
Practice of economic processes management

Cite This Article:

Filipova M., Dimitrakaki I. Evaluatuation of the competitiveness of the product offered by the dairy company / [Online] // *Economic Processes Management: International Scientific E-Journal*. 2017. № 3. Available: http://epm.fem.sumdu.edu.ua/download/2017_3/epm2017_3_6.pdf

Received
August 25, 2017
Accepted
November 11, 2017

JEL Classification: M120

**EVALUATUATION OF THE COMPETITIVENESS OF THE PRODUCT
OFFERED BY THE DAIRY COMPANY**

Filipova Milena

Ph.D., Associate Professor,

Dimitrakaki Ioanna

Ph.D. Candidate,

*Management and Marketing Department,
South-West University, Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria*

The milk market provides prosperity only to those companies that are able to satisfy customer requirements with a competitive product. The need to increase competitiveness is driven mainly by the increased customer requirements to the product of the milk - to its quality, price and service. In the dairy products industry the product itself is crucial and it should be considered a priority. Without this element the milk companies have nothing to distribute, advertise or sell. It must be competitive. The paper focuses on the evaluation of the competitiveness of the dairy companies in Greece. The major research methods used in this paper are questionnaire survey, interview, method of comparison, method of analysis and synthesis.

Keywords: *competitiveness, dairy companies, evaluation of the competitiveness.*

Introduction. The competitiveness assessment of the product makes it possible to determine the place of the product on the market compared to the products of the competitors. For this purpose, the product is compared with the same or similar competitor products, which meet a fixed demand. Both in theory and practice, for comparison purpose several groups of indicators are used measuring the consumer properties or product quality, economic characteristics and supply environment. Based on this assessment the milk production company decides how to act in order to ensure effective implementation of the product on the market.

In enterprises of dairy products during the evaluation process make comparisons and measurements products related to the products of direct or indirect her

competitors, with purpose the information extraction related to philosophies, politics, practices and measures that could help the enterprise in upgrade of quality product in order to become more competitive. While the benefits that the enterprise can reap from the evaluation of product competitiveness are: a) the identifying and the understanding of competitive weaknesses of product and b) the arrangement organizational and ways upgrade of quality. (Δεβιτσιώτης 2005, p 340)

The role of the evaluation of the competitiveness. The competitiveness is always related to a particular product and market and reflects its specificity. (Porter 1988, p.79) The complex assessment of competitiveness is preceded by the performance of a number of operations of summarizing nature. In their essence they are thorough analysis of demand and supply both on the domestic and the international market, the dynamics of quality and price of the assessed products being followed and used for determining the major directions for the creation and development of a product range demanded on the market, for the evaluation of the outlooks for sales of particular yogurt brands and establishment of the sales structure, for determining the price of the various yogurt brands and their market performance (Filipova 2005, p. 113).

The assessment of the product's competitiveness is based on comparison. It is used to establish the supremacy of one product's competitiveness over some other product, as well as the fact that a product has a smaller, equal or better competitiveness (Ribov 2003, p.343). Through such an assessment the differences in terms of quality between the products, resp. between the companies businesses are established (Filipova 2004, p. 110). The clarification of this issue aims at the development of a basis for building and algorithm and appropriate technology for determining the assessed products competitive advantage. Based on such evaluation decisions are taken with regard to the market research, development, production and sales of the various brands of yogurt. A competitor – company and base of comparison is chosen – the company of established positions on the researched market for a certain time of sales a product with a function matching that of a product assessed. For the purposes of this paper the company Fage S.A. shall be taken as a competitor – company and a base for comparison, the researched period being 2011-2015. The mark evaluating the competitiveness of the base company Fage S.A. – is accepted as equal to 1.

