

JEL Classification:  
F15; G34; O15; O34;  
P33

UDC 005.336.4

DOI: 10.30857/2415-  
3206.2020.2.4**METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH TO  
EVALUATION OF COMPONENT  
INTELLECTUAL POTENTIAL IN BUSINESS  
PROCESSES OF INTEGRATED STRUCTURES****O. NIFATOVA<sup>1</sup>, P. DUDKO<sup>1</sup>**<sup>1</sup> *Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design,  
Ukraine.*

**Background and objectives.** In today's information economy intangible assets play a more important role than tangible assets. An intellectual capital is used to determine intangible assets that enable a firm to increase its market value. In turn, the intellectual capital of an integrated business structure – a qualification, experience, staff motivation, knowledge, technology and communication channels are able to create added value providing a competitive advantage businesses.

**Methods.** The methods used: method of analysis of hierarchies – to establish the importance (priority) of the selected components of the potential of intellectual synergy; expert evaluation method – to assess the potential of intellectual synergy of the integrated business structure; graphical – for a visual representation of analytical calculations.

**Findings.** The results obtained in the pairwise comparison constituents potential intellectual synergy integrated business structure are as follows: within the component "human capital" greatest value on a scale of intensity has subconstituent "loyal employees" to part "structural capital" – "business model" for component "brand capital" – "trademarks

/brands". The results obtained when comparing the components together on a scale of intensity showed that the most important component of intellectual capital is the "human capital".

**Conclusion.** The study revealed the importance of examined components of intellectual potential synergies, which include three subsystems: the potential of human capital, structural capital potential, the potential of brand equity and the comparison of them in terms of each individual business units using the analytic hierarchy process. The conducted study proves that the integration of intellectual capital management into the overall management system of the integrated business structure is a necessary condition for the harmonious combination of all systems of individual business units. That study has significant implications for brand management of integrated business structures by providing empirical evidence that can improve understanding of the need to prioritize the components of intellectual capacity.

**Keywords:** intellectual synergy; brand capital; structural capital; human capital.

NUMBER OF REFERENCES	NUMBER OF FIGURES	NUMBER OF TABLES
21	0	5

JEL Classification:  
F15; G34; O15; O34;  
P33

УДК 005.336.4

DOI: 10.30857/2415-  
3206.2020.2.4

## МЕТОДИЧНИЙ ПІДХІД ДО ОЦІНЮВАННЯ СКЛАДОВИХ ІНТЕЛЕКТУАЛЬНОГО ПОТЕНЦІАЛУ В БІЗНЕС-ПРОЦЕСАХ ІНТЕГРОВАНИХ СТРУКТУР

О. НІФАТОВА<sup>1</sup>, П. ДУДКО<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Київський національний університет технологій та дизайну, Україна.

**Постановка проблеми та завдання.** В умовах сучасної інформаційної економіки нематеріальні активи відіграють більш важливу роль, ніж матеріальні активи компанії. Інтелектуальний капітал використовується для визначення нематеріальних цінностей, завдяки яким фірма має змогу підвищити свою ринкову вартість. Своєю чергою, інтелектуальний капітал інтегрованої структури бізнесу – це кваліфікація, досвід, мотивація персоналу, знання, технології і канали комунікації, здатні створити додану вартість, що забезпечує конкурентні переваги бізнес-структури.

**Методи.** Використані методи: метод аналізу ієрархій – для встановлення важливості (пріоритетності) виокремлених складових потенціалу інтелектуального синергізму; метод експертного оцінювання – для оцінювання потенціалу інтелектуального синергізму інтегрованої структури бізнесу; графічний – для наочного представлення аналітичних розрахунків.

**Результати:** отримані результати в ході попарного порівняння складових потенціалу інтелектуального синергізму інтегрованої структури бізнесу, є такими: в рамках складової «людський капітал» найбільше значення за шкалою інтенсивності має підскладова «лояльність працівників», для складової «структурний капітал» – «бізнес-модель», для складової

«бренд-капітал» – «торгові марки/бренди». Результати, отримані під час порівняння складових між собою за шкалою інтенсивності, показали, що найбільше значення має складова інтелектуального капіталу – «людський капітал».

