https://doi.org/10.15407/econforecast2021.02.005
JEL: F10, F43

***Oleh Pustovoit*[1]**

PRICE AND VALUE COMPETITIVENESS OF UKRAINIAN MERCHANDISE EXPORTS

In economics, "competitiveness" remains a very general concept, and its use in applied research does not allow combining their results and making unambiguous conclusions. This process is also complicated by the fact that the concept is composite and has two components – the price competitiveness and the value competitiveness. The latter can serve as an indicator of qualitative changes in the economy. However, this aspect of competitiveness in developing countries is still underestimated by researchers. Therefore, it is safe to say that today there are no studies, which, with a high level of accuracy, can analyze the value competitiveness of exports in such countries. Economists usually focus their efforts on the analysis of export price competitiveness and one of its main factors, which is the exchange rate of the national currency. However, this approach has limited cognitive capabilities, because the emergence of new centers of global growth, such as China and India is impossible to explain, based only on the high price competitiveness of their exports.

The article attempts to solve some accumulated problems in economic science. In particular, based on the results of the analysis of modern definitions of the concept of "competitiveness", the author proposes to expand its content, generalizing the level of conformity of goods (services) to consumer preferences of market participants. This conceptual position is used to deepen the understanding of the basic, value and price competitiveness of products. A method for assessing the dominant role of value (price) competitiveness of exports in ensuring its dynamics has been developed. According to the results of the of methodology, it was found that in Ukraine's export markets, the cyclical process of alternating growth of value or price competitiveness of this country's products is mostly interrupted. The reason for this is the high price competitiveness of raw material exports, which is mainly attained due to low wages in the economy.

[1] **Pustovoit, Oleh Valentynovych** – Doctor of Sciences (Economics), Leading Researcher, Department of Sectoral Forecasting and Market Conjuncture, State Institution "Institute for Economics and Forecasting, NAS of Ukraine" (26, Panasa Myrnoho St., Kyiv, 01011, Ukraine, e-mail: avvit@ukr.net

In international markets, value competitiveness is inherent in a relatively small number of product groups of Ukrainian products. These include: insulated wires, cables and other insulated electrical conductors; fiber optic cables; turbojet engines, turboprop and other gas turbines; weapons, ammunition, their parts and accessories; electric heating devices and apparatus; vessels intended for the carriage of persons or goods; tugs and pushers; parts of aircraft; cars for transportation of passengers, cargoes, including self-propelled ones; water steam turbines and other steam turbines; and women's and men's clothing. It is substantiated that from the point of view of finding a new strategy of economic growth for Ukraine, the most urgent issues are not those of intensifying export activities, but those of updating the composition of the largest export commodity groups. Leading positions among them should be occupied by goods with a large share of value added, and increased technological complexity and value competitiveness. The beginning of this process will mean the emergence of new qualitative changes in the economy, and the effectiveness of public policy of economic reform.

Keywords: *export, import, goods, services, consumer preferences, unit value, basic competitiveness, price competitiveness, value (non-price, qualitative) competitiveness, economic growth*

The global financial crisis of 2008 increased the demand for economic growth strategies. As a result, in March of the already distant year of 2010, the World Bank held a discussion on the ability of traditional, export-oriented growth strategies to ensure high economic dynamics in the future. As usual, during the debates, the experts did not reach a consensus. However, the value of their communication was to justify alternative approaches to solving the problem of economic growth. Thus, Christian Ketels, a participant in the discussion from the Harvard Business School, argued that the focus of the discussion should be on policy aimed not at increasing the countries' exports, but at the competitiveness of their products [1]. Subsequently, new trends in the world economy proved the infallibility of this opinion. In particular, with the exception of 2017, the average annual growth of world GDP in 2014–2019 reached and exceeded that of global merchandise exports [2, p. 18]. This new market situation showed that merchandise exports lost their ability to significantly affect the growth of world output.

This economic trend led some economists to believe that exports should be considered as a diagnostic tool and policies to support it - as one of the levers in a broader strategy to raise the competitiveness of economies and ensure their growth. This formulation of the question actualized a number of theoretical and applied problems that scientists have to solve. The most difficult among them is associated with the development of public policy measures to increase the competitiveness of economy. However, issues of methodological nature related to assessing the level of export competitiveness, describing it as a "facade" of the economy, and a "showcase"

of its capabilities acquired no less scientific importance. The latter is confirmed by empirical facts, which testify that exporting companies are 8-12% more productive than those who supply products to domestic markets [3].

These issues became relevant not only at the global but also at the national level. This is evidenced by the experience of Ukraine, in which after the crisis of 2014-2015, the search for ways to resume economic growth began. At the same time, the focus on export expansion was considered one of the most promising and short ways to attain this goal. A step in this direction was the development of the Export Strategy of Ukraine ("road map" of strategic trade development) for 2017-2021, which was approved by the order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine № 1017-r of December 27, 2017. The strategy was prepared with regard to the fact that the share of goods in the structure of total exports exceeded 83%.

In 2017–2019, the annual growth rate of merchandise exports was high and demonstrated a post-crisis economic recovery. However, with the completion of this task, there is a growing understanding among specialists that the intensification of export activities takes place mainly in the industries associated with the production of raw materials and products of its low-level processing. The expansion of their sales on the global market has its natural limit. Therefore, the country's current export specialization cannot be considered as the main means of boosting economic growth in the medium and long term. It is only possible to achieve new export opportunities under one condition - to increase the level of product competitiveness. However, how to know whether Ukraine, under the influence of the ongoing reforms, is gradually approaching this goal, or moving away from it, or moving around it in a vicious circle?

The answer to this question can be found by analyzing the changes in the basic (general), price and value competitiveness of Ukrainian export goods. In particular, the increase in their level of basic competitiveness is evidence of the increasing impact of merchandise exports on this country's economic growth. However, if we gather the facts about the increase in price competitiveness of exports, they can be seen as evidence of the preservation of incentives in the economy to keep the existing structure of exports, which is dominated by raw materials and semi-finished products. If we find the facts of increasing value competitiveness of exports (which is often called value, non-price or qualitative competitiveness), they can serve as evidence of the formation of incentives in the economy to change its structure in favor of technologically more complex goods with innovative or higher-quality properties.

At the same time, the modern arsenal of scientific knowledge does not allow gathering the necessary factual evidence. This is partly due to the existence of unsolved methodological issues. The main issues are what competitiveness is, and which concept is fundamental among those characterizing competitiveness at the level of different economic structures such as enterprises, industries, regions, and economies (countries). Questions about research methodol remain open too. The key ones among them are the following: how to assess the level of basic, value and price competitiveness of the product? The purpose of this article is to specify the content of the concept of "competitiveness", to identify the basic among related notions that contain this term, to develop and test on the example of Ukraine the methods of to

assessing the role of basic, price and value competitiveness of merchandise exports in ensuring its dynamics.

