



## ДЕРЖАВА ТА ЕКОНОМІКА

УДК [339.9:005.336.6]:33.001.76(477)

### **ОЦІНКА ІННОВАЦІЙНОСТІ ЕКОНОМІКИ УКРАЇНИ В МІЖДЕРЖАВНИХ РЕЙТИНГАХ**

**У**

( ).

[1; 2].

( ).

1.

The Global Competitiveness Report [3].

2004

$$, \quad - \quad , \quad ( \quad ) \quad : \quad$$

. 1.

[3; 4].

. 2.

( )	, %
<b>1.</b>	<b>25</b>
- . : ;	75
- - ( , , );	20
- - , , ;	20
- - ( , , );	20
- - ( , , , );	20
- - ( , , ; ; )	20
. : ;	25
- - ( );	50
- - ( , , ; )	50
<b>2.</b>	<b>25</b>
- . ( )	50
- . ( ; ; ; )	50
; ; ; ; )	
<b>3.</b>	<b>25</b>
; ; ( / ; ; - )	
<b>4.</b>	<b>25</b>
- . ' ( ; ; ; ; / ; ; )	50
- . ( ; ; )	50
<b>5.</b>	<b>17</b>
. ( - ; ; )	33
. ( ; ; )	33
. ( - ; ; )	33



**2007–2012 .**

	2007–2008		2009–2010		2011–2012	
	<b>73</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	90	4.06	94	3.96	98	4.18
1.	115	3.12	120	3.10	131	2.98
2.	77	3.09	78	3.39	71	3.87
3.	82	4.67	106	3.96	112	4.21
4.	74	3.57	68	5.41	74	5.64
	66	3.93	68	4.05	74	4.00
5.	53	4.20	46	4.38	51	4.58
6.	101	3.74	109	3.74	129	3.58
7.	65	4.30	49	4.57	61	4.44
8.	85	3.96	106	3.56	116	3.39
9.	93	2.75	80	3.37	82	3.47
10.	26	4.67	29	4.67	38	4.54
	75	3.52	80	3.42	93	3.29
11.	81	3.83	91	3.63	103	3.48
12.	65	3.22	62	3.21	74	3.11

2011–2012 . 82 142

4.0,

• : 98 , 4.18;  
 • – 74 , 4.00;  
 • – 93 , –  
 3.29.

— ,

, , ,  
 ; , , – 46 ; – 63  
 ; – 68 .  
 , , – 82 ,

(International Institute of Management Development, IMD) – 1990 . : IMI ( , 1946) IMEDE ( , 1957). : 8 . 100 . "IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook", [5].

,  
‘ 4 ( , , ,  
5 ), :  
(78 )

, , ,  
; ,  
( , ) (71 )  
: , ,  
, - ;  
(68 ).

, ( ,  
: , , ,  
, , ,  
; ,  
(114 ).  
, ,  
,

, " " "  
:  
: ,  
( , ),  
;  
;  
;  
:( , ).

, : , ,  
( , , , ).

314 , 128 – ,

57 ; 73 ; 113  
4 .

( 2011 . 4935 , 84 -  
). -

2011 .  
57 59  
51.454 ( -  
100). 2010 .  
: , - ;  
- , - (36 - ).  
51 49 . -

. 3.

3

**2007–2011 . [6]**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
,	46	54	56	57	57
.. :					
-	43	50	55	55	45
-	48	52	56	56	58
-	46	52	53	54	55
-	47	46	48	41	48

, 5

, ( 11 5 , ). -  
" " , -  
, (33 ) , , (43 -  
). , 2010 . ( 10 -  
) . -

3.

— , -  
— , ,  
" " ,  
, [7]. ,

, .



- 1 10. ,

1995, 2000 2009 . [7]

4.

4

1995–2009 .

( )				( )			
		-	-	-	-	-	-
2009	6.0	6.58	4.27	5.83	8.15	5.77	
	5.63	6.43	3.21	6.35	8.19	4.75	
	5.97	6.89	3.18	6.10	8.26	6.32	
2000	8.76	8.78	8.71	9.27	8.29	8.78	
	8.97	8.95	9.05	9.33	8.51	9.00	
	8.95	9.04	8.69	9.21	8.66	9.25	
1995	5.95	6.19	5.21	8.11	4.24	6.22	
	6.24	6.56	5.26	8.12	4.47	7.10	
	6.35	6.86	4.84	8.20	4.85	7.52	

6.0 (5.95).  
6.0 (8.76),

(*p* < 0.03).

0.4.

$$(5.77 \quad ), \quad (8.15 \quad ).$$

4.27 .

2000 ..	1995 ..	,				
6.1	5.83;	-	8.26		8.15	
		-	6.32	5.77		.

). ,

3.18 4.27 .

4.

Business School Alcatel-Lucent, 2007 INSEAD  
Booz, -  
( ) . -

, , ,

93.2 % 2011 [8] 125 ,  
98.0 %  
125 , , - 35.01 ( 100- 60 : 2009 - 79 , 2010 - 61 ).  
: ( ): (63.82); (62.12);  
(59.04), (58.8), (57.5); (56.96),  
(56.57). 2011 56 ,  
35.85.


