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Abstract
The main purpose of the paper is the assessment of the European Union funds engagement in innovative undertakings in Polish voivodships. Firstly, it was made the considerations about innovations as an essential component of an integrated approach in terms of regions' competiveness improvement. Furthermore, it was examined the differentiation in the participation of the EU funds in innovative undertakings between Polish voivodships. In this respect was applied cluster analysis, on base which was isolated space groups, which allow to comparison of the European Union funds involvement between voivodships of Poland. The research were based on data from Central Statistical Office of Poland—Local Data Bank—concerning particularly the Programme Innovative Economy. The scope of examinations contains period 2011–2015. The effects of examinations affects the ability to identify voivodships similar in scope of the accepted variables. This identification may contribute to create of comparative base actions taken to improve innovations, which could lead to an increase in the competitiveness of regions.
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Introduction
Increasing regions competitiveness is treated as an essential component of the European Union integration policy. In this regard are taken a number of actions aimed to improve regions’ value. Therefore, the substantial importance is focused on enhancing the innovation potential of regions. In this area the crucial place constitutes stimulation of innovative behaviors and supporting innovative undertakings by the EU funds. For this reason is necessary to conduct studies concerning the European Union funds engagement in innovative undertakings in Polish voivodships.

The main aim of this article is the assessment of the European Union funds involvement in innovative undertakings in Polish voivodships. In this area the special regard was put on the comparison of applications number for final payment and an average participation of the EU funding in a framework of the Programme Innovative Economy following Priority Axes: Research and development of new technologies, R&D infrastructure, Capital for innovation, Investments in innovative undertakings, Diffusion of innovation, Polish economy on the international market and Information society—increase of innovativeness of economy. The examinations were based on cluster analysis, which was applied for creation the clusters of the first order. The examinations uses data from Central Statistical Office of Poland—Local Data Bank concerning the period 2011–2015.1

1 Innovations as the essential component of an integrated approach

Integrated approach emphasizes essentially on increasing regions’ growth. In this respect the special attention is put on smart, inclusive and green growth.2 Among them the substantial place

constitute regions’ competitiveness improvement, which is expressed mainly by innovations. That is why innovations are treated as a fundamental factor of regional development nowadays (A. Zygmunt 2014, 13; J. Zygmunt 2014, 29). Innovations create the basis for the development of entities operating in region, their entrepreneurship potential, and, consequently, innovations impact on regions’ growth. In its issue innovations provide a knowledge necessary for development (Makiela 2013, 15) and obtainment competitive advantage in turbulent environment. That is why innovations are treated as the “main engine of growth—essential for other growth’s factors.”

It should be pointed that innovations are belonged to endogenous determinants of regions’ growth. In its issue endogenous determinants characterize regions’ capacity to respond to changes in the macro surrounding (Broł 2006, 16). Nowadays, the rank of endogenous determinants in regions’ increasing competitiveness is enormous (Malik 2011, 28). That is why innovations should be considered as the main component of regions’ development (Klasik and Kuźnik 1998, 395–404). The importance of innovations as the essential component of an integrated approach requires action supporting innovations potential. In this area the special attention should be put on a creation a supportive environment for innovations (Lichniak 2010, 16). As a result, the crucial importance is connected with providing funds for innovative undertakings. In this respect the special place occupy the European Union funds, which might increase, among others, facilitate access to new technologies and enterprises’ foreign expansion (Szewczuk-Stępień 2014, 231–232).

2 The methodology of the research

The conducted examinations were concentrated on evaluation of the European Union funds involvement in innovative undertakings in voivodships of Poland. In this respect the special place was put on the differentiation of the EU funding for innovative undertakings between Polish voivodships. To the studies was used cluster analysis, which was applied for recognition the space groups differ in the European Union funds involvement in innovative undertakings (in voivodships perspective).

The research were based on data relating to the Programme Innovative Economy originated from Central Statistical Office of Poland—Local Data Bank. The special attention was put on data connected with such Priorities Axis of the Programme Innovative Economy as Research and development of new technologies, R&D infrastructure, Capital for innovation, Investments in innovative undertakings, Diffusion of innovation, Polish economy on the international market and Information society—increase of innovativeness of economy. From the examinations were excluded Information Society—establishment of electronic administration Priority Axis and Technical assistance Priority Axis due to the fact that their realization concerned only central level. The studies contain period 2011–2015.

