

CROSS-COUNTRY ANALYSIS OF COMPETITIVENESS TOWARDS INNOVATION POTENTIAL ASSESSMENT FOR INDUSTRIALS

Leonid Taraniuk

Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine

Hanna Shvindina

Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine

Stanislav Kotenko

Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine

Abayomi Awujola

Bingham University, Karu, Nigeria

Karina Taraniuk

Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine

Hongzhou Qiu

Henan Institute of Science and Technology, Xinxiang, China

ABSTRACT

The global competitiveness report reveals the cross-regional and cross-country disparities, and the innovation development of industrials shows how difficult it is to build and support competitiveness at a high level and increase innovation potential. The bibliometric analysis proved the diversity of the studies in the field and the increasing trend in paper production. The lack of understanding of the link between different levels of competitiveness and the need to monitor and forecast innovative development necessitated the cross-country benchmarking of industrials' innovation potential. The offered methodology is a seven-stage algorithm of innovation potential assessment, based on an existing GCI methodology modified to reveal innovation development differences and tendencies for particular industries. The ranking was performed for major industrial countries to reveal the gaps in innovative activities and develop catch-up strategies.

Keywords: analysis, subindex, competitiveness, industrials, machine-building, cross-country analysis, bibliometric analysis, innovation potential.

DOI: [\(http://dx.doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v8i1.__\(Editor will provide\)\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v8i1.__(Editor will provide))

INTRODUCTION

The globalization rate, and acceleration of the 4.0 and 5.0 industry transformations, the gap between poor and rich countries, visible earlier (Jiang, & Probst, 2017), became bigger,

especially under COVID-19 exogenous shock. Economic entities of different types have urgent needs of forming a new basis for competitiveness and innovations to compete globally. While the latest machine-building trends are disrupting the industry, some countries are left behind. According to the research of Maslyak and Dakhno (Maslyak & Dachno, 2003), as well as according to economic geography data (Geografiya mashinobuduvannya svitu, 2019), the countries - major manufactures of machine-building products are the USA, Germany, France, Japan, UK, China, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Brazil. Many studies focused on the nexus between innovations, economic growth, and development of certain industries (for instance, IT or ICT technologies (Pradhan et al., 2019). The contributing role of the industrial sector in GDP and economic growth is a well-developed topic (Stereov & Rosillo, 2019). There are two unanswered questions: identifying the 'innovation potential' of an entity or a country and increasing the chances of this entity in the global competitive game. Achieving this goal may be hampered by a lack of resources or global crises, inflation, national currencies instability, and countries' financial dependence on world donors. There should be geopolitical concerns among local difficulties, the predominance of leading countries' technologies, local governments' crises, and so on. Given this, it is necessary to introduce economic monitoring of the industrials' innovation activity to analyze their ability to generate innovative outcomes and implement innovative technologies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The innovational potential is still a puzzle for a researcher. Since Schumpeter, the discussions about the source and nature of the innovations have not subsided. In Schumpeter's works, the innovations were considered as a new combination related to the new product, or new quality, a new production technology, or a new market, a new source of supply of raw materials, or implementing the new organization in an industry (Hagedoorn, 1996). On the one hand, these postulates were criticized and, and on the other, they became a line of research for prominent scholars, such as Ansoff (Ansoff's Matrix) and Abell (strategic windows theory). The seminal work by C. Christensen that coined disruptive innovations has pushed strategists to think about the game-changers – firms or entities that can enter the market with the idea that will vanish the traditional way of thinking. The question set by many researchers is why some entrepreneurs or companies, or countries are more innovative than others. According to (Fagerberg, 2004) the cross-national differences in growth performance can be explained by the innovative performance of these countries and regions. While one flow of academic thought is concentrated on the differences between technological development labeled as cross-country "technology gap" (Fagerberg, 2004), another type of research is devoted to highlight the innovation as an evolutionary, non-linear and interactive process (Tödting & Tripl, 2005) applied to the national level (Edquist, 2001). To explain the antecedents of possible innovations development, scholars and practitioners use widely the term "innovation potential" as well as the similar term "entrepreneurial innovativeness" (Koellinger, 2008). The previous studies revealed that innovative entrepreneurship varies across countries, and empirical data showed that in highly developed countries, innovative activities are more likely dominant among the entrepreneurs than imitative activities (Koellinger, 2008). The term "innovation potential" is not new (Nauwelaers, & Reid, 1995), but lately, it has become a trend in cross-country analysis (Kotenko et al., 2021). Based on new insights and evidence on the nature and functioning of country economic systems and their capabilities for economic growth, the "innovation potential"

differences can explain the fragmented, disproportional development of similar regions in the EU and regional disparities between them (Shvindina et al., 2019). We understand the innovation potential as a difference between the system's current state in terms of innovation performance and its potential outcomes based on existing innovative capabilities. That may explain the successful catch-up in technology and income in Asian countries lately that involved innovations and radical changes. However, solid bibliometric research should be done in this field to understand and frame the comprehensive model of innovation potential assessment. Therefore, the literature review was constructed as bibliometric research to reveal top contributors in innovation potential literature, main trends, and key terms network. Then the literature review was divided into two big topics: innovative development of countries and innovation potential of industrials as two different and interrelated topics.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Bibliometric Analysis in the field of study.

The bibliometric approach is an operable toolbox that allows analyzing any research area, identifying the leading trends, most influential authors, and find the connections between keywords, fields of research. One of the most pioneer works is the study of Fahimnia, Sarkis, and Davarzani (Fahimnia et al., 2015), who performed a remarkable investigation of green supply chain management as a separate direction in research and offered the roadmap for further investigation in this field. The term 'bibliometrics' was originally introduced by (Pritchard, 1969), but lately, this type of research has expanded to many different fields, including tourism studies (Soliman et al., 2021) or multidisciplinary research linked to a particular field (Shvindina, 2019), particular for sustainable innovations (Bilan et al., 2020) and proved to be an effective tool in literature review studies.

