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***Summary***

*This article considers evolutionary the of concept "enterprise competitiveness" in Ukraine. There has been carried out the analysis of its development within the period of the birth of classical economic science and the present day. There are considered the main scientific schools that research the problem of competition and competitiveness development. On the basis of the research, the author proposed a logical-historical scheme for the development of the concept "enterprise competitiveness".*

At the economic development of the XXI century, the problem of competitiveness is central one in economic policy of Ukraine. The creations of the competitive advantages are competitor becomes a strategic direction of the state and its bodies in the field of providing the national economy.

The competitiveness increase should take place at all of its hierarchical levels: products (goods and services), enterprises, industries, regions and countries one whole. But the enterprise competitiveness becomes very important as the main link of the economy.

The challenge of competitiveness is actual for Ukraine because of the negative effects of economic reforms in the 1990s that have largely weakened their positions both on the domestic and foreign markets.

The ability of the company to compete in the basic industry, on the inter-branch and world markets, has been in to the "competitiveness" category.

In order to improve the process of the enterprises competitiveness reflected we will a research of the concept "enterprise competitiveness" in an evolutionary context.

Evolution is the process of change and phased development [1, p. 208].

Nowadays, the competition phenomenon is one of the most important factors that determines and outlines successful economic development the concept of competitiveness is a direct indicator of the success of the subject functioning of any level (enterprise, enterprise association, industry, country).

The variability of the economic environment in Ukraine creates the need to consider issues related to the main features appearance of the market existence- competition and competitiveness in the context of the dynamic market processes development.

The economic categories "competition" and "competitiveness" started to form since the birth of classical economic science. In our opinion these two concepts are very closely connected in a logical sense and they have one root which is "competitor". There can be no competitiveness of any object without competition. The presence of competition on the market of goods or services where the company operates requires providing certain competitiveness. Otherwise it can to its lead crowding out of the markets.

V. Ivanov follows the dialectical dependence of these two categories. He believes that one flows from another forming a base that, in turn, creates conditions for the development of the first. The competitiveness is the basis for the competition creation as competition itself, sets the limits and imposes its requirements for the product while arising [2, p.24]. But we cannot agree with the statement of V. Ivanov. In our opinion modern studies show that competition sets the limits and demands not only to the goods, but also to any object that can exist in a competitive environment. It may also be a country, region, industry, enterprise or employee.

The first stage in the scientific views the theory of absolute advantages evolution on the problem of competition has become proposed by A. Smith. According to this theory, competition is considered as the rivalry of the one who increases the price (within offer decrease) and the one who reduces the price (excess offer). The benefits of the competition are the best natural and climatic conditions [3, p.429].

The second stage is the theory of comparative costs. Consideration formulated by D. Ricardo. This theory arose from the production development and industrial innovations introduction. D. Ricardo revealed the expediency of foreign trade for those cases when the country does not have an absolute advantage in the production of any goods [4]. The scientists were guided by the principles of labor value.

The further development of the comparative costs theory was obtained in the works of Swedish economists B. Olin and E. Heckscher. They united the trade success of the country not only with the costs of the one resource (labor), but also considered other resources (land and capital) [5].

A. Smith, D. Ricardo, B. Olin and E. Heckscher considered the competitiveness of the country as a whole, depending on the above factors. But only M. Porter has become the first who evaluated the competitiveness of the country at the level of the operating enterprises in it [6, 7].

Later, the competitiveness at the enterprise level was evaluated and supplemented by many economic scientists and it is supplementing by this time.

M. Ivashkov argues that the terms "competition", "competitiveness" was unfamiliar and rarely used by scientific circles during the Soviet period. For a long period of time, the interpretation of these terms was considered as capitalism bourgeoisie synonymous and it was not a favorable factor for the formation scientific works there was reflected related to this issue.

Therefore, almost complete absence in the domestic economic literature of the theoretical substantiation of the essence of competition between enterprises of the sectors of the national economy and the products that they produce to be disclosed only on the basis of an analysis of the essence of competition in general [8, p.109-112].

