing and deducing this moral law which is a common right and duty to differ from everyone. Do what others need and what can’t do any other person!

The best action, according to M.Epstein, is an action which will be coordinated with
requirements of the major and possibilities of the minor number of people. The first criterion is universality of the moral action, the second one is uniqueness. The morals are impossible without that and another. Hence: Act to become an object of the given action, but no other person could become its subject! Act so that everyone could do but that nobody can do instead of you!

Morals are possibilities which we create for each other. Therefore in a new society in human relations ethical requirements are not justified towards each other, but possibilities which they create for each other. First of all, it’s for achievement of the general significant purposes. The new paradigm of moral behavior is reflected in the direct image (or follows from it) in definition of the modern businessman: “A Businessman is a person for whom creativity and innovations are a habit, so in a result of the given possibilities, he creates and delivers something new and valuable to the consumer”.

The given ethical set is obviously necessary for encouragement and wide advancement of new demanded type of labor productivity – a synergetic one. On the basis of synergetic labor productivity the effect of strengthening of the collective intelligence which has been found out in the mid-eighties and consisting lies that the group of experts has an important ability to find the decision of problems more effective, than the best individual decision in this group.

A person-oriented division of labor in the organized group promotes the increase of its productivity, and this circumstance as well as the others has become a basis of the new moral law of a postindustrial society. The personal qualities of effective representatives of an enterprise class – businessmen-leaders – have led to successful development enough great number of the countries (Singapore, Japan, republic Korea etc.) last decades and are not only theoretically important (virtual) for them, but are operating factors of success.

In what way is the given scheme of an ethical choice realized in Russia? To get the answer to this question, we made an opinion poll among students, experts and businessmen, participating or intending to participate in innovative activity, in Krasnoyarsk in December, 2009 – January. The personal qualities of businessmen-leaders noted above have been put in a basis of the questionnaire of the given poll.

**Poll groups**

Poll was held in February – May, 2010.
As a whole, 41 businessmen, 45 experts and 42 students have been interrogated.

The average age of businessmen is 42 years. About three out of four interrogated businessmen there were men (71 %), hardly more a quarter were women (29 %). All of them are proprietors of private enterprise or private businessmen, 100 % from them have higher education.

The average age of experts is 35,5 years. The number of men and women of experts was almost equal (24 and 21 persons, accordingly). The majority of experts (19 people) were scientists, university tutors, political scientists and journalists. Other experts are heads of Institutes of the Russian Academy of Sciences, heads and employees of the state or municipal enterprises. 91 % of experts have higher education, 9 % – incomplete higher or average vocational training.

The average age of students that took part in this poll is 20 years. They are students from Siberian Federal University, the Siberian State Technological University and Krasnoyarsk State Teacher Training University of V.P.Astafev and have such specialties as physics, management, philology, history, philosophy, psychology and economy.
Innovative economy
as the desirable purpose
of development
Awareness of ‘new economy’

The image of the desirable future is the major element of formation strategic goal-setting and future planning and defines its vision and is most full reflected in popularity of its key concepts. The conducted researches show that the concept ‘innovative economy’ is well-known for Krasnoyarsk experts and businessmen (71.11% and 65.85%, accordingly). Every fourth businessman (26.83%) and every fifth expert (22.22%) heard something about it, and only a minor part of them (on 7.32%) heard about it for the first time. The students have another situation. Only a quarter of the interrogated students are well-aware about the concept ‘innovative economy’, and more than two thirds (71.43%) have heard something about it. Such is a deficiency of pro-innovative formation.

From the list of the offered definitions of concept ‘innovative economy’ the greatest support was received by two of them: “It is such type of economy in which the profit is created not at the expense of production of goods and not at the expense of concentration of a financial resource, but at the expense of the intellectual capital” and “It is the economy making products with high cost”. The first formulation was supported by more than half of experts (55.56%), half of students and about half of businessmen (46.34%). The second – about half of experts and businessmen (46.67% and 41.46%, accordingly) and only about a quarter of students (23.81%). They find another variant of the answer more attractive: “It is the economy making the new goods and services”. We will notice that in poll it was possible to choose some variants of the answer and for this reason the sum of answers often exceeds 100%.

Much bigger distinction is observed in an estimation of degree of development of innovative sector of economy. The greatest pessimists are businessmen. More than half from them (58.54%) consider that we “are far behind the developed countries”, and almost third (31.71%) – that “innovative economy only starts to develop”. At experts the relation to these questions are nearly equal (44.44 and 42.22%, accordingly). Students sound more ‘optimistic’: 12% of them believe that backlog of our country from the developed countries isn’t great, more than half of students (54.76%) consider that our innovative economy only starts to develop. Only about third of them (28.57%) consider that we strongly lag behind the developed countries’.

