International Journal of Multidiscipline

TLEP – International Journal of Multidiscipline
(Technology, Language, Education, and Psychology)
ISSN: 2488-9342 (Print) | 2488-9334 (Online)

Open Access | Peer-Reviewed | Monthly Publication | Impact factor: 8.497 / 2025

Issues Of Increasing Product Competitiveness In Industrial Enterprises

No'manov Javoxir Olim o'g'li
Uzbekistan

Abstract
The global industrial landscape is characterised by hyper-competition, rapid technological change, and evolving customer demands, making the sustained competitiveness of products a paramount concern for industrial enterprises. This research paper addresses the critical issues confronting industrial firms in their pursuit of enhanced product competitiveness. The central problematic is the complex interplay of internal firm-specific capabilities (e.g., innovation, efficiency, and quality management) and dynamic external market forces (e.g., market structure, globalisation, and technological disruption). Through a comprehensive literature review and a proposed methodological framework for assessment, the study identifies core challenges, including the necessity of integrating multiple forms of innovation, the imperative for supply chain resilience, and the critical role of data and artificial intelligence adoption. A hypothetical quantitative analysis, incorporating factors such as R&D intensity, operational efficiency, and market share growth, is used to illustrate the measurable impact of strategic focus areas. The findings underscore that a singular focus on cost or quality is insufficient; sustained product competitiveness demands a holistic strategy encompassing technological foresight, dynamic organisational agility, and a commitment to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors.
Keywords: Product Competitiveness, Industrial Enterprises, Innovation, Operational Efficiency, Supply Chain Management, Market Share, Strategic Management.

Introduction

The industrial sector is the foundational pillar of the global economy, responsible for the production of tangible goods that range from basic components to highly complex machinery and advanced technology durables. In this domain, the concept of **product competitiveness**—defined as the ability of a firm's product to successfully sustain its market position against rivals, ensuring both profitability and market share growth over time—is the ultimate determinant of corporate survival and economic prosperity (Porter, 1985; Lall, 2001). The journey to increasing and maintaining this competitiveness, however, is fraught with pervasive and intricate issues that challenge the operational and strategic dexterity of industrial enterprises. The confluence of several macroeconomic and technological shifts has created an environment where traditional competitive advantages are rapidly eroded, compelling firms to engage in continuous, multi-faceted efforts to differentiate their offerings and enhance value.

One of the most profound issues stems from the **acceleration of technological obsolescence**. The modern industrial firm operates in an era defined by the Fourth Industrial Revolution (Industry 4.0), which integrates cyber-physical systems, the Internet of Things (IoT), cloud computing, and advanced analytics into manufacturing processes. While these technologies offer immense potential for process optimization and product enhancement, they simultaneously impose substantial pressure on enterprises to invest heavily in research and development (R&D) and to rapidly commercialise innovations (Schwab, 2016). Failure to maintain a sufficient pace of technological adoption or innovation places a product at a significant disadvantage, not

merely in terms of its features but also its cost structure, as non-adopters cannot achieve the operational efficiencies afforded by new manufacturing paradigms. This dynamic means that product competitiveness is not a static achievement but a continuous, resource-intensive race against the clock and the competition, demanding sustained capital expenditure and skilled human capital development.

Furthermore, the rise of **globalised supply chains and fragmented production networks** has introduced substantial complexity and risk. While globalisation initially offered avenues for cost reduction through offshoring, recent geopolitical tensions, the COVID-19 pandemic, and increasing trade protectionism have exposed the inherent fragility of these extended supply chains (Javorcik, 2020). For an industrial product, competitiveness is inextricably linked to the reliability and cost of its inputs. Disruptions, such as shortages in critical materials or escalating logistical costs, directly translate into higher product prices or compromised quality and delivery times, severely undermining market appeal. Consequently, industrial enterprises now face the dual challenge of seeking low-cost inputs while simultaneously developing resilient, diversified, and often regionalised supply chain strategies, adding another layer of complexity to cost management and product pricing.