Ukrainian Soviet encyclopedia reflects the definition of "competition" as the main objective pattern of goods production during capitalism meaning the antagonistic struggle of the private manufacturer of goods within the best conditions of production and sales man ship to get the highest profits. In this case, competition is manifested in the act of the main economic law of capitalism and the anarchy of production. It is indicated in the encyclopedia that during the pre-monopoly capitalism era there was free competition which had the intra-industry and sectoral forms. Under imperialism, the forms of competitive struggle changed, becoming more diverse, and its methods became the most diverse and the most rigorous. Only in to socialism transition - the competition disappeared in general [9, p. 358].

Domestic scientist faced a significant breakthrough after national economy transition into market relations. All these revived the interest of the scientists into theoretical interpretation and deeper disclosure of this economic category.

So, after the Soviet Union collapse other interpretations of competition began to appear in encyclopedias and dictionaries. Competition is an economic rivalry and struggle between private and collective manufacturer of goods and sellers of goods /services for the most favorable conditions of their production and sales, the purpose of appropriating the largest profits, where spontaneously regulate the proportions of social production. In encyclopedias and dictionaries various forms of competition are already given, for example: intersectoral, active, inter-branch, imperfect, non-monopolistic, non-price, dishonest, civilized, pure (perfect) [10, p.818-824;] But the definition of "competitiveness" and "enterprise competitiveness" is absent in the encyclopedia. Apparently it can be explained because by the ambiguous formulation of this statement, as well as because by not enough research of this problem.

The explanatory dictionary of the modern Ukrainian language defines the term "competitiveness" as the ability to compete. Also there defined separately the terms "competitiveness of goods" as - the compliance of the goods with the requirements of the market and the possibility of their sale in a specific market and "competitor" as the one who competes with someone. Manufacturer of goods, the expansion of which activity leads to a decrease in the market share of another commodity producer; "Competition" 1. Rivalry in any industry, 2. Struggle between commodity producers for more favorable conditions of production and sales of goods and commodity production [11, p.448]. In our opinion the explanatory dictionary has a positive feature considering competition from the point of marketing and the market component which is the product as this approach allows characterizing the essence of the concept nowadays.

The investigations of competition and competitiveness problems are conducted fairly effectively by foreign scientists, because of the three major research centers (Fig. 1):

- US School of Science. Professors M. Porter, A. Chandler, M. Enright, J. MacArthur are the core of this school. For the any first time, there were presented the results of evaluating the competitiveness of products, companies and individual industries problems the solving. There was made presented, a significant contribution to the strategic management of the company in a competitive environment, identified and evaluated the factors of competitive advantages, key paints of success also there were achieved the particularly significant results in the research of competitiveness regulation problems at the level of industry.

**Main scientific centers**

US School of Science

Japan School of Science

European School

Figure 1. Current research centers of the competition and competitiveness research problems

Japan School of Science: Tokyo Universities, Khitotsubasi, Vaseda, Meiji coordinate their research in the field of non-price competition, within competitors for product promotion. They pay much attention to the problem of national manufacturers’ cooperation and interaction in order to owner new geographic markets.

The bright representatives of the Japanese school are Professors X. Takuuchi, H. Koboyasy, M. Tsuchiya.

- European School. Scientists from Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Austria, Italy, Germany have virtually their own (though largely pro-American) models that describe the company’s competitive behavior. The problems of competition were reflected in works of European scientists on the international scale as global competition. [12, pp. 60-61].

Every year in Ukraine, more and more scientists are engaged in the issues of competition and competitiveness of various objects. At the legislative level, these issues are supported by laws and regulations. Although the Constitution of Ukraine established that the state provides competition in entrepreneurial activity. It is prohibited the abuse of the market, illegal competition restriction and unfair competition [13]. The legal principles of competition and its protection are defined by the Laws of Ukraine: " On Antimonopoly Committee of Ukraine " [14], " On protection from unfair competition" [15], " On natural monopoly " [16], " On protection of the economic competition " [17], " On Amendments to the law of Ukraine on economic competition protection " [18], and acts of the Antimonopoly Committee of Ukraine.

In 2005there was created the Competitiveness Council of Ukraine. It is a body whose purpose is to coordinate the efforts of academics, educators, small business, business, management of large companies and financial institutions, as well as representatives of government and law-makers in order to facilitate the "institutionalization" of the concept of competitiveness in the countries economic policy practice. [19].

