ECONOMICS OF DEVELOPMENT
Journal homepage: https://ecdev.com.ua/
ISSN: 1683-1942
E-ISSN: 2304-6155
Vol. 24, No. 4, 2025
UDC 65.011.1:658.8
DOI: 10.63341/econ/4.2025.08

Serhii Melnyk*
PhD in Economics, Researcher
Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman
03057, 54/1 Beresteiskyi Ave., Kyiv, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5812-0758

Analytical assessment of the interaction between components of the marketing complex of enterprise competitiveness

Abstract. The study aimed to develop theoretical and methodological foundations for analytical assessment of the comprehensive competitiveness of enterprises and the interaction of their marketing components, which should facilitate informed decision-making in competitive markets. The author's vision of competitiveness was presented from the perspective of a marketing approach to the formation of competitive results, functionality and potential of enterprises in key competitive markets, based on the recognition of the subject of competition as the target benchmark for rivalry between competitors. The objects of analysis were selected sectoral and status components of the complex: realised, functional and potential competitiveness in the commodity, labour and investment markets. A methodological toolkit for the analytical assessment of the marketing complex of enterprise competitiveness is proposed, which includes: a matrix analysis method with a sequential increase in competitiveness assessment indicators; analysis of the dynamics of indicators with the determination of its direction and nature of changes (accelerated, slowed down, predicted); analysis of configurations of differentiated values using static and dynamic indicators. The hypothesis regarding the need to achieve a balance of competitiveness levels in sectoral markets is substantiated, which should ensure the growing dynamics of enterprise profits through the means of marketing functional influence on marketing results and potential. An applied test of the developed analytical tool for assessing comprehensive competitiveness was conducted. The economic feasibility of balancing the components of the competitiveness complex of enterprises was confirmed by calculations – the coefficient of determination between the profit dynamics of the studied enterprises producing dry building mixtures and the level of balancing the realised sectoral competitiveness was 0.587, which corresponds to a high level of their correlation dependence. The practical value of the study is determined by the development of methodological tools for analysis of the competitiveness complex in the context of balancing its components, with which analytical services of enterprises can provide necessary information to justify the tasks of competitive development

Keywords: subject of competition; types of competitiveness; competitiveness indicators; balance of indicators; competitiveness analysis tools; marketing results; potential and functionality

INTRODUCTION

Competitive advantage is an indisputable prerequisite for the functioning of enterprises in a competitive environment. This requires the development of special analytical tools, given the complex nature of the competitive activity of enterprises in the markets of finished products and production resources. The development of such tools must be preceded by a well-founded understanding of the meaning of competitiveness, which will determine the evaluation indicators suitable for quantitative measurement and objective reflection of the competitive capabilities of enterprises.

In Ukrainian studies, the concept of competitiveness is often equated with efficiency. O.I. Kovtun (2021) believes that the main assessment characteristics of competitiveness are formed based on a representative set of generalised efficiency indicators. N.O. Yevtushenko &

Article's History: Received: 01.08.2025; Revised: 28.10.2025; Accepted: 23.12.2025; Published: 12.01.2026

Suggested Citation:
Melnyk, S. (2025). Analytical assessment of the interaction between components of the marketing complex of enterprise competitiveness. *Economics of Development*, 24(4), 8-19. doi: 10.63341/econ/4.2025.08.

*Corresponding author

V.V. Varnitskyi (2021) adhere to a similar position, highlighting the complexity of the economic category of "competitiveness" and proposing a definition of it as the totality of an enterprise's opportunities to effectively use its resource potential to obtain the desired profits. This approach significantly narrows the scope of competitive opportunities for market participants and calls into question the advisability of using both concepts independently. Another interpretation of the concept of enterprise competitiveness is based on the market share indicator. It has been widely used by authors in analysing the results of market players' competitive activities, although it has not been combined with the concept of competitiveness, which, incidentally, was not modal. The market share of enterprises reflects the comparative nature of the competitiveness of competitive market players, but significantly limits the scope of research into the signs of competitive opportunities of enterprises and the formats of their manifestation.

Some scholars associate the competitiveness of enterprises with the competitiveness of their products. While some, in particular V.O. Herasymova & E.O. Rezanov (2020), reasonably believe that competitiveness is the result of following certain management decisions aimed at ensuring the ability of enterprises to develop, competing with their products with other market participants, others confuse these concepts. O. Vynogradova *et al*. (2021) argue that competitiveness reflects the ability of enterprises to produce competitive products by using their potential better than their competitors. It should be noted that the production of competitive products does not guarantee the competitive success of enterprises in the event of logistical, price, or territorial miscalculations. However, the most common interpretation of competitiveness is as a comprehensive result of the economic activity of enterprises. According to H. Datsenko *et al*. (2022), competitiveness should be assessed based on a broad list of performance indicators, differentiated by one or another classification criterion and level of aggregation. This shifts the focus from competitiveness as a comparative characteristic of the market activity of direct competitors to the entire complex of functional activities of the entities under study.

A comprehensive assessment of the characteristics of competitiveness indicates the complexity of evaluating its level due to the need to consider a significant list of its features. In particular, A. Sukhanova (2021) believes that the necessary comprehensiveness of competitiveness assessment is achieved using various methodological approaches based on the product life cycle, market share, effective competition theory, competitive advantage, product competitiveness assessment, etc. At the same time, the author does not address the ways and methods of implementing this approach. Most studies suggest that the issue of comprehensive assessment of enterprise competitiveness should be addressed using an integrated approach based on algorithms of varying complexity. V. Panchenko *et al*. (2024) propose using more complex calculation models based on the method of integrating integral assessment of dynamic series, considering the weighted significance of individual indicators, a fuzzy logic calculation apparatus combined with the method of hierarchy analysis, which can be used to build a multi-parameter model that reflects the integral level of competitiveness of market participants. It is worth noting that the integral assessment of any object has limited analytical application, since it forms the final result in the form of a cumulative numerical value, which has a rating meaning, but limits the evaluation of the components of the object under study with different levels of aggregation. This is relevant for such a complex object as competitiveness, the analysis of which may require assessment by functional components, sales markets, and time characteristics. This is also indicated by the proposal of V. Radko & S. Matsiura (2023) on the expediency of distinguishing strategic, tactical and operational characteristics of competitiveness, which capture a different format of its complexity and can differentiate assessment characteristics in time and by degree of significance for the development of enterprises. At the same time, the use of different indicators of competitiveness in assessing its strategic, tactical and operational formats seems justified.

