

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ДЕРЖАВНИЙ ВИЩИЙ НАВЧАЛЬНИЙ ЗАКЛАД
«УЖГОРОДСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ»
ФАКУЛЬТЕТ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН

**НАУКОВИЙ ВІСНИК
УЖГОРОДСЬКОГО НАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО
УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ**

Серія
**МІЖНАРОДНІ ЕКОНОМІЧНІ ВІДНОСИНИ
ТА СВІТОВЕ ГОСПОДАРСТВО**

Випуск 19

Частина 3

Ужгород-2018

РЕДАКЦІЙНА КОЛЕГІЯ:

- Головний редактор:** **Палінчак Микола Михайлович** – декан факультету міжнародних відносин Ужгородського національного університету, доктор політичних наук, професор
- Заступники
головного редактора:** **Приходько Володимир Панасович** – завідувач кафедри міжнародних економічних відносин Ужгородського національного університету, доктор економічних наук, професор
Химинець Василь Васильович – професор кафедри міжнародних економічних відносин Ужгородського національного університету, доктор економічних наук, професор
- Відповідальний
секретар:** **Дроздовський Ярослав Петрович** – доцент кафедри міжнародних економічних відносин Ужгородського національного університету, кандидат економічних наук
- Члени редколегії:** **Ярема Василь Іванович** – завідувач кафедри господарського права Ужгородського національного університету, доктор економічних наук, професор
Мікловда Василь Петрович – завідувач кафедри економіки підприємства Ужгородського національного університету, доктор економічних наук, професор, член-кореспондент Національної академії наук України
Філіпенко Антон Сергійович – доктор економічних наук, професор кафедри світового господарства і міжнародних економічних відносин Інституту міжнародних відносин КНУ ім. Тараса Шевченка, заслужений професор КНУ ім. Тараса Шевченка, академік АН ВШ України
Газуда Михайло Васильович – професор кафедри економіки підприємства Ужгородського національного університету, доктор економічних наук, професор
Луцишин Зоряна Орестівна – професор кафедри світового господарства і міжнародних економічних відносин Інституту міжнародних відносин КНУ ім. Тараса Шевченка, доктор економічних наук, професор
Старостіна Алла Олексіївна – завідувач кафедри міжнародної економіки економічного факультету КНУ ім. Тараса Шевченка, доктор економічних наук, професор
Слава Світлана Степанівна – професор кафедри економіки підприємства Ужгородського національного університету, кандидат економічних наук, доцент
Ерфан Єва Алоїсівна – доцент кафедри міжнародних економічних відносин Ужгородського національного університету, кандидат економічних наук
Кушнір Наталія Олексіївна – доцент кафедри міжнародних економічних відносин Ужгородського національного університету, кандидат економічних наук
Шинкар Віктор Андрійович – доцент кафедри міжнародних економічних відносин Ужгородського національного університету, кандидат економічних наук
Король Марина Михайлівна – доцент кафедри міжнародних економічних відносин Ужгородського національного університету, кандидат економічних наук
Рошко Світлана Михайлівна – доцент кафедри міжнародних економічних відносин Ужгородського національного університету, кандидат філологічних наук
Бурунова Олена – доктор економічних наук, професор Полонійського університету (Республіка Польща)
Andrzej Krynski – доктор габілітований, професор, ректор Полонійського університету (Республіка Польща)
Ioan Horga – доктор історичних наук, професор Університету Орадеа (Румунія)
Eudmila Lipková – доктор економічних наук, професор Братиславського економічного університету (Словаччина)

Журнал включено до міжнародної наукометричної бази Index Copernicus

Науковий вісник Ужгородського національного університету.
Серія «Міжнародні економічні відносини та світове господарство»
включено до переліку наукових фахових видань України з економіки
на підставі Наказ МОН України від 21 грудня 2015 року № 1328.

Рекомендовано до друку та поширення через мережу Internet
Вченою радою Державного вищого навчального закладу
«Ужгородський національний університет»
на підставі Протоколу № 5 від 24 травня 2018 року.

Свідоцтво про державну реєстрацію друкованого засобу масової інформації
серія KB № 21015-10815P,
видане Державною реєстраційною службою України 29.09.2014 р.