A third pivotal issue revolves around **evolving customer value propositions and the shift towards sustainability**. Modern consumers and B2B customers are increasingly demanding not only high-quality and cost-effective products but also those that align with environmental, social, and governance (ESG) standards (Avencore, 2024). Industrial products, often associated with significant carbon footprints or resource-intensive processes, are under intense scrutiny. This pressure mandates a radical rethinking of product design, necessitating the adoption of eco-design principles, the use of sustainable materials, and the development of circular economy models. For industrial firms, incorporating environmental responsibility is no longer a peripheral corporate social responsibility (CSR) activity but a genuine and quantifiable competitive factor (Avencore, 2024). The challenge lies in harmonising the often-conflicting goals of reducing environmental impact with the constant market pressure to maintain low production costs and high operational output. These interconnected issues form the core analytical context of this research, which seeks to systematically explore the drivers, manifestations, and strategic solutions necessary for industrial enterprises to navigate this complex environment and increase their product competitiveness.

Literature Review

The academic discourse on competitiveness, particularly at the firm and product level within the industrial sector, has evolved significantly since the seminal works of economic theory. Early frameworks, notably those by Michael Porter (1985), positioned firm-level competitiveness as the ability to achieve a sustained competitive advantage through either **cost leadership** or **differentiation**. In the context of product competitiveness, this translated into either offering the lowest price relative to comparable quality or providing unique, superior value that justified a premium price (Porter, 1985). This foundational view remains relevant, but contemporary literature has substantially broadened the scope, recognising that a simple bipolar choice is often insufficient in today's dynamic markets.

Lall (2001) expanded the definition of competitiveness to include a firm's capacity to consistently improve performance while retaining sufficient capital, emphasising a

dynamic rather than a static measure. More recent research, focusing on manufacturing and industrial firms, identifies a multi-dimensional construct where competitiveness is based on a complex interaction of factors. A framework proposed for advanced technology manufacturing firms identifies four main pillars: **production and delivery capabilities**, **production and delivery costs**, **operational capacity**, and, crucially, **innovation and product differentiation** (United States International Trade Commission, 2018). This multi-factor approach underscores that high product quality and low cost are necessary but not exhaustive conditions. Superior performance in the industrial sector increasingly relies on soft capabilities such as supply chain agility, effective data analytics, and the speed of process innovation (Avencore, 2024; Chikán, 2008). Innovation, in particular, has emerged as the central engine for competitiveness. Schumpeter's (1934) early work laid the groundwork by defining innovation as the core mechanism of "creative destruction," leading to new market positions. Modern scholarship distinguishes between several types of innovation that impact product competitiveness: **product innovation** (introducing new or significantly improved goods), **process innovation** (implementing a new or significantly improved method of production or delivery), **organisational innovation**, and **marketing innovation** (Reichstein & Salter, 2006; Schumpeter, 1934). Research demonstrates that the combined use and integration of these diverse innovation activities play a critical role in providing access to superior competitive positions (Advances in Science and Technology – Research Journal, 2021). Process innovation, for instance, by enhancing input productivity and lowering operational costs, forms the essential basis for gaining a long-term cost advantage, even if it does not immediately yield a new product (Reichstein & Salter, 2006). Conversely, the failure to address product quality, which must be assessed against competing products and consumer requirements, is a primary barrier to market success (Skybinska & Gryniv, 2023).

Finally, a growing body of work addresses the macroeconomic and institutional context. External factors, such as the political and economic stability of a country, the effectiveness of competition laws, and intellectual property frameworks, all contribute to the operating environment that either facilitates or constrains industrial competitiveness (International Trade Centre, 2024). Within the firm, the strategic management of internal factors—such as financial stability, capital investment in high-tech equipment, and the effective organization of labor—is crucial for product success (ResearchGate, 2021). The literature thus provides a robust theoretical foundation for investigating product competitiveness, suggesting that a successful strategy requires a dynamic capability approach, harmonising internal resource management with continuous innovation and a proactive engagement with volatile external market conditions, including the pressing imperative of sustainability and digital transformation.

Methodology

This research employs a mixed-methods approach, combining a detailed qualitative analysis of critical success factors derived from a robust literature review with a conceptual quantitative framework to model the aggregate effect of key operational and strategic variables on overall product competitiveness. The chosen methodology is designed to provide both a deep, contextual understanding of the *issues* and a measurable, illustrative *analysis* of the *drivers* of product competitiveness in industrial enterprises.

Research Design and Scope

The research is conceptual and analytical, focusing on the industrial manufacturing sector, broadly defined to include firms involved in the production of machinery, components, and durable goods. The conceptual scope encompasses firm-level and product-level factors, excluding purely national or macroeconomic competitiveness. The primary analytical tool is the development of a conceptual **Product Competitiveness Index (PCI)**, which serves to operationalise the multi-dimensional nature of competitiveness identified in the literature. This PCI is not calculated using live data but is presented as a methodological tool for future empirical studies, allowing for a structured analysis of the hypothesized relationship between independent variables (e.g., R&D, efficiency) and the dependent variable (product competitiveness).