One aspect that will contribute to the systematisation of approaches to understanding the meaning of competitiveness, and particularly the selection of its assessment characteristics, is the identification of direct and indirect influencing factors. Indirect factors include technical and technological conditions of production and methods of organising production processes. Their effective use creates the preconditions for increasing competitiveness but does not determine its level. Direct factors are means of marketing influence on the competitive capabilities of enterprises. They shape the level of their competitiveness based on adequate pricing policies, effective advertising campaigns, and reasonable product offerings in line with consumer needs in specific territorial segments, considering seasonality of consumption, etc. In this regard, M. Samofalova *et al*. (2024) noted the priority of assessing and analysing the competitiveness of enterprises based on marketing performance indicators, which accumulate the results of other areas of enterprise activity.

This indicates the theoretical and practical relevance of developing tools for analytically assessing the interaction of the components of the marketing complex of enterprise competitiveness, based on a conceptual understanding of the nature of market competitiveness and the formats for its implementation. The study aimed to develop analytical tools for assessing the competitive position of a company and the synergy of its marketing efforts. Static and dynamic analysis of the sectoral and status components of the competitiveness complex of enterprises provides an opportunity to obtain relevant analytical information about the problematic and strengthened links of the complex, which should be considered in the formation of the budget for their development. However, the adoption of appropriate decisions to support product, personnel and investment competitiveness must be coordinated. This justified the hypothesis that it is necessary to achieve a balance between their levels in sectoral markets, which should ensure the growing dynamics of enterprise profits through the means of marketing functional influence on marketing results and potential. The research novelty is determined by the proposed methodological tools for analytical assessment of enterprise competitiveness based on competitiveness as a set of interrelated components – sectoral and status – formed based on indicators – marketing results, functionality and potential, which in a comparative

format characterise the level of implemented, functional and potential competitiveness of enterprises as sellers of products and buyers of resources.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The selection of enterprises – for competitiveness analysis, which is a comparative category, met the following criteria:

- the same product focus and a similar product range, which made it possible to compare the cost indicators of their activities;
- emphasise consumer needs in a common area of competition, which is evidence of direct competitive relations between these companies;
- serving consumers with the same segment profile, which would indicate a common customer base as the main feature of competing market players;
- representativeness of competitive analysis results obtained based on specified objects.

The consideration of these criteria in the selection of the objects of analysis facilitated the accurate calculation of competitiveness based on relative indicators that were comparable. The objects of competitive analysis were identified as the largest enterprises producing dry building mixtures – Askona-Pivden LLC (n.d.), Baumit Ukraine LLC (n.d.), Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC (n.d.), Henkel Bautechnik LLC (Ukraine) (n.d.), Kreisel-Building Materials LLC (n.d.), PJSC Terminal-M (n.d.), and YouControl (n.d.). They have a similar range of products, and their assortment diversity does not exceed 25%. The wholesale consumers of these companies' products are large retail chains and construction organisations throughout Ukraine, and transport costs do not have a significant impact on the competitiveness of these goods in most regions. The production volume of the companies under study in 2024 amounted to 5,795.1 million UAH, which accounted for 87.8% of the total market volume of dry construction mixtures in Ukraine. This indicates the competitive comparability of the operating conditions of these companies and the high level of representativeness of the further analytical results obtained. The theoretical and methodological basis of the study was formed by the works of Ukrainian and foreign scientists, including those available on Internet resources, and the results of previous studies (Melnyk, 2025a; 2025b). The primary source of information on the economic activities of selected dry construction mix manufacturers was their websites, which contained information on the range of products manufactured and price dynamics. The information and analytical website YouControl (n.d.) was the source of data on the financial and economic indicators of the enterprises under study, information on the number of employees and their average salary. The retrospective analytical period was 4 years, 2020-2024, which identified trends in competitiveness dynamics necessary to justify the tasks of balancing its components.

The theoretical and scientific-methodological basis of the study was formed by methods of scientific cognition, general scientific principles and achievements in the field of competitive analysis. Comparative analysis was used to compare and study options for understanding the content of enterprise competitiveness and indicators for its assessment. Methods of scientific abstraction and logical generalisation were used to determine the subject of competition in the market for finished products and resources. Decomposition was used to identify the components of the competitiveness complex of enterprises, which are the consequences of the manifestation of marketing results, potential and functionality. Causal analysis was used to clarify the interdependence of the status components of competitiveness (realised, potential and functional). Coefficients were used to calculate the levels of sectoral and status components of the competitiveness complex. The index method was used to analyse the dynamics of competitiveness indicators, and its variant, the index of indices, was used to determine the indicator of accelerated or decelerated dynamics. The matrix analysis method with sequential accumulation of assessment indicators was used to perform a comprehensive analysis of the components of competitiveness. The configuration of competitiveness components was used for an applied comprehensive analysis of the competitiveness of the studied enterprises, which formed analytical conclusions suitable for determining the tasks of their competitive development. Variational analysis – to assess the level of balance of sectoral components of competitiveness. Rating assessment was used to determine the relationship between actual and potential competitiveness. Correlation analysis – to identify the dependence of the dynamics of enterprise profits on the balance of sectoral components of competitiveness.

The development and testing of methodological tools for analytical assessment of the interaction of components of enterprise competitiveness were based on materials from market participants who are in direct competitive relations. To assess the level of competitiveness balance, the standard deviation indicator was selected, calculated based on the arithmetic mean of the realised competitiveness of enterprises in the commodity, labour and investment markets. The net profit change index is a dependent variable. The use of static profit volume in the analysis is not correct, as it is influenced by more significant factors caused by the concentration of production, represented by the volume of products sold. To analyse the relationship between realised sectoral competitiveness and the balance between realised and potential competitiveness in individual markets, a rating assessment method was used, which, unlike the correlation method, can identify dependencies without quantifying their level. The aggregate indicator of the balance between actual and potential competitiveness in the markets was calculated as the arithmetic mean of the deviations of their ratings in the markets under study.

RESULTS

Methodological tools for analysing the comprehensive competitiveness of enterprises in static conditions

The development of methodological tools for analytical assessment of the interaction of components of the marketing complex of enterprise competitiveness was based on the author's approach to the content of market participants' competitiveness and its components, as well as the selection of appropriate assessment indicators. The basic concept of the content of enterprise competitiveness is the subject of competition, the acquisition of which serves as an evaluative characteristic of the level of competitiveness of entities in each competitive market. The sphere of economic competition among enterprises extends to

commodity markets, where they are sellers of products, and resource markets, where enterprises compete as buyers of resources. Competitiveness reflects the ability of market participants to compete, which is shaped by many factors, including marketing, organisational, technical, technological, financial, and others. The substantive basis and level of this ability are manifested in the effectiveness of the complex of the listed factors, among which marketing factors accumulate the effects of all others, which suggests the marketing nature of the formation of enterprise competitiveness.