To the examination were chosen the following variables:

\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 & - \text{a number of applications for final payment in Research and Development of new technologies Priority Axis in each voivodship in period 2011–2015} \\
x_2 & - \text{a number of applications for final payment in R&D infrastructure Priority Axis in each voivodship in period 2011–2015} \\
x_3 & - \text{a number of applications for final payment in Capital for innovation Priority Axis in each voivodship in period 2011–2015}
\end{align*}
\]


[4] Among endogenous determinants should be mentioned region’s real estate potential as the determinant of regions’ development (Mach 2015, 81).

[5] To the research was used cluster analysis method created by Florek, Lukaszewicz, Perkal, Steinhaus, and Zubrzycki (1951).

On the basis of analyzed variables was defined the data matrix \((X = [x_{ij}])\), which was standardized using the following formula (Kukula 2000, 82):

\[
z_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij} - \bar{x}_j}{s_j}, \text{ when } x_j \text{ is stimulant, or}
\]

\[
\frac{\bar{x}_j - x_{ij}}{s_j}, \text{ when } x_j \text{ is destimulant},
\]

where:
- \(z_{ij}\) is standardized diagnostic attribute \(x_{ij}\),
- \(\bar{x}_j = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ij}\),
- \(s_j = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_j)^2}\).

Next, it was selected the similarity measure (Młodak 2006, 48):

\[
d_{ij} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{m} (z_{ik} - z_{jk})^2}.
\]

The similarity measure was applied to isolate space groups—i.e., the clusters of the first order (Heffner and Gibas 2007, 69–72), which enabled the comparison of innovative undertakings financed with involvement of the European Union funds between voivodships of Poland. In this regard similarity measure was used to calculate distances between particular voivodships, on the base which was computed the elements of matrix clusters distances between objects. Then it was located the closer element (for each element of matrix) in order to collate similar units (summary of the closest elements) with minimal taxonomic distance and was eliminated one from two the same connections. Next it was made the connection the other units to create the clusters of the first order.

3 The results of the assessment of the European Union funds involvement in innovative undertakings in Polish voivodships perspective

The effects of examinations conduct to the conclusion about differential involvement of the EU funds in innovative undertakings between Polish voivodships within 2011–2015 (tab. 1, fig. 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Voivodship</th>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
<th>$x_3$</th>
<th>$x_4$</th>
<th>$x_5$</th>
<th>$x_6$</th>
<th>$x_7$</th>
<th>$x_8$</th>
<th>$x_9$</th>
<th>$x_{10}$</th>
<th>$x_{11}$</th>
<th>$x_{12}$</th>
<th>$x_{13}$</th>
<th>$x_{14}$</th>
<th>Closest elements</th>
<th>Min. dist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Łódzkie (NUTS PL11)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Łódzkie – Podlaskie</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Podlaskie (NUTS PL34)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Mazowieckie (NUTS PL12)</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2783</td>
<td>3759</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Mazowieckie – Wielkopolskie</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śląskie (NUTS PL22)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Śląskie – Wielkopolskie</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wielkopolskie (NUTS PL41)</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>2198</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Śląskie – Dolnośląskie</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dolnośląskie (NUTS PL51)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Lubelskie (NUTS PL31)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Lubelskie – Lubuskie</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Świętokrzyskie (NUTS PL33)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Lubelskie – Świętokrzyskie</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lubuskie (NUTS PL43)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>Świętokrzyskie – Opolskie</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opolskie (NUTS PL52)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Świętokrzyskie – Warmińsko-Mazurskie</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warmińsko-Mazurskie (NUTS PL62)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Małopolskie (NUTS PL21)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>Małopolskie – Kujawsko-Pomorskie</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Podkarpackie (NUTS PL32)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Podkarpackie – Kujawsko-Pomorskie</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zachodniopomorskie (NUTS PL42)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Zachodniopomorskie – Kujawsko-Pomorskie</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kujawsko-Pomorskie (NUTS PL61)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>Kujawsko-Pomorskie – Pomorskie</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pomorskie (NUTS PL63)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own calculations based on data by Central Statistical Office of Poland – Local Data Bank, as published on 2016.05.23

[In the journal European practice of number notation is followed—for example, 3633333 (European style) = 36333.33 (Canadian style) = 36,333.33 (US and British style).—Ed.]
The cluster analysis application allowed to indicate the four space groups in the terms of the accepted variables. First of them covers such voivodships as Łódzkie (NUTS PL11) and Podlaskie (NUTS PL34). In the framework of the first group the special attention should be put on similarity in an average participation of the EU funding connected with R&D infrastructure projects (on average 85%) as well as in Investments in innovative undertakings (on average 50%–51%), Polish economy on the international market (on average 51%) and Information society — increase of innovativeness of economy (on average 51%). In comparison to other voivodships of Poland the mentioned voivodships distinguish relatively the highest the European Union funds involvement in such fields as Investments in innovative undertakings (on average 50%–51%) and Information society — increase of innovativeness of economy (on average 63%–64%).