Specifying the methodology of competitiveness research

"Competitiveness" is a widely used economic concept, which has no unambiguous generally accepted interpretation. It is used to describe phenomena in market economies that are associated with competition for consumer. It does not make sense to use this concept to analyze monopolized markets or areas of turnover in planned and centralized economies. A detailed analysis of the history of theoretical development of the concept of "competitiveness" was carried out by English scientist R. Martin; Austrian scientists K. Aiginger, S. Berentaler-Sieber, and J. Vogel; American scientists M. Delgado, K. Ketels, M. Porter, and S. Stern, and Polish scientists T. Syudek, and A. Zavoyska.

Based on the achievements of these and other scientists, it can be argued that over the past fifty years, the contents of "competitiveness" is often explained by such general terms as *ability*, *potential*, *probable future opportunities* of firms and countries to successfully sell goods and services under the conditions of market competition. M. Delgado, K. Ketels, M. Porter, and S. Stern aptly remarked that such definitions are imperfect and need to be clarified. In particular, they emphasized that modern understanding of competitiveness is related to *what* underlies wealth creation and economic performance [4, p. 7].

The implicit, hidden nature of what underlies wealth and economic performance has led scientists to look for ways to more accurately describe the contents of "competitiveness" based on quantitative assessments of the properties (characteristics) of the real phenomenon it generalizes. However, here they faced a new problem: how to evaluate such characteristics as "ability", "potential", "opportunities", which reflect not the essence, but the random nature of competitiveness? This follows from the fact that in real life, for example, potential or opportunities either can be realized or cannot be realized. At the same time, it is known that economic science studies *mainly* logical and causal phenomena, rather than incidental ones. The latter are the subject of analysis of the probability theory.

In order to overcome this deadlock, economists used the following theoretical assumption. If competitiveness is an accidental event, then it can be studied, on the one hand, by a combination of conditions that precede it and shape its properties, and on the other - on the results of the impact of these properties on other economic phenomena. This approach proved to be quite effective because it paved the way for the description of competitiveness based on quantitative assessments of its factors and features.

For example, scientists began to consider as factors of competitiveness a set of conditions that explain the success of firms in competition on the market, and its features – as the results of such successful firms.

Features and factors of competitiveness became the subject of numerous studies. However, they all were based on a somewhat paradoxical situation. Its essence was that the features and factors were events that could be quantified and described, and competitiveness itself was not. However, this somewhat contradictory method of

cognition did not disturb the scientists, because they already had a positive experience of using it to analyze other random phenomena. The most famous of these is the economic crisis. Without going into the essence of this stochastic phenomenon, economists successfully describe it via causes and consequences, which are never repeated in the future.

Analysis of research showed that historically, as the main features of the competitiveness of firms and countries they considered: the share of their products' sales in the market, relatively lower local production costs, deficit-free trade balance or current account, and per capita GDP. Today, some economists are of the opinion that as such a feature one should consider the ability of a country or region to export more value added than to import [5, p. 2], and the expected level of output per one working age person [4, p. 8], i.e. the possible productivity of a potential employee.

At the same time, some European scholars call to rethink the traditional features of competitiveness. They propose to include not only contributions to production (production costs, productivity), but also the results of economic activities, and the level of their focus on solving modern problems associated with the transition of countries to socially inclusive and environmentally sustainable growth. In their opinion, the main of such results is the ability of a country (region, local entities) to attain for its citizens goals that go 'beyond GDP'. The need to use this feature to identify competitiveness is justified by the fact that social system and environmental aspirations of public and private institutions can become a "productive force". The contributions of firms and countries to its development are beyond-GDP goals [6, p. 13–14].

The features of competitiveness were actively analyzed first at the level of firms, sectors, and countries, and later - economic regions. This process was combined with the search and specification of competitiveness factors. In this regard, economists noted that the real issue of competitiveness analysis is not the description of its results, but revealing the factors that explain it [7, p. 2– 3]. Some of the achievements in these areas of research can be summarized as follows.

A solid analysis of the main features and factors (sources) of competitiveness of firms was carried out by Indian scientists A. Ambastha and K. Momaya. Based on their research, they came to the conclusion that the following results of its activity can serve as signs of competitiveness of the firm: increased customer satisfaction, productivity, profitability, market share, and product assortment, new product development, and generation of value. According to these scientists, the sources of results can be combinations that arise from the unification of available in firms tangible and intangible assets (human resources, technologies, production structure, reputation, and trademarks) with the processes of strategic management, operational management, quality, product design, and improvement of technologies and marketing activities [8, p. 54]. Some stages of the development of scientific thought on the features and factors of competitiveness of firms were summarized by the Polish scientist M. Pyatkovsky [9].

Macroeconomic competitiveness is being quite actively analyzed. In particular, experts from the World Economic Forum (WEF) have proposed a method to study the Global Competitiveness Index, developed to assess the integrated contribution

of macroeconomic factors (favorable environment, human capital, markets, and innovation ecosystem) to the aggregate factor productivity. The latter was considered as the main feature of competitiveness, whose factors were assessed and described using 103 indicators [10, p. 2].

In turn, scientists from the International Institute for Management Development (IMD) in the World Yearbook of Competitiveness (WCY) proposed to consider as the main feature of macroeconomic competitiveness the existence of a favorable competitive environment for enterprises. The most influential factors in its formation includes economic environment indicators, government efficiency, business efficiency, and infrastructure. To evaluate them, more than 330 criteria were used [11, p. 36].

Scientific search for features and factors of macroeconomic competitiveness took place in discussions and today is far from complete. One part of economists propose to reduce and optimize the number of factors and indicators of macroeconomic competitiveness [12], the second one - to identify among them the most important ones characteristic for a certain group (cluster) of countries [13], and the third one - to deepen their research in countries at the level of sectors and clusters [14]. Among scientists, there are also opinions that the search for features and factors of competitiveness of countries is a wrong idea (or a controversial one requiring a significant clarification), since it is not the countries who compete on the markets but the firms [15, p. 516]. Doubts about its infallibility are raised by the following considerations. If the features of country's competitiveness include such as GDP per capita, and achievement of beyond-GDP goals, this a priori means that only developed and wealthy countries that produce high-tech goods and services with high added value can be regarded competitive. If so, the meaning of the concept of "competitiveness" should be associated with the ability not to compete in markets, but to produce high-tech products. However, such a concept of competitiveness contradicts the empirical facts of the development of world economy. In particular, it does not explain why developing countries presently account for almost half of global merchandise exports, compared with 25% in 1990. Why is the growth of the world economy today determined not only by the United States and the Eurozone countries, but also by China and India, who started to become new centers of global growth without a leading position in the markets of high-tech goods and services?