**Висновки:** проведене дослідження дозволило встановити важливість (пріоритетність) виокремлених складових потенціалу інтелектуального синергізму, який включає три підсистеми: потенціал людського капіталу, потенціал структурного капіталу, потенціал бренд-капіталу та порівняти їх в розрізі кожної окремої бізнес-одиниці за допомогою методу аналізу ієрархій. Проведене наразі дослідження доводить, що інтеграція управління інтелектуальним капіталом в загальну систему управління інтегрованою структурою бізнесу є необхідною умовою гармонійного поєднання всіх систем окремих бізнес-одиниць. Поточне дослідження має значні наслідки для управління брендами інтегрованих структур бізнесу шляхом надання емпіричних доказів, які можуть покращити розуміння необхідності визначення пріоритетності складових інтелектуального потенціалу.

**Ключові слова:** інтелектуальний синергізм; бренд-капітал; структурний капітал; людський капітал.

**Introduction.** In today's information economy intangible assets play a more important role than tangible assets. According to the leading international consulting organization "Interbrand", tangible assets account for only 5 to 12% of the total value of assets of leading corporations in the market (*Best Global Brands, 2020*).

Besides the concept of intangible assets there exists a broader concept – intellectual capital, which is used to determine intangible assets and through which the firm is able to increase its market value (*Ermolenko et al., 2011; Leontev, 2011*). In terms of global competition the intellectual capital becomes a major factor in the increased cost and competitive advantages in the market (*Seitkazieva et al., 2018*). The intellectual capital of an integrated business structure is qualifications, experience, staff motivation, knowledge, technology and communication channels that can create added value that provides a competitive advantage of the business structure.

In a view of above-mentioned, it is important to develop a methodological approach to prioritize the components of the intellectual potential of integrated business structures.

**Materials and methods.** There are different approaches to understanding the structure of intellectual capital (*Marchenko, 2012; Tarique et al, 2020; Carroll, 1979; Keller, 2003*). From our point of view, the intellectual capital has human, structural and client capital in its structure. Human capital is seen as the inalienable values of the organization (qualifications, knowledge, experience, etc.). Structural capital is the company's infrastructure (information technology, workflows, communication systems, information resources, etc.). The innovative part of structural capital is the intellectual property, which determines the value of the company (scientific and technical research and development, know-how, ideas, inventive activity). Customer capital (brand capital) is a value that lies in customer relationships (*Kryvoviaz, 2011*). These are trademarks and service marks; brand names; business reputation; presence of insiders in partner organizations or clients; availability of regular customers; repeated contracts with clients. Each of these components of the intellectual capital of the integrated business structure can be reliably quantified or only qualitatively assessed.

In modern conditions, there is no unambiguous interpretation of the category "intellectual capital of an integrated business structure" due to the setting of different goals. Recent studies clarify the understanding of the components of intellectual capital that gives grounds to formulate the following definition: intellectual capital – is the stock value of economic benefits of an integrated business structure in the form of intelligent competitive advantage, which brings a substantial marginal profit. In other words, intellectual capital is

a knowledge that can be turned into the value (*Zhenyuan et al, 2018; Banu, 2019; Godfred et al, 2019*).

In our study we propose to provide our own definition of the potential of intellectual synergy of integrated business structure and consider it as opportunities created by intellectual resources of business units, which are integrated considering the harmonious combination of all components of intellectual capital, its quantitative and qualitative changes. business acquires a new qualitative state in the form of a certain ratio of elements of intellectual capital, which provides a synergistic effect. Thus, at the stage of integration of business units it is important to assess the potential of intellectual synergy of business units involved in the integration process.

To assess the potential of intellectual synergies business units involved in the integration process we should identify all the intellectual capabilities of each individual business units, comparing their level of use, identify units that need restructuring and further recomposition and implementation of the best components of intellectual capital. The main task of the integrated business structure in the process of merger or acquisition is to assess the totality of all components of intellectual capital and ways to obtain and use them for an effective operation.