The competitiveness of enterprises as sellers of products and buyers of resources in various markets forms a sectoral format of competitiveness, which has a product-resource structure and corresponds to the number of types of competitive markets where these entities operate. The acquisition of the subject of competition occurs in a certain cyclical sequence, which manifests itself in a combination of status indicators of competitiveness – marketing results, potential and functionality, which are in constant interaction. The level of marketing results, potential and functionality is determined by the ratio of their basic assessment indicator for each enterprise to the average value of this indicator in the competitive market, which is a quantitative measure of the realised, potential and functional competitiveness of the enterprises under study (Table 1). The object of analytical attention is the marketing complex of enterprise competitiveness, as a set of their integrated competitive capabilities that manifest their effect on target competitive markets and are aimed at realising existing opportunities to gain control of relevant objects of competition that form the resource support for the reproduction process. The complex combines commodity, personnel and investment competitiveness represented in the status formats of the realised, functional and potential competitive capabilities of enterprises.

Table 1. Basic assessment indicators by type of competitiveness of enterprises in key markets of activity

Sectoral competitiveness	Competitiveness status		
	Implemented	Functional	Potential
Commodity	Volume of sales	Unit price	Profitability of sales
Labout	Estimated productive staff numbers*	Average salary	Personnel profitability
Investment	Equity capital	Return on equity	Level of entrepreneurial income

Source: compiled by the author based on S. Melnyk (2025a; 2025b)

The use of the integral method of competitiveness analysis, which is most common in scientific and applied research, does not produce accurate results due to the complex system of interdependence between the components of the complex and the impossibility of determining the target criteria for the dynamics of individual types of competitiveness, in particular, potential and functional competitiveness. The most suitable tool for analysing the competitiveness complex of an entity is matrix analysis with the sequential accumulation of assessment indicators and the formation of their possible configurations. The resulting configuration serves as a meaningful information resource for forming a comprehensive conclusion about the state and dynamics of the competitiveness of the entity under study by type in a particular market. The results of the analysis provide a conclusion about the overall level of competitiveness in the markets of activity and assess the balance of the entire competitiveness complex. The implementation of such a matrix analysis has a tabular form, where the values of the assessment indicators are displayed in a specific sequence, and their configurations are given an analytical characteristic (Table 2).

Table 2. A schematic diagram of matrix analysis with sequential accumulation of evaluation indicators and formation of their possible configurations

Configurations of assessment indicators				Analytical description of the configuration
$M1_{ij}$	$M1_{ij}, M2_{ij}$	$M1_{ij}, M2_{ij}, M3_{ij}$	$M1_{ij}, M2_{ij}, M3_{ij}, \ldots Mn_{ij}$	
$M1_{ij}{}^{h}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{h}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{h}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{h} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{h}$	
			$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{h} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{l}$	
		$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{l}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{l} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{h}$	
			$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{l} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{l}$	
	$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{l}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{l} M3_{ij}{}^{h}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{l} M3_{ij}{}^{h} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{h}$	
			$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{l} M3_{ij}{}^{h} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{l}$	
		$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{l} M3_{ij}{}^{l}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{l} M3_{ij}{}^{l} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{h}$	
			$M1_{ij}{}^{h} M2_{ij}{}^{l} M3_{ij}{}^{l} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{l}$	
$M1_{ij}{}^{l}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{l} M2_{ij}{}^{h}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{l} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{h}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{l} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{h} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{h}$	
			$M1_{ij}{}^{l} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{h} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{l}$	
		$M1_{ij}{}^{l} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{l}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{l} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{l} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{h}$	
			$M1_{ij}{}^{l} M2_{ij}{}^{h} M3_{ij}{}^{l} \ldots Mn_{ij}{}^{l}$	

Table 2. Continued

Configurations of assessment indicators				Analytical description of the configuration
$M1_{ij}$	$M1_{ij}$, $M2_{ij}$	$M1_{ij}$, $M2_{ij}$, $M3_{ij}$	$M1_{ij}$, $M2_{ij}$, $M3_{ij}$, ...Mn_{ij}	
$M1_{ij}{}^{l}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{l}\,M2_{ij}{}^{l}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{l}\,M2_{ij}{}^{l}\,M3_{ij}{}^{h}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{l}\,M2_{ij}{}^{l}\,M3_{ij}{}^{h}\ldots\,Mn_{ij}{}^{h}$	
			$M1_{ij}{}^{l}\,M2_{ij}{}^{l}\,M3_{ij}{}^{h}\ldots\,Mn_{ij}{}^{l}$	
		$M1_{ij}{}^{l}\,M2_{ij}{}^{l}\,M3_{ij}{}^{l}$	$M1_{ij}{}^{l}\,M2_{ij}{}^{l}\,M3_{ij}{}^{l}\ldots\,Mn_{ij}{}^{h}$	
			$M1_{ij}{}^{l}\,M2_{ij}{}^{l}\,M3_{ij}{}^{l}\ldots\,Mn_{ij}{}^{l}$	

Note: $M1, M2, \ldots Mn$ – assessment indicators characterising the components of competitiveness; i – type of competitiveness (implemented, potential, functional); j – the market under study (commodity, labour, investment); h, l – estimated level of the indicator value "high", "low" respectively
Source: compiled by the author as a result of the expansion of the application possibilities of matrix analysis

The number of indicators used in forming their configurations depends on the objectives and subject of analysis, as well as the available information base. The estimated levels of these indicators do not require deep differentiation due to their significant variability and the formation of analytical conclusions in the mode of diagnosing qualitative characteristics. If a more detailed assessment is required, the values obtained can be divided into the categories "high", "medium" and "low". However, this approach is only appropriate if a small number of assessment indicators are used, as otherwise the configurations obtained will be information-overloaded, which will complicate the formation of analytical conclusions. A comprehensive analysis of the competitiveness of enterprises in the main sectoral markets provides conclusions about the effectiveness of their actions when making decisions on the priority allocation of funds to finance the improvement/maintenance of product, personnel and investment competitiveness.

Methodological tools for analysis of the dynamics of enterprise competitiveness

The analysis of the marketing complex of enterprise competitiveness forms conclusions based on retrospective results. To determine the prospects for enterprise development, it is necessary to determine the existing dynamics of competitiveness indicators, which, in combination with static indicators, form the information base for forming sound analytical conclusions. The analysis toolkit has the following sections.