No less contrasting is the debate on the features and factors of regional competitiveness. Summarizing scientific research in this area, R. Martin proposed a concept that the features of competitiveness of regions with different development level may be the facts of their transformation into sites (places) of production, increased profits or knowledge centers. The most influential factors to shape the first of the above region types include: factors of production (labor, land, capital), the second type - regional investment climate (infrastructure, human resources, and production environment), and the third type - institutions, technology availability, scientific infrastructure, social capital, demographic situation, and qualitative characteristics of the locality and environment [7, p. 2-36–2-37.]. Croatian scientist D. Borozan substantiated the concept that, to attract labor, capital and markets, regions compete with each other using their absolute advantages. She included, in

the latter, technological, social, infrastructural, and institutional assets and proposes to consider them as features of regional competitiveness. Among the factors that determine the appearance of these features are the unique regional features that can be used to create reliable conditions for life and work [16, p. 60].

Researchers began to actively use the identified features and factors of competitiveness for comparative description of goods, services and their brands, firms, sectors, industrial branches, regions, economies (nations, countries), and economic blocs of countries. The common feature of these studies could not be explained with the concept of "competitiveness", because only firms took direct participation in the market competition. This situation raised the issue of revising the meaning of the notion of "competitiveness". Thus, scientists T. Syudek, and A. Zavoyska proposed to consider it as a purely *evaluative* notion, like "GDP" or "employment", meaning a set of characteristics of one object relative to those of a comparable (reference) object in the market [17, p. 92–94]. This interpretation of competitiveness is universal, and with its help, it is possible to explain all modern applied researches in this area. However, such a concept of "competitiveness" lost its economic meaning and became a set of indicators.

Different understandings of competitiveness, its features and factors increasingly confused the question of corresponding policy-making. Policy makers had considerable difficulties with such theoretical problems. If competitiveness is interpreted as a set of comparative characteristics of firms, regions, and countries, it is impossible to implement a policy to raise its level, because in market conditions, each of the above entities, in their activities, cannot be guided by the wishes of politicians or government directives. If competitiveness is considered as a random phenomenon that occurs every time under the influence of a new combination of micro-, meso- and macroeconomic factors, then it is impossible to determine exactly what their future combination should be, which will not only raise the ability, potential, and opportunities of economic entities, but also provide them with a guaranteed success in the market competition in the market.

The above-mentioned difficulties in policy-making are likely to persist until economists begin to consider competitiveness not as an incidental phenomenon, but as a *natural one*. In our opinion, there is already enough evidence accumulated in science to change opinions about this phenomenon. The most important among them is this: The main criterion for a random phenomenon is not the unpredictability of its occurrence, but a set of factors that cause it. According to this assumption, a random phenomenon is every time caused by a new combination of factors, which will never happen again in the future. If scientists describe and specify the set of constant factors that cause a particular economic phenomenon (including competitiveness), it means that the phenomenon is by nature deterministic and occurs logically under the action of certain forces.

If we realize that competitiveness is a natural phenomenon, it inevitably raises the problem of more accurate definition of the content of the concept that summarizes it. The search for ways to solve it should begin with analysis of the hierarchy in the system of concepts that contain the term "competitiveness". It is

advisable to recognize as fundamental among them the notion that is used to characterize goods and services. The argument for this approach is simple. It is impossible to prove or imagine that there may be competitive firms, sectors, regions, or countries where no competitive goods or services are produced. It is exactly they, which are the main condition for the competitiveness of all other economic entities.

However, such approach to describing the hierarchy of concepts that contain the term "competitiveness" raises a counter-question: what makes goods and services competitive? At first glance, the answer is simple - the special unique properties of a product and its affordability. In this context, it should be noted that every year a large number of affordable products with new properties are produced in the world. However, only some of them become sales leaders on the markets and bring higher incomes for companies and countries. The above-mentioned fact can be used as an argument in favor of the conclusion that only the consumer priority in relation to the purchase of a product makes it competitive. Thus, the concept of "competitiveness" should be generalized to nothing more than the *correspondence of the product (service) to consumer preferences of market participants*. In other words, this approach can be described as follows. On the market, any product (service) remains competitive as long as its properties and price are within the buyers' consumer preferences. The proposed conceptual understanding of competitiveness makes it possible to interpret the common feature of all related research.

It can be assumed that the conformity of the product (service) to consumer preferences of market participants can have both the minimum and the maximum values, which vary, for example, in the range of 1-100%. At the same time, the accumulated empirical facts give grounds to assert that the correspondence of goods (services) to consumer preferences of buyers can reach the maximum possible values only if all available micro-, meso-, and macro-economic factors of competitiveness are activated in the economy. Therefore, in applied research, the concept of "*basic competitiveness*" should be used. It is expedient to use it in order to describe, in economies, the *maximized by means of micro-, meso-, and macroeconomic factors correspondence of goods (services) to consumer preferences of market participants*.

The proposed conceptual interpretation of the concept of *"basic competitiveness"* makes it possible to find methods of direct assessment of the phenomenon that it generalizes. In particular, in the economy, the maximized compliance of a product (service) to buyers' consumer preferences can be quite accurately described by quantifying its share in total market sales of the products of similar purpose. The peculiarity of this indicator is that it contains information that the purchase of a particular product (service) is perceived as a priority by consumers, who generate a separate portion of market demand.

The concept of "basic competitiveness" is composite. Its content is composed of two constituent elements. One of them is generalized in the concept of "*price competitiveness*", which characterizes the level of correspondence of the price of goods (services) to the purchasing power of market participants. The second element is described by the concept of "*value competitiveness*". It reflects the level of compliance of the properties of a product (service) with subjective perceptions and

expectations of market participants about the utility of its use or consumption. Here it should be kept in mind that with "zero" value competitiveness of the product, i.e. with the absolute mismatch of its properties with consumer perceptions or expectations, buyers do not care about the price. And vice versa, with "zero" price competitiveness of the product, i.e. with its absolute unavailability, buyers do not care about its properties.

Entrepreneurs constantly try to create new products with high value competitiveness. However, they only begin to receive significant increased additional income when the value competitiveness of a new product (service) is supplemented by its price. The latter involves reducing the product's market price to the level at which it becomes a mass product, i.e. becomes available to a great number of consumers. It follows that the value of contribution of value and price competitiveness in sales is constantly changing. This regularity is the engine of long-term economic growth. Solid empirical evidence that the value and price competitiveness of goods are equivalent factors in the growth of exports, have been collected by French scientists R. Cezar and F. Cartellier [18].

