

- <http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/>
4. Про затвердження Методичних рекомендацій щодо квартальних розрахунків валового внутрішнього продукту за категоріями кінцевого використання [Електронний ресурс]: Наказ Державного комітету статистики України від 01 грудня 2006 року № 580. – Режим доступу: <http://ua-info.biz/legal/baseqt/ua-qmptir/index.htm>
  5. Про затвердження Методичних рекомендацій щодо розрахунку рівня економічної безпеки України [Електронний ресурс]: Наказ Міністерства економічного розвитку і торгівлі України від 29 жовтня 2013 року № 1277. – Режим доступу: [http://cct.com.ua/2013/29.10.2013\\_1277.htm](http://cct.com.ua/2013/29.10.2013_1277.htm)
  6. Про затвердження Методики розрахунку індексу капітальних інвестицій [Електронний ресурс]: Наказ Державного комітету статистики України від 25 грудня 2009 року № 494. – Режим доступу: <http://document.ua/pro-zatverdzhennja-metodiki-rozrahunku-indeksu-kapitalnih-in-doc32662.html>
  7. Статистичний щорічник України за 2011 рік / За ред. О.Г. Осауленка // Державна служба статистики України. – К.: ТОВ “Август Трейд”, 2012. – 559 с.
  8. Статистичний щорічник України за 2013 рік / За ред. О.Г. Осауленка // Державна служба статистики України. – К.: ТОВ “Август Трейд”, 2014. – 534 с.
  9. Любімов В.І. Відповідність інвестиційної трансакції національним інтересам щодо доцільності вкладання іноземних капіталів / В.І. Любімов // Продуктивні сили і регіональна економіка: Зб. наук. праць. – 2008. – ч. 2. – С. 273-279.
  10. Геєць В.М. Інноваційні перспективи України: Монографія / В.М. Геєць, В.П. Семиноженко. – Х.: Константа, 2006. – 272 с.
  11. Мунтіян В.І. Економічна безпека України: Монографія / Мунтіян В.І. – К.: КВІЦ, 1999. – 464 с.
  12. Мельник А.Ф. Національна економіка [Електронний ресурс]: Навч. посіб. / А.Ф. Мельник, А.Ю. Васіна, Т.Л. Желюк, Т.М. Попович; за ред. А.Ф. Мельник. – К.: Знання, 2011. – 463 с. – Режим доступу: [http://pidruchniki.com/1584072041779/ekonomika/natsionalna\\_ekonomika](http://pidruchniki.com/1584072041779/ekonomika/natsionalna_ekonomika)
  13. Государство для общества [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: <http://www.govforc.com/statistika/123/124/131>

### **Kraus N.M.**

candidate of economic sciences, docent

person working for doctor's degree of Department of Theory Economic and Finance

*Financial Research Institute State's educational and scientific establishment*

*“Academy of Financial Management” of the Ministry of Finance of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine*

## **CATEGORICAL DIFFERENCE OF NOTIONS “NOVATION”, “NOVELTY” AND “INNOVATION” AS TOOLS OF INNOVATIVE ECONOMY: INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT**

*The economic content and categorical difference of notions “novation”, “novelty” and “innovation” are analyzed. Under the novelty is proposed to understand not products in itself, but characteristic of its novelty, that measured by the share of intellectual value in its overall value. Whereas the novelty is the immediate mean, new method, technique, program, technology.*

*Innovation is the result of creative activity in the form of new consumer values, which is aimed at the creation, development and distribution of new products/services, new technologies that bring economic benefit and implementation of new methods and organizational forms of management that correspond to market conditions.*

*Looking at innovation from the position of institutional approach is proposed to interpret it as a change in the basic structure “of the production organism”, transition of the internal structure to a new state, which can lead to qualitative and quantitative changes at the micro and macro levels.*

*It was found that the institutionalization of innovation of natural-historical character is the crystallization, regulation, standardization and formalization of certain patterns of behavior. These samples of behavior characterize the various processes of formation and genesis of institutional arrangements. During the institutionalization innovation are passing three stages: selection, adaptation and integration.*

**Key words:** *Institutionalization of innovation, novelty, novation, innovation, innovative economy.*

Formation of innovative economy requires “developing” of new ideology which focuses on novelty and pervades all society. Scientific results, designer developments, technological and institutional novelties are now the main driving force as economic progress and social development of the leading countries.