ЗМІСТ

Романенко О. О. ФОРМУВАННЯ КОМУНІКАЦІЙНОГО ПРОСТОРУ ПІДПРИЄМСТВА.....	6
Романчук К. В., Саакян А. Д. МОДЕЛЮВАННЯ ВАРТОСТІ ІМПОРТНИХ ПРОПОЗИЦІЙ З УРАХУВАННЯМ БАЗИСНИХ УМОВ ПОСТАВКИ INCOTERMS 2010 ЯК ПЕРЕДУМОВА ВСТАНОВЛЕННЯ ЦІНИ ЗЕД-КОНТРАКТУ КУПІВЛІ-ПРОДАЖУ.....	10
Савіна С. С. НАУКОВО-МЕТОДИЧНІ ПІДХОДИ ДО РОЗРОБЛЕННЯ МАРКЕТИНГОВОЇ СТРАТЕГІЇ ПІДПРИЄМСТВА.....	15
Salun M. M., Zaslavska K. A., Palyanychka Ye. M. THE COMPETITIVENESS OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN INDUSTRY: THE UKRAINIAN EXPERIENCE.....	20
Семененко К. Ю., Бакуліна С. А. ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ ІНСТРУМЕНТІВ ОНЛАЙН-ПРОСУВАННЯ В МАРКЕТИНГОВІЙ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ ПІДПРИЄМСТВА.....	26
Семененко О. В. ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ В КОНТЕКСТІ РОЗВИТКУ ФОРМ ВЛАСНОСТІ.....	30
Семенов В. Ф., Жилович Ю. І. СТРАТЕГІЇ РЕГІОНАЛЬНОГО РОЗВИТКУ ПІДПРИЄМСТВ РЕСТОРАННОГО БІЗНЕСУ.....	35
Семенцов Р. В., Самородов Б. В. ДІАГНОСТИКА ФІНАНСОВОГО СТАНУ БАНКУ: ВИЗНАЧЕННЯ ЙМОВІРНОСТІ ДЕФОЛТУ БАНКУ.....	40
Сімків Л. Є., Мелінішин Н. Т. ОСОБЛИВОСТІ СТРУКТУРНИХ ЗРУШЕНЬ В ЕКОНОМІЦІ УКРАЇНИ.....	44
Смєсова В. Л., М'ячин В. Г. НЕЙРОМЕРЕЖЕВИЙ ПІДХІД ДО КЛАСТЕРИЗАЦІЇ КРАЇН ЗА ПОКАЗНИКАМИ, ЩО ХАРАКТЕРИЗУЮТЬ ПРОЦЕСИ ФОРМУВАННЯ ТА РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ ЕКОНОМІЧНИХ ІНТЕРЕСІВ	49
Соболева І. В., Андронатій О. П., Волкова А. Г. ОБЛІК СТАТУТНОГО КАПІТАЛУ ТОВАРИСТВ З ОБМЕЖЕНОЮ ВІДПОВІДАЛЬНІСТЮ В УМОВАХ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЇ ЕКОНОМІКИ.....	57
Совик М. І. НЕОБХІДНІСТЬ УПРОВАДЖЕННЯ ОБЛІКУ ЕКОЛОГІЧНИХ ВИТРАТ В УМОВАХ ЗДІЙСНЕННЯ ЕКОНОМІЧНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ ЗГІДНО З КОНЦЕПЦІЄЮ СТАЛОГО РОЗВИТКУ.....	61
Сорока О. В., Кривцова М. С. БРЕНД ЗАКЛАДУ ВИЩОЇ ОСВІТИ – ОСНОВА КОНКУРЕНТОСПРОМОЖНОСТІ НА РИНКУ ОСВІТНІХ ПОСЛУГ	65
Стащук О. В. СТРУКТУРИЗАЦІЯ ПОНЯТТЯ «ФІНАНСОВА БЕЗПЕКА АКЦІОНЕРНИХ ТОВАРИСТВ».....	71
Дяченко Б. І., Стець Д. І. РОЛЬ КРАЇН «ВЕЛИКОЇ СІМКИ» У СУЧАСНИХ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ЕКОНОМІЧНИХ ВІДНОСИНАХ.....	76

Salun M. M.

*Doctor of Economic Sciences
Professor at Department of Economy of Enterprise and Management
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics*

Zaslavska K. A.

*Candidate of Economic Sciences
Senior Lecturer at Department of Management
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics*

Palyanychka Ye. M.

*Postgraduate Student at Department of Economy of Enterprise and Management
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics*

Салун М. М.

*доктор економічних наук, професор кафедри економіки підприємства та менеджменту
Харківського національного економічного університету імені Семена Кузнеця*

Заславська К. А.

*кандидат економічних наук, доцент кафедри менеджменту
Харківського національного економічного університету імені Семена Кузнеця*

Паляничка Є. М.

*аспірант кафедри економіки підприємства та менеджменту
Харківського національного економічного університету імені Семена Кузнеця*

THE COMPETITIVENESS OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN INDUSTRY: THE UKRAINIAN EXPERIENCE

Summary. The article highlights scientific approaches in the field of the analysis of the competitiveness of enterprises. In particular, the method for assessing the competitiveness of types of entrepreneurship based on the principles of a dynamic approach that allows ranking the competitiveness of economic entities according to the type of economic activity, the size of the enterprise, operational efficiency, and strategic positioning is proposed. Low labour intensity of the dynamic method of assessing the competitiveness of types of entrepreneurship makes it indispensable for identifying leaders of economic development. The method allows you to assess the competitiveness of groups of enterprises, which ensures its usage on different levels.

Key words: competition, theory of competitiveness, enterprise competitiveness, competitiveness measuring, entrepreneurship.

Introduction. The effectiveness of the entire economy depends on the success of small and medium-sized businesses. In the EU, the policy of small business supporting is implemented, the main purpose of which is to balance the state and business interests, to ensure optimal conditions for entrepreneurship, and to increase the competitiveness of small businesses.