Schematically the assessment of environmental and object subsystems of integration and the effectiveness of the use of human, structural and brand capital in the integration process can be represented as follows. To represent the potential of intellectual synergy, the model of W. Edward Deming was used, who presented the potential of synergy of the team as follows (*Deming, 2010*):

$$A+B+C+D+\dots+(AB)+(AC)+(AD)+\dots+(DC)+(DB)+\dots+(CD)+(ABC)+(ABD)+(BCD)+\dots+(ABCD).$$

Taking into account the research and theoretical developments (*Ken, 2009; Saibonova, 2014; Carroll, 2000; Keynes, 1931*), the first component of intellectual capital – human capital, which will be considered as a set of the following components: education; work culture; key competencies; management competencies; professional qualification; employee loyalty; psychometric characteristics; knowledge of the secrets of production; creativity; the moral values; habits; experience.

Structural capital is that part of the intellectual potential of a business unit (intellectual property, information systems, instructions, regulations, standards, awards, diplomas, prizes, etc., received by the business unit), which remains even in the absence of staff. Structural capital also includes the strategy and culture of the business unit, structures and systems, organizational procedures, and so on.

Brand capital will be considered as a system of capital, reliable on a long-term trust and mutually beneficial relations of the business unit with its

customers and buyers. These include the brands themselves, brand name, sales channels, licensing and other agreements, the presence of their own people in partner organizations / customers, the presence of regular customers, repeated contracts with customers (*Chih-Hsing et al, 2020; Ganushchak-Efimenko et al, 2018*). Let's single out the main components of brand capital: business reputation; customer base; brand portfolio; order portfolio; trademark / brand; business cooperation; contracts (licenses, franchises).

The main idea of this technique is that the research and the study of the experience of using the intellectual capital of one business unit gives the ability to implement and compare it with the implementation of intellectual capital of another business unit or with the existing model (through the use of competitive integration benchmarking) and on the bases of results obtained by the estimation it identifies the potential for intellectual synergies in one or both of the business units undergoing the integration phase. This assessment of potential intellectual synergy needs an attraction of a significant amount of empirical data and intellectual abilities and professional evaluators. Thus, evaluating intellectual potential synergies of an integrated business structure, in our opinion, should be performed by using the method of expert evaluations.

Another stage is the formation of the structure of the potential of intellectual synergism, indicating the directions of possible synergy of its elements.

From our point of view, the structure of the intellectual potential synergies, according to the stages of peer review of the use of intellectual potential synergies IPS includes three subsystems: the potential of human capital, structural capital potential, the potential of brand equity. Each subsystem is divided into components that include elements of intellectual potential. The total amount of constituent subsystems in the structure of intellectual potential is thirty-three.

This amount of elements provides the most complete analysis of the level of use of intellectual potential, which directly affects its overall assessment. The distribution of subsystems by elements will help us to determine which of elements is used by the business unit, that furthermore will help us to eliminate this shortcoming in a timely manner.

It is proposed to establish the priority of the components which we have already identified and compare them in the context of each individual business unit using the method of hierarchy analysis (MHA). The method of hierarchy analysis is a mathematical tool of a systematic approach to complex decision-making problems. On the development of MHA worked such famous scientists as: R. Bellman, B.N. Brooke and W.N. Burkov, but the greatest popularity of this method was obtained due to the works of T. Saati. The proposed method provides an excellent opportunity to rationally structure a complex decision-

making problem in the form of a hierarchy, also it helps us to compare and quantify the alternative solutions (Saaty, 1987; Lipsey, 2001).

After the hierarchical structuring of the problem, the priorities of the criteria are set and each of the alternatives is evaluated according to the criteria. When using the method of analysis of hierarchies, a pairwise comparison of the elements of the problem is realized, taking into account their impact on their common characteristics. The results obtained during the pairwise comparisons can be represented as an inversely symmetric matrix. The element of the matrix  $a(i, j)$  is used to be the intensity of the demonstration of the hierarchy' element relative to the element of the hierarchy  $j$ , which is estimated on a scale of intensity from 1 to 9 (Saaty, 1987) (Table 1).