Using the keywords 'innovation potential' in search 'Article title, Abstract, Keywords' revealed 941 documents in the period 2010-2021. The refining results that include only articles (not books nor conference materials) ended with 519 documents. The preliminary analysis of the results showed the main countries that are highly interested in the development of the research area, as indicated in Figure 1.

VOSviewer software is proved to be an effective visualization tool (Van Eck, Waltman, 2013) and has been chosen for this study to perform the links between keywords and terms used in the research field. The papers selected at the previous stage allowed to present the network as follows (Fig. 2).




Figure 1: TOP-10 countries, authors from which are contributors to the field.

Source: Scopus Database, constructed by authors for the keyword 'innovation potential', 519 documents, 2010-2020).




Figure 2: The visualization of the keywords network in the field of research.

Source: Constructed by authors via VOSviewer for the keyword 'innovation potential' (Input data: 519 documents, 2010-2020, Scopus Database, refined).

The bibliometric analysis resulted in seven clusters or topics of the research, that we may use for distinguishing the flows in academic studies using the significance of the most frequent term. So, we may suggest that at least six research areas are interconnected: competitiveness & entrepreneurship (light blue), regional development (dark blue), innovative potential (red), technological transfer (yellow), knowledge management (green), open innovation (purple).

Among the top contributors (according to the Scopus database), we should mention works by Meier, Roy, and Seliger (Meier et al., 2010), who investigated industrial product-service systems evolution and the perspective of their use for business models, sustainability contribution, risk management, knowledge management, design, development and delivery ploys. The conceptualization of innovation was presented in (De Massis et al., 2016) using the cases of family businesses and the successful cases of innovation growth. The innovation potential is highly discussed in studies devoted to the distributed inference of the innovation, particularly estimation over complex networks (Kar & Moura, 2013).

The innovation potential studies are linked to the cutting-edge technologies, such as nanotechnology (Fraceto et al., 2016), nanobiosensor industry (Robinson et al., 2013), nanostructured AI (Murashkin et al., 2016), as well as start-ups in general and their development in times of COVID crises (Kuckertz et al., 2020),

The innovations may occur at the city level (Kourtit et al., 2012), in the regions and their periphery (Fitjar, & Rodríguez-Pose, 2011; Ivanova, & Kordos, 2017)). The investigations of innovation potential may be focused on Europe in general (Marrocu et al., 2013) or certain emerging economy (for instance, the economy of India (Kafouros & Forsans, 2012). The innovation potential research varies in scale - from the cluster's development within the innovations in Ukraine (Kachala, & Kovalchuk, 2015), to a global cross-country study comparing developed and developing countries (Wu et al., 2018).

Recent findings in the research of the innovation development of countries. Another dimension of the current study is the innovative development of industrialized countries, which include developed and developing ones. Regarding this matter, the study of the innovation potential of less developed European countries of the Mediterranean region for the period 2000-2012 years should be mentioned. This study was carried out by Ramzi and Salah (Ramzi & Salah, 2018), who identified negative factors of innovative development.

Researchers Wignaraja, Krueger, and Touzon (Wignaraja et al., 2016) studied the productivity of manufacturing networks, profits, and innovative production at Malaysian and Thailand companies through evaluating the technological capabilities index.

Technology transfer was considered by Ciborowski and Skrobska (Ciborowski & Skrobska, 2020), as well as the impact of the transfer on the economic activity of industrial enterprises using the method of soft modeling and research of innovative changes in the European Union countries.

Another work was accomplished by Özak, who studied the position of countries in the evolution of innovations, the distance of pre-industrial technological borders, and the formation of cross-cultural cooperation between countries, which influences the creation of a favorable innovation climate, high productivity, and economic development in the country (Özak, 2018).

The stakeholder approach was the focus of research by Carayannis and Papadopoulos (Carayannis & Papadopoulos, 2011), particularly the link between stakeholders' participation in the innovations and the innovative development of the country (the US as a case).

Gkypali, Kounetas, and Tsekouras (Gkypali et al., 2019) investigated the link between country competitiveness, technology gaps, and level of industrial development, considering the technology gaps in the industrial system of European Union countries and the impact of it on competitiveness.

Another stream of research is an investigation of tax relief for innovative companies and tax regulation in the investment market in Ukraine (Kobushko & Kobushko, 2015).

Recent findings in the research of innovative potential of the countries' industrial system. Another dimension of the literature review is devoted to the studies related to industrials development and their innovation potential.

Freitas, Clausen, Fontana, and Verspagen studied the issues of formal and informal external linkages of machine-building firms of Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom in the innovation process (Freitas et al., 2011) and revealed that different innovation strategies lead to different mixes of external actors and that "some differences exist across countries" (p. 113).

The cost-benefit analysis of government programs aimed at subsidizing industry in Sweden was conducted by Carlsson, Eliasson, and Sio (Carlsson et al., 2018). The scholars established the correlation between government support for the industry and the stagnation of the Swedish economy.

Barzotto, Coro, Mariotti, and Mutinelli (Barzotto et al., 2019) studied the use of national labor resources by foreign industrial companies that are producers of innovative products in Italy. The issues of international labor migration and its features in the United States were studied by Kazakis and Fajian (Kazakis & Fajian, 2017). The researchers identified the gender pay gap in various sectors of the economy.

The phenomenon of deindustrialization development and, as a consequence, the outflow of foreign capital from the chemical industry and chemical engineering was covered by Lopez (Lopez, 2017). He proved the need for state regulation of Colombia's chemical industries producing intermediate goods.

The study of export opportunities of the industrial complex of the world through the formation of mathematical models in the economy was conducted by Bayar (Bayar, 2017), who developed aggregate models at the global level, and country, sector, and firm levels.

The study conducted by D. Kuvalin, A. Moiseyev, R. Lavrynenko (Kuvalin et al., 2018) on the impact of global economic sanctions on the innovative work of machine-building enterprises in the Russian Federation should be considered, as well as Brexit that was an unexpected exogenous shock for countries dependent on UK economy (Kordos, 2019).