In Ukraine, the entrepreneurship is considered as a direct independent, systematic, at its own risk, activity in the goods production, works performance, services provision for profit, which is carried out by individuals and legal entities registered as the subjects of entrepreneurial activity in accordance with the procedure established by Law of Ukraine "On Entrepreneurship" [10].

In accordance with the Commercial Code of Ukraine [11], the subjects of microenterprises are the following:

The persons registered in the manner prescribed by law as individual persons – entrepreneurs whose average number of employees for the reporting period (calendar year) does not exceed 10 persons and the annual income from any activity does not exceed the equivalent of 2 million euros, as determined by the average annual rate of the National Bank of Ukraine;

The legal entities, which are economic entities of any organizational and legal form and ownership, in which the average number of employees for the reporting period (calendar year) does not exceed 10 persons and the annual income from any activity does not exceed the amount equivalent to 2 million euros, as determined by the average annual rate of the National Bank of Ukraine.

The subjects of small business are the following:

Individuals registered in the manner prescribed by law as individual persons – entrepreneurs whose average number of

employees for the reporting period (calendar year) does not exceed 50 persons and the annual income from any activity does not exceed the equivalent of 10 million euros, as determined by the average annual rate of the National Bank of Ukraine;

Legal entities of any organizational form and kind of ownership, in which the average number of employees for the reporting period (calendar year) does not exceed 50 persons and the annual income from any activity does not exceed the amount equivalent to 10 million euros, as determined by the average annual rate of the National Bank of Ukraine.

Subjects of large business are legal entities of any organizational and legal form and ownership, in which the average number of employees for the reporting period (calendar year) exceeds 250 persons and the annual income from any activity exceeds the amount of equivalent to 50 million euros, as determined by the average annual rate of the National Bank of Ukraine.

Subjects of medium entrepreneurship are all the other economic entities.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The complexity of the competitiveness of entrepreneurship studying is its empirical measurement. The modern concept of enterprise competitiveness (Sieradzka K., Luft R., 2015) [7], (Siudek T., Zawojcka A., 2014) [8], (Zairi M., 1997) [13] is based on many definitions formulated within the classical Competitiveness Theory of Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Eli Heckscher, Bertil Ohlin; Neoclassical, Austrian, and Institutional Concepts and Competitiveness Theories of John M. Clark, Ludwig von Mises, Joseph A. Schumpeter, Friedrich List, Max Weber, James Buchanan; Contemporary Concept and Competitiveness Theory of Paul R. Krugman, Michael Porter.

Determinants used in European empirical studies of the enterprise competitiveness

Determinants	Factors for the evaluation of the enterprise competitiveness
Assets (resources)	Enterprise size, human resources, technology, trust and reliability, social responsibility.
Processes	Strategic Management Processes: Competence and Quality, Corporate Competitive Strategy, Flexibility and Adaptability, Internalisation Strategies. The process of human resources management: designing and identifying talent, the outflow of minds / enhancing the intellectual potential of the enterprise, mobilizing the workforce. Technological processes: innovations, information and communication technologies. Operational processes: production, quality, design. Marketing processes: market research, advertising, management of relationships.
Productivity of the enterprise	Profitability, market share, product differentiation, efficiency and profitability, prices and costs, value-added, customer satisfaction (volume of claims), development of new products and preparation of production.
Support for related industries and clusters	Share participation, the number and quality of counterparties, the state of the cluster development, management experience, and organizational relationships.
Institutional and state policy	The volume of industrial subsidies, quality of regulation, limitation of capital flows, government tenders and taxation, exchange rate, interest rates.

Each of the researchers proposed an own approach to assessing the company's competitiveness: one-dimensional, two-dimensional, and multidimensional valuation models were used, which, in turn, were divided into static (assessing the level of competitiveness at any given time), and dynamic (estimates of changes in the ability to compete within the time). Due to a large number of available methods used to assess the competitiveness of entrepreneurship, an emphasis is needed in choosing the most appropriate and effective ones.

The main aim of the article is to substantiate the competitiveness of entrepreneurship in the industry on the principles of a dynamic approach.

Presenting the main material. To reflect the complexity of business competitiveness by types of economic activity, the most relevant approach at present is the use of composite indicators that characterize an enterprise and actions that determine its profitability.

Based on literature review (Bosma N., Stam E., Schutjens V., 2011) [1], (Brunet F., 2012) [2], (Gulati A. B. S., Knif J., Kolari J., 2013) [5], the micro- and macroeconomic sources of entrepreneurship competitiveness were revealed (Table 1).

Microeconomic factors that directly affect the competitiveness of an enterprise include the riskiness of firm operations and strategy perfection, quantitative and qualitative factors of production, technologies and innovations, as well as factors of catalysts of related industries and clusters. The macroeconomic environment (monetary and fiscal policy, the rule of law, and the quality of social and political institutions) sets the general conditions for creating opportunities for a higher competitiveness of enterprises by types of economic activity (Brunet F., 2012) [2].