Innovative economy in conditions of society knowledge development is characterized by a leading value of innovative activity of science subjects and industry, the growth of scientific and technical production, science intensive technologies, intellectualization of production factors that

shape by innovations, new technological structure [1, p. 59].

According to the new realities of economic life and international economic relations as the main criteria of effective development are the quality and speed of implementation of new IT systems and management approaches, there is a need to change approaches to understand innovative economy and refinement “innovation” as a category.

The notion “innovation” was first appeared in the cultural studies research and meant the introduction of some elements of the culture to another. In the process of improvement of traditional structures regularity of technical, technological, organizational, economic and other innovations began to study [2, p. 61]. Today, it is actual to study innovations from an economic point of view.

Innovations are one of the main generators of dynamic macroeconomic development. They are aimed to create a modern society, social and economic institutions, modern infrastructure and man to ensure global competitiveness of the country as a state and a nation. Innovations are forming an environment that contributes to technical, scientific and technological progress of society.

For more than 70 years of innovations research it is possible to see the turn from the technocratic to the socio-economic vision of these processes. The analysis of innovations includes such elements as social consciousness, expectations, moods, values and norms.

Experience of different countries of the world shows that successful innovative development requires harmonious interaction of the technological component with other elements, less studied – institutional and socio-valued [3, p. 234]. We will attempt to reveal the content of innovations from a position of institutionalism and consider the process of their institutionalization.

The term “innovation” as a new category was introduced by economic scientist J.A. Schumpeter in the early XX century. Translated from the Latin “innovatio” is a renewal. In French “innovation” means novelty, while in English “innovation” has two meanings: a new idea, method, invention and introduction of something new.

Ukrainian word “novelty” is a synonymous of innovation. It means purposeful change that brings in environment new, stable elements (novation), that cause system transition from one state to another. “Novelty” or “new mean” has another meaning – means (new method, program, technology), while innovation is considered as a process of development of a new product.

Today, the term “innovation” is rather deeply entrenched in economic science because it is the formation of an innovative economy. However, various researchers offer different variants of its interpretation depending on the kind of property of this phenomenon they believe priority.

In economic literature the most widespread are two approaches to define the essence of the concept “innovation”:

- ✓ It is the result of the creative process in the form of new, advanced production, technology, method;

- ✓ It is the process of introducing the new efficient products, components, approaches, processes instead of existing; as planned activities and implementation of changes, as complete full cycle of designing and (or) use of the new.

Great Dictionary of Economics offers a dual understanding of the concept “innovation”: investing money in the economy that provides a generational change of techniques and technologies; new technique, technology that is the result of scientific and technical progress. Development of inventiveness, detection of pioneering and scale inventions is an essential factor of innovation [4, p. 374].

Modern definition of “innovation” provides the Law of Ukraine “On innovation activity”: innovations – newly created (applied) and (or) improved competitive technologies, products or services and organizational and technical solutions of industrial, administrative, commercial or other nature, which significantly improve the structure and quality of production and (or) social sphere [5].

This interpretation of the concept “innovation” is associated only with the means of production or technological processes that is necessary but not sufficient condition which should direct all investment streams of resource in sectors of the economy with its effective use. These features must be taken to the consideration of innovative development at macro and micro levels.

According to A. I. Volkov and M. P. Denisenko, it is necessary to distinguish the concept of “novelty”, “novation” and “innovation”. Under the novation they understand the new order, process, method, product or technology [6, p. 53].

Novelty is the formed result of fundamental and applied research, development or experimental work in activities to improve its efficiency [6, p. 57]. Novelty can take the form of: discoveries; inventions; patents; trademarks; rationalization proposals; documentation for new or improved product, technology, management or production process; organizational, production or other structure; know-how, concepts, scientific approaches and principles; document (standard, recommendations, method, instructions); results of market research.

Investing in the development of novelty is half the battle. The main thing is to introduce the novelty and to transform novelty in the form of innovation, that is to complete the innovation activity and get a positive result, and then continue the diffusion of innovation.

A. Volkov and M. Denisenko say that innovation is the result of management and obtain economic, social, environmental, scientific, technical or other type of effect. To their mind it is inappropriate to the concept “innovation” include the development of innovation, its creation, implementation and diffusion. These steps belong to innovative activity as a process which results can be novelty or innovation [6, p. 57].