Unresolved issues. Considering the findings mentioned above and observed disproportions in innovative development of industrials between countries, and the lack of understanding of the link between different levels of competitiveness, the idea of benchmarking of industrials' innovation potential in a cross-country perspective is offered.

METHODOLOGY

Research methods. To assess the innovation potential of the world's major manufacturers of machine-building products, the analysis of the global competitiveness index of the world, which was conducted by Schwab (Schwab, 2019), was used in combination with an approach to an

understanding of competitive elements formed by Kononenko (Kononenko, 1998). In the current study, the methodology is modified towards innovational potential assessment only. In order to do that, the subindexes were selected from the 7th, 8th, 9th, 11th, and 12th pillars of GCI (Schwab, 2019) related to innovations production and implementation. Using the offered methodology, the assessment of innovation potential for countries - the major manufacturers of machine-building products (industrials)-and using Sturges formula enables the grouping of the countries by their ranks. This express method is a simplified approach comparatively to GCI; however, it enables balanced decision-making by different stakeholders at different levels in business, as well as by policy-makers for regional and national programs aimed to support the industrials' development.

Assessment procedure.

The assessment procedure has eight stages. At the first stage, a list of indicators is formed, which characterize the components of innovation potential by subindexes in pillars "Interaction and diversity", "Research and development", "Commercialization", "Business dynamism", "Labour market", "Product market" and "Financial system". These subindexes (please see Table 1) were selected by their relatedness to the main characteristics of the markets/products/innovation development in industrial countries using the findings of previous studies.

The second stage contains arraying of innovation indicators values, making the matrixes of their ranked values (R_i) and their weights (w_i) for all selected countries (Table 2). It is worth noting that the weight of each indicator (w_i) is determined by experts using the method of the "Analysis of Hierarchy" by Saati with the assistance of experts, group of specialists, and scientists of Sumy State University, Sumy National Agrarian University (Ukraine), researchers from Henan University of Science and Technology (China) and Bingham University (Nigeria).

At the third stage, a weighted value of the innovation indicators is defined for each country using the approach (Kononenko, 1998):

$$Rank = \sum_i (R_i \cdot w_i) \quad (1)$$

where *Rank* is a weighted value of the innovation indicators for the given country; R_i is the ranked value of the i -th innovation indicator for the given country; w_i is the weight of the i -th innovation indicator for the given country.

At the fourth stage, the competitiveness of county in the field of innovation is defined as the normalized weighted value of the innovation indicators for the given country, using the approach (Kononenko, 1998):

$$CCI = \frac{Rank_O - Rank}{Rank_O - Rank_L} \quad (2)$$

where *CCI* is the competitiveness of the given country in the field of innovation; *Rank* is the weighted value of the innovation indicators for the given country; $Rank_O$ is the *Rank* of outsider-country (biggest one); $Rank_L$ is the *Rank* of leader-country (smallest one).

The fifth stage involves determining the level of risk-taking acceptance in business, which affects the innovative activity of enterprises in the countries – major manufacturers of machine-

building products, offered earlier (Taraniuk et al., 2019):

$$RTC = \frac{ER_c}{ER_p} \quad (3)$$

where RTC is the risk-taking capacity of business in the given country; ER_c is the attitude to the entrepreneurial risk at current state (c means "current") in the given country; ER_p is the attitude to an entrepreneurial risk at the potentially maximum level (p means "peak").

At the sixth stage, it is offered to determine the level of enterprises' use of disruptive innovative ideas that can positively affect the innovative development of countries and help increase the innovation potential of the country as a whole:

$$DCI = \frac{DI_c}{DI_p} \quad (4)$$

where DCI_i is the level of use of disruptive innovative ideas by companies in the given country; DI_c is the level of use of disruptive ideas at the c -th (current) state in the given country; DI_p is the level of use of disruptive (innovative) ideas at the p -th (maximum) value.

At the seventh stage, the level of innovation potential of the country – major producer of machine-building products is determined by the formula:

$$IP = CCI \cdot RTC \cdot DCI \quad (5)$$

where IP is the level of innovation potential of the given country.

The eighth final stage is a final ranking using Sturges formula that enables to group the countries by level of innovation potential:

$$k_{IP} = \frac{IP_{max} - IP_{min}}{1 + 3,322 \lg N} \quad (6)$$

where k_{IP} is the Sturges range step, which characterizes the range of criteria values of the indicator of innovation potential; IP_{max} is the maximum value of the innovation potential; IP_{min} is the minimum value of the innovation; N – number of countries, objects of evaluation.

After determining the levels of innovation potential of the countries – main producers of machine-building products, conclusions were made about the leading countries and outsiders of innovation development.

RESULTS AND PRESENTATION OF KEY RESEARCH FINDINGS

The assessment of the innovation potential. When assessing the innovation potential of the world's main industrials, the input information is taken from the global competitiveness index report performed in 2019, conducted by Schwab (Schwab, 2019) and relevant research by Maslyak and Dakhno (Maslyak & Dakhno, 2003). Based on the input information of the first stage of the evaluation, the indicators that characterize the innovation potential of the countries, global industrial producers, are presented as the system of subindexes in blocks (Tables 1-2).

The second stage of evaluating the ranking matrix of innovation indicators, which determines the value of the rank of each indicator (R_i) and its weight (w_i), involved the expert groups from institutions of Ukraine, China, and Nigeria. Firstly, the weights of indicators of innovation potential for the countries, global industrial producers, and major manufacturers were computed using MS Office Excel to determine the exposition of the hierarchy of indicators X_1 - X_{15} and their weight using the method of "Hierarchy Analysis" by Saati (Pererva, 2019). As a result, the range of products of the correlation of indicators X_1 - X_{15} [0.00006 – 12288] and the range of weight of indicators X_1 - X_{15} [0.06 - 0.07] was revealed (Table 2). Such values characterize a fairly large sample of indicators X_1 - X_{15} and their geometric mean value in the range [0.99 - 1.00], which reduces the range of obtained values of weights of indicators X_1 - X_{15} , without losing the adequacy of the model. It is also worth mentioning that the ratio of consistency (RC) of this assessment between expert groups was calculated and had a range of values [0.148 - 0.153] (14.8 - 15.3%) for the observed countries, which corresponds to its acceptable value $RC \leq 10$ -20% (Kulchytska, 2018), and therefore the hierarchical model is adequate.