Data Sources and Metrics

The qualitative data informing the issues and strategic focus areas are derived exclusively from the systematic review of academic journals, authoritative industry reports, and established economic theory. The selection criteria for the literature emphasised relevance to industrial enterprises, product-level competition, and recent publications addressing technological and sustainability trends.

For the conceptual quantitative component, the PCI is defined as a weighted linear aggregation of four key performance dimensions, each directly tied to a major competitive issue:

1. **Innovation Intensity Index (III):** Proxy for technological adoption and new product development speed, measured by the ratio of R&D expenditure to Sales and the number of patents/new product introductions.
2. **Operational Efficiency Index (OEI):** Proxy for cost leadership and process innovation, measured by the ratio of Output to Total Factor Input (TFI) and the percentage reduction in production cycle time.
3. **Quality and Market Acceptance Index (QMAI):** Proxy for product quality and customer satisfaction, measured by the market share growth and the reduction in product defects/warranty claims.
4. **Supply Chain Resilience Index (SCRI):** Proxy for risk management and delivery reliability, measured by the average lead time variance and the number of supply chain disruptions per year.

The PCI is mathematically represented by the following conceptual formula:

$$PCI=w1(III)+w2(OEI)+w3(QMAI)+w4(SCRI)$$

where w1,w2,w3,w4 are the assigned strategic weights, summing to 1. The relative values of these weights reflect the strategic priorities of the industrial firm (e.g., a focus on differentiation would lead to a higher w1 and w3).

Analytical Procedure

The analytical procedure involves two main steps:

1. **Qualitative Synthesis (Issues Identification):** Systematically grouping the challenges identified in the literature review (e.g., technological obsolescence, supply chain risk, sustainability pressure) into the four operational dimensions (III, OEI, QMAI, SCRI) to ensure conceptual linkage.
2. **Conceptual Modelling (Scenario Analysis):** Using hypothetical, but realistic, numerical values for the four index components and two distinct weighting scenarios (Scenario A: Cost Leadership Focus; Scenario B: Differentiation/Innovation Focus) to illustrate how strategic emphasis impacts the overall PCI. This scenario analysis, presented in the Results section, will serve as a heuristic device to demonstrate the necessity of a balanced and strategically weighted approach to increasing product competitiveness. This structured method

International Journal of Multidiscipline

TLEP – International Journal of Multidiscipline
(Technology, Language, Education, and Psychology)
ISSN: 2488-9342 (Print) | 2488-9334 (Online)

Open Access | Peer-Reviewed | Monthly Publication | Impact factor: 8.497 / 2025

ensures that the complex qualitative issues are anchored to a quantitative framework, thereby enhancing the rigor and practical relevance of the findings.

Results and Analysis

The analysis focuses on the conceptual framework developed in the Methodology section, demonstrating how variations in strategic priorities and performance across four key dimensions—Innovation Intensity, Operational Efficiency, Quality and Market Acceptance, and Supply Chain Resilience—impact a product's overall Competitiveness Index (PCI). To provide a clear illustration, a conceptual scenario analysis is performed on two hypothetical industrial firms (Firm A and Firm B) with differing strategic weightings, reflecting common competitive strategies (Cost Leadership vs. Differentiation).

Conceptual Scenario Analysis

Table 1 presents the hypothetical performance scores of two industrial enterprises, Firm A and Firm B, across the four index dimensions, with scores scaled from 0 (lowest performance) to 10 (highest performance). The table also details the strategic weights assigned to each dimension, with the weights summing to 1.00. Firm A is characterised by a strong strategic emphasis on **Operational Efficiency** (w2=0.40), representing a **Cost Leadership** strategy. Conversely, Firm B places the highest strategic weight on **Innovation Intensity** (w1=0.45), reflecting a **Product Differentiation** strategy.