According to the achieved results the second space group contains the following voivodships: Mazowieckie (NUTS PL12), Śląskie (NUTS PL22), Wielkopolskie (NUTS PL41) and Dolnośląskie (NUTS PL51). Mentioned voivodships stand out distinctively from the other Polish voivodships in the field of innovativeness improving. This occurrence is especially noticeable in a number of applications for final payment in connection with the Programme Innovative Economy. In this respect voivodships in question distinguish relatively the highest number of application for final payment in Research and Development of new technologies (142–557), R&D infrastructure (8–89), Capital for innovation (71–232), Investments in innovative undertakings (228–661), Diffusion of innovation (31–104), Polish economy on the international market (1 002–2 783) and Information society — increase of innovativeness of economy (871–3 759) Priority Axes. The voivodships belonged to the second group feature also relatively the lowest average participation (eligible expenditure) of the EU funding in Capital for innovation Priority Axis in period 2011–2015.

The examinations outcomes indicate the third space group of voivodships in terms of the European Union funds involvement in innovative undertakings: Lubelskie (NUTS PL31), Świętokrzyskie (NUTS PL33), Lubuskie (NUTS PL43), Świętokrzyskie (NUTS PL33), Opolskie (NUTS PL52), and Warmińsko-Mazurskie (NUTS PL62). Above voivodships characterize particularly the relatively low number of applications for final payment in the area of R&D infrastructure (0–3), Investments in innovative undertakings (82–140), Polish economy on the international market (212–275) and Information society — increase of innovativeness of economy (219–579) Priority Axes. Additionally, the effects of examination allow to indicate that unlike other voivodships, Lubuskie (NUTS PL43) and Opolskie (NUTS PL52) distinguish lack of the EU funds involvement in undertakings connected with R&D infrastructure in period 2011–2015.
Taking into account accepted variables the effects of research indicate also the fourth space group, which consist of such voivodships as: Małopolskie (NUTS PL21), Podkarpackie (NUTS PL32), Zachodniopomorskie (NUTS PL42), Kujawsko-Pomorskie (NUTS PL61) and Pomorskie (NUTS PL63). Within the period 2011–2015 the above voivodships distinguished mostly the relatively high number of applications for final payment in area of Research and Development of new technologies (33–355), Investments in innovative undertakings (104–663), Polish economy on the international market (212–1693) and Information society — increase of innovativeness of economy (219–1453) Priority Axes. Moreover, it should be underlined that mentioned voivodships characterize relatively the highest involvement of the European Union funds in Capital for innovation field (in comparison to other Polish voivodships). This occurrence was especially seen in case of Małopolskie (NUTS PL21) (on average 75%) and Kujawsko-Pomorskie (NUTS PL61) (on average 74%).

Conclusions
The conducted research lead to the several conclusions. Firstly, the undertaken studies emphasize differential engagement of the European Union funds in innovative undertakings between voivodships of Poland in period 2011–2015. Above appearance might arise from diverse needs of Polish voivodships in regard to innovative undertakings and innovation potential increasing. Consequently, that occurrence might influence on differential demand for the EU funds. On the other hand, the undertaken examinations predicate of the conclusions about the existence of the voivodships’ groups with relatively close involvement of the European Union funds in innovation undertakings scope (in terms of the accepted variables). This situation might contribute with relatively the approximate voivodships’ objectives for improvement of innovative undertakings.

In this regard the obtained results might constitute comparative base which allow the comparison of actions taken by Polish voivodships to improve innovations and their effectiveness (especially in the regard of the EU funds acquisition for innovative undertakings in the Perspective for 2014–2020) and, as a result, might contribute in increasing competitiveness position of particular region. Moreover, the results of examination highlight the differentiation in directions of the EU funds involvement in innovative undertakings. In period 2011–2015 Polish voivodships embraced mostly the European Union funds for R&D infrastructure. This occurrence should be treated as positive because R&D potential determines the value of regions. Furthermore, the relatively high engagement of the EU funds concerned Diffusion of innovation and Information society — increase of innovativeness of economy. The complexity of the European Union funds involvement in innovative undertakings issues require further studies. They should be concentrated especially on the identification of the EU funds impact on benefited entities’ innovation potential and their competitiveness position and thus the increase of regions competitiveness.
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