Other authors (Gulati A. B. S., Knif J., Kolari J., 2013) also show that increasing productivity and innovation of the enterprise are central factors in its international competitiveness when it comes to advanced economies [5]. The stable positive reputation is an important condition for the company to achieve business success, provides an organization with additional market value, promotes attraction of consumers and partners, protects the company's position from substitute products, accelerates sales, and extends the company's ability to lend. On the contrary, unsustainable reputation causes not only a negative attitude on the emotional level but also helps to reduce orders and sales, up to the complete cessation of the operation of the enterprise.

Thus, it is correct to assume that the competitiveness of entrepreneurship consists of operational efficiency and strategic positioning (Porter M. E., 1998) [6]. Operational efficiency includes assessing the effectiveness of using existing factors of production (resources) and productivity of the enterprise, while strategic positioning is aimed at creating a unique, profitable position based

on strategic management of supporting related industries and clusters, using the benefits of institutional and state policy.

It can be argued that the operational efficiency provides profit in the process of implementing added value, and strategic positioning ensures this process through the creation, maintenance, and expansion of sales markets. Thus, sustainable competitiveness of business can be achieved only if it is based on both sources of competitiveness, which, by combining and interacting, complementing and reinforcing each other, create powerful competitive advantages of the types of entrepreneurship within the competitive fight. It should also be assumed that operational efficiency is a value achieved, and strategic positioning is a potential opportunity for future achievements. In this context, the concept of the sources of competitiveness allows differentiating the current (achieved) and potential competitiveness of the types of entrepreneurship (Grinova V. M., Salun M. M., 2015) [4]. Consequently, the competitiveness of the types of entrepreneurship can be characterized and ultimately reduced to the assessment of operational efficiency and strategic positioning of the type of entrepreneurship. It is obvious that the proposed assessment should be based on a comparison of the relevant indicators of the type of business and competitors.

By highlighting indicators that are key indicators of the competitiveness of business, the economists definitely agree that these are the profits and proceeds of an enterprise. These indicators achieve two types of goals:

- internal goals of management and maximization of profit in the short run;
- satisfaction of external consumers and long-term growth of proceeds (Voronov D. S., 2015) [12].

Since the competitiveness of business is a complex concept, which is determined by many factors (Table 1), it is, therefore, advisable to evaluate its level by means of multidimensional or composite indexes of competitiveness.

Statistics of Entrepreneurship in Ukraine shows that in the field of industrial production, there are 42564 large, medium-sized, small business entities operating at present, 68.2% of which are micro-enterprises (Statistical Collection "Activities of subjects of large, medium, small, and micro enterprises", 2017) [9]. The number of large enterprises in the last five years has decreased from 347 to 233 units, that is, 7.65% of large industrial enterprises disappear every year in the industry. Similar processes are observed with medium and small enterprises, where the annual decrease in the number of enterprises is 5.13% and 1.87% respectively. Only the quantity of microenterprises in the industry shows a positive steady growth rate of +1.17% annually. Such a process means that some of the industrial en-




Figure 1. The dynamics of the number of enterprises by their size by type of economic activity “Industry”

terprises narrow down their activities and move to the adjacent group but the decline in the number of industrial enterprises for the period of 2010–2016 also means the dying out of individual enterprises and industries (Figure 1) due to the decrease of their competitiveness in the market as both external and external.

Based on the statistical data (Statistical Collection “Activities of subjects of large, medium, small, and micro enterprises”, 2017) [9] on the activities of large, medium and small enterprises in the industry, it is possible to identify the types of economic activity with low competitiveness and narrowing of production, works, and industrial services for the period of 2012–2017 (Table 2).

Table 2

Average annual growth rates (decrease) in the number of enterprises by their size by type of economic activity “Industry”, %

Type of economic activity	Large enterprises	Medium enterprises	Small businesses
Mining and quarrying	-12,29	-5,12	-0,74
Manufacturing industry	-6,63	-5,36	-2,31
Supply of electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning	-8,07	-1,55	8,33
Water supply; sewage, waste management	-5,59	-5,66	-0,83

The decline in entrepreneurial activity is observed in all types of economic activity but extractive industry and the development of quarries and the processing industry suffered the greatest decline in production. Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply is characterized by a decrease in large and medium-sized enterprises with the growth of small enterprises in this type of economic activity. Processing industry – a set of industries engaged in processing or processing of raw materials and semi-finished products, the release of finished goods.

The processing industry in Ukraine includes high-tech and “medium-tech” sectors of the industry: chemical production; manufacture of machinery and equipment; office equipment production; manufacture of electric machines and equipment; production of telecommunication equipment and communication equipment; manufacture of medical equipment, measuring instruments, optical instruments, and equipment of clocks; car production; production of space vehicles and other vehicles.

The assessment of the competitiveness of entrepreneurship in the industry was carried out on the basis of solving the problem of analysis of statistical indicators of activity of large, medium, small, and micro enterprises in three stages: Formation, evaluation, verification of indicators; Construction of the typology of objects; Construction of a scale of dynamics, studying the movement of objects on these scales and designing a typology of dynamic schemes for changing the competitiveness of entrepreneurship by types of economic activity in the processing industry.

