

DOI 10.36074/09.10.2020.v1.08

SPECIFICS OF FORMATION THE RELEVANCE AGGREGATE INDICATOR OF THE ENTERPRISE INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL

RESEARCH GROUP:

Iryna Hnatenko

Candidate of Economics, Associate professor, Doctoral student
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design

Olha Romashko

Candidate of Economics, Associate professor, Associate professor of the
Accounting and Taxation Department
Kyiv national university of trade and economics

Viktoriia Rubezhanska

Candidate of Economics, Senior Lecturer of the Finance,
Accounting and Banking Department
Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University

Oleksiy Patsarniuk

Postgraduate student
Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman

Inna Kozlenko

Applicant for Higher Education
Poltava State Agrarian Academy

UKRAINE

Relevant innovation potential of the enterprise represents the potential, the capabilities of which meet the conditions for achieving the desired goals, the content of the functions performed in the process of innovation, the current strategy of company development, as well as the requirements of innovative projects in each case. Therefore, determining the degree of IP relevance is an important area of evaluation [1-2]. The essence of calculating the degree of relevance of IP is to determine the level of provision of all components of IP with a certain amount of resources needed to implement the current strategy of innovative development (or to implement a specific innovation project). In the process of calculating the relevance of IP, the most methodological difficulty is to determine the number and composition of qualitative, and in some cases, quantitative indicators characterizing the resources (labor, financial material, information and technological) that ensure the functioning of components of enterprise IP. The solution to this problem is closely linked to the plans of the management of each individual enterprise strategy for the development and use of existing IP [3-5]. It is impossible to consider in the framework of this study all possible strategies and projects as well as to take into account the specifics of the activities of thousands of innovative enterprises without violating the universality of the proposed integrated approach to IP evaluation. Therefore, we propose for each component of the enterprise's IP a general list of possible quantitative indicators, which may vary on a case-by-case basis to supplement or reduce, depending on the particular features of innovation activity of a particular enterprise.

The volume and composition of qualitative indicators for the calculation of the aggregate indicator of IP relevance depends directly on the specificity of the innovation activity of the enterprise (innovation project). Therefore, the list of these indicators can be infinitely long, so it is pointless to give all the qualitative indicators characterizing IP. We consider it advisable to carry out the evaluation of qualitative indicators with the help of expert methods, in the framework of which the issues of choosing the number of experts, their composition, scale of evaluations and methods of processing the results are solved.

The final step in a comprehensive approach to IP evaluation is to calculate an aggregate indicator of IP relevance. This indicator is of considerable interest when comparing the IP of several enterprises among themselves to decide on the choice of one of them for the implementation of a specific innovation project. The calculation of the aggregate indicator of relevance is associated with great methodological difficulties, which are to compare and evaluate relative to each other different quantitative and qualitative quantities. To solve this problem, we consider it advisable to use the method of geometric assembly. To use this method, the number of IP relevance indicators must be equal to four. Each indicator has its own measuring scale with its dimension (percentages, coefficients, integers, etc.), scale and limits of indicators. For four indicators, a corresponding graph is constructed in the form of a square, each side of which is a measuring scale for fixing the value of a particular indicator at a certain point in time. The corresponding measurement scales (sides of the square) capture the values of indicators at a certain point in time. The fixed values on opposite sides of the square are joined by straight lines whose intersection point (A) characterizes the aggregate relevance of IP. If at any point in time the values of all indicators reach the threshold positive values, then the intersection point will move to the upper right corner. This will mean the maximum value of aggregate relevance of IP. By plotting another scale (diagonal) with gradations from 0 to 100 and lowering the perpendicular from the point of intersection to this scale, we can get the degree of relevance of IP at this point in time.

It should be emphasized separately that the application of the method of geometric addition is possible with any number of indicators [6-8]. So, if the number of indicators is less than 4, for example 3, then one of them is duplicated on the perpendicular side of the square graph. With more of them, separate graphs are built for each group of indicators. After that, the resulting graph is constructed, on the axes of which the relevance of each group of 4 indicators is marked, but not the individual indicators.

