Національна академія наук України
Міністерство освіти і науки України
Державна установа «Інститут досліджень науково-технічного потенціалу та історії науки ім. Г. М. Доброва НАН України»
Комітет освіти, науки, молоді та спорту Громадської ради Київської міської державної адміністрації
Комітет з питань суспільного розвитку та суспільно-владних відносин при Міністерстві юстиції України
Департамент економіки Київської обласної військової адміністрації
Департамент суспільних комунікацій виконавчого органу Київської міської ради (КМДА)
ВНЗ «Університет економіки та права «КРОК»
Національний науковий центр «Інститут аграрної економіки»
Київський академічний університет
Благодійна організація «Шлях до майбутнього»
Громадська організація «Українська асоціація зовнішньої політики»
Мережева громадська організація «Міжнародна академія геоінформатики»

ПРОБЛЕМИ І ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ ІННОВАЦІЙНОГО РОЗВИТКУ ЕКОНОМІКИ В КОНТЕКСТІ ІНТЕГРАЦІЇ УКРАЇНИ В ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ НАУКОВО-ІННОВАЦІЙНИЙ ПРОСТІР

Матеріали XXVI Міжнародної
науково-практичної конференції

м. Київ, Україна, 15 травня 2025 р.

Дніпро
«Середняк Т.К.»
2025

УДК 330.341.1:001.895

Vasylieva O. V.
PhD of economics, Head of the Innovation and Technological Development Center,
SI «G. M. Dobrov Institute for Scientific and Technological Potential and Science History Studies of the NAS of Ukraine»
lena_vovchenko@ukr.net
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7502-5702

GLOBAL INNOVATION INDEX: (NON-)OBJECTIVITY OF THE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Abstract. The article examines the challenges faced by Ukraine's scientific sector in the context of full-scale war, including the destruction of scientific infrastructure, the evacuation of specialists, reduced government funding, and the lack of up-to-date statistics. It identifies problems related to the use of international rankings, particularly the Global Innovation Index, for assessing the innovation potential of countries under crisis conditions. The paper emphasizes that methodological limitations—such as data subjectivity, indicator heterogeneity, and reliance on the availability of statistics—undermine the accuracy of such assessments for Ukraine during wartime. The study highlights the need to treat the Global Innovation Index as one of several tools for evaluating innovation potential rather than as a sole source for strategic decision-making.

Keywords: Global Innovation Index, innovation activity assessment methodology, international rankings.

With the onset of the full-scale war, Ukraine's scientific sector has faced serious challenges. The destruction of scientific infrastructure, the evacuation of specialists, and cuts in government funding have significantly limited the ability to conduct research. The war has led to the disorganization of research teams and the suspension of many projects, as well as hindering access to international cooperation, scientific databases, and research tools.

A major issue is the lack of up-to-date statistics: hostilities and the occupation of certain territories have disrupted data collection, making it impossible to conduct a high-quality analysis of innovation activity. The latest publication by the State Statistics Service for 2021–2023 [1] highlights the

incompleteness of submitted information, which prevents the formation of a comprehensive picture of development.

In these conditions, international rankings such as the Global Innovation Index (GII) and the Global Talent Competitiveness Index play an important role. However, government sources, including the website of the Ministry of Economy [2], provide only fragmentary data and lack in-depth analysis of internal processes.

Thus, under martial law, there is a clear gap between international assessments and the actual state of innovation development, complicating both internal strategic planning and external communication with partners.

Among all international rankings that assess innovation activity, the most authoritative and widely used is the GII. Its methodology is based on a multidimensional analysis of countries' innovation potential and is actively used by international institutions, government agencies, and researchers as a tool for decision-making. A country’s overall score in the index is calculated as the average of two main sub-indices: the Innovation Input Sub-Index and the Innovation Output Sub-Index. The former covers five key areas: institutional environment, human capital and research, infrastructure, market sophistication, and business sophistication. The latter includes two areas: knowledge and technology outputs, and creative outputs.

Each of the seven main pillars includes a range of specific indicators that evaluate both quantitative aspects (e.g., R&D expenditures, number of publications, patents, startups) and qualitative aspects (e.g., regulatory policies, institutional stability) of the innovation system. In 2024, the ranking was compiled using 78 diverse indicators reflecting both the scientific-technological and the socio-economic context of innovation activity [3].

Despite its methodological complexity and broad international recognition, the GII has a number of inherent limitations that call into question its full applicability for assessing the innovation development of individual countries-

especially those experiencing complex or unstable socio-economic conditions. According to the 2024 data, Ukraine ranked 60th out of 133 countries, positioned between Russia (59th) and Colombia (61st), with a minimal score difference - only 0.2 points lower than Russia and 0.3 points higher than Colombia. At first glance, this position may suggest a degree of stability for Ukraine within the global innovation landscape. However, a more detailed analysis raises doubts about the validity of such comparisons, particularly given the varying degrees of crisis experienced in these countries [3].