: ( ) ( ).

; ; ; ; ( ) ; .

; -

2011 .

## ВХІДНИЙ СУБІНДЕКС ІННОВАЦІЙ



:
 - 6 , - 17 ;
 ( - ) - 20 , ( - )
 - 22 . -

107 , : - 107 , -

- , ) - 104 . ,

" : " -
 , ( 2.65); -

" ( 11.18); " -
 , ( 10.81); -

" ( 12.86); (

17.09); " ( 25.1); " -
 , ( 35.1); " -
 , (84 ), (75 );
 , -

" (89 ). " -
 , -

5.

- :
- ;
- [9].

10 : -

, , ,

, ( ), ),

, " ", "

5

2007–2011 .

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
.. . . . .	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.0
•	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.5
•	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.4
•	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.2

, ( 2009 .)

"	2011	.	"	0.4	.
			"		"
	2009	.,			
2010	.,	0.3	.	"	,
"			"	-	2011
			.	.	,
0.2	.	.	,		

$$(8.5), \quad (8.5), \quad (8.3);$$

$$7.5; \quad - \quad 5.6.$$

2011 . "

" - 8.8;

- 5.3.

$$: " \quad \quad \quad " - 8.3 ( \quad \quad \quad )$$

(7.2) (6.2)

), " - 7.5 " - 5.4) " - 8.5 ( -

<sup>1</sup> See also the discussion of the relationship between the two in the section on "Theoretical Implications" below.

---

ISSN 1727-9313. ВІЧНИК КНТЕУ. 2012. № 3

6.

Economist Intelligence

Unit, 1946 .

100

( ),

T

5 %.

[10].

2011 . 51 66  
28.9 ( 100-  
). : - 80.5; - 72.0;  
69.8; - 69.4; - 68.1; - 67.9.

2009 2011 , . 6.

			2009	2011
- - - - -	: ; ; ; ;	( );	<b>64</b> 41.5 40.0 40.0 40.0	<b>-40.3</b> 41.5 40.0 40.0 40.0
I - - - - -	: , , ; ; ;	(XDSL, ISDN PRI, FWB, , FTTx);	<b>45</b> 7.2 21.0 13.4 0.5 57.3	<b>-20.4</b> 6.0 24.1 20.1 0.6 52.0
- - - - -	: ( ); ( ).	);	<b>39</b> 57.3 3.1 2.8	<b>-37.6</b> 52.0 3.0 2.7
- - - - -	: ( , , , ).	,	40.0	40.0
- - - - -	( , ):	;	<b>23</b> 6.0 3.6 46.1 0.2	<b>-26.4</b> 7.6 2.9 18.3 0.5
- - - - -	( , ):	, ;	<b>48</b> 40.0 50.0 80.0 20.0 80.0	<b>-49.5</b> 40.0 50.0 80.0 40.0 80.0
- - - - -	: ; ; ; ;	" " "	<b>65</b> 20.0 7.0 40.0 40.0	<b>-31.0</b> 40.0 3.3 40.0 40.0
- - - - -	( , )	;		

(41) " - " (42), 2009 . ( -  
" 2 19 " - " (64 )  
" 2011 . 2009 . " (65 ).  
10 32, :

**СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ**

1. — : [ ]. — : http://ia-prometei.org.ua/?p=522.
2. — : [ ]. — : www.kno.rada.gov.ua/komosviti/doccatalog/document?id=49594.
3. *The Global Competitiveness Report 2011–2012* [ ]. — Way of access : http://www.weforum.org/reports/global-competitiveness-report-2011-2012.
4. — : [ ]. — : www.feg.org.ua/docs/Competitiveness\_report\_2010\_ua.pdf.
5. *The World Competitiveness Scoreboard 2011* [ ]. — Way of access : http://www.imd.org/research/publications/wcy/upload/scoreboard.pdf.
6. *The IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook* [ ]. — Way of access : http://www.imd.org/research/publications/wcy/wcy\_book.cfm.
7. *KEI and KI Indexes (KAM 2009)* [ ]. — Way of access : http://info.worldbank.org/etools/kam2/KAM\_page5.asp.
8. *Global Innovation Index 2011* [ ]. — Way of access : http://www.globalinnovationindex.org/gii.
9. *International Property Right Index 2011REPOR* [ ]. — Way of access : http://www.internationalpropertyrightsindex.org/ATR\_2011%20INDEX\_Web.pdf.
10. *IT Industry Competitiveness Index 2011* [ ]. — Way of access : www.bsa.org/globalindex.

15.02.2012.

**Ligonenko L. Evaluation of innovativeness of Ukraine's economy in international ratings.** Information about the rating systems that are used to compare the innovativeness of economies of individual countries has been summarized. The place of Ukraine in inter-state comparisons and the factors that cause it have been identified. The most problematic aspects of the formation and implementation of innovative potential of Ukraine, which require priority decisions at the state and local level have been identified

**Key words:** innovativeness of economy, innovative development, inter-state ratings, rating system, inter-state comparisons, ratings.