

УДК 339.9:004:338.46

*V. Panchenko,**Doctor of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of Economics and International Economic Relations, Mariupol State University**ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5578-6210>**N. Reznikova,**Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Department of World Economy and International Economic Relations,**Educational and Scientific Institute of International Relations, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv**ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2570-869X>**D. Podolchuk,**PhD in International Economic Relations, Assistant Lecturer of the Department of World Economy and International Economic Relations, Educational and Scientific Institute of International**Relations, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv**ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5239-4987>**S. Vitchenko,**Master of International Economic Relations, Educational and Scientific Institute of International Relations, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv**ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8575-3333>*

DOI: 10.32702/2306-6814.2026.8.238

## BUSINESS MODEL TRANSFORMATION IN THE CONTEXT OF GEO-ECONOMIC FRAGMENTATION: A DIFFERENTIATED LANDSCAPE OF COMPETITIVE POSITIONS

В. Г. Панченко,

д. е. н., доцент, професор кафедри економіки та міжнародних економічних відносин, Маріупольський державний університет

Н. В. Резнікова,

д. е. н., професор, професор кафедри світового господарства і міжнародних економічних відносин, НН інститут міжнародних відносин, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка

Д. В. Подольчук,

доктор філософії зі спеціальності "Міжнародні економічні відносини", асистент кафедри світового господарства і міжнародних економічних відносин, Навчально-науковий інститут міжнародних відносин, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка

С. Е. Вітченко,

магістр міжнародних економічних відносин, Навчально-науковий інститут міжнародних відносин, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка

### ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ БІЗНЕС-МОДЕЛЕЙ В УМОВАХ ГЕОЕКОНОМІЧНОЇ ФРАГМЕНТАЦІЇ: ДИФЕРЕНЦІЙОВАНИЙ ЛАНДШАФТ КОНКУРЕНТНИХ ПОЗИЦІЙ

***The purpose of this article is to investigate the patterns of business model transformation in international business under the influence of geoeconomic fragmentation and to substantiate the concept of a differentiated competitive landscape as an analytical framework for assessing corporate adaptation strategies in a reconfigured global economic environment. The prevailing narrative that equates geoeconomic fragmentation with deglobalization is conceptually misleading. An empirical analysis of bilateral trade flows across 187 countries over 2015–2023 demonstrates that global trade volumes grew rather than contracted during this period, including in the United States, China, and the European Union. Fragmentation reconfigures the architecture of globalization by redirecting***

trade and investment flows rather than reducing their aggregate scale. This distinction carries direct strategic implications: the optimal corporate response to fragmentation is not full regionalization of value chains but the preservation of institutional flexibility across competing geopolitical blocs.

The asymmetric distribution of gains across three trading configurations confirms this logic quantitatively. The conclusion for international business is unambiguous: institutional and logistical flexibility constitutes a standalone competitive asset. Mergers and acquisitions in the IT sector and in strategic industries are increasingly driven by the logic of technological sovereignty rather than operational synergy alone, reflecting the new strategic calculus imposed by geoeconomic competition and containment.

The article identifies six new business models that represent structural responses of international business to the differentiated competitive landscape: emotion-first products, network-driven commerce, microsegments and microproducers, knowledge-driven customer acquisition, Conglomerates 3.0, and AI-native consumer platforms. The scientific novelty of this typology lies in its framing of these models as simultaneously globally scalable technological architectures and regionally specific in their institutional realization. Each model converts regional specificity from a constraint into a competitive asset, which distinguishes them fundamentally from the business models of the hyperglobalization era. The article further demonstrates that Conglomerates 3.0 derive market power not from vertical production integration but from horizontal control over platform interaction points, and that AI-native platforms generate entry barriers through the cumulative accumulation of regional behavioral data rather than through product or price competition. Both findings point to a fundamental methodological inadequacy in traditional antitrust frameworks when applied to platform economy actors.

**Мета статті** полягає у дослідженні закономірностей трансформації бізнес-моделей міжнародного бізнесу під впливом геоекономічної фрагментації та обґрунтуванні концепції диференційованого ландшафту конкурентних позицій як аналітичної рамки для оцінки адаптаційних стратегій компаній у реконфігурованому глобальному економічному середовищі. Геоекономічна фрагментація є одним із визначальних процесів сучасного етапу розвитку світової економіки, проте поширений наратив про її ототожнення з деглобалізацією є концептуально хибним. Фрагментація реконфігурує архітектуру глобалізації, змінюючи маршрути торговельних і інвестиційних потоків, але не їх загальний масштаб. Таке розмежування є принциповим для розуміння того, які стратегії адаптації є раціональними для міжнародного бізнесу в умовах геополітичного суперництва великих держав.