Table 1

**Interpretation of the intensity scale of the method of analysis of hierarchies for the determination of the priority of the components of intellectual potential**

Numerical values of the intensity scale	Interpretation of numerical values
1–2	Equivalence of criteria
3–4	Moderate advantage of one criterion over another
5–6	Significant advantage of one criterion over another
7–8	Superior advantage of one criterion over another
9	A very significant advantage of one criterion over another

The relative significance or probability of each individual object in the hierarchy is determined by estimating the corresponding element of the eigenvector of the priority matrix, normalized to unity. Priorities are synthesized starting from the second level. Local priorities are multiplied by the priority of the corresponding criterion, which is at a higher level and added for each element according to the criteria affected by the element.

In order to obtain information on the degree of inconsistency of the opinions obtained during the expert assessment, it is necessary to calculate the consistency index (CI) and the ratio of coherence (CR) (Lipsey, 2001).

The consistency index is determined by the following formula:

$$IC = (\lambda_{\max} - n) / (n - 1),$$

where  $\lambda_{\max}$  – is the maximum eigenvalue of the matrix of pairwise comparisons;

$n$  – is the number of elements to be compared (matrix size).

The consistency ratio is calculated by the formula:

$$CR = IC/RC,$$

where  $RC$  – is a random consistency.

The level of consistency is considered acceptable if  $CR \leq 10\%$ , otherwise, it is necessary to review and correct the matrix of pairwise comparisons.

**Results and discussion.** Thus, the results obtained during the pairwise comparison of subcomponents are as follows: within the component "human capital" the most important on the intensity scale is the subcomponent "employee loyalty", for the component "structural capital" – "business model", for the component "brand-capital" – "trademarks / brands". The results obtained when comparing the components on the scale of intensity showed that the most important component of intellectual capital is "human capital".

The result of the analysis by the method of hierarchies is a pairwise comparison of all sub-components within the selected alternatives – business unit 1 and business unit 2 (Table 2–5).

Table 2

**Typical conditions for the assessment of the potential of intellectual synergy of an integrated business structure**

Possible synergy directions on IR subsystems	Weight of the direction	Possible synergy directions on IR subsystems	Weight of the direction
HUMAN CAPITAL		STRUCTURAL CAPITAL	
1. Education	0,081	1. Philosophy of the management	0,075
2. Labor culture	0,086	2. Corporate culture	0,072
3. Key competencies	0,088	3. Business model	0,076
4. Management competencies	0,083	4. R&D	0,072
5. Professional qualification	0,079	5. Management processes	0,035
6. Employee loyalty	0,092	6. Informational technologies	0,074
7. Psychometric characteristics	0,079	7. Data bases	0,072
8. Knowledge of production secrets	0,079	8. Knowledge bases	0,075
9. Creativity	0,09	9. Patents	0,074
10. Moral values	0,083	10. Software	0,075
11. Abilities	0,079	11. Trademarks	0,074
12. Experience	0,081	12. Know-how	0,075
		13. Copyright	0,072
		14. Production secrets	0,035
BRAND CAPITAL			
1. Business reputation	0,14	General assessment of the level of intellectual potential of the business unit $In_1 \succ In_2$ $In_1 \prec In_2$ $In_1 = In_2$	
2. Customer base	0,139		
3. Brand portfolio	0,154		
4. Portfolio of orders	0,139		
5. Trademarks / brands	0,159		
6. Business cooperation	0,133		
7. Contracts (licenses, franchises)	0,137		

Source: author's development.

Table 3

**Listing of application of hierarchies' analysis method (Expert Choice)  
for the structural capital of ISB assessment**

AID	Alternative	structural capital corporate culture 2 (L:0,350)	structural capital business model 2 (L:0,350)
A1	business unit 1	1,000	1,000
A2	business unit 2	0,500	0,250
AID	Alternative	structural capital IT-technologies 2 (L:0,350)	structural capital data bases 2 (L:0,350)
A1	business unit 1	1,000	0,333
A2	business unit 2	0,333	1,000
AID	Alternative	structural capital knowledge bases 2 (L:0,350)	structural capital patents 2 (L:0,390)
A1	business unit 1	1,000	0,333
A2	business unit 2	0,200	1,000
AID	Alternative	structural capital trademarks 2 (L:0,350)	structural capital know-how 2 (L:0,390)
A1	business unit 1	0,333	1,000
A2	business unit 2	1,000	0,250
AID	Alternative	structural capital copyright 2 (L:0,370)	structural capital production secrets 2 (L:0,390)
A1	business unit 1	0,333	0,250
A2	business unit 2	1,000	1,000