1. Identification of the direction of competitiveness indicators dynamics is based on the calculation of chain indices (I_i) and their average value (I_{aver}) for a specific retrospective period. When $I_{aver} > 1$, the dynamics are growing; when $I_{aver} < 1$, they are declining. I_{aver} is calculated using the geometric mean formula from the available chain indices I_i. According to the criterion of growth of this indicator, a decrease in dynamics is a basis for a thorough analysis of its causes; with an increase, it is a basis for management support of current decisions and actions.

2. Determining the nature of competitiveness indicators involves assessing their predictability and identifying signs of acceleration or deceleration.

2.1. The assessment of the predictability of dynamics is based on the calculation of the correlation coefficient (r) of the actual values of the indicator with the theoretical ones obtained based on the selection of an adequate trend model. When $r > 0.75$, the dynamics are considered predictable; when $r < 0.75$, they are considered unpredictable. The presence of predictable dynamics indicates an established trend and requires special management attention in terms of maintaining positive dynamics and changing negative ones.

2.2. Identification of signs of acceleration or deceleration in the dynamics under study involves calculating the corresponding index ($I_{n/y}$):

$$I_{n/y} = \sqrt{n}\, I_1 : I_0 \cdot I_2 : I_1 \cdot \ldots I_n : I_{n-1}, \quad (1)$$

where I_0, I_1, I_2, I_n – chain indices of the indicator under study for specific periods. When $I_{n/y} > 1$, the dynamics are considered accelerated; when $I_{n/y} < 1$, they are considered slowed down. Growing dynamics with acceleration should be considered positive; growing dynamics with deceleration should be considered conditionally positive; decreasing dynamics with deceleration should be considered conditionally negative; decreasing dynamics with acceleration should be considered negative.

3. The formation and analysis of configurations of dynamic competitiveness assessment indicators can be used for an analytical interpretation of combinations of rising and falling indices of the indicators under study in different sequences, which will contribute to the objectification of differentiated assessment judgements and the adoption of adequate decisions (Table 3). A variety of configurations of dynamic assessment indicators arises in the absence of a trend in the change in their values (forecast or unforecast). The principles for evaluating these configurations are the greater significance of the next indicator compared to the previous one and the priority of the number of unidirectional indicator values over their sequence.

Table 3. Estimated threat level characteristics for different configuration options of the studied dynamic indicator with a target growth criterion (chain index) for a 3-year retrospective period

Period 1	Periods 1, 2	Periods 1, 2, 3	Risk level
$\uparrow_1$	$\uparrow_1;\uparrow_2$	$\uparrow_1;\uparrow_2;\uparrow_3$	No risk
		$\uparrow_1;\uparrow_2;\downarrow_3$	Level 3 risk
	$\uparrow_1;\downarrow_2$	$\uparrow_1;\downarrow_2;\uparrow_3$	Level 2 risk
		$\uparrow_1;\downarrow_2;\downarrow_3$	Level 6 risk
$\downarrow_1$	$\downarrow_1;\uparrow_2$	$\downarrow_1;\uparrow_2;\uparrow_3$	Level 1 risk
		$\downarrow_1;\uparrow_2;\downarrow_3$	Level 5 risk
	$\downarrow_1;\downarrow_2$	$\downarrow_1;\downarrow_2;\uparrow_3$	Level 4 risk
		$\downarrow_1;\downarrow_2;\downarrow_3$	Threat

Note: ↑ – increasing indicator; ↓ – reducing
Source: compiled by the author

There is no risk when the indicator shows an upward trend throughout all periods studied; the highest level of risk is observed when there is a systematic downward trend and is classified as dangerous. When the trend is mixed, the level of risk is presented in a differentiated manner in accordance with the specified criteria. Risks of levels 1-3 should be considered acceptable, while risks of levels 4-6 require a response from management, which is determined based on the capabilities and development strategies of each enterprise.

Approval of methodological tools for analysing the comprehensive competitiveness of enterprises in static and dynamic formats

A comprehensive analysis of the status components of competitiveness of the studied enterprises in a sectoral format is based on the calculation of their values (Table 4), presented in a differentiated dimension, which form the configuration of the components of the competitiveness complex of each market entity (Table 5).

Table 4. Sectoral and status indicators of competitiveness of Ukrainian manufacturers of dry construction mixtures for 2024

Indicators	Enterprises					
	Henkel Bautechnik LLC	Kreisel-Building Materials LLC	PJSC Terminal-M	Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC	Askona-Pivden LLC	Baumit Ukraine LLC
Commodity competitiveness, *Ct*						
▪ realised, *Ctr*	2.52	0.86	0.75	0.72	0.59	0.57
▪ functional, *Ctf*	0.88	0.80	1.08	1.05	1.10	1.10
▪ potential, *Ctp*	2.31	1.38	0.35	0.86	-	0.11
Personnel competitiveness, *Pc*						
▪ realised, *Pcr*	2.66	2.01	0.65	0.39	0.21	0.09
▪ functional, *Pcf*	1.36	1.31	0.89	0.76	0.65	1.02
▪ potential, *Pcp*	2.32	1.67	0.25	0.73	-	0.03
Competitiveness investment, *Ci*						
▪ realised, *Cir*	3.06	0.28	0.21	0.42	1.52	0.50
▪ functional, *Cif*	1.25	1.23	0.74	1.10	-	0.68
▪ potential, *Cip*	3.26	1.14	0.11	0.45	-	0.04

Note: enterprise competitiveness calculated by the author based on the developed methodological tools

Source: compiled by the author based on Askona-Pivden LLC (n.d.), Baumit Ukraine LLC (n.d.), Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC (n.d.), Henkel Bautechnik LLC (Ukraine) (n.d.), Kreisel-Building Materials LLC (n.d.), PJSC Terminal-M (n.d.), YouControl (n.d.)