In our opinion, 2005 has become a key point in the intensive research of the competition phenomenon and the attribute of the objects as competitiveness at all levels starling from the state to enterprise. There began to appear the interpretation of the "enterprise competitiveness" concept for different types of enterprises, as well as various industries. At the same time, scientists tried to give an interpretation of the "enterprise competitiveness" concept both for the general category and for the enterprises of different types, but these definitions are based on different approaches.

O. Pokhilchenko and Ye. Krikavsky distinguish in their research two similar concepts of "competitiveness" and "competitive ability". They argue that these two economic categories, are similar, but they have different meanings. And very often while translating from the Russian language these two concepts are confused. Competitiveness and competitive ability come from one common word, "competition", which means rivalry contention or struggle. But the word "ability" derived from the word "capable", what means, who has the ability to perform, carries out, does something or may have the ability to do something. That "ability" - which comes from the word "capable", that is, which can, perform, performs, do something, behave in a certain way. The difference between these two terms that ability is means an opportunity to realize skills, and capability already objects inherent ability to implement the conceived action.

Therefore, some scientists, and we agree with this point of view propose to apply the category of "competitiveness" to objects that are already in the market, and the competitive ability of the newly created objects that are about to fulfill the market [20, p. 267].

Nowadays, there is no single definition of the "enterprise competitiveness" concept. In our opinion, the main factors that determine the possibility of many interpretations of this concept are different starting positions of economists, as well as the fact that as a manufacturer services or provider there is considered a separate enterprise, industry or the whole economy. One of the first who discovered the competitiveness multilevel was M. Helenovsky. In his opinion, at different levels of the national economic system, the concept of "competitiveness" is characterized by different criteria, and accordingly, this category must be analyzed and evaluated in different ways [21, p. 70].

M. Komkov argues that the term "competitiveness" is used both for created products and for the elements of economic systems now researchers pays more and more attention to the research of the products competitiveness, individual enterprises, cities, regions, countries, technologies, workers and even regulations. Thus, this term can be considered at the level of goods, enterprises, technologies, the whole industry, region or country. As part of this tradition, researchers believe that the competitive object is a product created within a business project and capable of generating profits in competitive markets [22, p.6-7].

L.S. Egorova and LA A. Makarichev distinguish four stages of the enterprise's competitiveness:

1. Products manufacturing that is not equal to the competitor;
 2. To be equivalent to the competitor while products or services manufacturing;

 3. While products manufacturing to take into account consumer to buy needs, paying more attention to marketing;

4. To be ahead of the competitor for many years at any country, taking into account the results of market research [23, p. 317].

Scientists L. Chaynikova and V. Chaynikov interpret the notion of enterprise competitiveness for different market players. Features of the concept of competitiveness of the enterprise relative to different subjects are given in Table 1. \*

In determining the competitiveness of the enterprise, scientists I. Zulkarnayeva, L. Ilyasova scientists focus on the marketing component. They argue that competitiveness is determined by the presence of the products demand for the enterprise and its share in the market. The bigger the last one the greater of the enterprise competitiveness [24].

In our opinion, the shortcoming of this definition is that market share is one of the competitiveness indicator, rather than competitiveness itself. The positive aspect of this definition reflects identifying the level of the enterprise competitiveness is relatively simple: it is enough to calculate what share of the company in any market.

Table 1. Features of the enterprise competitiveness concept relatively to different subjects

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Object | Definition of the concept |
| Consumer | The ability to meet the consumers’ needs based on the goods and services production that prevail over competitors in a specific set of parameters. |
| Competitor | The ability to produce the goods, provide services that meet the requirements of the world and domestic markets, and create conditions for the growth of competitiveness potential. |
| Investor | The ability to use enterprise resources for the dynamic markets development, increase the market value of the enterprise. |
| Partner | The ability to produce competitive products and create conditions for the growth of competitiveness potential based on innovative factors of growth. |

\* Formed by the author on the basis of the developments Chaynikova L.N. and Chaynikova V.N. [23.1, p. 24].