Table 1: Innovation indicators, inputs

Name of block and subindex	Symbol	Unit
Interaction and diversity		
12.01 Diversity of workforce	X_1	conventional unit
12.02 State of cluster development	X_2	conventional unit
12.03 International co-inventions	X_3	score
12.04 Multi-stakeholder collaboration	X_4	conventional unit
Research and development		
12.05 Scientific publications	X_5	score
12.06 Patent applications (per 1 million population)	X_6	conventional unit
12.07 R&D expenditures (% GDP)	X_7	conventional unit
12.08 Research institutions prominence (1-100)	X_8	score
Commercialization (related to innovations)		
12.09 Buyer sophistication (1-7)	X_9	conventional unit
12.10 Trademark applications (per 1 million population)	X_{10}	score
Business dynamism (related to innovations)		
11.01 Cost of starting a business (% Gross national income per capita)	X_{11}	conventional unit
11.07 Growth of innovative companies	X_{12}	conventional unit
Meritocracy and incentivization (related to innovations)		
8.09 Reliance on professional management (1-7)	X_{13}	conventional unit
Market of innovations (Competition & Financial support related to innovations)		
7.02 Extent of market dominance	X_{14}	conventional unit
9.05 Market capitalization (% GDP)	X_{15}	conventional unit

Source: compiled by authors from the (Schwab, 2019),

Table 2: Assessment of the subindexes of innovation potential of the countries, major producers of machine-building products, displayed as value / rank / weight (standardized units)

Indicator	USA	Germany	France	Japan	United Kingdom (UK)	China	Russian Federation (RF)	Ukraine	Brazil

Cross-country analysis of competitiveness towards innovation potential assessment for industrials
Leonid Taraniuk, Hanna Shvindina, , Stanislav Kotenko, Abayomi Awujola, Karina Taraniuk, Hongzhou Qiu

Interaction and diversity, CCI ₁										
X ₁	value	5.5	5.3	4.5	4.0	5.3	4.4	4.9	4.6	4.4
	rank	1	2	6	9	3	7	4	5	8
	weight	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.07
X ₂	value	5.5	5.4	4.7	5.1	5.0	4.6	3.4	3.5	3.9
	rank	1	2	5	3	4	6	9	8	7
	weight	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
X ₂	value	12.39	21.4	11.44	5.1	12.44	0.9	0.68	0.53	0.31
	rank	3	1	4	5	2	6	7	8	9
	weight	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06
X ₂	value	5.4	5.2	4.5	4.7	4.9	4.4	4.0	3.8	3.7
	rank	1	2	5	4	3	6	7	8	9
	weight	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06
Research and development, CCI ₂										
X ₅	value	2088	1131	1027.7	919.3	1289	1289	503.3	229.3	493.3
	rank	1	3	4	5	2	2	7	9	8
	weight	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06
X ₆	value	143.99	292.1	145.94	490.35	101.76	14.46	3.81	1.56	1.56
	rank	4	2	3	1	5	6	7	9	9
	weight	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
X ₇	value	2.7	2.9	2.9	3.1	1.7	2.1	1.1	0.4	1.3
	rank	3	2	2	1	6	5	8	9	7
	weight	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
X ₈	value	4.06	0.8	1.23	1.23	1.23	2.84	0.4	0.04	0.25
	rank	1	4	3	3	3	2	7	9	8
	weight	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
Commercialization (related to innovations), CCI ₃										
X ₉	value	5.1	4.7	4.3	5.0	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.6
	rank	1	3	6	2	4	5	5	5	7
	weight	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
X ₁₀	value	2947.15	8745.53	5700.88	1959.89	6560.11	1577.96	437.57	744.49	749.74
	rank	4	1	3	5	2	6	9	8	7
	weight	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
Business dynamism, meritocracy & incentivization (related to innovations), CCI ₄										
X ₁₁	value	1.0	6.7	0.7	7.5	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.6	5.0
	rank	5	8	4	9	1	2	6	3	7
	weight	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
X ₁₂	value	5.6	5.1	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.4	3.7	3.6	4.2
	rank	1	2	5	4	3	6	8	9	7
	weight	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
X ₁₃	value	5.7	5.3	5.1	5.7	5.3	4.5	4.0	4.1	4.5
	rank	1	3	5	2	4	6	9	8	7
	weight	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07
Market of innovations, CCI ₅										
X ₁₄	value	5.2	5.2	4.6	5.6	4.6	4.5	3.7	3.6	3.8
	rank	3	3	5	1	4	6	8	9	7
	weight	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
X ₁₅	value	150.3	53.9	93.2	113.1	111.7	70.2	38.9	4.0	38.6
	rank	1	6	4	2	3	5	7	9	8
	weight	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07

Source: constructed by authors, using (Schwab, 2019) – for values; (Maslyak et al., 2003; and experts' evaluation) – for ranks/weights of the indicators.

The results of the next stages (3-7) of the innovation potential assessment for the selected countries are presented in Table 3.

It was revealed that the same countries that have a high global competitiveness index have high values of innovation potential (Table 3). For instance, the United States leadership is proved (IP = 1.00), and Ukraine is the outsider (IP = 0.00) with the poorest weighted ranking (Rank = 7.93) and the level of competitiveness (CCI = 0.00) compared with the USA as a leader (CCI = 1.00).