Method for identifying price and value competitiveness of merchandise exports

The proposed methodological reasoning allows assuming that the levels of value and price competitiveness of products, including export products, are constantly changing. It follows that in some periods of time the dynamics of exports is determined by its high value competitiveness, and in others – by its high price competitiveness. This theoretical construction raises an urgent question: how can we prove that it really exists in the form of economic regularity? For this purpose, first of all, it is necessary to develop a method that would identify the dominant role of value or price competitiveness of export goods in ensuring the dynamics of their sales.

In our opinion, such a method can be developed based on the *unit value* index (UV). This index measures the change in the average value of units that are not homogeneous and can be affected by fluctuations in both the goods assortment and their prices [19]. In this study, the average unit cost of the country's exports (imports) is estimated in US dollars per 1 kilogram of weight of a set of goods of a certain group *j* or a set of product groups *t*. The value of 1 kilogram of weight is described by indexes UV*ix* and UV*im*, which reflect the unit value of the country's export and import commodity groups of country *i*. Some analytical capacities of these indices can be presented as follows:

First, index UV*ixj* (UV*imj*) can be used to compare the unit value of export (import) groups *j*1 and *j*2, whose products do not compete with each other in the market. In this case, indicator UV_{ixj1} / UV_{ixj2} (UV_{imj1} / UV_{imj2}) will reflect the relative *level of technological complexity* of the product groups. This methodological position can be explained as follows. For example, iron ore is not a subject of competition in the car market and vice versa. In this case, the cost of one kilogram of raw materials will always be lower than that of a car, because the latter is the result of deep processing of iron-ore materials, and much higher costs for attracting highly skilled workers in this process. It follows that relationship between the unit cost of

iron ore and cars is an estimate of the relative level of their technological complexity. Index UV*ixt* (UV*imt*) can be used to compare the unit value of the whole set of product groups *t* of country *i*1 with that of country *i*2. In this case, indicator UV*i*1*xt* / UV*i*2*xt* (UV*i*1*mt* / UV*i*2*mt*) will reflect the relative level of technological complexity of commodity exports (imports) of these countries.

Secondly, index UV*ixj* (UV*imj*) can be used to compare the unit value of export (import) groups *j*1 and *j*2, whose products compete with each other on the market. In this case, indicator UV*ixj*1 / UV*ixj*2 (UV*imj*1 / UV*imj*2) will reflect relative *level of value competitiveness* of the above product groups. This methodological position can be explained as follows. For example, today the average cost of a kilogram of a car with electric engine is higher than that of one with a gasoline or diesel engine. It is possible that these types of cars are almost identical in terms of technological complexity, but electric cars have better environmental performance. This gives electric vehicles consumer benefits of an increasingly greater number of consumers.

Third, indices UV*ixj* and UV*imj* can be used to compare the unit value of a set of export and import goods that belong to the same product group *j*. In this case, the export and import goods of group *j* should be considered as such that *indirectly compete* with each other in the market. This methodological position can be explained as follows. In a market economy, national products, regardless of the geographical structure of sales on foreign or domestic markets, have similar properties. In domestic market, one part of these products directly competes with imported ones and the other one – with exported ones. This gives grounds to state that exports conditionally compete with imported analogues.

If indicator UV*ixj* / UV*imj* >1, it is evidence that a unit of export commodity group *j* of country *i* has a higher average price in foreign markets than its imported analogues have in domestic market, and vice versa, if UV*ixj* / UV*imj* <1. However, indicator UV*ixj* / UV*imj* has no unambiguous interpretation. This is due to the fact that, for example, higher prices of export (import) products can be a sign of both higher costs of its production and its higher value competitiveness. In some cases, unambiguous interpretation of UV*ixj* / UV*imj* is possible due to the information contained in the ratio of exports and imports of goods of group *j* (X*ij* / M*ij*). This methodological provision has the following explanation. Excess of exports over imports (X*ij* / M*ij* >1) is only possible under two conditions – greater value competitiveness or greater price competitiveness of domestic products.

Based on indicators X*ij* / M*ij* and UV*ixj* / UV*imj* and methodological approaches to the interpretation of their combinations, as well as theoretical and empirical achievements in this field by K. Aiginger, M. Angeleska, O. Kostoska, G. Mancheska, P. Mitrevsky [20, p. 80], K. Benkovskis and J. Wertz [21, p. 9], let us try to describe and formalize a set of features that allow identifying the dominant influence of value or price competitiveness of export goods on their sales. In particular:

a) a sign that the high value competitiveness of a group of goods had a dominant effect on their exports is the market situation in which: exports of this group of goods

exceeds imports of analogues; average unit cost of an exported set of these goods is higher than that of an imported one. Formally, this sign can be presented as follows:

$$Xij / Mij > 1;\ UVixj / UVimj > 1,$$

where X*ij*, M*ij* - export, import of goods of group *j* of country *i*; UV*ixt*, UV*imt* - unit value of export, import goods of group *j* of country *i*;

b) a sign that the low value competitiveness of a group of goods had a dominant effect on their exports, is the situation in the economy, in which: imports of this group of goods exceed exports of analogues (due to their obsolescence, inconsistency with consumer preferences, or consumer indifference to low prices); unit cost of an exported set of these goods is lower than that of an imported one. Formally, this feature can be presented as follows:

$$Xij / Mij < 1;\ UVixj / UVimj < 1;$$

c) a sign that the high price competitiveness of a group of goods had a dominant effect on their exports is a market situation in which: exports of this group of goods exceeds imports of analogues; the unit cost of an exported set of these goods is less than that of an imported one. Formally, this feature can be presented as follows:

$$Xij / Mij > 1;\ UVixj / UVimj < 1;$$

d) a sign that the low price competitiveness of a group of goods had a dominant effect on their exports is a market situation in which: imports of this group of goods exceeds exports of analogues; unit value of an exported set of these goods is greater than that of an imported one. Formally, this feature can be presented as follows:

$$Xij / Mij < 1;\ UVixj / UVimj > 1.$$

We will try to use the above-mentioned analytical capabilities of the indicator "the country's share in world merchandise exports" to identify the trend of change in the basic competitiveness of Ukrainian merchandise exports in 2013-2019. At the same time, using indexes UV*ixj* (UV*imj*) and UV*ixt* (UV*imt*), indicators X*ij* (M*ij*) and X*it* (M*it*) and their combinations we will try to establish: whose influence on Ukraine's merchandise exports in this period was dominant - value competitiveness or price competitiveness?

The results of empirical study on competitiveness of Ukraine's merchandise exports

The level of macroeconomic basic competitiveness of Ukraine's export goods can be defined by estimating their share in global merchandise exports. For this purpose, we will use data of Table 1.