Another position is observed by scientists R. Fatkhuddinov, Yu. Ivanov, M. Kizim, O. Tishchenko, O. Ivanova O. Revenko, T. Chechetova-Terashvili [25, p. 320]. They argue that the researched category depends on the priority role of product competitiveness. R. Fatkhutdinov believes that "the competitiveness of the organization is its ability to produce competitive goods or services [26]. M. Mironov defines as "the ability of profitable products manufacturing and selling for the not higher price and not worse quality than the other enterprises in their market niche". [27] Such interpretation of the concept in our opinion, is wider than R. Fatkhutdinova. The definition of M. Mironov allows to reflect the relative level of the enterprise competitiveness. It means the price and qualitative aspects when the products of the competing enterprises are compared among themselves. The positive point of the proposed definition is that the author considers the company's competitiveness in a defined market niche.

Most scientists of this subject offer to unite in one concept "product competitiveness" and "organization competitiveness". This statement is not completely true, because the buyer does not always know which manufacturer owns the given product, and even if he knows the name of the firm, this name does not always say something. The products competitiveness and the company-producer competitiveness of products relate to each other as part and whole thing [28, p. 33].

In our opinion, the definition of the "enterprise competitiveness" is not completely correct solely at the expense of the concept of "products competitiveness ", because the life cycle of the enterprise, as a rule, is much greater than the life cycle of products, especially in modern conditions, when the update product range of the enterprise is constant. In spite of the fact that competitiveness is set for a certain moment, its determination should consider the fact of its preservation in the future: as medium range and long range perspective.

Another position of the "enterprise competitiveness" definition consist in competitiveness that is specified first of all by the efficiency and effectiveness of the enterprise.

According to M. Pertsovsky, the enterprise competitiveness is an opportunity to conduct effective economic activity and its practical profit-making realization in a competitive market. This is a general indicator of the company's stability, its ability to use effectively its financial, industrial, scientific and technical and labor potential [29].

G. Azoyev believes that the "enterprise competitiveness" is an opportunity to manage effectively their own and borrowed resources in a competitive market, i.e., the main focus is paid on the financial side of the enterprise [30].

A. Afonin, S. Bilyusova, K. Milskie define the company's competitiveness as an ability and behavior provided the company with the opportunity to pursue its own goals for a long time and successfully perform in the market along with other present subjects [31, p.173].

According to Y. Ivanov, the notion of "enterprise competitiveness" is an opportunity for the effective economic activity and its practical profitable realization in a competitive market [32].

 In our opinion, these definitions above are not sufficiently exhaustive and have a number of disadvantages. The enterprise competitiveness cannot be an opportunity, because if there is no opportunity, then there will be no competitiveness. This concept should mean not an "opportunity", but a "characteristic" of the enterprise to ensure competitiveness at a certain time, in a certain market and relatively specific objects of competition. At the present stage of evolution of the "enterprise competitiveness" concept, many researchers not only give their interpretation of this notion, but also conduct features its of classification. Y. Tkachuk has identified eight common features by which the researchers interpret the notion of "enterprise competitiveness". In his monograph, he highlighted the following features of this concept interpretation by the following directions: profitable management, products production with minimal costs, high-quality of consumers’ satisfaction, the presence of competitive advantages, environmental conditions adaptation, expanded reproduction, the presence of the strategy, and the manufacturer position in the market. The author has investigated in the first place in enterprise competitiveness definition there is a feauter of the competitive advantages presence, and the second place is divided among themselves - high-quality satisfaction of consumers' needs and effective management with in productive use of the resources. [33, p. 15].

The "enterprise competitiveness" concept interpretation is polyhedral and structural that combines not only a separate element of the characteristic, but also the interaction with each other of the above characteristics.

D. Panasenko exploring the essence of the "enterprise competitiveness" concept indicates that in most cases the competitiveness of the enterprise from the side of economists is associated with the parameters of the product or the efficiency of the operation, financial status, or a certain position in the market. Therefore, here is prevailed the prevalence of a one-sided narrow vision of this category, that is characterized by multi-vectority and not contribute to its similar understanding and perception by various subjects of the internal and external environment. At the same time, he highlights main characteristics of the category "enterprise competitiveness" which are as follows relativity, objectivity, dynamism, integration, belonging to a specific competitive market, the need of purposeful formation, immanence, decomposition, adequacy and unity. These components, in his opinion, will more accurately describe the researched

economic category [34, p.270-275].