The main indicators that shape the competitiveness of entrepreneurship in the industry are the coefficients of operational efficiency and strategic positioning, which are consolidated into a single indicator of the competitiveness of the type of entrepreneurship:

$$K1 = K2 \times K3, \quad (1)$$

where $K1$ – the competitiveness of the type of entrepreneurship;

$K2$ – the coefficient of operational efficiency;

$K3$ – the coefficient of strategic positioning.

The coefficient of operational efficiency of the type of entrepreneurship (Voronov D.S., 2015) [12] is determined by the formula:

$$K2 = \frac{B}{OB}, \quad (2)$$

where B – proceeds from the sale of products, works, services by type of business;

OB – operating expenses for the production of products, works, services by type of business.

When assessing the competitiveness of the type of entrepreneurship, it is obvious that there is a restriction on the territorial basis (when comparing the same types of entrepreneurship by regions) and the scope of activities (allocation of large, medium, small, and micro enterprises). Operating expenses are understood as all expenses for the production and sale of products, works, services, which include both direct cost, and commercial, managerial, and other costs, as well as the whole set of mandatory payments to budgets of all levels not included in specified cost categories. This is explained by the fact that costs that do not relate to the cost of production, works, services in some cases have a significant impact on the amount of profit, thus ignoring the assessment of the competitiveness of the type of entrepreneurship of these costs will lead to the inadequacy of the results.

Obviously, the operational efficiency index cannot be less than zero. If the operational efficiency index is less than 1, then this means the loss-making nature of entrepreneurship (exceeding operating costs over revenue), otherwise – the profitability of the type of entrepreneurial activity (operational efficiency is more than 1).

The coefficient of strategic positioning (Voronov D.S., 2015) [12] is determined by the formula:

$$K3 = \sqrt{\frac{I1}{I2}}, \quad (3)$$

where $I1$ – index of changes in the volume of proceeds from sales of products, works, services by type of business;

$I2$ – index of changes in the volume of the territorial market.

The higher the coefficient of strategic positioning, the more competitive is the type of entrepreneurship for the territory. Obviously that $0 \leq K1 \leq \infty$. At the same time, the closer it is $K1$ to 0, the lower is the competitiveness of the type of entrepreneurship. If $K1=1$ then the competitiveness of the analysed type of business is identical to the competitiveness of the sample.

If $K1 \geq 1$, the competitiveness of the type of business is higher than the sample.

Obviously, the information on the dynamics of the presented indicators will allow forming a more complete picture of the competitiveness of the business. From a methodological point of view, a dynamic approach to obtaining a dynamic range of competitive indicators presented will ensure the representativeness of the data array and will significantly increase the reliability of assessing the competitiveness of types of entrepreneurship.

The developed methodological approach to assessing the competitiveness of entrepreneurship in the processing industry allows:

to evaluate the conditional dependence of the competitiveness of the type of entrepreneurship by the factors of such assessment is conducted and conclusions on the competitiveness of individual enterprises are formed (Table 2). It provides the possibility of a broad mathematical processing of indicators of competitiveness of the types of entrepreneurship and allows developing an analysis of the category under study;

to change the volume and composition of the sample of businesses depending on the purpose of the analysis and the availability of input data. Such universality becomes especially important in cases where it is difficult to determine the geographical and commodity boundaries of the market, to establish a circle of competitors, as well as in situations with unavailable information;

to refuse collecting and processing dozens of parameters and, at the same time, significantly increasing the reliability of the evaluation of the competitiveness of types of entrepreneurship;

to conduct a comparison of types of entrepreneurship at the inter-branch level;

to make unambiguous conclusions about the level of competitiveness of types of entrepreneurship, as well as to carry out extrapolation and to forecast their competitiveness;

to realize the mechanism of approaching the behaviour of the enterprise competitiveness management system by types of economic activity to the rational and reliable determination of current threats and to predict their consequences.

In order to systematize the process of assessing the competitiveness of types of entrepreneurship in the processing industry, a sequence of actions is proposed:

1. Collection and processing of sufficient, reliable, relevant statistical information, calculation of coefficients of operational efficiency and strategic positioning of the type of business;

2. Calculation of the integral indicator of the competitiveness of the type of entrepreneurship in the processing industry for each type of economic activity.

The determined integral index allows measuring the differentiation of business competitiveness according to the types of economic activity of the processing industry and characterizing the competitiveness of entrepreneurship through the achieved level of development and the dynamics of development (as the implementation of competitive advantages of the type of economic activity).

3. Presentation of the evaluation results is realized through the methods of the positioning of types of economic activity of the processing industry in the space of parameters; mapping results on the map (building cartograms); a textual analytical conclusion based on the interpretation model.

The results of calculations of competitiveness of types of entrepreneurship for the period of 2014–2017 according to the presented methodological approach are presented in Table 3.