Аналіз трьох торговельних конфігурацій, що склалися у досліджуваний період, демонструє чітку асиметрію вигадів, і цей результат має пряме стратегічне значення для міжнародного бізнесу: інституційна та логістична гнучкість, тобто збереження диверсифікованої присутності на ринках без домінуючої прив'язки до одного геополітичного центру, є самостійним конкурентним активом. Відповідно, злиття і поглинання в IT-секторі та стратегічних галузях дедалі більше підпорядковуються логіці технологічного суверенітету, а не лише операційній синергії.

Паралельно з реконфігурацією торговельних потоків відбувається глибока трансформація архітектури бізнес-моделей під впливом цифровізації. Принциповим є те, що цифровізація реалізується через регіонально диференційовані інституційні сценарії: платформи-центричну інноваційну екосистему у США, регуляторно орієнтований єдиний цифровий ринок у ЄС і модель публічної цифрової інфраструктури як основи підприємницької інклюзії в Азії. Ця диференціація обумовлює неможливість механічного переносу бізнес-моделей між регіонами і пояснює, чому конкуренція між регіонами ведеться не лише на рівні технологій і ринків, а й на рівні інституційних стандартів: хто задає регуляторні норми для платформної економіки, той визначає умови конкуренції для решти учасників.

IT-сектор набув особливого стратегічного значення у цьому контексті: продукти і послуги, що він виробляє, перетворилися з нейтрального об'єкта міжнародної торгівлі на ключовий вимір геоекономічного суперництва, де інструменти стримання, зокрема експортний контроль над напівпровідниками, обмеження R&D-кооперації та санкційний тиск на окремі компанії, структурно змінюють ланцюги доданої вартості в технологічних галузях. Цифрові конгломерати нарощують вертикальну інтеграцію від R&D і виробництва чіпів до кінцевих IT-послуг, а IT-кластери формують нові вузли диференційованого конкурентного ландшафту поза межами традиційних технологічних гігантів.

**Наукова новизна дослідження полягає у розробці концепції диференційованого ландшафту конкурентних позицій та у систематизації шести нових бізнес-моделей як структурних відповідей міжнародного бізнесу на гео економічну фрагментацію: продукти емоційної прив'язки; мережево керована комерція; мікросегменти і мікровиробники; залучення клієнтів через економіку знань; Конгломерати 3.0; споживчі платформи на базі ШІ. На відміну від попередніх класифікацій, запропонована типологія будується навколо двоїстої природи цих моделей: вони є одночасно глобально масштабованими технологічними архітектурами і регіонально специфічними у своїй інституційній реалізації. Кожна модель перетворює регіональну специфіку з обмеження на конкурентний актив, що принципово відрізняє їх від бізнес-моделей епохи гіперглобалізації. Обґрунтовано, що традиційні антимонопольні інструменти, розроблені для оцінки вертикальної концентрації, є методологічно недостатніми для вимірювання ринкової влади платформних конгломератів, чия влада ґрунтується на горизонтальному контролі над інфраструктурою взаємодії, а не над виробничими ланцюгами.**

*Key words: fragmentation, deglobalization, geoeconomics, differentiation, shadowization, digitalization, inclusion, competition, rivalry, international trade, business model, regulation, infrastructure, conglomerate, platform economy, digital economy, IT sector, IT services, R&D, AI, cluster, innovation, ecosystem, global value chains, mergers and acquisitions.*

*Ключові слова: фрагментація, деглобалізація, гео економіка, диференціяція, мінізація, цифровізація, інклюзія, конкуренція, суперництво, міжнародна торгівля, бізнес, бізнес-модель, регулювання, інфраструктура, конгломерат, платформна економіка, цифрова економіка, ІТ сектор, ІТ послуги, R&D, ШІ, кластер, інновації, екосистема, глобальні ланцюги доданої вартості, злиття і поглинання.*

## PROBLEM STATEMENT

The transformation of business models in a fragmented economy is taking place against the backdrop of a deeper evolution of corporate logic itself [1–4]. The shareholder capitalism model that dominated from the 1970s and placed the maximization of shareholder value above all else is increasingly giving way to a stakeholder model in which the corporation bears responsibility toward a broader circle of participants: employees, consumers, communities, and the state. New-type digital conglomerates are accelerating this transition: control over data, platform ecosystems, and algorithmic infrastructure grants companies such market power that the traditional criterion of shareholder value becomes insufficient for assessing their impact on society. It is telling that researchers have already identified the phenomenon of Conglomerates 3.0, regional digital ecosystems that integrate payment systems, logistics, retail, and digital services into a unified platform architecture whose network effects operate at the level of a regional rather than a global user base [3]. It is precisely for this reason that regulatory systems, most prominently in the European Union, are increasingly incorporating data protection, competitive balance, and consumer digital rights into the perimeter of corporate responsibility, effectively institutionalizing stakeholder logic as a condition for the functioning of the platform economy.