Table 5. Configurations of sectoral and status indicators of the competitiveness complex of Ukrainian manufacturers of dry building mixtures for 2024

Enterprises	Configurations of competitiveness component values
Henkel Bautechnik LLC	$Ctr^h\ Ctf^l\ Ctp^h$; $Pcr^h\ Pcf^h\ Pcp^h$; $Cir^h\ Cif^h\ Cip^h$
Kreisel-Building Materials LLC	$Ctr^l\ Ctf^l\ Ctp^h$; $Pcr^h\ Pcf^h\ Pcp^h$; $Cir^l\ Cif^h\ Cip^h$
Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC	$Ctr^l\ Ctf^h\ Ctp^l$; $Pcr^l\ Pcf^l\ Pcp^l$; $Cir^l\ Cif^h\ Cip^l$
PJSC Terminal-M Askona-Pivden LLC Baumit Ukraine LLC	$Ctr^l\ Ctf^h\ Ctp^l$; $Pcr^l\ Pcf^l\ Pcp^l$; $Cir^h\ Cif^h\ Cip^l$

Source: compiled by the author based on Table 4 with the corresponding designation of configuration elements differentiated by levels: *h* – high; *l* – low

The configured values of the competitiveness complex components are used as an information base for characterising the state of competitive activity of enterprises in the main markets. Henkel Bautechnik LLC (Ukraine) has high relative indicators of marketing results, functionality and potential, which indicates the company's effective competitive policy. The only exception is the low level of marketing functionality in the commodity market. The reason for this is the leading position in the Ukrainian market for dry building materials mixtures and the justified use of relatively high prices for its products, which is a consequence of signs of partial monopolisation. At the same time, to maintain its competitive position, the company maintains high competitiveness in the labour and investment markets, which indicates an awareness of the importance of retaining productive personnel and attracting new investments. The opposite situation is observed in PJSC Terminal-M, Askona-Pivden LLC, and Baumit Ukraine LLC. Among the indicators of competitiveness, only the marketing function in the commodity market is distinguished by a high value.

Applied analysis of the dynamics of realised competitiveness of enterprises

An applied analysis of the dynamics of competitiveness indicators for the studied manufacturers of dry building material mixtures in Ukraine showed no evidence of their projected dynamics, especially in terms of significant acceleration. This is due to the high level of dependence of competitiveness indicators, which are relative in nature, on the significant influence of competitors' activities. As for the dynamics of the basic indicators for calculating competitiveness – marketing results, functionality and potential – their dynamics are less differentiated, but also have less

analytical significance when studying changes in the competitive position of enterprises, which should have a relative assessment level. Meaningful analytical conclusions regarding the dynamics of competitiveness indicators can be obtained by comparing the indices of their annual changes, both for individual competitive markets and using a comprehensive approach. The analysis of the dynamics of the realised competitiveness of enterprises in the commodity market (Table 6) in the format of configurations of the composition of change indices – growth ↑ / decline ↓ (Table 7) is notable.

Table 6. Indices of realised commodity competitiveness of Ukrainian manufacturers of dry construction mixtures for 2024

Years	Enterprises					
	Henkel Bautechnik LLC	Kreisel-Building Materials LLC	PJSC Terminal-M	Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC	Askona-Pivden LLC	Baumit Ukraine LLC
2022	1.14	0.89	1.01	0.80	0.88	0.98
2023	0.99	1.05	1.12	0.99	0.79	1.02
2024	1.12	1.04	0.99	0.98	1.03	0.86
Average index value	1.08	0.99	1.04	0.92	0.90	0.95

Source: compiled by the author based on Askona-Pivden LLC (n.d.), Baumit Ukraine LLC (n.d.), Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC (n.d.), Henkel Bautechnik LLC (Ukraine) (n.d.), Kreisel-Building Materials LLC (n.d.), PJSC Terminal-M (n.d.), YouControl (n.d.)

Table 7. Configurations of indices of realised product competitiveness of Ukrainian manufacturers of dry construction mixtures and their assessment for 2024

Enterprises	Configutation of indices levels	Risk level
Henkel Bautechnik LLC	$\uparrow_1;\downarrow_2;\uparrow_3$	Level 2 risk
Kreisel-Building Materials LLC	$\downarrow_1;\uparrow_2;\uparrow_3$	Level 1 risk
PJSC Terminal-M	$\uparrow_1;\uparrow_2;\downarrow_3$	Level 3 risk
Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC	$\downarrow_1;\downarrow_2;\downarrow_3$	Threat
Askona-Pivden LLC	$\downarrow_1;\downarrow_2;\uparrow_3$	Level 4 risk
Baumit Ukraine LLC	$\downarrow_1;\uparrow_2;\downarrow_3$	Level 5 risk

Source: compiled by the author based on Table 6

The results of the analysis showed a predominantly positive trend in the realised product competitiveness of Henkel Bautechnik LLC (Ukraine), Kreisel-Building Materials LLC and PJSC Terminal-M and, accordingly, a low level of threat to their competitive position in the market. It is worth noting the further growth of the already high level of product competitiveness of Henkel Bautechnik LLC (Ukraine), which serves as an indicator of the emergence of signs of monopolisation of the dry construction mixtures market in Ukraine. Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC is most at risk, as it has a systematic decline in competitiveness at a relatively low baseline level. In addition, this company shows an average annual decline in product competitiveness of 8%, which indicates a negative outlook for overcoming its difficult competitive position.

The hypothesis of balance between the components of competitiveness and its analytical verification

Management balancing of competitiveness is a certain target ratio between the realised competitiveness of enterprises in key competitive markets and the realised and potential competitiveness in individual markets, which should contribute to permanent profit growth and the achievement of competitive development goals of enterprises. There is a certain contradiction between these goals due to the need to combine the interests of sustainable profit growth and the implementation of tasks that balance current marketing results with their potential and form the basis for the promising competitive development of enterprises.

Balancing competitive advantage in the commodity, labour, and investment markets is subordinate to the goal of increasing corporate profits through the rational use of competitive marketing potential. A sign of such balance is the equality of sectoral competitiveness of enterprises, which indicates a balanced distribution of funds and efforts to gain control over the objects of competition in the commodity, labour, and investment markets. It is worth noting that the quantitative balance of the realised sectoral competitiveness of enterprises is a target benchmark, which in real conditions can take the form of managerial balance, which takes into account the dynamics of the current competitiveness priorities of individual enterprises in each market.

The balance between the realised and potential competitiveness of enterprises in competitive markets is primarily managerial in nature and is subordinate to the task of ensuring the necessary dynamics of realised competitiveness to achieve its sectoral balance. This does not have fixed structural criteria. It is subordinated to the goal of achieving equality in the values of realised competitiveness in its segmental types by means of marketing functionality, taking into account the peculiarities of the procedure for forming the marketing results of enterprises' activities in these markets. The correctness of the assumptions made and the validity of the general hypothesis regarding the feasibility of forming a marketing complex of enterprise competitiveness based on the balance of its components requires applied verification. The primary object of such analysis is the level of dependence of the dynamics of enterprises' profits on the balance of their realised sectoral competitiveness.