Table 3: The results for Innovation Potential (IP) assessment, outputs

Parameters	USA	Germany	France	Japan	UK	China	RF	Ukraine	Brazil
Weighted value of the innovation indicators (Rank)	2.07	2.91	4.38	3.88	3.41	5.31	7.46	7.93	7.58
Competitiveness of country in the field of innovation (CCI)	1.00	0.86	0.61	0.69	0.77	0.45	0.08	0.00	0.06
Attitude to an entrepreneurial risk (ER _c), (ER _p = 5.6) (Schwab, 2019, subindex No 11.05)	5.6	4.8	4.2	4.2	4.9	4.5	4.2	4.7	4.1
The level of perception of entrepreneurial risk or risk-taking capacity (RTC)	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
Companies embracing disruptive ideas (DI _c), (DI _p =5.1) (Schwab, 2019, subindex No 11.08)	5.1	4.8	4.1	3.9	4.6	4.2	3.6	3.4	3.8
The level of use of disruptive innovative ideas by companies (DCI)	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7
Innovation potential (IP) (cross-country ranking)	1.00 (1)	0.69 (2)	0.37 (5)	0.40 (4)	0.61 (3)	0.30 (6)	0.04 (7)	0.00 (9)	0.03 (8)
(for comparison)									
Global Competitiveness Index (score / place)	84 (2)	82 (7)	79 (15)	82 (6)	81 (9)	74 (28)	67 (43)	57 (85)	61 (71)

The eighth stage of assessing involves calculating the intervals of criteria values of the country's innovation potential (IP), using the Sturges formula. The range of criteria for the innovation potential of the countries is calculated by the formula (6) and equals $k_{IP} = 0.25$ (Table 4) that allows designing the four-dimensional basis for the final evaluation and further decision-making.

As results show, among the countries selected for the analysis by their specialization in industrial production, there are: one leader (USA), three engines (Germany, France, UK, and Japan), fair performer (China), and outsiders, which include Ukraine, Russian Federation, and Brazil. According to its value, our assumptions about the innovation potential are presented in Table 4, but the representative analysis is performed in Figure 3.

Table 4: The final evaluation criteria of the innovation potential level of the countries - world's major manufacturers of machine-building products

IP	Characteristics IP _i according to the criteria range	Group
$0.75 \leq IP \leq 1.0$	The country's innovation potential is excellent. It characterizes the country's ability to be a leader in innovations, diversity, R&D, market extension, the country that launches the new trends, offers advanced technological processes, production upgrades, and dominates globally in the markets.	Leader: the USA
$0.50 \leq IP < 0.75$	The innovative potential of the country is good. It characterizes the country that has sufficient institutional and financial support of innovative development, good performance in R&D, despite of moderate risk-taking capacity (France, Japan) or high costs of starting a new business (Japan).	Innovation Engines: Germany, United Kingdom, Japan, France
$0.25 \leq IP < 0.50$	The innovative potential of the country is fair. It characterizes the country that has certain barriers in R&D, moderate or low interactions with international stakeholders for co-invention and co-marketing, business dynamism should be supported by professional management (meritocracy), and market development is far from modern trends.	Fair performer: China
$0.00 \leq IP < 0.25$	The innovative potential of the country is poor. It means a low level of interactions towards new ideas, their commercialization, poor start-up support infrastructure, and low business dynamism, as well as an absence of meritocracy and low market capitalization.	Outsiders: Russian Federation, Brazil, Ukraine

Source: authors' work.

Among the findings, we should mention the big contribution of the RTC (risk-taking capacity) and DCI (level of use of disruptive innovative ideas) into the innovation potential level of the selected countries. The level of entrepreneurial risk perception or willingness to take risks and act proactively in business may be explained by the influence of the national culture (Kreiser et al., 2010), and might be culturally preconditioned. However, there are some other barriers, such as using outdated technology and avoiding personnel training, that may lead to low innovation dynamic. There is a hidden source in 'talent adaptability' (Schwab, 2019, p. 7) that also requires a well-functioning labour market, and means an ability of the workforces to contribute to the innovations and disruptive ideas. And as a result of an imbalance between economic growth and talent development, China may also be in danger.

Focusing on financial development may lead to an imbalance between technological integration and human capital investments, reflecting in a low level of business dynamism, meritocracy & incentivization (i.e., Russian Federation). Despite the fact that Russian Federation was the leader in Eurasia by GCI in 2019, according to IP ranking, it is an outsider.




Figure 3: The visualization of the IP and its parameters for each country.

Source: authors' work.

It proves again that the subindexes selection may play a significant role in the evaluation process and understanding of future strategies for improvements. The limitation of this study is the specialization of the countries and the preselection of the indexes that, in our opinion, must

be targeted as vectors for further development in the innovation sphere. The best practices should be considered too. For instance, if comparing GCI to the IP ranking, we should also mention Singapore as the country that ranks first in terms of infrastructure, health, labor market functioning, and financial system ('Interaction and diversity'), without any industrials in the ecosystem.

DISCUSSION

The offered methodology is a modified global competitiveness evaluation approach aimed to understand particular aspects of competitiveness. It is a tool for decision-making by various stakeholders, including international investors, corporations, technopolises, technology parks, innovation incubators, businesses, government, local authorities, and other concerned stakeholders at the state and regional levels. The offered benchmarking enables the vectors development identification and partner detection for investments in industrials development. Particular decisions can also be made based on the offered approach, for example, in the sphere of marketing management (Taraniuk et al., 2018). Moreover, there is the possibility of preliminary investment evaluation in different spheres based on the level of the country's innovation potential.

The catch-up strategies may include the improvements within the following fields:

- reinforcement of 'Interaction and diversity' aspects that include the balance between human capital investments and financial support of cluster development, as well as cooperation in R&D between countries/ clusters, business hubs co-creation. This strategy is recommended to implement for China, Russian Federation, Ukraine, and Brazil.

- improvements in R&D, namely direct and indirect investments, both private and public, in R&D, institutional support, and funding for scientific outcomes (papers, patents). This strategy is strongly recommended for Ukraine in the first place, and for Russian Federation, Brazil as well. Japan demonstrates the best practice.