In the assessment of the product's competitiveness all the major indicators of competitiveness are included, taking into account not only the particular type of product, but also the systems and complexes in which it is used (Kyurova 2014, p. 151). This is done in order to secure an unbiased assessment. It is needed to quantify the properties by which the competitiveness is characterized, as well as to transform the individual indicators into a complex indicator. It is important to take into account the parameter of significance for the separate indicators and the summarized complex

indicator (Filipova 2004, p. 102). At the assessment of competitiveness of the dairy company's product it is expedient to adhere to the following sequence. First, an analysis of the product assessed is made and the system of properties and the corresponding indicators of competitiveness assessment are determined. This is followed by choosing the competitor's product to be used as a base sample of comparison. After the base sample is chosen the absolute values of the separate indicators of competitiveness of the product assessed and of the base sample are determined. After that the relative values of the separate indicators of competitiveness are calculated. It is also necessary to determine the coefficient of significance of the separate indicators. Finally, the separate indicators are transformed into a complex indicator taking into account the coefficient of significance.

Research methodology. For this paper the objects of research shall be the dairy companies of Nounou Friesland Campina Hellas S.A., Delta Standard Dairy S.A., Dodoni S.A., Kri – Kri S.A., Mevgal S.A., Olympos S.A., Tyras S.A., Fage S.A. and Kolios S.A. The dairy company of Nounou Friesland Company Hellas S.A. is subsidiary of multinational company Royal Friesland Campina S.A. with headquarter the Netherlands, Delta S.A. belong to the group Vivartia SA.E.E with headquarter the Athens and owning partner Dimitris Daskalopoulos, Dodoni S.A. is a cooperate society with headquarter the Ioannina and belong to the Fund Si Cp Russian interests, Kri – Kri S.A. with headquarter the Serres and owning partner Panagiotis Tsinavos, Mevgal S.A. with headquarter the Koufalia of Thessaloniki and owned by 43% in group Vivartia S.A. the owning partners are Papadakis – Chatzitheodorou, Olympos S.A. is a Greek company with headquarter the Larisa and the owning partners M. Sarantis and D. Sarantis, Tyras S.A. with headquarter the Trikala and owning partners M. Sarantis and D. Sarantis, Fage S.A. with headquarter the Athens and owning partners A. Filipou and I. Filipou. and Kolios S.A. with headquarter the Kilkis and owning partner Kolios Dimitris. All of them offer uniform products at the same market. The products studied here in are the yogurt 200gr produced by the dairy companies listed here in above. These are “Classic Nounou”, “Compleat Delta”, “Strained Dodoni”, “Strained Kri – Kri”, “Strained Mevgal”, “Strained Olympos”, “Strained Tyras”, “Total Fage” and “Strained Kolios”. The listed brands of yogurt are similar in range and weight and belong to the segment of the popular brands of the “Complete 10%” category with a national or regional market. The studied brands of yogurt may have smaller, equal or better competitiveness depending of the degree to which they meet the consumer's needs compared to analogical brands of yogurt offered by the competitor company. The choice of yogurt for this research is based on the fact that the overall output of the dairy companies is formed mainly by the milk and plastic trays. Fage S.A. is taken as the competitor company, Nounou S.A., Delta S.A., Dodoni S.A., Kri – Kri S.A., Mevgal S.A., Olympos S.A., Tyras S.A., and

Kolios S.A. are the studied companies. This study does not claim representativeness; Its major function is to illustrate the methodology of assessment of the dairy company's competitive advantage and to establish the trends to that regard.

Table 1. Coefficient of significance of the relative indicators of competitiveness

	Relative indicators of competitiveness	Value of the coefficient of significance Cs
1.	Indicator of quality	0,6
2.	Indicator of price	0,4
Total		1,00

The complex approach is used to determine the relative indicator of some or all absolute indicators with which it is accepted to determine the products's competitiveness. In the first case a group complex indicator is derived and in the second – a summarized complex indicator. When applying this method the parameter of significance (Cs) is taken into account, it is a quantitative characteristic of the significance of the separate indicator in the complex group or summarized indicator. (Ribov 1997, p.134) The results obtained in the survey of consumers of yogurt show that 62% of respondents indicate that in the purchase of yogurt for them more important is the quality of the yogurt. The remaining 38% of respondents indicate that the price for them is more important. Through consultations with 25 experts of the branch of dairy and based on the results obtained from the questionnaire inquiry conducted by the author among 200 yogurt consumers at the age 15 – 65 the values of the coefficient of significance are determined for the relative indicators of competitiveness of the studied brands of yogurt of the dairy companies researched. They are shown in table 1.