As a whole, the received results show that Krasnoyarsk citizens, significant for formation of public opinion of group, have adequate enough representations about the degree of development of innovative economy in our country.

Estimation of utility
of formed innovative economy

The utility of any goal-setting is an indisputable feature in the picture of the world of each person. It has already been noticed that in expert community of Russia there is a big alarm that inhabitants of our country have no adequate representation about the basic calls of time and that the country population lags behind for thirty-forty years on all spectrum of key problems: development of new economy, country modernization and other problems. Do these alarms refer to the community of experts and businessmen in Krasnoyarsk? The data presented on Fig. 1, shows distinctly that it’s not so. In spite of the fact that an overwhelming number of the interrogated respondents believe that the innovative sector of economy in our country only starts to develop, the utility of ‘new economy’ doesn’t cause any doubts in the majority of them. Businessmen and experts estimate utility of new economy in a different
Fig. 1. Distribution of answers to a question: What do you think an innovative economy may give to Russian citizens?

Way. Experts are the most optimistic and patriotic. From Fig. 1 it is clear that almost two thirds from them (62,22 %) consider that “the innovative economy is chance for creation of competitive Russia”. About half – that “it is a necessary chance for creation of competitive economy of Russia”, 46,67 % – that “the new economy will give chance for realization of the possibilities of many active people” and only hardly more quarters from them consider, it «will allow to provide a high standard of living of Russia citizens”. Almost every tenth expert (11,11 %) considers that development of innovative economy is a unique chance of creation of influential community of businessmen. Only about third of experts is pessimistic about the future of innovative economy (29, 85 %).

The businessmen opinions are more balanced. Almost an equal number of them believe that ‘the innovative economy is chance
for creation of competitive Russia’, and that ‘the
new economy will give chance for realization of
the possibilities to many active people’ (39,02 and
41,46 %, accordingly).

Only a very seventh interrogated businessman
(14,63 %) considers that the new economy ‘will
allow to provide a high standard of living for
Russian citizens’ and every tenth of them (9,76 %)
is patriotic, believing that the new economy is ‘a
necessary resource for Russian leadership in the
global world’. The expectations of businessmen
are more pessimistic than expectations of experts.
Every fifth of them considers that possibilities of
innovative economy are limited by raw economy
(21,95 %) and before its development to us is
very far (19, 51 %). Thus, a number of optimists
among businessmen of all in 1,25 times above
pessimists.

Students perceive innovative economy as
vital hope. It, in their opinion, will not only
give chance for realization to active people
(40,48 %), it will enable to provide a high
standard of living (28, 89 %), but also can bring
a lot of use (26,19 %). Besides, they believe
that development of new economy also will be
useful for our country. Almost half from them
considers that development of new economy will
give chance for creation of competitive economy
of Russia, and more than a quarter of students
believe that the innovative economy will be a
resource for country leadership in the global
world (26,19 %).

A total number of students, is pessimistic
estimating the future of new economy, and is
close to number of experts-pessimists (totally
only 26,19 %). Thus, the number of experts and
the students optimistically estimating utility of
innovative economy for the country, inhabitants
and active people, accordingly in 2,35 and in 2,82
times exceeds the quantity is pessimistic experts
and the students sharing doubts of the successful
future of innovative economy in Russia.

It is really necessary to notice a very
insignificant number of interrogated, considering
that “there are no historical bases for construction
of innovative economy in Russia”, and that “we
can repeat only another’s innovations “(4,88, 0
and 7,14 %, accordingly businessmen, experts and
students). It is a very important fact for creation
of the environment encouraging innovative
activity.

Society support

Future innovative businessmen-leaders can
count on serious starting psychological support of
a society. This result in even more distinct form
which prove to be the true results of answers to a
question about the prospects of development of
innovative business in Russia.

From Fig. 2. It is clear that 100 % of
participants of poll negatively treat statements
‘Business is alien to Russian culture’ and, “there
is no special requirement for business”. It is
also evident from the chart that distribution of
answers of representatives of different groups is
close enough, except for the relation to a question
on positive influence of an economic crisis on
formation of innovative business. A major part
of experts (every fifth) considers that crisis will
seriously affect the development of innovative
business that more than twice of businessmen
and the students have the same point of view.