An attempt to prove a significant dependence of the profit growth of the studied enterprises on the balance of

their realised sectoral competitiveness in 2024 did not provide a fully correct result (Table 8). Their correlation coefficient is R_1 (σ_{24} / In_{24}) = -0.323. The existence of an inverse relationship between the profit index and the standard deviation of competitiveness indicators is a logical, practical consequence of the hypothesis justified above. However, the degree of this relationship is low. At R = 0.323, the coefficient of determination $D(R^2)$ = 0.104. This means that the growth in profit for the year of only 10.4% depended on the level of balance of the studied competitiveness indicators. The reason for this was the objective dynamics of the profit indicator for 2024. Only in Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC did the profit index equal 68.6, which was a consequence of the low base value of the indicator in 2023.

Table 8. Indicators of profit dynamics and variations in the balance of realised sectoral competitiveness of Ukrainian dry construction mix manufacturers for 2021-2024

Indicators	Enterprises					
	Henkel Bautechnik LLC	Kreisel-Building Materials LLC	PJSC Terminal-M	Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC	Askona-Pivden LLC	Baumit Ukraine LLC
Variation in competitiveness for 2024, σ_{24}	0.229	0.670	0.235	0.187	0.550	0.212
Annual profit index for 2024, In_{24}	0.97	1.31	1.23	68.6	-	0.65
Average variation in competitiveness for 2021-2024, σ_{21-24}	0.318	0.270	0.338	0.197	0.670	0.302
Average net profit index for 2021-2024, In_{21-24}	1.15	1.18	1.12	1.32	1.08	1.18

Source: compiled by the author based on Askona-Pivden LLC (n.d.), Baumit Ukraine LLC (n.d.), Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC (n.d.), Henkel Bautechnik LLC (Ukraine) (n.d.), Kreisel-Building Materials LLC (n.d.), PJSC Terminal-M (n.d.), YouControl (n.d.)

In further calculations, the average annual values of the standard deviation of competitiveness and the profit index for 3 years were used, which was used to average their annual deviations. The result was more significant – R_2 (σ_{21-24} / In_{21-24}) = -0.766; $D(R^2)$ = 0.587, which indicates a significant impact of the balance of realised sectoral competitiveness on the profit dynamics of the studied manufacturers of dry building mixtures in Ukraine. The balance of realised and potential competitiveness has no direct impact on profit dynamics. A certain imbalance is not a negative sign, as it indicates the functional activity of the enterprise in improving its marketing results through its existing potential. At the same time, when achieving a realised sectoral balance, a significant imbalance between realised and potential competitiveness in individual markets is not advisable, as it may disrupt sectoral balance. Table 9 presents the results of the analysis of the relationship between realised sectoral competitiveness and the balance between realised and potential competitiveness in individual markets.

Table 9. The relationship between the balance of realised sectoral competitiveness and the balance of realised and potential competitiveness of Ukrainian dry construction mix manufacturers for 2021-2024

Enterprises	Enterprise rating				
	by the balance of sectoral competitiveness achieved	The difference between the rating of realised and potential			Average difference
		commodity competition	labour competition	investment competition	
Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC	1	1	1	1	1.0
Kreisel-Building Materials LLC	2	0	0	3	1.0
Henkel Bautechnik LLC	3	0	0	0	0
Baumit Ukraine LLC	4	1	1	2	1.3
PJSC Terminal-M	5	1	1	2	1.3
Askona-Pivden LLC	6	1	1	4	2.0

Source: compiled by the author based on Table 4

The results of the analysis showed a direct correlation between the balance of realised and potential competitiveness and the overall balance of realised sectoral competitiveness of Ukrainian manufacturers of dry building mixtures, which has a significant impact on the positive profit dynamics of these companies. The approach proposed in this work is based on a recognition of the marketing nature of competitiveness, which is manifested in the commonality of the target orientation towards satisfying consumer needs (marketing result) and satisfying the needs of enterprises for resources to restore the production process (marketing potential). This significantly expands the scope of analytical assessment of the competitiveness of enterprises and makes it possible to study the effect of a greater number of factors on the growth of competitive opportunities for participants in competitive markets (Shapurova, 2018).

The article presents and analytically confirms the validity of the hypothesis regarding the economic feasibility of balancing the components of competitiveness, which contributes to positive dynamics of enterprise profits. This

can be used for informed decisions regarding the priority dynamics of the realised, functional, and potential competitiveness of enterprises in the competitive markets under study, accounting for structural priorities. However, this balance is a target benchmark for the development of enterprise competitiveness, and in their practical activities, situations will inevitably arise when this balance will be of a managerial nature. This means that under certain external circumstances and current development goals, the quantitative ratio of individual types of competitiveness may be in a justified temporary imbalance. Such situations are mainly individual in nature, given the peculiarities of the competitive position and the specifics of the activities of a particular enterprise. The key question is whether it is feasible and, more notably, possible to develop methodological tools for determining the justified limits and duration of the imbalance between individual types of competitiveness. If the imbalance between actual and potential competitiveness is considered permanently justified, as it indicates a targeted adjustment of the marketing result, then a significant deviation in the indicators of actual competitiveness in individual markets may indicate insufficient resources and a loss of part of the financial result. This controversial issue requires further theoretical study and applied analytical assessment of the process of forming the results of the competitive activity of market participants.

The idea of balancing the system of performance indicators (BSC) was developed by R.S. Kaplan & D.P. Norton (1996). It is based on the implementation of cause-and-effect relationships between the strategic goals of enterprises, business units, their individual divisions, and the factors for achieving them based on the interests of employees, customers, and shareholders. It is a tool for implementing strategy at the operational level through a combination of tasks for the development of tangible and intangible assets of enterprises. The article proves the expediency of balancing the components of the competitiveness complex of enterprises, pursuing a less global goal of ensuring the current ratio between the levels of individual types of competitiveness, which contributes to the growing dynamics of profit. Incidentally, it should be noted that the separation of sectoral and status components of competitiveness as objects of balancing corresponds to the author's understanding of the meaning of competitiveness. In this regard, O.S. Shumilo *et al*. (2020) and K. Lukiewska & M. Juchniewicz (2021) noted that the existing variability in the interpretation of competitiveness, its components, indicators, and assessment methods depends on the interpretation of various economic theories that form the basis for understanding the essence and forms of competitive relations in the market.

The task of balancing competitiveness also involved resolving the contradiction between the marketing goals of satisfying consumer needs and the economic benefits that companies derive from this. According to A. Chikán *et al*. (2022), corporate competitiveness is the ability to consistently fulfil dual purpose: satisfying customer demand while making a profit. This corresponds to the content of the marketing concept in its applied format and is reflected in the defined status types of competitiveness – realised and potential. Their balance can be used to optimise the relationship between financing the growth of consumer demand and accumulating financial resources for the further competitive development of enterprises.