Evaluation of a dairy company's competitiveness in Greece. The summarized complex indicator can be determined once the values of the relative indicators of competitiveness are known, as well as of their coefficients of significance. It is calculated as a sum of the product of significance (Ribov 2003, p.357). The coefficients of significance, the values of the relative indicators and the values of the summarized complex indicator of competitiveness obtained this way for the period 2011 – 2015 for the researched dairy companies are shown in tables 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and the charts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,7,8.

Table 2. Coefficient of significance, relative indicators and summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Nounou” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

Year	Competitive advantage in terms of quality			Competitive advantage in terms of price			Summarized complex indicator
	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _U)	C _s ·O _U	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _T)	C _s ·O _T	
2011	0,6	0,82	0,492	0,4	1,08	0,432	0,924
2012	0,6	0,79	0,474	0,4	1,08	0,432	0,906
2013	0,6	0,80	0,480	0,4	0,98	0,392	0,872
2014	0,6	0,80	0,480	0,4	0,98	0,392	0,872
2015	0,6	0,80	0,480	0,4	0,98	0,392	0,872




Fig. 1. Summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Nounou” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

The analysis of the data from the Table 2 and fig. 1 shows that the competitiveness of Nounou in terms of quality as compared to the competitor – company “Total Fage” are variable, and the values of the relative indicator of quality for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 0,79 to 0,82 and at the end of the period they are higher and constant for the last three years. The competitive advantage of Nounou in terms of price as compared to the competitor - company decreases, and the values of the relative indicator of price for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 1,08 to 0,98. This is a result from the increase of the values of the absolute indicators of price in Euro of the researched brands of yogurt for the period studied. The obtained values of the summarized complex indicator of competitiveness for the period 2011 – 2015 show that the competitiveness of Nounou was smaller as compared to the competitor

– company’s competitiveness, and at the beginning of the period studied – years 2011 and 2012 its value was the highest after which it decreased. This is caused by the variations of competitiveness in terms of quality and decrease of competitiveness in terms of quality and decrease of competitiveness in terms of price as compared to the competitor – company “Total Fage”.

Table 3. Coefficient of significance, relative indicators and summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Delta” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

Year	Competitive advantage in terms of quality			Competitive advantage in terms of price			Summarized complex indicator
	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _U)	C _s ·O _U	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _T)	C _s ·O _T	
2011	0,6	0,76	0,456	0,4	0,96	0,384	0,840
2012	0,6	0,73	0,438	0,4	0,96	0,384	0,822
2013	0,6	0,77	0,462	0,4	0,93	0,372	0,834
2014	0,6	0,76	0,456	0,4	0,93	0,372	0,828
2015	0,6	0,77	0,462	0,4	0,93	0,372	0,834




Fig. 2. Summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Delta”S.A. for the period 2011– 2015.

The results in table 3 and fig. 2 show that the competitiveness of Delta in terms of quality as compared to the competitor – company is inconstant, and the values of the relative indicator of quality for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 0,73 to 0,77 being higher at the end of the period. The competitiveness of Delta in terms of price as compared to the competitor company is decreasing, and the values of the relative indicator of price for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 0,96 to 0,93. This is a result from the increase of the values of the absolute indicators of price in Greece euro of the researched brands of yogurt for the period studied. Based on the obtained values

of the summarized indicator of competitiveness for the period 2011 – 2015 we can establish that the competitiveness of Delta in the course of the whole period was lower than that of the competitor company. It is determined by the worsened competitiveness with regard to quality and with regard to price as compared to the competitor enterprise.