The results of calculations (Table 3) according to the above methodical approach allow asserting:

The most competitive business in 2017 with the use of large business structures is the production of furniture, other products, repair and installation of machinery and equipment. It should be noted that the development of this type of business during 2014–2017 is decreasing with a nearly twofold decrease in the competitiveness indicator. The average indicators of competitiveness with a positive dynamics show large

enterprises manufacturing food, beverages, and tobacco products and machine building. Separately, the production of basic pharmaceuticals and pharmaceuticals should be highlighted, which, according to the indicator of the competitiveness of the type of activity, is approaching a high-competitiveness group but negative (negative) dynamics of the indicator for 2014–2017 are observed. Low indicators of competitiveness with positive dynamics (increasing competitiveness) noted the production of chemicals and chemical products, as well as metallurgy, production of finished metal products, except machinery and equipment. The manufacture of wood products, paper and printing activities, as well as the production of rubber and plastic products, and other non-metallic mineral products is characterized by low indicators of competitiveness that are non-interchangeable during the period under investigation. It should also be noted that textile manufacturing, clothing, leather, leather goods, and other materials are not represented in Ukraine by large entrepreneurial structures;

Medium-sized entrepreneurial structures are characterized by mostly average competitiveness indicators with positive dynamics of development. Separately, high-competitive types of entrepreneurship with consistently growing indicators should be highlighted: textile production, clothing, leather, leather goods, and other materials; Manufacture of basic pharmaceuticals and pharmaceuticals. The competitiveness of medium-sized enterprises in mechanical engineering far exceeds the indicators of large business structures during 2014–2016, although in 2017 they almost coincide;

Small business structures show high competitiveness and positive dynamics in machine building and production of furniture, other products, repair and installation of machinery and equipment. The negative dynamics with a loss of competitiveness are characteristic for the production of chemicals and chemical products and the production of basic pharmaceutical products and pharmaceuticals. Other investigated types of entrepreneurship in the processing industry balance on average and below average.

The estimation of competitiveness of business activities is advisable to supplement the statistical characteristics for understanding the differences between enterprises by economic activity by a number of employees and their average wages, profitability, profitability and so on. To make a sound management decision on the direction of increasing competitiveness: due to operational efficiency or strategic positioning.

Higher competitiveness indicators of economic activity with the release of the enterprise value describe the most attractive areas of investment, for example, in 2017, the highest rate inherent in the competitiveness of large enterprises producing furniture solutions, repair and installation of machinery and equipment (1.8233). Indeed, in 2017, the value of the operating profitability of enterprises (0.7%) is not high but only 26.7% of enterprises have been damaged. The competitiveness index is estimated engineering at 1.5494 while operating profitability for this type of economic activity is 6.2%, and unprofitable enterprises are more than 40%. The production of food products, beverages and tobacco products in the indicator of the competitiveness of entrepreneurship took the third place (1.6247). The operating profitability of this type is 3.1%, while unprofitable enterprises account for about 28%. At the same time, it should be noted significant differences between large enterprises of these types of economic activity by the average number of employees in one enterprise and the average monthly wage.

Thus, the group represented by large enterprises processing industry has a stable business competitiveness dependence on operating profitability, increase which is based on efficiency and innovation (automation) processes, training employees, with a gradual increase in their wages.

Average enterprises producing food products, beverages and tobacco products gained value of the integral index of compet-

Table 3

Competitiveness by the scale of entrepreneurship in the processing industry by types of economic activity

Type of economic activity	Competitiveness of the type of entrepreneurship			
	2014	2015	2016	2017
Large enterprises				
Production of food products, beverages, and tobacco products	1,2685	1,4519	1,7035	1,6247
Manufacture of wood products, paper and printing activities	1,2576	1,3053	1,4425	1,1266
Production of coke and refined products	1,1355	1,2972	1,3910	1,4969
Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products	0,9044	1,0897	1,2968	1,3286
Manufacture of basic pharmaceuticals and pharmaceuticals	1,8375	1,8912	1,5674	1,6658
Production of rubber and plastic products, other non-metallic mineral products	1,3217	1,3559	1,2580	1,3250
Metallurgy, manufacture of finished metal products, except machinery and equipment	1,0668	1,0778	1,2371	1,1700
Machine building	1,4420	1,4119	1,3698	1,5494
Manufacture of furniture, other products, repair and installation of machines and equipment	1,4575	3,0569	2,0017	1,8233
Medium enterprises				
Production of food products, beverages, and tobacco products	1,6556	1,3288	1,5180	1,4478
Textile production, clothing, leather, leather goods and other materials	1,6320	1,7743	2,0149	1,7159
Manufacture of wood products, paper and printing activities	1,4727	1,3892	1,4733	1,5827
Production of coke and refined products	1,1764	1,1518	1,1310	1,7685
Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products	1,7072	1,4568	1,6822	1,4161
Manufacture of basic pharmaceuticals and pharmaceuticals	1,7728	1,7541	2,0317	1,8943
Production of rubber and plastic products, other non-metallic mineral products	1,3357	1,3886	1,4680	1,3985
Metallurgy, manufacture of finished metal products, except machinery and equipment	1,5425	1,7693	1,4385	1,4724
Machine building	1,6764	1,6879	1,8554	1,5541
Manufacture of furniture, other products, repair and installation of machines and equipment	1,5518	1,6246	1,7636	1,6656
Small businesses				
Production of food products, beverages, and tobacco products	1,2715	1,3303	1,2652	1,4757
Textile production, clothing, leather, leather goods and other materials	1,6332	1,6149	1,5004	1,5936
Manufacture of wood products, paper and printing activities	1,4136	1,3851	1,3338	1,4473
Production of coke and refined products	1,6399	1,1312	2,4225	1,4350
Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products	1,8245	1,5510	1,6045	1,4643
Manufacture of basic pharmaceuticals and pharmaceuticals	1,8665	1,4961	1,2457	1,5254
Production of rubber and plastic products, other non-metallic mineral products	1,4682	1,4057	1,2707	1,4790
Metallurgy, manufacture of finished metal products, except machinery and equipment	1,6610	1,5624	1,2639	1,5604
Machine building	1,5211	1,6894	1,4995	1,7529
Manufacture of furniture, other products, repair and installation of machines and equipment	1,6943	1,6426	1,4752	1,8331