Table 1

Ukraine's share in global merchandise exports in 2013-2019

Indicator / Years	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Global merchandise exports, *billion USD*	18625	18629	16263	15787	17516	19268	18777
Ukraine's merchandise exports, *billion USD*	63.32	53.90	38.12	36.36	43.26	47. 33	50.05
Ukraine's share in global merchandise exports, *%*	0.34	0.29	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.25	0.27

Source: compiled by author based on: Goods exports (BoP, current US$): World Bank national accounts data. Washington: The World Bank. URL: https: //data.worldbank.org/indicator/BX.GSR.MRCH.CD?end=2019&start=1960&view=chart and Dynamics of the geographical structure of foreign merchandise trade / State Statistics Service of Ukraine URL: http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua

Data of Table 1 testify that in 2013–2019, Ukraine's share in global merchandise exports decreased from 0.34 to 0.27%. This fact is proof of decreased basic competitiveness of Ukrainian exported goods on global market compared to the pre-crisis 2013. At the same time, these data also show that since 2017, the basic competitiveness of exports has an upward trend compared to 2015-2016.

The above-mentioned positive economic trend inevitably raises the question: what *caused the increase in the share of Ukrainian goods in world exports - the dominant influence of value competitiveness or that of price competitiveness*? The search for an answer to this question should begin with analysis of the changes in the unit value of products that Ukraine imported and exported in 2013-2020. To do this, let us use data in Table 2, which reflect changes in the dynamics of the unit value of products that Ukraine imported and exported during the period.

Data of Table 2 show that in 2013–2019, the value of 1 kilogram of weight of the entire set of goods that Ukraine exported and imported decreased. In particular, the unit cost of total merchandise exports (UV*ixt*)) decreased from $0.36 to $0.30US/kg. For comparison, it should be noted that in developed countries this figure is about $7.5 US/kg [20, p. 80]. Ukraine's large lag in this indicator is evidence of low technological complexity of this country's exports.

Table 2

Dynamics of unit value of Ukraine's total merchandise exports and imports in 2013–2019

Years	Total merchandise imports			Total merchandise exports		
	Value (M*it*), *ths USD*	**Net weight,** *ton*	**Unit value** (UV*imt*), *USD/kg*	**Value** (X*it*), *ths USD*	**Net weight,** *ton*	**Unit value** (UV*ixt*), *USD/kg*
2013	76850494	75344171	***1.02***	63264122	174392468	***0.36***
2014	52533379	59475536	***0.88***	54044054	174031481	***0.31***
2015	36569603	57782723	***0.63***	38170630	159897001	***0.24***
2016	38869503	60690174	***0.64***	36364059	150323936	***0.24***
2017	49537383	73829551	***0.67***	43260180	153155757	***0.28***
2018	56875461	73277660	***0.78***	47328962	149107552	***0.32***
2019	60414393	75413733	***0.80***	50061057	166976286	***0.30***

Source: compiled by author based on data for relevant years: total volume of imports and exports in terms of commodity items by UKTZED codes / State Fiscal Service of Ukraine URL: http://sfs.gov.ua/ms/f11

At the same time, the unit cost of total merchandise imports (UV) decreased from 1.02 to 0.80 USD/kg. This meant that Ukrainian consumer further reduced requirements for the properties of imported products, while Ukrainian business did not try to import modern expensive technological equipment to modernize their own enterprises in order to expand the output of innovative and higher quality products. Despite this, in 2013–2019, the average unit value of total merchandise imports to Ukraine was more than 2.6 times higher than that of total merchandise exports. This indicated that the latter had lower technological complexity relative to imports.

At first glance, the data in Table 2 can also be used to identify the dominant role of value or price competitiveness of merchandise exports in ensuring the latter's dynamics. To do this, it suffices to analyze what the average annual values of X*it* / M*it* and UV*ixt* / UV*imt* were in 2016–2019 and to interpret them in accordance with the above method of identifying the impact of value (price) competitiveness of exported products on the dynamics of their sales. If we follow this, we can find that in this period the average annual value of X*it* / M*it* was 0.87, and UV*ixt* / UV*imt* was 0.4, i.e. these two indicators were less than unit. Formally, they can be summarized as follows: X*it* / M*it* <1; UV*ixt* / UV*imt* <1. Based on them, we can assume that they are a sign of low value competitiveness of Ukrainian merchandise exports, its obsolescence and inconsistency with consumer preferences of foreign market participants, and the emergence of indifference to low prices.

However, the assumption that low value competitiveness is inherent in the whole totality of exported goods is somewhat contradictory. Evidence tells us otherwise. In particular, in 2017–2019, Ukrainian merchandise exports had a positive dynamics within 126.3 to 106.3% of annual growth. Undoubtedly, this trend could not have appeared under the influence of low value competitiveness of Ukrainian exports. This means that it is necessary to find another, more accurate, method of estimating the level of value (price) competitiveness of a country's total merchandise exports.

In our opinion, the level of value (price) competitiveness of the country's total merchandise exports should be determined not at the macroeconomic but at the sectoral level. This is due to the fact that at the macro level, the X*it* / M*it* indicator can change under the influence not only of output and exports of domestic products, but also a number of other factors. The main ones among such factors are the country's foreign borrowings and debt, exchange rate, foreign investments, remittances coming from labor migrants abroad, etc.

The calculation error resulting from these factors can be reduced in the following way. In particular, the decisive role of value (price) competitiveness of goods in ensuring their total exports should be identified using the average values of X*ij* / M*ij* and UV*ixj* / UV*imj*, calculated for all or the largest product groups, whose share in the export structure exceeds 50%. This methodological approach can be argued as follows. Factors that determine the value of the X*it* / M*it* indicator at the macro level cannot simultaneously and proportionally change the X*ij* / M*ij* indicator in all sectoral markets. This means that the average of the latter will more accurately reflect the situation in foreign trade.

Let us try to test the above methodological provisions on the example of Ukraine's 10 largest export groups, whose share in total merchandise exports in 2019 was 51.52%. To do this, use the data from Table 3, which gives estimates of the average unit value of export and import product groups included in 10 largest in individual countries in 2019.

Table 3

Average unit value of 10 largest export and import product groups in individual countries in 2019

Country	Average unit value of 10 largest product groups *j*		UV*ixj*/UV*imj*, *times*
	Export groups j (UV*ixj*), *USD/kg*	Import groups *j* (UV*imj*), *USD/kg*	
Russian Federation	0.52	31.75	0.02
Ukraine	2.37	9.94	0.24
Kazakhstan	6.54	9.48	0.69
Spain	8.50	15.34	0.55
Greece	10.67	11.08	0.96
Sweden	27.04	17.66	1.53
France	61.71	82.26	0.75

Note: Average unit cost is calculated only for those product groups that were valued in USD/kg and did not contain rare resources.