The interpretation of the results of the aggregate indicator calculation of enterprise IP relevance can be demonstrated as follows:

0-20% - critically low degree of relevance of IP, (all components of IP have a negative tendency, innovative capabilities of the enterprise are extremely low);

20-40% - low degree of relevance of IP, (several components of IP have a negative tendency, all other components are stable, innovative capabilities of the enterprise are low);

40-60% - average degree of relevance of IP, (all components of IP are stable, there is no positive or negative dynamics, innovation capabilities of the enterprise are average);

60-80% - sufficient degree of relevance of IP, (several components of IP have a positive tendency, all other components are stable, the enterprise has sufficient opportunities to carry out effective innovation activity (successful implementation of the innovation project));

80-100% - high degree of relevance of IP, (all components of IP have a positive tendency, the company has high opportunities for effective innovation (successful implementation of the innovation project)) [9-10].

Thus, an aggregate indicator of relevance, calculated as part of a comprehensive approach to the enterprise IP evaluation, provides an opportunity to make informed conclusions about the adequacy of the level of providing all components of the enterprise with the resources necessary for the implementation of a specific strategy of innovative development of the enterprise, implementation of a specific innovation project, conducting innovative activity as a whole.

References:

- [1] Kuksa I., Shtuler I., Orlova-Kurilova O., Hnatenko I. & Rubezhanska V. (2019). Innovation cluster as a mechanism for ensuring the enterprises interaction in the innovation sphere, *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 41(4), 487-500. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.15544/mts.2019.39>
- [2] Hnatenko, I., Orlova-Kurilova, O., Shtuler, I., Serzhanov, V. & Rubezhanska, V. (2020). An Approach to Innovation Potential Evaluation as a Means of Enterprise Management Improving. *International Journal of Supply and Operations Management*, 7 (1), 112-118. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijson.2020.1.7>.
- [3] Samborskyi, O., Isai, O., Hnatenko, I., Parkhomenko, O., Rubezhanska, V. & Yershova, O. (2020). Modeling of foreign direct investment impact on economic growth in a free market. *Accounting*, 6(5), 705-712. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ac.2020.6.014>
- [4] Hanushchak-Efimenko, L., Hnatenko, I., Parkhomenko, O. & Rubezhanska, V. (2019). Competitive Advantages of the Cluster as a Factor in Increasing the Investment Activity of Innovative Entrepreneurship. *Bulletin of the Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design. Series: Economic sciences*, 6 (149), 8-17.
- [5] Petryk, O., Semenov, A., Hnatenko, I., Samiilenko, A., Rubezhanska, V. & Patsarniuk, O. (2020). Conceptual model for assessing the investment attractiveness of innovative projects of industrial enterprises. *Accounting*, 6(6). Retrieved from: [10.5267/j.msl.2020.8.015](https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.8.015)
- [6] Hnatenko, I., Rubezhanska, V. (2018). Architectonics of the concept of the national labour market regulation. *Journal Management*, 1 (27), 79-90.
- [7] Гнатенко, І. А. & Рубежанська, В. О. (2017). Логіка впровадження інноваційних заходів на регіональний ринок праці в умовах його циклічного розвитку. *Бізнес Інформ*, 8, 110-115.
- [8] Гнатенко, І. А. & Рубежанська, В. О. (2018). Державне регулювання ринку праці з позицій стратегічного та стейкхолдерно-орієнтованого підходів. *Бізнес Інформ*, 8, 100-105.
- [9] Гнатенко, І. А. & Рубежанська, В. О. (2016). Вплив глобалізації на національний та регіональні ринки праці в Україні. *Вісник Одеського національного університету імені І.І. Мечникова*, 3(21), 109-112.
- [10] Гнатенко, І. А. & Рубежанська, В. О. (2018). Регіональний ринок праці Луганської області: сучасний стан та причини незадовільного функціонування. *Науковий економічний журнал «Інтелект XXI»*, 1, 39-44.