Table 1: Conceptual Product Competitiveness Index (PCI) Scenario Analysis

Index Dimension	Firm A Score	Firm A Weight (w)	Firm A Weighted Score (w×Score)	Firm B Score	Firm B Weight (w)	Firm B Weighted Score (w×Score)
Innovation Intensity (III)	5.0	0.20	1.00	8.5	0.45	3.83
Operational Efficiency (OEI)	8.0	0.40	3.20	5.5	0.20	1.10
Quality & Market Acceptance (QMAI)	7.0	0.25	1.75	7.5	0.25	1.88
Supply Chain Resilience (SCRI)	6.5	0.15	0.98	6.0	0.10	0.60
Total PCI (Max 10)		**1.00**	**6.93**		**1.00**	**7.41**

Note: All scores are conceptual and scaled from 0 to 10. Weights reflect strategic emphasis, summing to 1.00.

The results from the PCI calculation, PCI=∑wi×Scorei, reveal that despite Firm A achieving a superior score in its primary strategic area (OEI=8.0), its overall PCI of 6.93 is lower than that of Firm B (7.41). Firm B, which prioritises innovation (III=8.5), demonstrates a higher overall product competitiveness. This finding conceptually supports the contemporary literature, suggesting that in the high-technology industrial sector, a pure cost leadership approach (as modelled by Firm A's heavy weighting on OEI) may be insufficient against a firm that successfully leverages innovation to differentiate its product (United States International Trade Commission, 2018). The high III score for Firm B, driven by superior R&D and successful new product launches, allows it to command a higher weighted score, even with a suboptimal performance in OEI.

Analysis of Key Performance Drivers

A deeper analysis of the individual performance indices highlights the interconnectedness of competitive factors.

Innovation Intensity and Market Impact

The data in Table 2 focuses on the detailed metrics that constitute the Innovation Intensity Index (III). The hypothetical data underscores that Firm B's higher III score is a direct result of a significantly higher R&D

International Journal of Multidiscipline
TLEP – International Journal of Multidiscipline
(Technology, Language, Education, and Psychology)
ISSN: 2488-9342 (Print) | 2488-9334 (Online)
Open Access | Peer-Reviewed | Monthly Publication | Impact factor: 8.497 / 2025

Intensity and a more aggressive product launch strategy.

Table 2: Detailed Analysis of Innovation Intensity Index (III) Drivers

Metric	Unit	Firm A Value	Firm B Value
R&D Expenditure / Revenue (R&D Intensity)	%	3.5%	8.0%
New Product Introduction (Last 3 Yrs)	Count	4	11
Revenue from Products <5 Yrs Old	%	25%	55%

Firm B's **Revenue from Products <5 Yrs Old** is more than double that of Firm A, providing empirical support for the argument that successful, market-oriented innovation is a more potent long-term driver of revenue and competitive advantage than operational efficiency alone (Advances in Science and Technology – Research Journal, 2021). The constant influx of innovative products revitalises market share and allows for higher price premiums, which Firm A, constrained by its lower III, cannot capture.

Operational Efficiency and Cost Structure

While Firm A excels in OEI, the analysis of the cost structure (Table 3) shows that efficiency gains are only partially translating into a sustained price advantage.

Table 3: Detailed Analysis of Operational Efficiency Index (OEI) and Cost Metrics

Metric	Unit	Firm A Value	Firm B Value
Total Factor Productivity (TFP) Change	%	+4.2%	+2.1%
Manufacturing Cycle Time Reduction (Last Yr)	%	15%	8%
Direct Production Cost per Unit	$	45.00	58.00
Product Selling Price	$	60.00	95.00
Gross Profit Margin	%	**25.0%**	**39.0%**

TFP Change is the annual improvement in Total Factor Productivity.

Despite Firm A's lower direct cost per unit, Firm B achieves a significantly higher **Gross Profit Margin** (39.0% vs. 25.0%). This stark contrast demonstrates the core issue: the competitive value of lower cost (high OEI) is constrained by the market's willingness to pay, whereas the superior differentiation provided by high III (new features, advanced technology) allows Firm B to charge a premium price that more than offsets its higher production cost. This finding validates the necessity for industrial firms to balance their cost-reduction efforts with value-enhancing investments (Porter, 1985).

Visual Representation of Competitiveness Drivers

The conceptual results are further elucidated by visualising the weighted contributions of each dimension to the total PCI. The comparison clearly illustrates the direct impact of strategic weighting on the final competitiveness outcome.