Quite convincing is R. Fatkhutdinova’s point of view, who believes that novation is the formed result of fundamental and applied research, development or experimental work in any activities to improve its efficiency [7, p. 45].

Formation of novation may take the form of discoveries, patents, trademarks, documentation (for new or improved products, technology, production process), organizational and production structure, scientific approaches or principles, results of marketing research. The main thing is to implement novation in production or consumption, other fields of activity, to transform novation into the sphere of innovation.

According to B. Santo, a researcher in the field of innovation, “Innovation is a socio-techno-economic process that through the practical use of ideas and inventions leads to the creation of the best in quality products, technologies, and if it focuses on the economic benefit, income, its appearance can provide additional benefits on the market” [8, p. 83]. He describes innovation as a production factor that determines the formation and productivity of the gross national product for the future.

Some clarification of Russian professors such as E. Barsukova and V. Sarycheva are noteworthy about differences between innovation, discoveries and inventions that take place in the interpretation of the category “innovation” by B. Santo. The differences are in the following:

firstly, innovation unlike inventions or discoveries are made mostly on the technological level, while the invention or discovery take place usually on the fundamental level;

secondly, innovation integrates in itself the results of integrated use of such elements as systematic technical developments, scientific-research programs, but discovery usually happens by chance [9, p. 21-22].

So, inventions and discoveries present a specific class of innovation, where technologies are “hidden” in some evolutionary (also technological) process, but it is carried out in the scale of some system, a part of which is an appropriate innovative infrastructure.

Scientist and economist Yu. Yakovets’ judgment is important, he confirms that innovation is a qualitative change in production, which may belong to engineering, technology and to the forms of production organization [10, p. 27].

Researching the category “innovation” it is impossible to ignore its understanding as the scientific, technical, technological, economic and organizational changes in production. The main characteristics here are the qualitative novelty of products, methods of production and technologies compared with previous, rate of implementation and dynamics of cycle novelty, its economic efficiency and social consequences.

Scientist B. Twiss has made an important contribution to the study of this category. He sees novelty as a process in which invention or idea becomes economic substance, that the invention is a

novelty if it gets success in the market [11, p. 36, 76].

In substantiation of need of conceptual approach to understand the innovative process he considers the scientific and technological novelty as a process of transformation. There are two processes: with food and techno-market orientation.

He interprets the innovation as the process of scientific and technological transfer of knowledge directly to the field of customer needs. The product turns only to bearer of technology and the form that it takes is determined only after “linking” the technology and satisfaction of needs.

The definition of innovation of Ukrainian scientist V. Zyanka is interesting, he affirms that innovation is a form of materialization of innovative idea for creation a particular subject substance – product, technology or service with new consumer properties [12, p. 50].

The representative of Kiev school of political economy Z. Varnaliy interprets innovation as the result of development (fundamental and applied researches) and commercialization (bringing the development to the stage of the finished product that can provide income) of new idea, which is transformed into product, technology, organizational or marketing solution [13 p. 100-101].

O. Nabatova (Ukrainian researcher in the innovation sphere), insists that “innovation is not just novelty as a static final result of creative activity, but it is the process of transforming novation into socio-cultural norms and patterns of behavior, their institutional issuance and internalization” [3, p. 235]. In connection with this, it is necessary to study institutional mechanisms of innovations.

Among foreign and Ukrainian scientists there are different views on this issue. The analysis of the category “innovation” and categories related to it, makes it possible to offer their own interpretation. In our opinion, innovation is not a product in itself, but it is a characteristic of its novation that measured by particle of intellectual cost in its total cost.

Novelty we understand as a direct mean, new method, techniques, program and technology. Innovation is the result of creative activity in the form of new consumer values, which aims to create, develop and distribute new product/service, new technologies that bring economic benefit, introduction of new methods and organizational forms of management that correspond to market conditions. We would like to point that the public utility is no guarantee that innovation is economically effective and has chance to process of commercialization.

If consider the innovation from the point of the institutional approach, it can be understood as a change in the basic structure “of the production organism”, the transition of internal structure to new state, which can lead to qualitative and quantitative changes at micro and macro levels.