It attracts attention of very small number
of businessmen, experts and students, “having
no doubts in the successful future of innovative
business” (2,44, 4,44 and 4, 76 %, accordingly).
It, undoubtedly, testifies to presence in public
opinion of the appreciable skeptical relation to
a reality of development of new economy in the
near future. However the number of participants
of poll isn’t big considering that “special prospects
for development of innovative business aren’t
visible yet”. So believes every seventh in all three
groups of poll. The basic distinction of opinions
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Fig. 2. Distribution of opinions of Krasnoyarsk businessmen, experts and students about prospects of development of innovative business in Russia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the prospects of development of innovative business in Russia in your point of view?</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Experts</th>
<th>Businessmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The development of civilized innovative business requires a lot of time and efforts, and it will be developing slowly in Russia in quite a long period of time</td>
<td>14,29%</td>
<td>15,56%</td>
<td>20,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business will be developing step by step, despite all the available problems. This is a challenge of time.</td>
<td>40,48%</td>
<td>37,78%</td>
<td>37,78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no special prospects for development of innovative productive business in our country yet.</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic crisis will help greatly in formation of innovative business</td>
<td>14,63%</td>
<td>15,56%</td>
<td>20,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no doubts in its successful future. It is useful and necessary beyond all doubt.</td>
<td>4,76%</td>
<td>4,44%</td>
<td>2,44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business is alien to Russian culture</td>
<td>14,29%</td>
<td>14,29%</td>
<td>15,56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems to me, there is no special requirement for business</td>
<td>7,32%</td>
<td>9,52%</td>
<td>7,32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Distribution of opinions of Krasnoyarsk businessmen, experts and students about prospects of development of innovative business in Russia

is observed at a choice strategically optimistic (‘business will develop despite available problems’) and pessimistic (‘development of innovative business will develop slowly during enough long time‘) positions.

From Fig. 2. It is clear that distribution of participants of poll on these questions occurs approximately in regular intervals (about 40% in each of groups, with hardly big (on 8-10%) more pessimistic relation to speed formation of new economy at businessmen). As a whole, results of the poll show that of a creation of new economy in our country is desirable, according to a considerable part of representatives of poll groups. The received result is very important for the further analysis as representations of the poll participants about those or other psychological features of the businessman-leader, strictly speaking, are in a greater way turned into the future, than based on available experience. For this reason it is necessary to expect that results of poll represent some mixture of ideal (virtual) and real (from available experience) representations about desirable shape of the businessman-leader.

The businessman-leader of Krasnoyarsk as the reality

Is a businessmen-leader the main character of new economy for poll groups? Research shows that it’s not so yet. There are several characters of new economy. They can be united in groups of
“organizers” and “creators”, using a well-known theoretical representations by Peter Drucker 38.

For businessmen this list consists of six priority persons (Fig. 3): the entrepreneur (46,34 %), the businessman (34,15 %), the scientist (31,71 %), the organizer (29,27 %), the inventor (26,83 %), the government (23,68 %) and the creator (17,07 %). The correlation of organizers of different type (without the government) to various creators is 1,45.

For experts there is another representation of the main characters of new economy. Their list consists of seven persons meaningful for them. The first places is taken by the scientist and the inventor (on 37,78 %). Then comes the businessman (31,11 %), the government (28,89 %) and the organizer (15,56 %), the sponsor (15,56 %) and the creator (13,33 %) follows. The correlation of organizers to creators is only 0,77, i.e. twice as less than with businessmen.

For students the following five characters are significant: the scientist and the inventor (on 26,19 %), then follow equally important businessman and the government (on 21,43 %) and the creator (11,90 %). The correlation of organizers to creators in the given group
is 0.58. Students unlike businessmen and experts essentially distinguish role functions of businessmen and businessmen. Businessmen almost don’t participate in innovative business.

The received results show that there is an important ideological distinction in representations of innovative economy at businessmen (it reflects a priority role of “organizers” in innovative activity) and experts and students whose traditional representation (a stereotype of the recent past) about priority creators in creation and innovation advancement is dominant.

Valuable sets for businessmen-leaders

While taking on a business decisions the key factor are values of the persons, taking on this decisions. In innovative business it is businessmen-leaders. Ethical values are the rules of behavior based either on inner conviction, or on the prospective purposes or results. It is obvious that in case of innovative activity they should have special character.

There are seven major valuable sets for businessmen with very close ratings of answers (40-30 %):

- aspiration to innovations,
- ability to work in a team,
- a recognition of competition and cooperation value,
- patience and ability to wait for success,
- admitting the value of education, science, technology and culture,
- conviction in utility of the business not only for yourself, but also for others, for a society and the state,
- Self-trust and trust to others,
- an ability to form future vision.