Table 4. Coefficient of significance, relative indicators and summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Dodoni” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

Year	Competitive advantage in terms of quality			Competitive advantage in terms of price			Summarized complex indicator
	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _U)	C _s ·O _U	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _T)	C _s ·O _T	
2011	0,6	0,69	0,414	0,4	0,90	0,360	0,774
2012	0,6	0,68	0,408	0,4	0,88	0,352	0,760
2013	0,6	0,68	0,408	0,4	0,90	0,360	0,768
2014	0,6	0,68	0,408	0,4	0,84	0,336	0,744
2015	0,6	0,67	0,402	0,4	0,84	0,336	0,738




Fig. 3. Summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Dodoni” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

With regard to Dodoni’s competitiveness in terms of quality as compared to the competitor the data obtained as a result from the assessment and shown in table 4 and fig. 3 prove that its competitiveness – similarly to Nounou and Delta – varies. The values of the relative indicator of quality for the period 2011 – 2015 are significantly lower, varying from 0,67 to 0,69 and as compared to the other researched companies it is going down to these of the base sample – “Total Fage”. With regard to the Dodoni’s competitiveness in terms of price as compared to the competitor company, the results in table No 4 and chart 3 show that during the period studied it is

decreasing. The values of the relative indicator in terms of price for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 0,90 to 0,84 and they are lower as compared to Nounou and Delta for the same period. The differences result from the changes in the values of the absolute indicators of price Euro of the researched brands of yogurt for the period studied. The obtained values of the summarized complex indicator of competitiveness for the period 2011 – 2015 give grounds to state that the competitiveness of Dodoni has been more lower as compared to the competitiveness of the competitor company – “Total Fage” , in the course of the entire period studied. Dodoni’s competitiveness showed the highest values at the beginning of the period studied, it decreased in 2014, 2015. This is so because the values of Dodoni’s absolute indicator of price in Euro in years 2011 - 2015 were higher than those of the competitor company and the values of the absolute indicator of quality were lower than those of the competitor company – “Total Fage” – in the course of the period studied.

Table 5. Coefficient of significance, relative indicators and summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Kri - Kri” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

Year	Competitive advantage in terms of quality			Competitive advantage in terms of price			Summarized complex indicator
	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _U)	C _s O _U	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _T)	C _s O _T	
2011	0,6	0,90	0,540	0,4	1,03	0,412	0,952
2012	0,6	0,91	0,546	0,4	1,03	0,412	0,958
2013	0,6	0,91	0,546	0,4	0,98	0,392	0,938
2014	0,6	0,91	0,546	0,4	0,98	0,392	0,938
2015	0,6	0,90	0,540	0,4	0,98	0,392	0,932




Fig. 4. Summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Kri – Kri” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

As seen from the data in table 5 and fig. 4, Kri – Kri’s competitiveness in terms of quality as compared to the competitor company for the period 2011 – 2015 is increasing. The values of the relative indicator of quality are higher than those of Nounou, Delta, Dodoni and vary from 0,90 to 0,91. Similarly to the dairy companies analyzed before, Kri – Kri’s competitiveness in terms of price as compared to the competitor company is decreasing during the period studied. The values of the relative indicator of price for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 1,03 to 0,98., and in years 2011 and 2012 they were higher than those of the competitor company. This drop results from the increase of the values of the absolute indicators of price in Euro of the researched brands of yogurt for the period studied. The obtained values of the summarized complex indicator of competitiveness for the period 2011 – 2015 show that “Kri – Kri” had bigger competitiveness as compared to Nounou, Delta and Dodoni, and in years 2011 and 2012 it almost reached that of the competitor company. It was a result from that fact that in years 2011 and 2012 “Kri – Kri” had high values with regard to price and quality.

Table 6. Coefficient of significance, relative indicators and summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Mevgal” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

Year	Competitive advantage in terms of quality			Competitive advantage in terms of price			Summarized complex indicator
	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _i)	C _s ·O _i	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _r)	C _s ·O _r	
2011	0,6	0,70	0,420	0,4	1,12	0,448	0,868
2012	0,6	0,69	0,414	0,4	1,12	0,448	0,862
2013	0,6	0,67	0,402	0,4	1,04	0,416	0,818
2014	0,6	0,67	0,402	0,4	1,04	0,416	0,818
2015	0,6	0,67	0,402	0,4	1,04	0,416	0,818




Fig. 5. Summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Mevgal” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