Table 4

**Listing of application of hierarchies' analysis method (Expert Choice)  
for the human capital of ISB assessment**

AID	Alternative	human capital moral values 1 (L:0,430)	human capital abilities 1 (L:0,360)
A1	business unit 1	1,000	0,500
A2	business unit 2	0,333	1,000
AID	Alternative	human capital experience 1 (L:0,350)	human capital education 2 (L:0,350)
A1	business unit 1	0,333	1,000
A2	business unit 2	1,000	0,333
AID	Alternative	human capital work culture 2 (L:0,360)	human capital key competencies 2 (L:0,370)
A1	business unit 1	1,000	1,000
A2	business unit 2	0,333	0,333



**Continuation of table 4**

AID	Alternative	human capital human capital 2 (L:0,370)	human capital professional qualification 2 (L:0,430)
A1	business unit 1	0,333	0,250
A2	business unit 2	1,000	1,000
AID	Alternative	human capital employee loyalty 2 (L:0,390)	human capital psychometric characteristics 2 (L:0,420)
A1	business unit 1	1,000	0,500
A2	business unit 2	0,200	1,000

*Table 5*

**Listing of application of hierarchies' analysis method (Expert Choice)  
for the human capital of ISB assessment**

AID	Alternative	brand capital business reputation 1 (L:0,640)	brand capital client base 1 (L:0,590)
A1	business unit 1	0,500	0,250
A2	business unit 2	1,000	1,000
AID	Alternative	brand capital portfolio of brands 1 (L:0,910)	brand capital order portfolio 1 (L:0,590)
A1	business unit 1	1,000	0,333
A2	business unit 2	0,500	1,000
AID	Alternative	brand capital trademarks/brands 1 (L:0,970)	brand capital business cooperation 1 (L:0,610)
A1	business unit 1	1,000	0,500
A2	business unit 2	0,250	1,000
AID	Alternative	brand capital contracts 1 (L:0,720)	brand capital business reputation 2 (L:0,760)
A1	business unit 1	0,333	0,333
A2	business unit 2	1,000	1,000

In accordance with the results obtained it is possible to make the following conclusions:

- in order to achieve the maximum level of synergy in the process of integration of business units it is advisable to use the positive experience (apply competitive integration benchmarking) of business unit 1 on the components of "human and structural capital" and the experience of business unit 2 on the component of brand capital;

- the total value of CR is 9%, which indicates the absence of contradictions during the expert assessment. Summary information on assessing the potential of intellectual synergy is presented in table 2.

**Conclusions.** For the effective management of the intellectual capital of the integrated business structure it is necessary to use a comprehensive approach related to the management of all types of intangible assets. Modern high-tech business can be effective if its management controls all three capitals: material, financial and intellectual. Thus, the integration of intellectual capital management into the overall management system of the integrated business structure is a necessary condition for the harmonious combination of all systems of individual business units.

Only the construction of a fully functional system for the assessment of the potential of intellectual synergy of an integrated business structure will help maximize its value and viability. Since each individual business unit before an integration has its own business model, which may differ significantly from the business model of another business unit, it becomes appropriate to develop methods for assessing the potential of intellectual synergy of the integrated business structure.

**Conflict of Interest.** The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this article.

**Abbreviations:**

CI	consistency index
CR	consistency ratio
MHA	method of hierarchies' analysis
In	an intellectual potential of the business unit
R&D	Research & Development

**References:**

- Banu, G.S. (2019). Intellectual Assets Management Model. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 32: 1064–1068. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2019.02.322>.
- Best Global Brands 2020. The financial times. Retrieved from: <https://www.interbrand.com/best-brands>
- Carroll, A.B. (1979). A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4): 497–505.
- Carroll, A.B., Buchholtz, A.K. (2000). *Business and Society: Ethics and Stakeholder Management*. 4th ed. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Co.
- Chih-Hsing, L., Jing-Feng, J. (2020). Assessing the moderating roles of brand equity, intellectual capital and social capital in Chinese luxury hotels. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 43:139–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.03.003>.
- Deming, W. (2010). *The New Economics for Industry, Government, Education*. 3rd ed. Kindle Edition.
- Ganushchak-Efimenko, L., Shcherbak, V., Nifatova, O. (2018). Assessing the Effects of Socially Responsible Strategic Partnerships on Building Brand Equity of Integrated Business Structures in Ukraine. *Oeconomia Copernicana*, 9(4): 715–730. <https://doi.org/10.24136/oc.2018.035>.
- Godfred, K.O., Pattanayak, J.K. (2019). Does investing in intellectual capital improve productivity? Panel evidence from commercial banks in India. *Borsa Istanbul Review*, 19(3): 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bir.2019.03.001>.