Source: compiled by author based on data from: 2019 International Trade Statistics Yearbook. Vol. I. United Nations, New York, 2020. 372 p. URL: https://comtrade.un.org/pb/downloads/2019/VolI2019.pdf

Data in Table 3 show that in 2019, in Ukraine, the average unit value of 10 largest export commodity groups only exceeded the same figure in the Russian Federation, and imported commodity groups - a similar figure in Kazakhstan. In addition, with the exception of Russia, Ukraine was notable for the fact that within the 10 largest product groups, it imported products of much higher technological complexity than it exported. This is evidenced by the ratio of average unit value of the 10 largest export and import product groups, which is less than unit, namely UV*ixj*/UV*imj* = 0.24. The most pronounced reverse trend was observed in Sweden, which in the 10 largest product groups exported much more technological products than imported (UV*ixj*/UV*imj* = 1.53).

According to the three-digit codes of the Standard International Trade Classifier SITC (0-9) in Ukraine, the 10 largest export product groups included the following: sunflower, safflower or cottonseed oils (code 421), corn (044), wheat (041), semi-finished carbon steel (672), iron ores and concentrates (281), flat rolled carbon steel (673), soybeans (222), ferroalloys (671), cake, solid waste from the extraction of vegetable fats and oils (081). In these product groups, the average value of indicators was: X*ij* / M*ij* - 5101.9; UV*ixj* / UV*imj* - 0,55. These indicators can be formalized as follows: X*ij* / M*ij* >1; UV*ixj* / UV*imj* <1. Their combination is a sign of a relatively high level of price competitiveness of the nine largest export commodity groups of Ukraine.

And only one of the 10 largest export commodity groups had a slightly different combination of indices. This is a group whose products are usually included in those that have higher technological complexity, namely: insulated wires, cables and other insulated electrical conductors; fiber optic cables (code 773). In this product group, the value of indicators was: X*ij* / M*ij* - 2.56; UV*ixj* / UV*imj* - 2,12. These indicators can be

formalized as follows: X*ij* / M*ij* > 1; UV*ixj* / UV*imj* > 1. Their combination is a sign of a high level of value competitiveness of this product group.

Certainly, other types of Ukrainian products were also characterized by high value competitiveness. However, it should be noted that, unfortunately, they were few and their share in Ukraine's merchandise exports was insignificant. For example, the product group "turbojet engines, turboprop and other gas turbines" had the following values of X*ij* / M*ij* - 6.76; UV*ixj* / UV*imj* - 2.46, which testified to the high value competitiveness of this product group. However, its share in total Ukrainian exports was only 0.53%, i.e. it was more than five times smaller than in the group of goods called "insulated wires, cables and other insulated electrical conductors; fiber optic cables".

The fact that the high level of price competitiveness became the main reason for the expansion of Ukrainian merchandise exports in 2017-2019 naturally raises the question: what factors made it possible? The search for answer should begin with quoting a well-known scientific statement that the main factors of high price competitiveness of exports are savings due to the growing scale of production and relatively lower wages. Data of Table 1 confirm that in 2017–2019, the scale of sales of Ukrainian products in foreign markets was constantly growing.

In order to understand how the relative competitiveness of exports could be affected by the relative level of wages, it is advisable to study it considering the effects of the economic crisis of 2014-2015. In order to estimate wage changes, we will use indicators that characterize its nominal, real and relative levels calculated at the exchange rate of the hryvnia to euro. The latter is interesting because it makes it possible to show what the average labor costs are incurred by Ukrainian entrepreneur who exports his own products to world markets at international prices. The trend of changes in the level of wages in Ukraine's economy in 2013–2019 is presented in Table. 4.

Table 4

Dynamics of real and relative level of wages in Ukraine in 2013–2019

Indicator / Years	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Average monthly wage of a full-time employee, *UAH*	3265	3480	4195	5183	7104	8865	10497
Average monthly wage of a full-time employee, *euros*	295.7	180.9	160.1	182.4	212.2	255.4	397.3
Growth rates of real wages, *% to previous year*	100.7	86.4	90.1	111.6	118.9	109.7	111.3
Real wage index, *% to 2013*	100	86.4	77.8	86.9	103.3	113.3	126.1

Source: compiled by author based on: Growth/decrease rates of nominal and real wages; Average monthly wage of full-time employees / State Statistics Service of Ukraine.URL: http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua

Data of Table 4 show that after the economic crisis of 2014–2015, average monthly nominal and real wages in Ukraine grew quite rapidly. In particular, in 2017 real wages reached the pre-crisis level of 2013, and in 2019 - exceeded it by more than a third. At the same time, in 2019 average monthly salary, expressed in euros at the then exchange rate, exceeded the level of 2013 by 34.3%. Undoubtedly, such a rapid increase in wages was a positive trend in the development of Ukraine's domestic economy.

Analysis of the relative size of average monthly wage shows that it was a powerful lever to reduce production costs and maintain exclusively the price competitiveness of Ukrainian products. This is evidenced by a comparison of hourly labor costs in the EU and Ukraine. In particular, according to Eurostat, in 2019 in the EU-27 the average hourly labor cost was 27.7 euros. The highest it was in Norway - 50.2 euros, Denmark - 44.8; Luxembourg - 41.9; Iceland - 41.2; and Belgium - 40.5 euros, and the lowest - in Lithuania - 9.4 euros, Romania - 7.7 and Bulgaria - 6.0 euros [22]. According to our calculations, in 2019 in Ukraine the average hourly labor cost was 5.2 euros. Such a relatively low level served, on the one hand, as a factor in increasing the price competitiveness of Ukrainian export products, and on the other hand, as a lever for pushing the available in Ukraine skilled labor force to labor migration.

Conclusions

Examining competitiveness as a natural economic phenomenon that is inherent in all economies that develop in a competitive environment, we can draw the following conclusions.

First, high competitiveness can be inherent in countries with both developed and developing economies. However, comparisons of such countries in terms of international competitiveness sometimes seem incorrect and unconvincing, because their firms do not usually compete with each other because they sell different types of products on world markets.

Secondly, one of the important factors in the development of economies is the cyclical process of alternating growth in value and price competitiveness of national products. As suggested by world experience, the interruption of this process usually occurs in countries - exporters of raw materials and semi-finished products, which, due to their rarity and limited stocks, usually maintain high demand and price levels.

The possibility of making extra profits from their sale does not encourage business to develop other activities related to processing available national and imported raw materials into consumer and investment goods, enter international markets with them, or invest in improving their value and price competitiveness. This situation in economy today has been described from different angles and received such names as "Dutch disease", "resource curse", "trap of commodity markets", and "trap of divergence".