Notes:

	- high degree of competitiveness
	- average competitiveness
	- competitiveness indicators below average

itiveness at 1.4478, as the average profitability of operating activities of enterprises is 3.4%; however, the share of loss-making enterprises is approaching 31.7%. Average machine-building enterprises do not rank as leaders in the competitiveness of entrepreneurship – 1.5541. The average profitability of the operating activities of enterprises in this group is 2.0%, and the share of loss-making enterprises exceeds 34%. It should also be noted that the number of personnel of enterprises producing food, beverages and tobacco products is 30% lower than in machine building, and the average monthly salary of an employee is 7.2% higher.

In the group of medium-sized enterprises of the processing industry, the convergence of the main indicators of competitiveness of entrepreneurship is observed. The organization of a medium-sized enterprise is a more acceptable, more efficient and more competitive type of business structure for all types of economic activity in the processing industry.

Small business is characterized by the following most competitive types of economic activity: furniture production, other products, repair and installation of machinery and equipment (1.8331); Machine building (1.7529); textile production, clothing, leather, leather goods and other materials (1.5936). Small enterprises of these types of economic activity reach the profitability of operating activities from 3.5% to 7.1% with an average number of employees from 6 to 8 people. The listed types of economic activity do not reach high indicators of competitiveness in the use of larger organizational structures, thus it is reasonable to conclude that the competitiveness of entrepreneurship by types of economic activity of the processing industry depends on the type of organized business entity (large, medium, small, microenterprise), as well as on determinants used in empirical studies.

Conclusions. The proposed method of assessing the competitiveness of entrepreneurship types:

Based on the principles of a dynamic approach to the assessment of competitiveness, it allows us to rank the competitiveness of economic entities by type of economic activity, the size of the enterprise, operational efficiency, and strategic positioning;

The low complexity of the dynamic method of assessing the competitiveness of entrepreneurship makes it in-

dispensable for the identification of economic development leaders;

The method allows quickly evaluating the competitiveness of groups of enterprises, which makes it possible to conduct research on the state, region, separate area or territory levels.

References:

1. Bosma N., Stam E., Schutjens V. Creative Destruction and Regional Productivity Growth: Evidence from the Dutch Manufacturing and Services Industries // *Small Business Economics*. – 2011. – 36(4). – P. 401–418.
2. Brunet F. Regulatory Quality and Competitiveness in Recent European Union Member States // *L'Europe en Formation*. – 2012. – 364. – P. 59–90.
3. Buckley Peter J., Pass Christopher L., Prescott Kate Measures of International Competitiveness: A critical Survey // *Journal of Marketing Management*. – 1988. – 2. – P. 175 – 200.
4. Grinova V.M., Salun M.M. Optimization of the cost of components of the resource potential of the enterprise, Kharkiv, Publishing house of S. Kuznets KhNEU, 2015. – 244 p.
5. Gulati A.B.S., Knif J., Kolari J. Exchange Rate Shocks and Firm Competitiveness in a Small, Export-Oriented Economy: The Case of Finland // *Multinational Finance Journal* [viewed 14 May 2017]. Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1484572.
6. Porter M.E. 1998. *On Competition*. Boston, Harvard Business School, 1998. – 452 p.
7. Sieradzka K., Luft R. Theoretical aspects of enterprise competitiveness // *Central European Review of Economics & Finance*. – 2015. – 4. – P. 133–141. [viewed 8 August 2016]. Available from: https://www.google.com.ua/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKewjnt4Kvq_OAhXiO5oKHWCEC2k4ChAWCFIwB-w&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.uniwersytetradom.pl%2Ffiles%2Fget_userfile.php%3Ffid%3D8596&usg=AFQjCNEqH70mHl-wEWbJbsGpLiqfZJ9U_Tw&bvm=bv.131783435,d.bGs.
8. Siudek T., Zawojcka A. Competitiveness in the economic concepts, theories and empirical research [viewed 24 July 2016]. Available from: https://www.google.com.ua/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKewiGwub8g4rPAhXia5oKHeNZDkMQFggaMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fagro.icm.edu.pl%2Fagro%2Felement%2Fbwmeta1.element.agro-b3b94eea-5c1c-4805-9a76-c82799727548%2F91-108.pdf&usg=AFQjCNHq14loDvRMg8m93r_2B-jzxDD7Xgw&sig2=2gBjb9yHY-KvOEFNwK5L8w&bvm=bv.132479545,d.bGs.
9. State Statistics Service of Ukraine. Statistical Collection “Activities of subjects of large, medium, small and microenterprises” [viewed 12 May 2017]. Available from: <http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/>.
10. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2015. No. 698-12 Law of Ukraine “On Entrepreneurship” [viewed 4 May 2017]. Available from: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/698-12>.
11. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2016. Commercial Code of Ukraine [viewed 4 May 2017]. Available from: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/436-15>.
12. Voronov D.S. Assessment of the competitiveness of many enterprises // *Bulletin of the UrFU. Series of Economics and Management*. – 2015. – 2. – P. 24–40.
13. Zairi M. Business process management: a boundaryless approach to modern competitiveness // *Business Process Management Journal*. – 1997. – 3(1). – P. 64–80 [viewed 7 May 2017]. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235305430_Zairi_M_Business_process_management_a_boundaryless_approach_to_modern_competitiveness_Business_Process_Management_Journal_31_64-80.