The results obtained from the assessment of Mevgal competitiveness in terms of quality for the period 2011 – 2015 as compared to the competitor company are shown in table 6 and fig. 5 and prove that Mevgal competitiveness is decreasing. The values of the relative indicator of quality for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 0,67 to 0,70. Similarly to the other researched dairy companies, Mevgal competitiveness in terms of price is decreasing during the period studied, but it is higher as compared with Nounou, Delta, Dodoni, “Kri – Kri”, also as compared to the competitor company. The values of the relative indicator of price for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 1,12 to 1,04. This is due to the increase of values of the absolute indicators of price in Euro of the researched brands of yogurt for the period studied. Based on the obtained values of the summarized complex indicator of competitiveness for the period 2011 – 2015 we can state that at the beginning of the period in years 2011 and 2012 Mevgal competitiveness was higher and in years 2013, 2014 and 2015 its competitiveness is lower. In all study period the Mevgal competitiveness was lower than that of the competitor company “Total Fage”. Mevgal competitiveness at the end of the period drops down due to the decrease of the competitive advantage in terms of price as compared to the competitor company in years 2013, 2014 and 2015.

Table 7. Coefficient of significance, relative indicators and summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Olympos” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

Year	Competitive advantage in terms of quality			Competitive advantage in terms of price			Summarized complex indicator
	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _U)	C _s ·O _U	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _T)	C _s ·O _T	
2011	0,6	0,83	0,498	0,4	1,03	0,412	0,910
2012	0,6	0,82	0,492	0,4	1,03	0,412	0,904
2013	0,6	0,86	0,516	0,4	1,05	0,420	0,936
2014	0,6	0,85	0,510	0,4	0,99	0,396	0,906
2015	0,6	0,85	0,510	0,4	1,05	0,420	0,930




Fig. 6. Summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Olympos” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

The analysis of the data in table 7 and fig. 6 shows that the competitiveness in terms of quality of the dairy company “Olympos” represented by the brand of yogurt “Strained Olympos”, as compared to the competitive company is variable, and in the end of the study period – 2013, 2014, 2015 it gets higher. This is the only one of the study milk companies, with increasing competitiveness regarding the quality. In difference with the other researched dairy companies “Olympos” competitiveness in terms of price as compared to the competitor company is relatively constant in all the study period. The values of the relative indicator of price for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 1,05 to 0,99. Based on the obtained values of the summarized complex indicator of competitiveness for the period 2011 – 2015 we can state that Olympos competitiveness in period 2011 - 2015 is relatively constant and is lower as compared to the competitor company. This is because of the relatively constant values of competitiveness regarding the quality and price.

Table 8. Coefficient of significance, relative indicators and summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Tyras” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

Year	Competitive advantage in terms of quality			Competitive advantage in terms of price			Summarized complex indicator
	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _U)	C _s ·O _U	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _T)	C _s ·O _T	
2011	0,6	0,57	0,342	0,4	1,07	0,428	0,770
2012	0,6	0,56	0,336	0,4	1,07	0,428	0,764
2013	0,6	0,58	0,348	0,4	1,03	0,412	0,760
2014	0,6	0,57	0,342	0,4	1,03	0,412	0,754
2015	0,6	0,57	0,342	0,4	1,03	0,412	0,754




Fig. 7. Summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Tyras” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

The analysis of the data in Table 8 and Fig. 7 shows that the competitiveness in terms of quality of the dairy company “Tyras” represented by the brand of “Strained Tyras” as compared to the competitive company is variable and the values of the relative indicators of quality for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 0,56 to 0,58. Similarly to the other researched dairy companies “Tyras” competitiveness in terms of price as compared to the competitor company is decreasing the year 2013 - 2015. The values of the relative indicator of price for the period 2011 – 2015 are getting lower from 1,07 to 1,03. This decrease is due to the increased values of the absolute indicators of price in Euro of the researched brands of strained yogurt 200 gr. during the period studied. Based on the obtained values of the summarized complex indicator of competitiveness for the period 2011 – 2015 we can state that Tyras competitiveness was higher in the years 2011, 2012, 2013, and it was lower in the years 2014 and 2015. This is due to the fluctuations of competitiveness in terms of quality and decrease of competitiveness in terms of price as compared to the competitor company.