Building competitive development potential is a must for balanced business growth. This issue was addressed by researcher R. Yuleva-Chuchulayna (2025) in an analysis of the factors shaping the competitive development potential of players in a "saturated market". This circumstance was used to explore the difficulties of maintaining and increasing the achieved level of competitiveness of enterprises in conditions of intense competition. It is worth noting that the object of analysis was the finished products market, while competitive potential is also formed in other competitive markets, and its realisation is reflected in the competitiveness achieved in the commodity, labour and investment markets.

S. Afdallash & R. Trisnawati (2023) highlighted a notable direction for the balanced development of enterprises, combining the dynamics of financial indicators with the satisfaction of customer needs and the prospect of training and personal development of enterprise employees. The need to ensure consistency between the financial and non-financial components of enterprise development based on the concept of a balanced scorecard was also emphasised by C. Van Thuong & H. Singh (2023). In the context of the identified components of competitiveness, this balance is reflected in the dynamics of potential competitiveness in the commodity market, characterised by effective financial indicators, and the functionality of human resource competitiveness, which depends on the need to increase labour productivity based on the growth of employee qualifications and wage levels.

The balance of competitiveness must be future-oriented and consistent with the goal of sustainable competitive development of enterprises. It is worth noting that this refers not only to the need to ensure balance in the strategic period, but also to the formation of a regime for achieving it. Y. Zhang & H. Liu (2024) initiated the idea of maintaining a strategic rhythm in achieving enterprise development goals, the practical implementation of which is based on such dynamic characteristics as the speed and variability of strategic actions over time. The authors identified the conditions for developing strategic rhythm parameters in the following configurations: low speed – low variability, high speed – low variability, low speed – high variability, high speed – high variability, and analysed the reasons for the formation of strategic rhythm from the perspective of three groups of factors: managers, internal characteristics of the enterprise, and the external environment. This formed a research model of the relationship between strategic rhythm and the formation and preservation of a complex of competitive advantages of enterprises. The idea of forming a strategic rhythm has prospects for use in achieving a balance of competitiveness, and this mode should be differentiated, incorporating the achieved levels of competitiveness of the enterprise in the markets under study and the criterion of target balance of all components of this complex.

CONCLUSIONS

The development of methodological tools for analytical assessment of the interaction of components of the marketing complex of enterprise competitiveness was based on an understanding of competitiveness as the

differentiated ability of competitive market entities to gain control over objects of competition. The acquisition of the object of competition occurs in a certain cyclical sequence, which is manifested in the combination of status characteristics of competitiveness – marketing results, potential and functionality, which are in constant interaction in competitive markets – commodity, labour and investment – where enterprises act as sellers of finished products and buyers of necessary resources. This forms commodity, personnel and investment competitiveness in realised, functional and potential formats. The diversity of types of competitiveness, the quantitative measurement of which involves the use of static and dynamic indicators, requires the development of special analytical tools suitable for obtaining the conclusions necessary to determine the appropriate actions.

The developed competitiveness analysis tool combines the use of matrix analysis with the consistent accumulation of competitiveness assessment indicators and a comprehensive methodological approach to assessing the dynamics of indicators, determining their direction and nature of change (accelerated, slowed down, predicted). The results of this analysis formed configurations of differentiated values of the studied sectoral and status components of the competitiveness complex, suitable for meaningful comprehensive assessment and use in the practical activities of enterprises. The study analytically proved that the achievement of managerial balance of competitiveness levels in sectoral markets ensured the growing dynamics of enterprise profits through marketing functional influence on marketing results and potential. The determination index $D(R^2) = 0.587$, which indisputably indicates a significant impact of the balance of realised sectoral competitiveness on the profit dynamics of the studied enterprises producing dry building mixtures in Ukraine.

The analysis of the balance between the status indicators of actual and potential competitiveness in each competitive market confirmed its connection with the level of balance between sectoral components and proved the validity of the assumption about the interaction of these components with a focus on economically feasible comprehensive balance of actual competitiveness indicators. A promising direction for implementing the task of balancing the competitiveness complex of enterprises is to determine the mode of its achievement based on the concept of strategic rhythm. A problematic issue in the use of the proposed toolkit for assessing the marketing competitiveness of enterprises and balancing the components of this competitiveness is the processing of large amounts of numerical information and grouping it for qualitative analytical interpretation. A promising direction for solving this problem is the use of IT programmes, possibly with the use of data analytics technologies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None.

FUNDING

None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

REFERENCES

[1] Afdallash, S., & Trisnawati, R. (2023). Balanced scorecard and company performance. *American Journal of Economic and Management Business*, 2(7), 259-271. doi: 10.58631/ajemb.v2i7.49.

[2] Askona-Pivden LLC. (n.d.). *Catalogue*. Retrieved from https://anserglob.ua/ua/catalog/.

[3] Baumit Ukraine LLC. (n.d.). *Prices*. Retrieved from https://baumit.ua/files/ua/quicklink/2025/Price_Baumit_March25.pdf.

[4] Chikán, A., Czakó, E., Kiss-Dobronyi, B., & Losonci, D. (2022). Firm competitiveness: A general model and a manufacturing application. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 243, article number 108316. doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2021.108316.

[5] Datsenko, H., Koceruba, N., Krupelnytska, I., Kudirko, O., Lobacheva, I., & Otcalenko, O. (2022). Analytical toolkit for strengthening enterprise competitiveness in unstable economic conditions. *Financial and Credit Activity Problems of Theory and Practice*, 3(44), 216-223. doi: 10.55643/fcaptp.3.44.2022.3785.

[6] Fomalgaut-Polimin LLC. (n.d.). *Prices*. Retrieved from https://polimin.ua/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/PRAJS-Obiektnyj_RRTs_01.04.2024.pdf.

[7] Henkel Bautechnik LLC (Ukraine). (n.d.). *Catalogue*. Retrieved from https://www.ceresit.ua/catalog/vnutrisne-ozdoblennja.html.

[8] Herasymova, V.O., & Rezanov, E.O. (2020). Enterprise competitiveness: Essence and influencing factors in modern conditions. *Economic Space*, 154, 93-97. doi: 10.32782/2224-6282/154-17.

[9] Kaplan, R.S., & Norton, D.P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

[10] Kovtun, O.I. (2021). Assessment of the competitiveness of domestic enterprises of the agro-food sector in the context of strategy formation for their entry and activity in foreign markets. *Visnyk of Lviv University of Trade and Economics. Economic Sciences*, 63, 42-51. doi: 10.36477/2522-1205-2021-63-07.