The Italian economists D. Depper and D. Seratto [35, p. 10-17] proposed to classify the researched economic category as a two-factor definition. Thus, the competitiveness definitions the level of the enterprise were classified depending on understanding of its essence and approach of its analysis. By the first feature scientists thoughts were grouped into those who consider the researched phenomenon as: 1) the basis, a kind of engine of entrepreneurial activity and these who concentrate the attention into the internal and external sources of competitive advantages; 2) the result of the use of competitive advantages, which is characterized by a set of relevant indicators of successful management. From the point of view of another classification feature the competitiveness research is carried out on the basis of analysis that has either a static or a dynamic characteristic. In the first case it is considered that the enterprise competitiveness is formed on the basis of its resources (including abilities), in the other - on the basis of processes [36].

The concept of enterprise competitiveness should be considered as a dynamic indicator, which depends on a complex of factors as external and internal, as well as the definition of strategic goals, missions, the selection and implementation of the enterprise strategy and the competence of the high-level management while decision making effectiveness in order to task was set.

Ukrainian scientist O. Yankovy outlines four approaches by which scientists define of the "enterprise competitiveness" concept. According to the author, the first approach is comparative – and its essence is to distinguish the quality relativity category of "competitiveness", that is expressed in comparison with the characteristics of the enterprise and the relevant competitors. The second approach is resourceful which means that competitiveness of the company is based on its potential, due to the level of the development and the use of strategic potential. The third approach considers competitiveness as quality of complex dynamic socio-economic systems. The fourth approach is a combination of comparative and resourceful approaches [37].

The historical development of the "enterprise competitiveness" concept can be arranged in the form of a scheme (Figure 2). We propose to distinguish three main periods of the "enterprise competitiveness" concept development. The first period is the period of the classical economic theory birth. The second period is the twentieth century. The third period is the end of the twentieth century, the beginning of the XXI century. In our opinion due to this division, it is possible to accurately determine the origin of the "enterprise competitiveness "concept and predict its further development.

**The period of the birth of classical economic science** (mid-eighteenth to the end of the XIX century)

The theory of absolute preferences (A.Smith)

The theory of comparative costs (D. Ricardo)

Development of the theory of comparative costs
(B. Olin, E. Heckscher)

Soviet period 1922-1991r.r. Ukraine, Russia

**ХХ century**

Foreign scientific schools: USA, Japan, Europe on competition research

**The end XX century - the beginning of the XXI century, Ukraine, Russia**

*The formulation of the "enterprise competitiveness" category from different sights*

**Marketing**  (I. Zulkarnayeva, L. Ilyasova)

**Marketable**

(R. Fathutdinov, Yu Ivanov, M. Kizim, O. Tishchenko, O. Ivanova, O. Revenko, T. Chechetova-Terashvili)

**The effectiveness of the enterprise detivity**

 (M. Pertsovsky, G. Azoyev, A. Afonin, S. Bilousov, K. Milsky, Y. Ivanov)

The classification of the "enterprise competitiveness" concept within to different approaches

**Marketing:** 1. the condition of the manufacturer on the market; 2. presence of competitive advantages; 3. high-quality satisfaction of the consumers needs

**Relatively to dif-ferent subjects:**1. consumer; 2. competitor; 3. investor; 4. partner

**Commodity position:** 1. product parameters

**From the standpoint of the efficiency enterprise:**
1. static;
2. dynamic

Categories: "Competition" and "Competitiveness" are not used and are not researched

The estimation "enterprises competitiveness” Professor M. Porter of the competitiveness of the country at the enterprise level, the first formulation of the concept

Figure 2. The logical-historical scheme of the "enterprise competitiveness" concept

Due to the analysis of the evolution "enterprise competitiveness" concept, we have established that in Ukraine this began to be used in XXI century. The active research began only in the XXI century. There is possible to argue about the ambiguity of the interpretation of this concept, due to multilevel and its application in to the different market players.
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