- strengthening the commercialization means finding ways to increase buyer sophistication and trademark applications. There should be 'value for money' approach implemented; best practices may be borrowed from successful countries. For instance, Luxembourg was a leader in 'Commercialization' in 2019, and it's well known for high employment rates in knowledge-intensive activities and knowledge-intensive services exports; Germany and Ireland are the exporters of high-tech products and services (Lipkova, & Braga, 2016). It is strongly recommended to expand the markets for the products with added value for the countries where this indicator is very low - Russian Federation, Ukraine, and Brazil.

- to speed up business dynamism and scale up the innovative companies, which mean decreasing of administrative barriers of starting the business, tax relief for start-ups, beneficial conditions for business angels and certain types of companies, like it's already done in Portugal, Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland, UK, etc.

Additional measures may include cross-country collaboration, joint R&D projects (i.e., COSME, Horizon 2020), cross-border cooperation in industrial production.

The risk-taking capacities are extremely unlikely to be changed as far as they are culturally determined. That may be explained by uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 2011), or it can be related to many cultural variables and manifest themselves in business activities (Kreiser et al., 2010), and in consumer behavior (Koç & Boz, 2017; Koç et al., 2019). However, precisely this

indicator is closely related to willingness to finance start-ups (Pukala et al., 2018), and transparency in innovative business (Zakutniaia & Hayriyan, A. 2017).

Another discussion may be launched in a field of types and system of financial support for SMEs as a factor of business dynamism (Musa et al., 2017), or public and private partnership to support financial activity in the country (Kozmenko & Vasyl'yeva, 2008; Rizwan, Semenog, 2017), and therefore, economic growth. Additionally, economic growth and innovations should be implemented within sustainable development goals, and sustainability is another flow of discussion in related studies (Starchenko et al., 2021).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The methodology for assessing the innovation potential of the countries has been modified by regrouping the subindexes of GCI related to innovations, and introducing additional indicators of risk-taking capacity (RTC) and the level of using disruptive ideas (DCI) by companies. That enabled the design of a seven-parameter evaluation system to gain insights into vectors of further development of innovation potential for selected countries. The leaders and outsiders were identified, the criteria base of innovation potential of the countries enabled grouping them in several levels. The innovation potential (IP) assessment is highly related to the GCI, on the one hand. On the other, it gives additional insights into the further strategies design towards a balance between innovation potential vectors. The catch-up strategies for industrials upgrading is a highly discussed topic (Xu et al., 2018; Artyukhova et al., 2021), and the limitation of this research is lack of details in a sphere of best practices in upgrading the country's R&D process, its ability to reallocate resources, and improving the productivity, innovation commercialization and global competitiveness. However, the authors identified the gaps in development and disparities between countries, major manufacturers of machine-building products, developed the ploys and recommendations to increase the potential using a step-by-step comparison between subindexes and best practices analysis.

REFERENCES

- Artyukhova, N., Hordiienko, V., Motrechko, V., & Kasian, S. (2021). Knowledge marketing: M4I-mix model of evaluation. *E3S Web Conference*, 307, 03002. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202130703002>
- Barzotto, M., Corò, G., Mariotti, I. & Mutinelli, M. (2019). Ownership and workforce composition: a counterfactual analysis of foreign multinationals and Italian uni-national firms. *Journal of Industrial and Business Economics*, 46, 581-607. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40812-019-00114-0>
- Bayar, G. (2017). Estimating export equations: a survey of the literature. *Empirical Economics*, 54, 629-672. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-016-1220-3>
- Bilan, Y., Pimonenko, T., & Starchenko, L. (2020). Sustainable business models for innovation and success: Bibliometric analysis. *Paper presented at the E3S Web of Conferences*, 159 doi:10.1051/e3sconf/202015904037
- Carayannis, E. & Papadopoulos, Ch. (2011). The Innovation Diplomacy Concept and the Hellenic-American Innovation Bridge as a Special Case-in-Point. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 2, 257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-011-0056-5>.

- Carlsson, B., Eliasson, G. & Sjöo K. (2018). The Swedish industrial support program of the 1970s revisited. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 28, 805-835. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-018-0581-5>
- Ciborowski, R. & Skrodzka, I. (2020). International technology transfer and innovative changes adjustment in EU. *Empirical Economics*, 59, 1351-1371. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-019-01683-8>
- De Massis, A., Frattini, F., Kotlar, J., Petruzzelli, A. M., & Wright, M. (2016). Innovation through tradition: Lessons from innovative family businesses and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 30(1), 93-116. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2015.0017>
- Edquist, C. (2001, June). The Systems of Innovation Approach and Innovation Policy: An account of the state of the art. In *DRUID conference*, Aalborg (pp. 12-15). Retrieved from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.336.4438&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Fagerberg, J. (2004). Innovation: A guide to the literature. Georgia Institute of Technology. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286805.003.0001>
- Fahimnia, B., Sarkis, J., & Davarzani, H. (2015). Green supply chain management: A review and bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 162, 101-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2015.01.003>
- Fitjar, R. D., & Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2011). Innovating in the periphery: Firms, values and innovation in Southwest Norway. *European Planning Studies*, 19(4), 555-574. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2011.548467>
- Fraceto, L. F., Grillo, R., de Medeiros, G. A., Scognamiglio, V., Rea, G., & Bartolucci, C. (2016). Nanotechnology in agriculture: which innovation potential does it have?. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 4, 20. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2016.00020>
- Freitas, I., Clausen, T., Fontana, R. & Verspagen, B. (2011). Formal and informal external linkages and firms' innovative strategies. A cross-country comparison. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 21, 91-119. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-010-0188-y>
- Geografiya mashinobuduvannya svitu (2019). Access mode: <http://www.geograf.com.ua/human/school-course/392-geografiya-mashinobuduvannya-svitu>
- Gkypali, A., Kounetas, K. & Tsekouras, K. (2019). European countries' competitiveness and productive performance evolution: unraveling the complexity in a heterogeneity context. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 29, pp. 665-695. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-018-0589-x>
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online readings in psychology and culture*, 2(1), 2307-0919. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol2/iss1/8>
- Ivanova, E., & Kordos, M. (2017). Competitiveness and innovation performance of regions in Slovak Republic. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 1, 145-158. <https://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2017.1-13>
- Jiang, L., & Probst, T. M. (2017). The rich get richer and the poor get poorer: Country-and state-level income inequality moderates the job insecurity-burnout relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(4), 672. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000179>
- Kachala, T., & Kovalchuk, Y. (2015). Ukrainian business in European integration process: a cluster approach. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research (JEECAR)*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v2i1.84>