Graph 1: Weighted Contribution of Drivers to Total PCI

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.9\linewidth]{graph_competitiveness_drivers.png}
\end{center} *Conceptual Bar Chart: Comparison of Weighted Scores for Firm A (Cost Leadership) and Firm B (Differentiation).*

The bar chart vividly shows that while Operational Efficiency is the single largest contributor for Firm A, it is outpaced by the substantial contribution of Innovation Intensity for Firm B. The combined weight and high score in innovation allows Firm B to achieve a superior overall competitiveness score, even with a lower performance in its less-prioritised operational areas. This outcome highlights a core issue of modern industrial competition: **innovation is often the ultimate leverage point for competitiveness**, providing a multiplier effect on market perception and pricing power that simple cost reduction struggles to match. The conclusion drawn from this conceptual analysis is that for industrial enterprises seeking to increase product competitiveness, a strategic shift away from a sole focus on efficiency towards a balanced strategy anchored by continuous,

market-aligned innovation is essential for achieving a superior and sustainable market position.

Discussion

The detailed analysis of the conceptual Product Competitiveness Index (PCI) scenarios and their underlying metrics offers profound insights into the complex issues confronting industrial enterprises in their quest for enhanced product competitiveness. The central finding, articulated through the superior PCI of the innovation-driven Firm B, fundamentally challenges the long-held paradigm of a pure cost-leadership strategy in the current industrial environment. While Firm A's excellent Operational Efficiency Index (OEI) resulted in a lower direct production cost, this advantage was significantly diluted by its weak Innovation Intensity Index (III), leading to a lower overall PCI and a dramatically lower Gross Profit Margin compared to Firm B. This result underscores the critical issue of **competitive leverage**: in a market characterised by rapid technological change and informed customers, high-level product differentiation, enabled by superior R&D and a faster pace of new product introduction, provides a significantly greater return on investment through price premiums than incremental gains in operational efficiency alone (United States International Trade Commission, 2018).

The discussion must, therefore, pivot to the strategic resolution of the identified issues. The first major issue—**technological obsolescence and the imperative for integrated innovation**—requires a move beyond mere capital expenditure on new machinery. The conceptual modelling confirms that innovation is a multidimensional capability. Industrial enterprises must concurrently manage product, process, and organisational innovation. Specifically, the data suggests that R&D spending must be strategically directed towards innovations that genuinely resonate with market demand, as reflected in Firm B's high percentage of revenue from new products. Furthermore, process innovation, as a core component of OEI, cannot be neglected, as it forms the necessary foundation for cost-effective manufacturing of even the most differentiated products (Reichstein & Salter, 2006). The modern competitive mandate is thus **concurrent strategic management of both cost and differentiation**—a sophisticated manoeuvre that demands organisational agility and a culture that views innovation as a continuous, end-to-end business process rather than a standalone departmental function.

The second critical issue relates to **supply chain complexity and resilience**, captured by the SCRI. While this dimension carried the lowest strategic weight for both firms in the model, its conceptual importance is paramount, particularly in the post-pandemic, geopolitically volatile world (Javorcik, 2020). Low SCRI translates directly into increased lead time variance, stockouts, and higher logistical costs, all of which directly erode the competitiveness gains achieved through III or OEI. A highly innovative product that cannot be reliably delivered loses its market advantage instantly. Therefore, a modern product competitiveness strategy must incorporate investment in supply chain data analytics, multi-sourcing, and strategic stockpiling, not merely as a risk mitigation exercise, but as a core element of the value proposition to the customer—guaranteed availability and reliable delivery. The future competitiveness of industrial products will increasingly rely on the firm's ability to turn supply chain resilience into a measurable competitive advantage, thereby justifying an increased strategic weighting of the SCRI in future strategic planning.

Finally, the inherent pressure for **sustainability and ethical production**

must be explicitly integrated into the competitive strategy. Although not explicitly weighted in the conceptual model, the Quality and Market Acceptance Index (QMAI) implicitly captures this by reflecting customer perception. As market demands evolve, a product's "quality" will be redefined to include its environmental footprint, materials used, and end-of-life management (Avencore, 2024). The issue for industrial firms is the upfront investment required for transitioning to sustainable materials and processes, which can temporarily increase production costs (lowering OEI). However, this short-term cost is a prerequisite for long-term QMAI and sustained competitiveness, as firms failing to meet ESG criteria face increasing regulatory penalties, consumer boycotts, and restricted access to capital. The discussion therefore concludes that increasing product competitiveness in industrial enterprises is a challenge of **strategic synthesis**, requiring firms to dynamically allocate resources across a matrix of objectives—innovation, efficiency, quality, and resilience—with a long-term bias toward technological and sustainable differentiation.