The list of ratings of answers is made (here and in the lists below) according to reduction of percent of a rating of the answer.

Thus, it is possible to say that images of modern innovative business are shared among more than a third of businessmen in Krasnoyarsk.

For experts the given picture is even more significant. For them the major valuable sets are ten with answer ratings in an interval (60 – 40 %):

- ability to work in a team,
- aspiration to innovations,
- a recognition of competition and cooperation value,
- conviction in utility of the business not only for yourself, but also for others, for a society and the state,
- A respect for the property, the government, laws,
- an ability to form vision of the future,
- admitting the value of education, science, technology and culture,
- Patience and ability to wait success,
- Self-trust and trust to others
- an ability to create culture of training and self-training.

For students the given picture also is close. For them the major valuable sets are eight with answer ratings in an interval (66 – 40 %):

- A recognition of competition and cooperation value,
- an ability to work in a team,
- respecting yourself of as person and any person as yourself,
- Conviction in utility of the business not only for itself, but also for others, for a society and the state,
- Aspiration to innovations,
- admitting the value of education, science, technology and culture,
- Respect of the property, the government and laws,
- An ability to form future vision.

At all three lists above have six same sets which can possibly be considered as a core of desirable system of values of the businessman-
leader as they are shared by the majority of participants of this poll (from 40 to 66 % depending on a kind of group of the poll):

1) ability to work in a team,
2) aspiration to innovations,
3) a recognition of competition and cooperation value,
4) conviction in utility of the business not only for yourself, but also for others, for a society and the state,
5) admitting the value of education, science, technology and culture,
6) an ability to form future vision.

Personal qualities of the successful businessman-leader

The received results show that for more half of interrogated businessmen and experts following personal qualities are very significant: readiness to run risks, pursuing the exact set goals and new possibilities, persistence (65-44 %). Perseverance, persistence in solving the problems, a victory spirit, honesty, self-control (61-22 % for businessmen and 64-33 % for experts) also are of vital importance for them. Experts value in high degree such qualities of businessmen that are useful from their point of view, as a thirst for achievements and self-criticism (24-22 %). Students are more exacting to the personal qualities of businessmen. From three quarters to half of students consider that the businessman-leader should be ready to run risks, be persevering, pursue the exact set goals and new possibilities, to be persistent in solving the problems, the decision of problems, have self-control. Creativity and self-criticism should also be important for him.

As a whole, the basic desirable characteristics of the businessman-leader coincide among the representatives of all the three groups. The difference lies in fact that the list of desirable characteristics of a major part of experts and students is wider and also their requirements stricter than those of businessmen. A core of desirable system referring to the characteristics of the businessman and stated by half and more participants of groups of poll are:

- readiness to run risks, pursuing the exact set goals and new possibilities and persistence.
- 1. Have reputations of honest people (53,66; 66,67 and 64,29 %, accordingly, businessmen, experts and students),
- 2. Are reliable (51,2; 71,11 and 73,81 %),
- 3. Show respect to employees, treating them as partners (48,78; 68,89 and 61, 90 %),
- 4. Inspire (34,15; 44,44 and 26,19 %),
- 5. Are able to listen (29,27; 51,11 and 33,33 %).

Observing the difference in figures among businessmen and students from more exacting or in some way more ‘idealized’ requirements, the figures of experts considerable distinctions in comparison with their vision. However, this close enough vision reflects the desirable picture of the world of ‘the brought up person’ of new time depicted above.

The given results show quite self-coordinated system of sets and the values, allowing us to make rather important conclusions.

As an example we can take a very high and almost equal level of support among the interrogated respondents of the known point of view of Francis Fukuyama39 that not moral countries can’t reach a high level of well-being. It was supported by more than half of businessmen, experts and students (56,10; 57,78 and 52,38 %, accordingly). More than 10 % of businessmen have also supported a position «I have seen it quite a number of time in my life. One can earn money often in a legal way. The fifth part of businessmen...
(19,51 %). More a quarter of experts (28,89 %) and more than a third part of students (35,71 %) believe that it probably may happen and support a position ‘Perhaps, sometimes it happens so.’

**Trust**

Now the trust is a basis of new economy, it can possibly be called a core and a major ideological base. The well-being of the nation becomes a cultural characteristic – the level of the trust inherent in the given society. There are well-known elements of trust: predictability, reliability and belief. Sociologists as well as economists, measure trust by answering the question «Is it possible to trust the majority of people?» The level of trust is 40-42 % among people in the countries with effective national innovative systems.