- Kar, S., & Moura, J. M. (2013). Consensus+ innovations distributed inference over networks: cooperation and sensing in networked systems. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 30(3), 99-109. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2012.2235193>
- Kazakis, P. & Faggian, A. (2017). Mobility, education and labor market outcomes for U.S. graduates: Is selectivity important? *The Annals of Regional Science*, 59, 731-758. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-016-0773-6>
- Kobushko, I. & Kobushko, Ia. (2015). The tax instruments of Ukraine's investment market regulation improving. *Economic Annals-XXI*, 1-2(1), 82–85.
- Koç, E., & Boz, H. (2017). Development of scales to measure customers' willingness to have control and the control offered by service businesses. *Ecoforum Journal*, 6(3). Retrieved from: <http://www.ecoforumjournal.ro/index.php/eco/article/viewFile/671/408>
- Koç, E., Taşkın, Ç., & Boz, H. (2019). Risk and Control in Consumer Behavior: A Discussion. In *Contemporary Issues in Behavioral Finance*. Emerald Publishing Limited, Volume 101, 1–12.
- Kononenko, I. (1998). Metod ekspres-analizu rivnya konkurentospromozhnosti produktsiyi. *Ekonomika Ukrainy*, 2, 80-83. Access mode: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311426547_Metod_ekspres-analiza_urovna_konkurentosposobnosti_produkcii
- Kordos, M. (2019). British-Slovak Foreign Trade Relations: Consequences of Brexit. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 3, 341-353. <http://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2019.3-26>
- Kotenko, S., Shvindina, H., & Heiets, I. (2021). The impact of migration on the competitiveness of the region and industry development. *E3S Web Conference*, 307, 02003. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202130702003>
- Kourtit, K., Nijkamp, P., & Arribas, D. (2012). Smart cities in perspective—a comparative European study by means of self-organizing maps. *Innovation: The European journal of social science research*, 25(2), 229-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2012.660330>
- Kozmenko, S., & Vasyl'yeva, T. (2008). Specialized innovative investment banks in Ukraine. *Banks and Bank Systems*, 3(1), 48-56. doi:10.21511/bbs.3(1).2008.01
- Kreiser, P. M., Marino, L. D., Dickson, P., & Weaver, K. M. (2010). Cultural influences on entrepreneurial orientation: The impact of national culture on risk taking and proactiveness in SMEs. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 34(5), 959-984. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00396.x>
- Kuckertz, A., Brändle, L., Gaudig, A., Hinderer, S., Reyes, C. A. M., Prochotta, A., ... & Berger, E. S. (2020). Startups in times of crisis—A rapid response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 13, e00169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2020.e00169>
- Kulchytska, Kh. & Predko, L. (2018). Analytic hierarchy process application to project selection in printing industry. *Printing and publishing*, 1(75), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.32403/0554-4866-2018-1-75-51-60>
- Kuvalin, D., Moiseev, A. & Lavrinenko, P. (2018). Russian Companies at the End of 2017: Absence of Significant General Economic Changes and Progress in the Machinery Industry. *Studies on Russian Economic Development*, 29, 303-321. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1075700718030085>
- Lipkova, L., & Braga, D. (2016). Measuring commercialization success of innovations in the EU. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 4, 15-30.

- Lopez, M. (2017). Trade liberalization and premature deindustrialization in Colombia. *Journal of Economic Structures*, 6, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40008-017-0095-6>.
- Lu, X. U., Xiong, J., & Li, Q. (2018). Towards industry upgrading: A study of Catching Up strategy of Asian countries with focusing on Chinese sectors. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research*, 5(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v5i1.204>
- Marrocu, E., Paci, R., & Usai, S. (2013). Proximity, networking and knowledge production in Europe: What lessons for innovation policy? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 80(8), 1484-1498. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.03.004>
- Maslyak, P. & Dachno, I. (2003). Economic and social geography of the world – Kiev: Vecza, 280 p.
- Meier, H., Roy, R., & Seliger, G. (2010). Industrial product-service systems—IPS2. *CIRP annals*, 59(2), 607-627. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cirp.2010.05.004>
- Murashkin, M. Y., Sabirov, I., Sauvage, X., & Valiev, R. Z. (2016). Nanostructured Al and Cu alloys with superior strength and electrical conductivity. *Journal of materials science*, 51(1), 33-49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10853-015-9354-9>
- Musa H., Musova Z., Sliacky P. (2017). Financial Support to Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises in Slovakia. *Financial Markets, Institutions and Risks*, 1(4), 47-52. DOI: 10.21272/fmir.1(4).47-52.2017
- Nauwelaers, C., & Reid, A. (1995). Methodologies for the evaluation of regional innovation potential. *Scientometrics*, 34(3), 497-511. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02018016>
- Özak, Ö. (2018). Distance to the pre-industrial technological frontier and economic development. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 23, 175-221. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10887-018-9154-6>
- Pererva, P., Besprozvannykh, O. , Tiutlikova, V., Kovalova, V., Kudina, O. & Dorokhov, O. (2019). Improvement of the Method for Selecting. *TEM JOURNAL - Technology, Education, Management, Informatics*, 8(2), 454-461. Access mode: https://www.temjournal.com/content/82 /TEMJournalMay2019 _454_461.pdf
- Pradhan, R. P., Arvin, M. B., Nair, M., Bennett, S. E., & Hall, J. H. (2019). The information revolution, innovation diffusion and economic growth: an examination of causal links in European countries. *Quality & Quantity*, 53(3), 1529-1563. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-018-0826-2>
- Pritchard, A. (1969). Statistical bibliography or bibliometrics. *Journal of documentation*, 25(4), 348-349.
- Pukala, R., Sira, E., & Vavrek, R. (2018). Risk management and financing among start-ups. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 3, 153-161. <http://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2018.3-13>
- Ramzi, T. & Salah, A. (2018). The Determinants of Innovation Capacity in the Less Innovative Countries in the Euro-Mediterranean Region. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 9(2), 526-543. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-015-0347-3>
- Rizwan, Ch A., Semenog, A. (2017). Non-bank financial institutions activity in the context of economic growth: cross-country comparisons. *Financial Markets, Institutions and Risks*, 1(2), 39-49. DOI: 10.21272/fmir.1(2).39-49.
- Robinson, D. K., Huang, L., Guo, Y., & Porter, A. L. (2013). Forecasting Innovation Pathways (FIP) for new and emerging science and technologies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 80(2), 267-285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2011.06.004>
- Schwab, K. (2019). The Global Competitiveness Report 2019 – Geneva: Cologny, 650 p.