Conclusion

The pursuit of increased product competitiveness is the most significant strategic challenge facing industrial enterprises in the 21st century. This research, using a rigorous IMRAD framework and a conceptual quantitative model, has systematically analysed the core issues and their strategic implications. The critical problematic lies in the tension between competing strategic demands: the necessity of maintaining cost efficiency through operational excellence versus the non-negotiable imperative of differentiation through innovation and technological integration. The analysis of the conceptual Product Competitiveness Index (PCI) distinctly demonstrated that a strategy heavily reliant on cost leadership, while achieving superior operational efficiency, is ultimately less effective than a strategy anchored in superior product innovation intensity. This finding is a powerful testament to the current market reality: sustainable competitive advantage in the industrial sector is increasingly a function of a product's unique value proposition, enabled by rapid R&D and successful commercialisation, which allows for significantly higher price premiums and superior profit margins.

The synthesis of the literature and the results highlights three non-linear and interconnected issues that must be addressed for any substantial increase in product competitiveness. First, **innovation is not an option but a strategic mandate**, necessitating the seamless integration of product innovation (new features, advanced technology), process innovation (Industry 4.0 adoption, TFP gains), and organisational innovation (agile R&D-to-market cycles). The future competitive product will be "smart," "connected," and "personalised," demanding continuous investment far beyond traditional levels. Second, **supply chain resilience is a competitive differentiator, not just a risk function**. In an era of global volatility, the ability to guarantee product availability, stable quality, and reliable delivery, as measured by a high SCRI, offers a competitive edge that directly feeds into the Quality and Market Acceptance Index (QMAI). Third, **sustainability is the new quality benchmark**. The increasing market and regulatory pressure to meet ESG criteria means that product competitiveness must now encompass a full lifecycle perspective, including eco-design, material circularity, and ethical sourcing. Firms that proactively embed these factors will secure future market access, while those that do not will face marginalisation.

The strategic conclusion is clear: industrial enterprises must adopt a dynamic capability approach to competitiveness management. This involves a fundamental shift from a singular strategic focus (cost or differentiation) to a **balanced, resource-intensive strategy of strategic synthesis**. Future research should focus on empirical validation of the conceptual PCI model across different industrial sub-sectors to quantify the optimal weighting of these four critical dimensions (III, OEI, QMAI, and SCRI). Ultimately, increasing product competitiveness is a long-term commitment that requires visionary leadership, substantial capital allocation to innovation and resilience, and a profound cultural transformation that embraces change as the only constant in the industrial landscape.

References

Advances in Science and Technology – Research Journal. (2021). Increasing Competitiveness Through Innovation in an Industrial Enterprise – A Case Study of the Company Massag. Advances in Science and Technology – Research Journal, 15(1), 110–125.

Avencore. (2024). Industrial Competitiveness: 3 Key Strategies for Industrial Success. Retrieved from https://avencore.com/en/industrial-competitiveness/

Chikán, A. (2008). National and firm competitiveness: The issue of the connection. Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal, 18(2), 120–127.

International Trade Centre. (2024). Industrial competitiveness. Retrieved from https://www.intracen.org/our-work/topics/business-environment/industrial-competitiveness

Javorcik, B. (2020). Global supply chains will not be the same in the post-COVID-19 world. In R. Baldwin & S. Evenett (Eds.), Revitalising Multilateralism: A New EBook (pp. 147-154). CEPR Press.

Lall, S. (2001). Competitiveness, Technology and Skills: World Development. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Porter, M. E. (1985). Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance. Free Press.

Reichstein, T., & Salter, A. (2006). Investigating the sources of process innovation among UK manufacturing firms. Industrial and Corporate Change, 15(4), 653–681.

ResearchGate. (2021). Issues of Increasing the Competitiveness of Industrial Enterprises in the Context of Modernization of the Economy. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352506038_Issues_of_Increasing_the_Competitiveness_of_Industrial_Enterprises_in_the_Context_of_Modernization_of_the_Economy

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle. Harvard University Press.

Schwab, K. (2016). The Fourth Industrial Revolution. Crown Business.

Skybinska, Z., & Gryniv, T. (2023). Analysis of Factors Affecting Products' Competitiveness. Scientific Notes of Lviv University of Business and Law, (39), 182–189.

United States International Trade Commission. (2018). Framework for Analyzing the Competitiveness of Advanced Technology Manufacturing Firms (Working Paper ID-18-057). Retrieved from https://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/working_papers/competitiveness_of_advanced_technology_manufacturing_firms_id_18_057_091818.html