In Russia the share of affirmative replies to this question has considerably fallen for last 20 years. In 1990 trust level in Russia, according to the international service World Values Survey was 38 %, in 1995 and 1999 it became 24 %, and in 2005 rose up to 27 %. According to the data of ‘public opinion Fund’, the level of trust in Russia in 1991 was 36 %, in 2006 it became 22 %, and by 2009 rose to 33 %. Suffice it to say, according to the following research, the level of trust level varies in different regions of our country. So, according to the same data of ‘public opinion Fund’, in Novosibirsk and Irkutsk areas the level of trust level considerably exceeded all-Russian in 2008 (above 38 %), in the Tomsk region it was close to 38 %, in Krasnoyarsk region, the Kemerovo and Omsk areas it was a little below an average in Russia (28-32 %).

Our research shows that students, experts and businessmen can quite precisely estimate the trust size in our region (31-29 %) and believe that the level of trust should be considerably higher for successful innovative activity. So believes more than 34-40 % of students, experts and businessmen. A low level of trust between Krasnoyarsk citizens can become a serious barrier in its innovative development and should be overcome with advancing development of social and arts innovations and, first of all, the change of goal-setting in education. So believes almost one third of businessmen (29 %) and more than half of experts (52 %).

**A scale of ethical moral development of businessmen-leaders**

Dominating opinion of all interrogated is that the share of such moral civilized businessmen in our country is insignificant and less than 10 %. That was stated by half of businessmen (43,90 %), more than half of students (54,76 %) and third of experts (33,33 %). Appreciable number of representatives of these groups (14,63; 15,56 and 11,90 %, accordingly) believe that there are less than 1-2 % of them. More than a third of experts (37,78 %) unlike 15-17 % of businessmen and students consider that them much more (about 20 %). As a whole, it is obvious that while the number necessary for innovative development of the country of businessmen in the country is insignificant, as it is not surprising, as mass demand for them while really isn’t available. In this connection resulted above figure can be considered as rather encouraging.

The surprising fact of this research is close agreement (within several percent) of opinions of representatives of different groups of poll according to a share of levels of business in Krasnoyarsk region on a scale of moral development of Kohlberg. The given scale has six levels:

**Level 1.** A ‘primitive’ stage. Desire to avoid physical discomfort.

**Level 2.** ‘A child’ stage. Desire to take pleasure.
Level 3. ‘A good guy’ stage. Desire to be accepted in your close environment.

Level 4. “Law and an order” stage. Desire to avoid conflicts within the law.

Level 5. A stage of social responsibility.

Level 6. A stage of patronage and charity.

In their opinion, the highest stages of business development are ‘patronage and charity’ and ‘social responsibility’ which has 7 and 14 % of businessmen, accordingly. All the rest stages of business development businessmen are approximately equal and take the lower positions of ‘the good guy’, ‘A child’ stage, ‘law and an order’ and a ‘primitive’ stage.

The conclusion

The conducted research has shown that the major part of the interviewee (businessmen, experts and students of Krasnoyarsk) supports personal qualities of successful businessman-leaders that are well-used in theory and practice in successful innovative countries. Almost half of them are the main valuable sets that are considerably different from the majority of stereotypes in mass-media and public opinion.

The received results testify that in Krasnoyarsk there is a rather big level of positive perception of ‘innovative economy’ and a support of innovative businessmen-leaders. In spite of a considerable difference in figures in representations of students, experts and businessmen, as a whole, for the majority of them they are close enough to a desirable picture of successful innovative activity. As a whole, more than half of students and experts and almost half of businessmen in Krasnoyarsk are sure that the innovative economy in our country will develop step by step and that crisis will help it with it.
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Конец XX века резко изменил картину экономического развития мира. Возникло новое разделение труда, усилилась потребность в системном инновационном развитии многих отраслей экономики, образования и общественной жизни. Эти изменения последовательно фиксировались в идеях новых видов обществ. Названия этих обществ условны и не связаны с какой-либо идеологией развития. Они предельно функциональны и несут в себе
явно социологическую окраску, поскольку в их названиях отчётливо отражается новый приоритетный тип деятельности населения (более 50 %) конкретной страны. В «инновационном обществе» такими людьми являются «организаторы» (предприниматели-антрепренеры), знающие потребности рынка и ищущие необходимые знания (идеи) для создания нужного востребованного на рынке продукта, и «творцы» (учёные и инженеры-новаторы), способные создать идею и реализовать ее в конкурентоспособном продукте – инновации.
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Работа выполнена при финансовой поддержке федеральной целевой программы “Научные и научно-педагогические кадры инновационной России на 2009-2013 гг.”