Third, in Ukraine, the cycle of alternating growth of value and price competitiveness for the vast majority of types of export products is interrupted. The reason for this is the high price competitiveness of raw materials and products of low-level processing in foreign markets. However, this situation brings about both

additional opportunities and significant constraints on future economic growth. In particular:

a) additional opportunities because Ukraine can continue to expand export activities in traditional international markets of raw materials and products of low-level processing. This will encourage the government and business to invest in the development of appropriate infrastructure, and to create additional jobs for its maintenance;

b) significant limitations are that Ukraine will not be able to endlessly raise the sales of grain, iron ore, metal, ferroalloys, waste oil and other raw materials on global markets. In addition, the relatively small added value created by their production will continue to doom Ukraine's economy to low wages and labor migration.

Fourth, Ukraine's economy will not be able to overcome the above-mentioned development constraints on its own with the help of market forces (demand, supply, prices) alone. This means that in the context of search for a new strategy of economic growth, the issues that are most relevant are not the intensification of export activities, but the upgrade in the composition of the largest groups of merchandise exports.

In particular, among them it is advisable to give leading positions to new groups, which, on the one hand, have an increased technological complexity and are capable to generate more added value, and on the other – are characterized by a rather high value competitiveness in the international markets. Given these criteria, the role of new domestic leaders in exports can be claimed, in addition to the already mentioned product groups (insulated wires, cables and other insulated electrical conductors; fiber optic cables; turbojet engines, and turboprop and other gas turbines), by such product groups as weapons, ammunition, their parts and accessories; electric heating devices and apparatus; vessels intended for the carriage of persons or goods; tugs and pushers; parts of aircraft; cars for transportation of passengers, cargoes, including self-propelled; steam turbines and other steam turbines; and women's and men's clothing.

Fifth, the replacement of leading product groups in Ukraine's exports is a long-term problem, which cannot be solved quickly with the help of standard tools of foreign trade development like optimization of the geography of international markets, conclusion of bilateral trade agreements between Ukraine and other countries, introduction of an organizational and legal mechanism of credit and export insurance, etc. This is due to the fact that the roots of the problem are much deeper - in the field of product properties, and their compliance with consumer preferences and the buyers' purchasing power. The fact that the properties of Ukrainian products with increased value competitiveness, still do not meet the consumer expectations of the participants of international markets is evidenced by their relatively low exports. For example, in 2019, Ukraine exported worth of 244.3 million USD of the product group "steam turbines and other steam turbines", while Poland - 3372.0 million USD, i.e. almost 14 times more.

Sixth, today the question is becoming more and more relevant: do modern Ukrainian reforms raise the opportunities for products with increased value

competitiveness and technological complexity to become part of the largest export groups in the near future? According to the study's results, that can be argued. Formal reports of public authorities on the reform of Ukraine's economy seem clear, and large-scale.

For example, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine of the IX convocation during its 1st and 2nd sessions (August 2019 - January 2020) adopted 155 laws. And such intense legislative activity was no exception to the rule. Thus, during the first two sessions, the Verkhovna Rada of the VIII convocation passed 140 laws (December 2014 - August 2015). However, analysis of the real facts shows that current reforms have not yet acquired the critical force that would be sufficient for the development of industries that produce items of high technological complexity. In particular, while in 2013 in Ukraine the volume of sales per capita of these products, which are mainly included in of the XVI, XVII, and XVIII export commodity groups, amounted to 233.6 USD, in 2019 it was 131.9 USD.

Recommendations for the use of the research results

The research only made it possible to find answers to some important questions of today. In particular, it was found that the key to future accelerated economic growth of Ukraine and a significant increase in living standards of this country's population is not the development of exports but rather that of industries that produce certain items with a high level of value competitiveness and technological complexity. In addition, it has been established that current institutional reforms have not yet brought Ukraine closer to achieving this goal. At the same time, these scientific results raise even more new questions. In our opinion, the most important among them are the following: how in the future the world markets will develop, in which Ukraine can potentially increase exports of products with increased value competitiveness and technological complexity; what the government's mechanism to encourage expansion of output and exports of such items should be like; whether the new centers of global economic growth will be able to generate additional demand for them; and how the regulatory framework for innovation in the corresponding areas can be improved in order to focus this country's limited available scientific potential to their development? At the same time, it should be understood that the emergence of these and other issues, on the one hand, is quite normal for science, and is an incentive to seek new knowledge, and on the other – is an additional obstacle to economic reform. The point is that politicians are not always ready to take risks and to solve long-term economic problems with many unknowns by trial and error, because they mostly need fast and bright results between government elections. Probably this explains why in Ukraine and other countries there are still no examples of successful implementation of programs to increase product competitiveness, while the programs to increase exports are in excess. It follows that in the future only those countries will be able to overcome the above-mentioned tradition, where they will find effective levers to combine the efforts of far-sighted politicians and inquisitive scientists.

References

1. Ketels, C. (2010, Oct. 20). Export competitiveness: reversing the logic. Harvard business school Working knowledge. Retrieved from https://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/export-competitiveness-reversing-the-logic
2. WTO (2020). World trade statistical review 2020. Geneva. Retrieved from https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/statis_e/wts2020_e/wts2020_e.pdf
3. De Loecker, J. (2004). Do exports generate higher productivity? Evidence from Slovenia. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. *LICOS Discussion Paper,* 151. Retrieved from https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/74870/1/dp151.pdf
4. Delgado, M., Ketels, C., Porter ,M.E., Stern, S. (2012, July). The determinants of national competitiveness. *NBER Working paper,* 18249. Retrieved from https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w18249/w18249.pdf; https://doi.org/10.3386/w18249
5. Atkinson, R.D. (2013, August). Competitiveness, Innovation and Productivity: Clearing up the Confusion. Information Technology and Innovation Foundation. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://antonioviader.com/phocadownloadpap/ use rupload/toni/Innovation_Policies/EU_Competitiveness_and_Growth/ITIF%20Compe titiveness%20Innovation-Productivity%20Clearing%20Up%20Confusion. pdf
6. Aiginger, K., Bärenthaler-Sieber, S., Vogel, J. (2013). Competitiveness under new perspectives. *WWW for Europe Working paper*, 44. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/economy/Competitiveness-under-New-Perspectives.pdf
7. Martin, R.L. (2003). A Study on the factors of regional competitiveness. A draft final report for the European commission directorate-General regional holicy. Cambridge: University of Cambridge. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/ regional_ policy/ sources/docgener/studies/pdf/3cr/competitiveness.pdf
8. Ambastha, A., Momaya, K. (2004). Competitiveness of firms: review of theory, frameworks and models. *Singapore management review,* 26: 1, 45-61. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2146487
9. Piatkowski, M. (2012). Factors strengthening the competitive position of SME sector enterprises. An example for Poland. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 269-278. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/ article/pii/S1877042812044631; https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.1001
10. World Economic Forum (2019). The global competitiveness report 2019. Geneva. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_TheGlobal CompetitivenessReport 2019.pdf
11. IMD World competitiveness yearbook 2019 (2019). International institute for management development. Lausanne. Retrieved from https://www.nesdc.go.th/ article_attach/article_file_20191114160558.pdf
12. Stevans, L.K., Neelankavil, J.P., Mendoza, R. Shankar, S. (2012). The economic competitiveness of countries: a principal factors approach. *International journal of economics and finance*, 4: 12, 76-90. Retrieved from http://ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijef/article/view/21720; https://doi.org/ 10.5539/ijef.v4n12p76