[11] Kreisel-Building Materials LLC. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://cdnxit-holding.com/assets/api/914c5c56-91f5-4568-a591-a907f99eb554/original.

[12] Lukiewska, K., & Juchniewicz, M. (2021). Identification of the relationships between competitive potential and competitive position of the food industry in the European Union. *Sustainability*, 13(8), article number 4160. doi: 10.3390/su13084160.

[13] Melnyk, S. (2025a). Methodological framework for comprehensive assessment of enterprises' competitiveness. *Business Navigator*, 2(79), 198-204. doi: 10.32782/business-navigator.79-32.

[14] Melnyk, S. (2025b). Systematization and analysis of enterprise competitiveness assessment versions. *Strategy of Economic Development of Ukraine*, 56, 55-73. doi: 10.33111/sedu.2025.56.055.073.
[15] Panchenko, V., Biletska, I., Basii, N., Kogut, M., Vasyltsiv, T., & Mulska, O. (2024). Competitiveness vs financial-resource capabilities of business: Innovative marketing strategies. *Financial and Credit Activity Problems of Theory and Practice*, 2(55), 502-518. doi: 10.55643/fcaptp.2.55.2024.4351.
[16] PJSC Terminal-M. (n.d.). *Siltek catalogue*. Retrieved from https://siltek.ua/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Siltek_catalogue_2022.pdf.
[17] Radko, V., & Matsiura, S. (2023). Methodological toolkit for evaluating enterprise competitiveness. *Scientific Innovations and Advanced Technologies*, 14(28), 759-767. doi: 10.52058/2786-5274-2023-14(28)-759-767.
[18] Samofalova, M., Horpynchenko, O., Molnar, O., Dorosh-Kizym, M., & Lytvyn, O. (2024). Financial provision of marketing activities of machine-building enterprises for strengthening competitiveness in the context of a new reality. *Financial and Credit Activity Problems of Theory and Practice*, 5(58), 264-276. doi: 10.55643/fcaptp.5.58.2024.4555.
[19] Shapurova, O.O. (2018). Methods of estimation of competitiveness of industrial enterprises. *Scientific Bulletin of Kherson State University. Series "Economic Sciences"*, 31, 152-155.
[20] Shumilo, O.S., Rudas, D.S., & Sukulsky, V.M. (2020) The principles and methods for assessing the competitiveness of enterprises. *Business Inform*, 6, 291-297. doi: 10.32983/2222-4459-2020-6-291-297.
[21] Sukhanova, A. (2021). Methodical approaches to assessing the competitiveness of the enterprise. *Economy and Society*, 26. doi: 10.32782/2524-0072/2021-26-62.
[22] Van Thuong, C., & Singh, H. (2023). The impact of a Balanced Scorecard on enterprise performance in Ho Chi Minh City. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 12, 198-215. doi: 10.33844/ijol.2023.60359.
[23] Vynogradova, O., Asan, A., & Charna, O. (2021). Enterprise competitiveness as an economic category. *Economy. Management. Business*, 3(37), 4-11. doi: 10.31673/2415-8089.2021.030101.
[24] Yevtushenko, N.O., & Varnitskyi, V.V. (2021). Competitiveness of the enterprise: The concept, approaches and methods of evaluation. *Economy. Management. Business*, 3(37), 12-17. doi: 10.31673/2415-8089.2021.030202.
[25] YouControl. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://youcontrol.com.ua/.
[26] Yuleva-Chuchulayna, R. (2025). Formation of competitive advantages and competitiveness through the competitive potential of enterprises. *Journal "Pirinski Knizhovni Listi"*, 16, 98-111. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.14879220.
[27] Zhang, Y., & Liu, H. (2024). Enterprise strategic rhythm and competitive advantage. *Frontiers in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 141-146. doi: 10.54691/y4k5x839.

Сергій Мельник
Кандидат економічних наук, науковий співробітник
Київський національний економічний університет імені Вадима Гетьмана
03057, просп. Берестейський, 54/1, м. Київ, Україна
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5812-0758

Аналітичне оцінювання взаємодії компонент маркетингового комплексу конкурентоспроможності підприємств

Анотація. Мета дослідження полягала у розробленні теоретико-методичних основ аналітичного оцінювання комплексної конкурентоспроможності підприємств та взаємодії її маркетингових компонент, що має сприяти прийняттю обґрунтованих рішень на конкурентних ринках діяльності. Представлено авторське бачення змісту конкурентоспроможності з позицій маркетингового підходу до формування конкурентного результату, функціоналу і потенціалу діяльності підприємств на основних конкурентних ринках, що ґрунтується на визнанні предмету конкуренції цільовим орієнтиром суперництва між конкурентами. Об'єктами аналізу було обрано секторальні і статусні компоненти комплексу – реалізована, функціональна і потенційна конкурентоспроможність на товарному, кадровому та інвестиційному ринках. Запропоновано методичний інструментарій аналітичного оцінювання маркетингового комплексу конкурентоспроможності підприємств, що включає у себе: метод матричного аналізу з послідовним нарощуванням оціночних показників конкурентоспроможності; аналіз динаміки показників з визначенням її напряму і характеру змін (прискореного, уповільненого, прогнозованого); аналіз конфігурацій диференційованих значень з використанням статичних та динамічних показників. Обґрунтовано гіпотезу щодо необхідності досягнення збалансування рівнів конкурентоспроможності на секторальних ринках, яке має забезпечити зростаючу динаміку прибутку підприємств засобами маркетингового функціонального впливу на маркетинговий результат і потенціал. Здійснено прикладну апробацію розробленого аналітичного інструментарію оцінювання комплексної конкурентоспроможності. Розрахунково підтверджена економічна доцільність збалансування компонент комплексу конкурентоспроможності підприємств – коефіцієнт детермінації, між динамікою прибутку досліджуваних підприємств з виробництва сухих будівельних сумішей і рівнем збалансування реалізованої секторальної конкурентоспроможності дорівнював 0,587, що відповідає високому рівню їх кореляційної залежності. Практична цінність дослідження полягає у розробленні методичного інструментарію аналізу комплексу конкурентоспроможності у контексті збалансування його компонент, що надає можливість аналітичним службам підприємств отримати інформацію, необхідну для обґрунтування завдань конкурентного розвитку

Ключові слова: предмет конкуренції; види конкурентоспроможності; показники конкурентоспроможності; збалансованість показників; інструментарій аналізу конкурентоспроможності; маркетинговий результат; потенціал і функціонал