

FEATURES OF THE THEORY OF CREATING COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGES OF ENTERPRISES

**Uvarova M., undergraduate,
Kharkov Petro Vasylenko National Technical University of
Agriculture**

Strategic approaches to competitiveness management have become widespread in the works of foreign scholars, however, despite their high level of research, the full use of existing theories in the practice of domestic enterprises, due to the peculiarities of the economy is not yet possible.

Strategic management of competitive development is aimed at finding, defining and formulating objectives for competitiveness, ie strategic goals. In conditions of market competition, the main task of any business entity is to obtain a better competitive position in the selected market through the successful formation, ongoing support and dynamic development of competitive advantages. As a result, receiving the greatest economic benefits. Therefore, the purpose of strategic management of competitive development of economic entities is the formation, implementation and dynamics of competitive advantage. Competitive advantages of enterprises can be determined by strategic competitive advantages, if they are stable over time, attract constant attention from the external environment of enterprises. Possibilities of effective functioning of enterprises in the chosen competitive environment can be determined by the presence of a certain range of strategic competitive advantages.

The category of "competitive advantage" should be considered through competitiveness. The essence of competitive advantage has been studied by many economists for many decades. Most of them have their own personal opinion on the definition of the essence of competition, its relationship with other categories, the impact on the activities of economic entities, the concept of "competitive advantage".

M. Porter in his book emphasizes that “competitive advantages essentially arise from the value that the company is able to create for its customers and which exceeds the cost of its creation. Cost is what buyers are willing to pay: high cost is due either to a lower price level compared to the price of competitors for a similar product, or the provision of unique benefits that rehabilitate a higher price” [2, 3]. A feature of M. Porter's proposed theory is the possibility of using the category of competitive advantage at both the macro and micro levels. M. Porter identifies the factors of competitive advantage at the country level, which he calls the determinants of competitive advantage or properties of the country. Also, M. Porter points out that the degree of manifestation of competitive advantage will depend on the accounting of factors that determine competition in certain industries.

J. Lamben understands competitive advantages as “characteristics, properties of a product or brand that create a certain advantage for the firm over its direct competitors. These attributes or characteristics can be very different and relate to the product itself (basic service) and additional services accompanying the basic, to the forms of production, sales or sales specific to the company or product” [1]. J. Lamben's definition, the positive emphasis is on the fact that competitive advantages are relative, because they are determined in comparison with competitors who occupy the best positions in the commodity market or in its individual segments. At the same time, it should be noted that the definition of competitive advantage through the prism of the properties and characteristics of the product can lead in some cases to substitutions of the concepts of competitive advantage and product quality, which is also determined by a set of properties of a particular product. In this regard, the essence of competitive advantage based on the characteristics and properties of goods, in our opinion, is impractical.

M. Porter's theory of competitive advantage and J. Lamben's research are developed in the works of P. Zavyalov, R. Fatkhutdinov, R. Azoev, and A. Chelenkov. These authors clarify

the essence of competitive advantage. P. Zavyalov provides the most generalized definition of competitive advantage, which should be understood as "qualities that are absent or less pronounced in rivals." Competitive advantage should be considered as an important indicator of the level of competitiveness of an economic object at any level. A positive feature of this definition is the attempt to connect the essence of competitive advantage and competitiveness. However, the characterization of competitive advantage, as one of the indicators of competitive development, should still be considered incorrect, as competitive advantage has its own essence, somewhat different from the essence of the concept of "competitiveness" [1].

In addition, the possession of economic entities of qualities that competitors do not have, ambiguously indicates their positive or negative impact on the effectiveness of their production and economic activities. Therefore, it does not guarantee that economic entities will gain a competitive advantage in any area.

References:

1. Ivashchenko, O.V. (2007). Ekonomichna sutnist' katehoriyi "rynok" [The economic essence of the category of "market"]. *Visnyk KhNAU. Seriya "Ekonomika i pryrodokorystuvannya" – Bulletin KhNAU. The series "Economics and Natural Resources*, (5), 161-165.

2. Mandych, O. V. (2015). Rynkova pozytsiya sil's'kohospodars'kykh pidpryyemstv [Market position of agricultural enterprises]. *Visnyk Kharkivs'koho natsional'noho tekhnichnoho universytetu sil's'koho hospodarstva imeni Petra Vasylenka: Ekonomichni nauky – Bulletin of the Kharkiv Petro Vasylenko National Technical University of Agriculture: Economic sciences*, (162), 229-234.

3. Mandych, O. V. (2018). Opportunities of reengineering and modeling of business processes in the marketing activities of enterprises. *Visnyk KHNTUSG: ekonomichni nauky*, (193), 311-319.

4. Mykytas, A. et al. (2018). Competitive development of subjects of the agri-business: theory and practice. *Fundamental and applied researches in practice of leading scientific schools*, 28(4), 86-91.