13. Stanickova, M. (2015). Classifying the EU competitiveness factors using multivariate statistical methods. *Procedia economics and finance,* 23, 313-320. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00508-0
14. Guerrieri, P., Maggiolini, P., Zezza, G. (1993, February). The dynamics of international competitiveness: first results from an analysis at the industry level. *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 129(3), 451-471. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02707997
15. Voinescu, R., Moisoiu, C. (2015). Competitiveness, theoretical and policy approaches. Towards a more competitive EU. *Procedia economics and finance,* 22, 512-521. Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82701554.pdf; https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00248-8
16. Borozan, D. (2008, May). Regional competitiveness: some conceptual issues and policy implications. *Interdisciplinary management research,* 4, 50-63. Retrieved from http://www.efos.unios.hr/repec/osi/journl/PDF/InterdisciplinaryManagement ResearchIV/IMR4a03.pdf
17. Siudek, T., Zawojska, A. (2014). Competitiveness in the economic concepts, theories and empirical research. *Acta Scientiarum Polonorum. Oeconomia,* 13 (1), 91-108. Retrieved from http://www.oeconomia.actapol.net/pub/13_1_91.pdf
18. Cezar, R., Cartellier, F. (2019, July-August). Price and non-price competitiveness: lessons from global value chains. *Bulletinde la Banque de France,* 224/2. Retrieved from https://publications.banque-france.fr/sites/default/ files/medias/documents/819223_bdf224-2_competitiveness_v5.pdf
19. OECD. Unit value index. Glossary statistical terms. Retrieved from https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=2810
20. Kostoska, O., Mitrevski, P.J., Angeleski, M., Mancheski, G. (2012, October). Measuring the qualitative competitiveness of the Macedonian economy. In: *Proc. of the 2nd International scientific conference "Researching economic development and entrepreneurship in transition economies"* (REDETE 2012) (p. 76-86). Banja Luka. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257880591_ Measuring_the_Qualitative_Competitiveness_of_the_Macedonian_Economy
21. Benkovskis K., Wörz J.(2013, November). Non-price competitiveness of exports from emerging countries. European Central Bank. Working Paper Series, 1612. 27 p. Retrieved from https://www.comp-net.org/fileadmin/_compnet/user_upload/ research/Trade_and_Com petitiveness/ecbwp1612.pdf
22. Labour costs annual data – NACE Rev. 2. Luxembourg: Eurostat. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/tps00173/default/table?lang=en

Received 19.04.21.
Reviewed 26.05.21.
Signed for print 29.06.21.

***Олег Пустовойт*[2]**

ЦІНОВА ТА ЦІННІСНА КОНКУРЕНТОСПРОМОЖНІСТЬ ТОВАРНОГО ЕКСПОРТУ УКРАЇНИ

В економічній науці "конкурентоспроможність" і надалі залишається занадто загальним поняттям, і його використання в прикладних дослідженнях не дає змоги поєднувати їх результати та дійти однозначних висновків. Цей процес також ускладнюється тим, що поняття є композитним і має дві складові частини – цінову та ціннісну конкурентоспроможність. Остання може виконувати роль індикатора якісних змін в економіці. Проте цей аспект конкурентоспроможності в країнах, що розвиваються, поки що залишається поза увагою науковців. Тому напевно можна стверджувати, що сьогодні не існує досліджень, в яких із високим рівнем точності вдалося проаналізувати ціннісну конкурентоспроможність експорту в таких країнах. Зазвичай економісти спрямовують свої зусилля на аналіз експортної цінової конкурентоспроможності та один із основних її чинників – обмінний курс національної валюти. Однак цей підхід має обмежені пізнавальні можливості, тому що появу нових центрів глобального зростання, таких як Китай та Індія, неможливо пояснити, спираючись лише на високу цінову конкуренто-спроможність їхнього експорту.

У статті здійснено спробу вирішити окремі накопичені проблеми в економічній науці. Зокрема, на основі результатів аналізу сучасних визначень поняття "конкурентоспроможність" запропоновано розширити його зміст, узагальнивши з його допомогою рівень відповідності товару (послуги) споживчим перевагам учасників ринку. Це концептуальне положення використано для поглиблення розуміння базової, ціннісної та цінової конкурентоспроможності продукції. Розроблено методику оцінювання домінуючої ролі ціннісної / цінової конкуренто-спроможності експорту в забезпеченні його динаміки. За підсумками апробації методики виявлено, що на експортних ринках України циклічний процес почергового зростання ціннісної або цінової конкурентоспроможності національної продукції переважно перерваний. Причиною цього є висока цінова конкурентоспроможність сировинного експорту, що досягається переважно за рахунок заниженого рівня оплати праці в економіці.

[2] **Пустовойт, Олег Валентинович** – д-р екон. наук, провідний науковий співробітник відділу секторальних прогнозів та кон'юнктури ринків, ДУ "Інститут економіки та прогнозування НАН України" (вул. П.Мирного, 26, Київ, 01011), e-mail: avvit@ukr.net

На міжнародних ринках ціннісна конкурентоспроможність притаманна відносно невеликому числу товарних груп української продукції. Серед них такі: проводи ізольовані, кабелі та інші ізольовані електричні провідники; кабелі волоконно-оптичні; двигуни турбореактивні, турбогвинтові та інші газові турбіни, зброя, боєприпаси, їх частини та приладдя; електронагрівальні прилади та апарати; судна, призначені для перевезення людей або вантажів; буксири та судна-штовхачі; частини літальних апаратів; вагони для перевезень пасажирів, вантажів, у тому числі самохідні; турбіни на водяній парі та інші парові турбіни; жіночий, чоловічий одяг. Обґрунтовано, що з точки зору пошуку нової стратегії економічного зростання України найбільшої актуальності набувають питання не активізації експортної діяльності, а оновлення складу найбільших експортних товарних груп. Лідируючі позиції серед них мають посісти товари з великою часткою доданої вартості, підвищеним рівнем технологічної складності та ціннісної конкурентоспроможності. Початок цього процесу означатиме появу нових якісних змін в економіці, ефективності державної політики щодо її реформування.

Ключові слова: *експорт, імпорт, товари, послуги, споживчі переваги, одинична вартість, базова, ціннісна та цінова конкурентоспроможність, економічне зростання*