Table 9. Coefficient of significance, relative indicators and summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Kolios” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

Year	Competitive advantage in terms of quality			Competitive advantage in terms of price			Summarized complex indicator
	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _i)	C _s ·O _i	Value of the coefficient of significance (Cs)	Value of the relative indicator (O _r)	C _s ·O _r	
2011	0,6	0,61	0,366	0,4	1,02	0,408	0,774
2012	0,6	0,59	0,354	0,4	1,08	0,432	0,786
2013	0,6	0,61	0,366	0,4	1,04	0,416	0,782
2014	0,6	0,60	0,360	0,4	1,04	0,416	0,776
2015	0,6	0,60	0,360	0,4	1,04	0,416	0,776




Fig. 8. Summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of “Kolios” S.A. for the period 2011 – 2015.

The analysis of the data in Table No 9 and Fig. 8 shows that the competitiveness in terms of quality of the dairy company “Kolios” represented by the brand of “Strained Kolios” 200 gr. as compared to the competitive company is relatively constant and the values of the relative indicators of quality for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 0,59 to 0,61. Similarly to the other researched dairy companies “Kolios” competitiveness in terms of price as compared to the competitor company is lower in the year 2011, it is higher the year 2012 and it is constant the years 2013, 2014 and 2015. The values of the relative indicator of price for the period 2011 – 2015 vary from 1,08 to 1,02. This fluctuation is due to the varied values of the absolute indicators of price in Euro of the researched brands of strained yogurt during the period studied. Based on the obtained values of the summarized complex indicator of competitiveness for the period 2011 – 2015 we can state that Kolios competitiveness in year 2011 is lowest and it is increasing the years 2012 and 2013. This is due to the fluctuations of competitiveness in terms of quality and price as compared to the competitor company.

The values of the researched dairy companies in Greece summarized complex indicator of competitiveness for the period 2011 – 2015 are shown in table 10, Fig. 9 and Fig. 10.

Table 10. Value of the summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of the researched dairy companies in Greece for the period 2011 – 2015.

Dairy Companies	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average
“Nounou” S.A.	0,924	0,906	0,872	0,872	0,872	0,889
“Delta” S.A.	0,840	0,822	0,834	0,828	0,834	0,832
“Dodoni” S.A.	0,774	0,760	0,768	0,744	0,738	0,757
“Kri – Kri” S.A.	0,952	0,958	0,938	0,938	0,932	0,944
“Mevgal” S.A.	0,868	0,862	0,818	0,818	0,818	0,837
“Olympos” S.A.	0,910	0,904	0,936	0,906	0,930	0,917
“Tyras” S.A.	0,770	0,764	0,760	0,754	0,754	0,760
“Kolios” S.A.	0,774	0,786	0,782	0,776	0,776	0,779




Fig. 9. Summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of the researched dairy companies in Greece for the period 2011 – 2015.




Fig. 10. Summarized complex indicator of competitiveness of the researched dairy companies in Greece for the period 2011 – 2015.

The results from the research made by the authors are shown in table 10, chart 9 and figure 1 and prove that the researched dairy companies competitiveness during the entire period of research was lower than that of the competitive company. The values of the summarized complex indicator of competitiveness prove that “Kri – Kri” S.A. was the closest to the competitor company, followed by “Olympos” S.A., “Nounou” S.A. and “Mevgal” S.A. The lowest competitiveness as compared to the

competitor company was that of “Dodoni” S.A., “Tyras” S.A., “Kolios” S.A., and “Delta” S.A. It is important to note that at the beginning of the period studied the competitiveness of “Kri – Kri” S.A., “Nounou” S.A., “Mevgal” S.A., “Tyras” S.A., “Kolios” S.A., and “Dodoni” S.A. had greater values, while at the end of the period their competitiveness decreased. That resulted from the increase in the values of the absolute indicators for price in Euro of the brands of yogurt studied in years 2013, 2014 and 2015. The values of the absolute indicators for price in Euro of „Strained Olympos“ made exclusion as they remained constant except for year 2014.