The «neighboring» countries in the ranking differ significantly in key socio-economic indicators, which undoubtedly affect their overall innovation potential. For example, GDP per capita (PPP) in 2024 was: Ukraine - $14,304; Colombia - $19,482; Russia - $35,310. The reported population for Ukraine was 37.7 million, but this figure is highly questionable due to the full-scale war, mass migration, internal displacement, population losses, and the absence of up-to-date census data. Therefore, the actual demographic base for calculations remains unverified and potentially inaccurate.

Moreover, it is surprising that Ukraine, classified as a lower-middle-income country, ranks between countries with higher income levels. This suggests that inclusion in a particular income group does not necessarily correlate with the overall ranking in the Global Innovation Index. A closer look at the sub-index scores [3] reveals that Colombia, ranked just below Ukraine, shows no indicators of poor performance, unlike Ukraine and Russia. Ukraine’s strongest performance is in the «Knowledge and Technology Outputs» category.

These examples highlight a fundamental vulnerability in the methodology of the Global Innovation Index: it relies on data provided by governments or analytical organizations, often without sufficient verification. In times of war, when the statistical system is unstable, such a model can create a distorted picture. For Ukraine, this may lead to either underestimation or overestimation of innovation development, complicating the use of the index for policymaking. It

also raises doubts about the validity of comparisons with countries that have reliable statistical systems. Incomplete national reporting can affect the accuracy of Ukraine's positioning in international rankings, which in turn influences investment attractiveness and scientific cooperation.

The developers of the Global Innovation Index emphasize the importance of its indicators in assessing the innovation potential of countries. However, several shortcomings exist: subjectivity of data, due to the use of surveys and expert assessments; heterogeneity of indicators, which complicates comparisons between countries; limited scope, as social innovations and environmental factors are often excluded; the impact of economic crises can distort results; variability in data quality affects accuracy; and a tendency toward average values may fail to reflect the real capabilities of countries with extreme conditions. These limitations suggest that the Global Innovation Index should be used as one of many tools for assessing a country's innovation potential, rather than as a singular source of truth.

Therefore, international rankings such as the Global Innovation Index can be useful for providing a general overview of innovation potential. However, in times of war and instability, they do not always accurately reflect the real situation. Methodological flaws—such as the subjectivity of indicators and reliance on available data—raise concerns about their relevance for assessing Ukraine under crisis conditions. The use of standard approaches for countries with diverse socio-economic and political contexts can result in methodological bias.

References:

1. State Statistics Service of Ukraine. URL : https://www.ukrstat.gov.ua

2. Informational Materials on the State of Innovation Activity. Ministry of Economy of Ukraine. URL : https://me.gov.ua/documents/detail?lang=uk-ua&id=69b9a9bf-5fbc-4035-8c0f-ac26b853c0eb&title=informatsiinimaterialischodostanuinnovatsiinoidiialnosti

3. Global Innovation Index 2024. URL : https://www.wipo.int/web-

publications/global-innovation-index-2024/en/

Васильєва О. В.
ГЛОБАЛЬНИЙ ІННОВАЦІЙНИЙ ІНДЕКС:
НЕ(ОБ'ЄКТИВНІСТЬ) МЕТОДОЛОГІЇ ОЦІНЮВАННЯ

Анотація. У статті розглядаються виклики, з якими стикнулася наукова сфера України в умовах повномасштабної війни, зокрема руйнування наукової інфраструктури, евакуація фахівців, скорочення державного фінансування та відсутність актуальної статистики. Визначено проблеми, пов'язані з використанням міжнародних рейтингів, зокрема Глобального інноваційного індексу, для оцінки інноваційного потенціалу країн у кризових умовах. Підкреслено, що методологічні обмеження, зокрема суб'єктивність даних, неоднорідність показників та залежність від доступності статистики, ставлять під сумнів точність таких оцінок для України в умовах війни. Стаття наголошує на необхідності використання Глобального індексу інновацій як одного з інструментів оцінки інноваційного потенціалу, а не як єдиного джерела для стратегічних рішень.

Ключові слова: Глобальний інноваційний індекс, методологія оцінки інноваційної діяльності, міжнародні рейтинги.

УДК 336.71:327.56

Kinda A.
Ph.D. in Economics,
Thomas SANKARA University,
augustinkinda5@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4170-1121

FINANCIAL INCLUSION AND CONFLICT IN WAEMU COUNTRIES

Annotation. This article examines the complex relationship between financial inclusion and conflicts in the countries of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU) over the period 2006–2023. Financial inclusion is recognised as a key driver of economic and social development; however, the prevalence of conflicts in the WAEMU region significantly hinders access to financial services. Armed, social, and political conflicts lead to instability, population displacement, the destruction of infrastructure, and disruption of economic activities, which undermine trust in financial institutions and increase the economic vulnerability of populations. Conversely, a low level of financial inclusion can exacerbate social tensions and contribute to the emergence of conflicts. The main objective of this study is to analyze how the level of financial inclusion influences the likelihood and intensity of conflicts, and how conflicts affect access to and the use of financial services in WAEMU countries. To achieve this objective, a quantitative methodology is employed based on the analysis of macroeconomic and financial data from the eight WAEMU countries.