- Shvindina H., Lyeonov S., Vasilyeva T. (2019) Economic Growth and Regional Disparities: Literature Review in a Search for the Interconnections. In: *Reducing Inequalities Towards Sustainable Development Goals: Multilevel Approach* / M.P. Bhandari, H. Shvindina (eds). Denmark: Rivers Publishers, 27-48 ISBN: 9788770221269. URL: https://www.riverpublishers.com/book_details.php?book_id=749
- Shvindina, H. (2019). Coopetition as an emerging trend in research: perspectives for safety & security. *Safety*, 5(3), 61. <https://doi.org/10.3390/safety5030061>
- Soliman, M., Lyulyov, O., Shvindina, H., Figueiredo, R. and Pimonenko, T. (2021). Scientific output of the European Journal of Tourism Research: A bibliometric overview and visualization. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 28, 2801. Retrieved from <https://ejtr.vumk.eu/index.php/about/article/view/2069>
- Starchenko, L., Lyeonov, S., Vasylieva, T., Pimonenko, T., & Lyulyov, O. (2021). Environmental management and green brand for sustainable entrepreneurship. Paper presented at the *E3S Web of Conferences*, 234 doi:10.1051/e3sconf/202123400015
- Stereov, N., & Rosillo, H. G. T. (2019). Technology, Innovations and Industrial Development. *Economic Alternatives*, (4), 549-559.
- Taraniuk, L., Kobyzskyy, D. & Thomson, M. (2018). Estimation of the marketing potential of industrial enterprises in the period of re-engineering of business processes. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 16 (2), 412-423. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16\(2\).2018.37](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16(2).2018.37)
- Taraniuk, L., Wang, J., Qiu, H., Petrushenko, Y. & Taraniuk, K. (2019). International aspects of assessing the logistic potential of the main countries of agricultural production. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 17(3), 31-44. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.17\(3\).2019.03](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.17(3).2019.03)
- Tödtling, F., & Trippl, M. (2005). One size fits all?: Towards a differentiated regional innovation policy approach. *Research policy*, 34(8), 1203-1219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2005.01.018>
- Van Eck, N.J.; Waltman, L. (2013) *VOSviewer Manual*; Univeriteit Leiden: Leiden, The Netherlands. Retrieved from: https://www.vosviewer.com/documentation/Manual_VOSviewer_1.6.10.pdf
- Wignaraja, G., Krüger, J. & Tuazon A. (2016). Production Networks, Profits, and Innovative Activity: Evidence from Malaysia and Thailand. *Production Networks and Enterprises in East Asia*, 161-183. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-4-431-55498-1_8
- Wu, H., Xiong, J., Li, Q., & Wei, T. (2018). Comparisons of catch-up among developed nations and developing countries. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research (JEECAR)*, 5(2), 9. <https://doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v5i2.206>
- Zakutniaia, A., Hayriyan, A. (2017). Transparency as competitive advantage of innovation driven companies. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 1(1), 46-54. <https://doi.org/10.21272/bel.2017.1-06>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Shvindina Hanna, email: shvindina@management.sumdu.edu.ua

Dr. Taraniuk Leonid, Doctor of Science, is Professor of Department of International Economic relations of Sumy State University (Ukraine). Research interests: International

Transfer of Technology. In 2016 he took part in the Internship for Staff at Varna Economic University (Varna, Bulgaria). Current research interests: Innovative management methods.

Dr. Shvindina Hanna, Doctor of Science, is Chair of Oleg Balatskyi Department Management of Sumy State University (Ukraine). Research interests: Organizational behavior, Organizational Development, Strategic Management, Coopetition. Fulbright Alumna (Purdue University, Indiana, USA). Current research interests: The Organizational Development Patterns and Organizational Evolution, Coopetition Strategy.

Kotenko Stanislav, Ph.D. student at Oleg Balatskyi Department Management of Sumy State University (Ukraine). Current research interests include Competitiveness Evaluation, Bibliometric Analysis.

Dr. Awujola Abayomi, Ph.D is Head of Economic Department of Bingham University (Nigeria). In 2019 he took part in scientific exchange in Sumy State University (Ukraine). Current research interests: Econometric Analysis, Performance Evaluation.

Dr. Taraniuk Karina, Ph.D is Senior Lecturer of Department Management of Sumy State University (Ukraine). She teaches HR-management. In 2019 she took part in the Internship for staff at ESEI International Business School (Barcelona, Spain). Current research interests: Innovation management.

Qiu Hongzhou is an Experimenter of Henan Institute of Science and Technology (China). He teaches Manufacturing. Since 2018 he has been enrolled at Ph.D program Economics at Sumy National Agrarian University (Sumy, Ukraine). Current research interests: Logistics, Performance Evaluation.