КОНКУРЕНТОСПРОМОЖНІСТЬ ПІДПРИЄМНИЦТВА В ПРОМИСЛОВІСТІ: УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ ДОСВІД

Анотація. В статті висвітлюються наукові доробки щодо теорії та аналізу стану конкурентоспроможності підприємств. Зокрема, запропоновано метод оцінки конкурентоспроможності видів підприємництва на принципах динамічного підходу, що дозволяє ранжувати конкурентоспроможність господарюючих суб'єктів за видом економічної діяльності, величиною підприємства, операційною ефективністю та стратегічним позиціонуванням. Низька трудомісткість динамічного методу оцінки конкурентоспроможності видів підприємництва робить його незамінним для виявлення лідерів економічного розвитку. Метод дозволяє оперативно оцінювати конкурентоспроможність груп підприємств, що робить можливим проводити дослідження в масштабах держави, області, окремого району чи території.

Ключові слова: конкуренція, теорія конкурентоспроможності, конкурентоспроможність підприємства, оцінка конкурентоспроможності, підприємництво.

КОНКУРЕНТОСПОСОБНОСТЬ ПРЕДПРИНИМАТЕЛЬСТВА В ПРОМЫШЛЕННОСТИ: УКРАИНСКИЙ ОПЫТ

Аннотация. В статье освещаются научные разработки в области теории и анализа состояния конкурентоспособности предприятий. В частности, предложен метод оценки конкурентоспособности видов предпринимательства на принципах динамического подхода, позволяющего ранжировать конкурентоспособность хозяйствующих субъектов по виду экономической деятельности, величине предприятия, операционной эффективности и стратегическому позиционированию. Низкая трудоемкость динамического метода оценки конкурентоспособности видов предпринимательства делает его незаменимым для выявления лидеров экономического развития. Метод позволяет оперативно оценивать конкурентоспособность групп предприятий, что делает возможным проводить исследования в масштабах государства, области, отдельного района или территории.

Ключевые слова: конкуренция, теория конкурентоспособности, конкурентоспособность предприятия, оценка конкурентоспособности, предпринимательство.

Науковий журнал

**НАУКОВИЙ ВІСНИК
УЖГОРОДСЬКОГО НАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ**

**Серія
МІЖНАРОДНІ ЕКОНОМІЧНІ ВІДНОСИНИ
ТА СВІТОВЕ ГОСПОДАРСТВО**

Випуск 19

Частина 3

Коректура • *авторська*

Комп'ютерна верстка • *Удовиченко В. О.*

*Засновник видання – Факультет міжнародних економічних відносин
Ужгородського національного університету*

Заснований у 2014 році. Виходить 6 разів на рік.

Адреса редакції:

88000, Україна, м. Ужгород, вул. Університетська 14, каб. 510

Факультет міжнародних економічних відносин,

Ужгородський національний університет

Телефон редакції: +38 (097) 085 34 95

Електронна пошта редакції: editor@visnyk-econom.uzhnu.uz.ua

Сторінка наукового журналу: www.visnyk-econom.uzhnu.uz.ua

Формат 64x84/8. Гарнітура Times New Roman.

Папір офсет. Цифровий друк. Ум.-друк. арк. 19,76.

Підписано до друку 31.05.2018 р. Замов. № 0718/86. Наклад 100 прим.

Видавець: Видавничий дім «Гельветика»

м. Херсон, вул. Паровозна 46-а

E-mail: mailbox@helvetica.com.ua

Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи

ДК № 4392 від 20.08.2012 р.