- Keller, K.L. (2003). Strategic brand management. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliff, NJ:Prentice Hall.
- Ken, Mc. (2009). Where is the ethical knowledge in the knowledge economy?: Power and potential in the emergence of ethical knowledge as a component of intellectual capital. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 20(7): 804–822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2008.09.004>.
- Keynes, J.M. (1931). The Pure Theory of Money. A Reply to Dr. Hayek. *Economica*, 34: 387–397.
- Lipsey, M.W., Wilson, D.B. (2001). Practical Meta-Analysis. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.
- Saaty, R.W. (1987). The analytic hierarchy process – what it is and how it is used. *Mathematical Modelling*, 9(3–5): 161–176. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0270-0255\(87\)90473-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0270-0255(87)90473-8).
- Saibonova, L.N. (2014). Intellectual potential of the region in conditions of information integration. *Statistics and Economics*, 6(2): 340–345. [https://doi.org/10.21686/2500-3925-2014-6\(2\)-340-345](https://doi.org/10.21686/2500-3925-2014-6(2)-340-345).
- Seitkazieva, A., Zhunisbekova, G., Tazabekova, A. (2018). Intellectual potential as a key factor of the region’s competitiveness. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 51(30): 177–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2018.11.282>.
- Tarique, M., Muhammad, S.M. (2020). Balancing innovation and exploitation in the fourth industrial revolution: Role of intellectual capital and technology absorptive capacity. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 160: 1–9, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120248>.
- Zhenyuan, L., Renyan, Mu., Shuhua, Hu., Li, W., Song, W. (2018). Intellectual property protection, technological innovation and enterprise value – An empirical study on panel data of 80 advanced manufacturing SMEs. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 52: 741–746, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogsys.2018.08.012>.
- Ermolenko, V.V., Popova, E.A. (2011). Intelektual’nyj kapital korporaczii: sushhnost’, struktura, strategii razvitiya i model upravleniya. *Chelovek. Soobshhestvo. Upravlenie*, 2: 110–122.
- Krivovyaz, A.A. (2011). Ocenka brenda kak osnovy` klientskogo kapitala organizaczii. *Ekonomika i pravo*, 2: 34–36.
- Leont’ev, B.S. (2011). Upravlenie intellektual’noj sobstvennostyu na predpriyatii. Ekaterinburg: Raritet.
- Marchenko, V.V. (2012). Intelektualnyi kapital u protsesakh zlyttia ta pohlyannia korporatsii. *Formuvannia rynkovykh vidnosyn v Ukraini*, 9(136): 100–105.

#### AUTHOR (S) BIOSKETCHES



**Nifatova Olena**, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Department of Entrepreneurship and Business, Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design, Ukraine.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9325-6176>

Scopus Author ID: 57194712734

Researcher ID: Q-1893-2016

E-mail: [nifatova.om@knutd.edu.ua](mailto:nifatova.om@knutd.edu.ua)



**Dudko Pavlo**, PhD, Associate Professor of Department of Entrepreneurship and Business, Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design, Ukraine.

**<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1470-022X>**

*E-mail:* [vonpaulus83@gmail.com](mailto:vonpaulus83@gmail.com)

### **COPYRIGHTS**

©2020 The author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, as long as the original authors and source are cited. No permission is required from the authors or the publishers.

### **HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE**

Nifatova, O., Dudko, P. (2020). Methodological approach to evaluation of component intellectual potential in business processes of integrated structures. *Management*, 2(32): 53–64. <https://doi.org/10.30857/2415-3206.2020.2.4>.