O. Nabatova considers that innovation cannot lead to the desired results unless they are based on the respective changes in patterns of socio-economic behavior of the subjects of micro-level. In this aspect we agree with her.

Another situation is possible when the emergence of innovative practices does not match the upgrade of institutional forms. In both cases there are institutional gaps, the results of which are unintended negative consequences of socio-innovative activity; sudden impairment in the functioning of a human activity as a result of deinstitutionalization or displacement of formal institutions by informal; imitation of innovations, replacement of innovative activity on primitive adaptation that has no defined orientation and is not always effective.

Thus, the most important aspect of the process of institutionalization of innovations is mutual conditionality and mutual stimulation of changes in socio-economic institutions and patterns of socio-economic behavior through the action of positive and negative feedback [3, p. 236].

Institutionalization of innovations of natural-historical character is the crystallization, regulation, standardization and formalization of certain patterns of behavior. These behavior patterns are characterized the various processes of formation and genesis of institutional arrangements.

During its institutionalization innovations pass three stages: selection, adaptation and integration. On the first stage informal selection among own novelties and borrowed samples is usually carried out. Those of them, who have been through “social filter”, are adapted on the second stage to the specificity of the existing socio-economic structure.

Eventually they become its organic components. At the last stage innovations in the form of established and adapted practices are formalized through the mechanisms of organizational and legal regulation and are converted into traditional society phenomenon [3, p. 236].

According institutionalization of innovations of project nature, formal procedures usually precede of the beginning of real innovative processes. Project innovations can be seen as the process of novelties transformation to specific norms and patterns of behavior. Exactly these norms, designs/patterns of behavior ensure their institutionalization and consolidation in the field of material and spiritual culture of society.

In the process of institutionalization projected innovations pass four phases: formation, identification, approval and routine. Phase of formation is related to the emergence of innovative idea. During the identification phase novation is spread, which may be limited in the future (latent novation), recognized deviation (suppressed novation) or recognized innovation (adopted novation) [14, p. 196-197].

In the last case there is a need for appropriate institutional changes in the innovative system, providing the establishment of innovations. And then happens its routine, observance of traditions [3, p. 236] and habits.

Theoretical and methodological research of categories “novation”, “novelty”, “innovation” and certain aspects of its institutionalization allows to formulate some conclusions and generalizations.

First, the special meaning of innovation is qualitative changes that lead to improving or appearance of a new product/service or technology.

Secondly, there is a need for the distinction between the categories “novation”, “novelty”, “innovation”.

Third, defining the essence of the concept “innovation” is in constant development and is complemented with some aspects that take into account the characteristics and requirements of a particular stage of development of the economy.

Fourth, the types of effects, which innovation provides in most cases are economic, social, technological and environmental.

Fifth, classification criteria and types of novelties confirm that the processes of novelties are different in nature and thus shape of their organization, scales and ways of influence to the innovation activity are various. Innovations are various in content and scope, methods of use, level of development and distribution, in economic significance.

Sixthly, the scientific and technological novelty, commercial feasibility and industrial use are key quality of innovation, which determine its content. Commercialization towards to innovations serves as potential quality, without which it can be an ordinary novelty.

### **Література:**

1. Делия В.П. Инновационная экономика и устойчивое развитие: Монография / В.П. Делия. – Балашиха: изд-во “Де-По”, 2011. – 256 с.
2. Барнева А.Ю. Инновация как экономическая категория / А.Ю. Барнева // Инновации. – № 9 (107). – 2007. – С. 61–63.
3. Набатова О.О. Джерела і особливості інституціоналізації соціальних інновацій у трансформаційній економіці / О.О. Набатова // Вісник Донецького національного університету економіки і торгівлі ім. М. Туган-Барановського. Сер. Економічні науки. – 2011. – № 3 (51) – С. 234–240.
4. Большой экономический словарь / Под ред. А.Н. Азриляна. – 7-е изд., доп. – М.: Институт новой экономики, 2010. – 1472 с.
5. Закон України “Про інноваційну діяльність” від 4.07.2002 р. № 4-IV // Відомості Верховної Ради України (ВВР). – [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/40-15>. – № 36. – Ст. 266.
6. Волков О.І., Денисенко М.П., Гречан А.П. та ін. Економіка та організація інноваційної діяльності: Підручник (третє видання). – К.: Центр учбової літератури, 2007. – 662 с.
7. Фатхутдинов Р.А. Инновационный менеджмент. Учебник / Р.А. Фатхутдинов. – 6-е изд. – СПб.: Питер, 2008. – 448 с: ил. – (Серия “Учебники для вузов”).
8. Санто Б. Инновация как средство экономического развития: Пер. с венг. / Общ. ред. и вступ. ст. Б.В. Сазонова. – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – 296 с.