Conclusion. Determining the summarized complex assessment of competitiveness aims at defining the positions of the dairy companies researched in accordance with the competitiveness established through the assessment as compared to the company taken as competitor. The numeric data obtained show “Kri – Kri” S.A. as the most competitive Greek dairy company followed by “Olympos” S.A., “Nounou” S.A., “Mevgal” S.A and “Delta” S.A. The brands of strained yogurt they offer feature low prices and good quality for the Greek market. The summarized values of the complex assessment put the remaining three dairy companies – “Kolios” S.A., “Tyras” S.A. and “Dodoni” S.A. within the frames of the almost the same level of competitiveness with minor deviations (from 0,779 to 0,757). Their competitive position is good with values above the average level and upon proper ranging of the company priorities in future shall guarantee significant success on the yogurt market in Greece.

As a result from the research conducted by the author a conclusion can be drawn that the marketing policy of “Dodoni” S.A. is orientated at the increase of competitiveness in terms of quality aiming at the attraction of loyal customers that hardly change their purchasing behavior under the influence of price changes. “Mevgal” S.A., “Tyras” S.A., “Kolios” S.A. and „Olympos“ S.A. marketing policy is aimed at the increase of competitiveness in terms of price in order to attract a larger number of consumers and this way to expand their market share. It is established based on the research made that the marketing policy of the other dairy companies “Nounou” S.A., “Kri – Kri” S.A. and “Delta” S.A. is orientated to the maintenance of competitiveness both in terms of quality and price, stipulating to the maximum extent the satisfaction of the potential customers known and supposed needs.

All the representations here in above aim at supporting the statement that for a product (incl. the dairy company’s product) to be saleable it should be competitive. Competitiveness sense is the opportunity to satisfy better the defined and supposed needs shown by potential customers than the competitors do. At the same time the proper study of these needs by the part of the dairy company and the production of a product meeting them are important prerequisites for the increase of the competitiveness and the guarantee of its competitive capabilities on the yogurt market. Based on the assessment made the level of quality and price of the brands of

strained yogurt produced can be determined and decisions for the development, production, acceptance or abandonment of brands can be made. The observation and analysis of competitors are difficult and comprehensive activities. But the information they provide will contribute to a large extent to the proper orientation of the dairy company's competitive behavior. The results obtained bring forward the actual parameters of the market position and contribute to designing, introducing and improving a competitiveness management system.

References

1. Porter, M., (1988). On Competition, Harvard Business Press
2. Filipova, M., (2005). Managing of the Competitiveness in Brewery industry, In 10-th National Symposium "Quality, Competitiveness, Sustainable Development", UNWE Press, Sofia, p.113
3. Filipova, M., (2004). Increase the competitiveness of the breweries companies, Publ. „Korect“, S.
4. Kyurova, V., (2014). Marketing in the entrepreneurial activity, University PH "Neofit Rilski", Blagoevgrad
5. Ribov, M., (2003). Management of Tourism Competitiveness, Publ.Trakia-M, S., 2003
6. Ribov, M., (1997). Competition and Competitiveness of the Tourism Product, Univ. Publ."Stopanstvo", S
7. Velev, Ml., (2004). Evaluation and Analysis of Company Competitiveness, Publ. „Softtrade", S.
8. Βέττας Ν. – Κατσουλάκος Γ., (2000). Πολιτική ανταγωνισμού & Ρυθμιστική πολιτική. Εκδόσεις Τυποθύτω.
9. Δερβιτσιώτης Κ., (2005), «Διοίκηση ολικής ποιότητας», Εκδ. Νομική βιβλιοθήκη ΑΕΒΕ
10. Δερβιτσιώτης Κ. (2007). Ανταγωνιστικότητα των επιχειρήσεων. Έκδοση Νομική βιβλιοθήκη Α.Ε.
11. Μπουραντάς, Δ. 2001. Μάνατζμεντ , Εκδόσεις Αθήνα Γ.Μπένου