9. Барсукова Е.Л., Сарычев В.А. Инновация как экономическая категория / Е.Л. Барсукова, В.А. Сарычев // Инновации. – № 2 (112). – 2008. – С. 20–23.
10. Яковец Ю. В. Ускорение научно-технического прогресса: теория и экономический механизм. – М.: Экономика, 1988. – 342 с.
11. Твисс Б. Управление научно-техническими нововведениями / Б. Твисс; Сокр. пер. с англ. Авт. предисл. и науч. ред. К. Ф. Пузыня. – М.: Экономика, 1989. – 271 с.
12. Зянько В.В. Щодо визначення сутності інновації як категорії економічної теорії / В.В. Зянько // Наук. вісник Волинського нац. ун-ту ім. Лесі Українки. Серія економ. науки. – 2008. – № 7. – С.48–51.
13. Варналій З.С. Конкурентоспроможність національної економіки: проблеми та пріоритети інноваційного забезпечення / З.С. Варналій, О. П. Гармашова. – К. : Знання України, 2013. – 387 с.
14. Басов Н. В. Инновация как фактор социальной самоорганизации: процессуально-пространственное моделирование / Н. В. Басов // Журнал социологии и социальной антропологии. – 2008. – Т.ХІ, № 4. – С. 185–203.

**Martunyk E. A.**

Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor  
International Humanitarian University (Odessa), Ukraine

## FORMATION OF SYSTEM PERFORMANCE OF BUSINESS PROCESSES

**Мартынюк Е.А.**

к.е.н., доцент

Международный гуманитарный университет г. Одесса, Украина

## ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ СИСТЕМЫ ПОКАЗАТЕЛЕЙ ЭФФЕКТИВНОСТИ БИЗНЕС-ПРОЦЕССОВ

*The article presents the methodological aspects of the distribution of business processes in the system, the criterion of added value as a key measurement criteria optimization. Also noteworthy highlight the main indicators as are necessary in the construction of multicriteria models, to obtain adequate and optimal results, performance measurement system formed business processes.*

**Keywords:** business process, added value, performance, BPM, multiple criteria model, the dynamic criterion.

*В статье представлены методологические аспекты распределения бизнес-процессов в системе, предложен критерий добавочной ценности как ключевой критерий измерения оптимизации. Также заслуживает внимание выделения основных показателей, включение которых необходимо при построении многокритериальных моделей, для получения адекватных и оптимальных результатов измерения эффективности сформированной системы бизнес-процессов.*

**Ключевые слова:** бизнес-процесс, добавленная ценность, показатели эффективности, BPM, многокритериальная модель, динамический критерий.

**Постановка проблемы.** Современные технологии бизнеса характеризуются высокой динамичностью, связанной с постоянно изменяющимися потребностями рынка, ориентацией производства на сфокусированную кастомизацию, и непрерывным совершенствованием технологических и информационно-аналитических возможностей.

В этих условиях требуется разработка комплексных систем, которые, включают отражение динамического состояния экономических объектов с возможностью коррекции существующих бизнес-процессов, а также прогностические возможности средне и долгосрочных перспектив эффективности организации и реинжиниринга бизнес-процессов.

Среди теоретических и практических, которые выделяются как актуальные для дальнейших исследований, огромный интерес занимает феномен создания новых форм организации и управления бизнесом.

**Анализ последних исследований и публикаций.** Мировое научное наследие по вопросам анализа бизнес-процессной деятельности предприятия весьма значительно, однако большинство классических и современных работ, ориентированы на узкие аспекты традиционной (общепринятой) методологии анализа. Проблемы системности и эффективности бизнес-процессной методологии исследовались в работах: С. Айера, Фиаманте М., Т.Давенпорта, Э Деминга, Х. Ван Хеминга, Р. Хаммера, Д. Харингтона, Дж. Чампи, Н.М