A simultaneous spatial reorientation of global economic activity is underway [1; 2]. An empirical analysis of bilateral trade flows across 187 countries over 2015–2023 reveals the consolidation of three stable configurations: the US bloc (43 states, including the majority of European countries, India, Japan, and South Korea), the China bloc (46 states), and the neutral group (98 countries) that preserved flexibility in trade relations with both centers [3]. Of particular significance is the

finding that neutral countries emerged as the largest beneficiaries of fragmentation: their median real GDP gain was 0.8%, compared to 0.5% for countries in the US bloc and only 0.3% for the China bloc, with a portion of the latter's members incurring absolute losses due to incomplete compensation for rising external trade costs [3]. Asian economies play an increasingly prominent role in contemporary transformation processes, emerging as centers for the formation of new production chains, technology clusters, and innovative business practices. Active attraction of foreign direct investment, the development of digital infrastructure, and large-scale state programs supporting technology industries reinforce the Asian region's role in shaping the new architecture of the global economy [1; 3].

At the same time, the fragmentation of the global economic space generates asymmetric pressure on companies across different countries and sectors. Firms in advanced economies face the need to rethink value chains amid intensifying trade restrictions, while companies in developing countries gain new opportunities to enter reconfigured production networks, provided they adapt their organizational and technological models in time. This asymmetry creates a differentiated landscape of competitive positions in which the advantage lies not with the largest players but with those capable of restructuring their architecture most rapidly to meet the new conditions of the geoeconomic environment. Under these conditions, the study of new business models emerging as corporate responses to the changing geoeconomic environment becomes particularly relevant. It should be noted that digitalization is not a technologically neutral process: in different regions it is realized through fundamentally distinct institutional scenarios, via platform inclusiveness across much of Asia, innovative scaling in the United States, regulatory

coordination in the European Union, or public digital infrastructure in India [3] and it is precisely this differentiation that determines the character of competitive rivalry in the digital economy.

## ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

The structural context of this study is shaped by two converging bodies of literature. The first concerns the geopolitical reconfiguration of global trade. Industry-level research documents a decisive reorientation of Asian economies within global value chains, showing how the region is emerging as the primary beneficiary of trade realignment amid bloc formation [1]. Complementary analytical work identifies six breakthrough business models that are reshaping growth trajectories across fragmented markets [2]. At the academic level, the foundational tension between deglobalization and the persistence of globalization is examined through the lens of international trade flows, demonstrating that geopolitical friction does not necessarily contract aggregate trade volumes but restructures their geography [3]. The quantitative dimension of bloc-based decoupling, including its welfare costs, adjustment asymmetries, and distributional consequences across participating economies, is rigorously modelled in [4], providing the empirical backbone for assessing competitive differentiation at the country level. The specific impact of armed conflict on integration and polarization dynamics within the global system is addressed in [5], extending the fragmentation framework to include security-driven disruptions as a distinct driver of structural change in international business.

The second body of literature addresses technological transformation and its institutional mediation. The concept of smart specialization, particularly the design of implementation strategies that avoid both targeting failures and institutional lock-in, offers a normative framework for how economies might position themselves in knowledge-intensive sectors under conditions of rapid technological change [6]. The scale and unevenness of digital transformation, including its systemic risks for open economies deeply integrated into global networks, constitute a separate and increasingly prominent research agenda [7]. The digital economy, as both an instrument of globalization and a driver of structural change in international trade in goods and services, is examined in close connection with platform dynamics and data governance [8]. Technological specialization as the foundation of competitive advantage in high-technology sectors, and the broader transition of the global conjuncture from what has been termed the period of great moderation toward conditions of global chaos, together define the environment in which new industries and business models acquire strategic importance [9, 10].

Industrial ecosystems and clusters, including innovation parks and eco-industrial zones, are analyzed as enabling structures for sustainable participation in global value chains and supply networks [11]. The platformization of the digital economy, and the question of whether it represents genuine techno-globalism or merely the global scaling of platform-specific archi-

tures, is examined through the transformative potential of digitized ecosystems for international business and trade [12]. The transition from industrial ecosystems to digital economy ecosystems, together with the emergence of new models of competition under conditions of digitalized international trade, is systematically conceptualized in [13]. Innovations as a driver of digital transformation in the context of techno-globalism, along with their cascading effects on the structure of international trade in both goods and services, are analyzed in [14]. Conceptual approaches to researching the impact of digital transformation processes on the global business environment and practical aspects of reengineering business operations within the digital economy are developed, respectively, in [15] and [16].

Two further dimensions complete the analytical framework of this study. The specifics of mergers and acquisitions in international business, understood as an instrument of market consolidation, technological acquisition, and strategic repositioning under fragmentation, are examined in [17], while the role of risk-oriented financial systems in conditions of accelerating information technology development is addressed in [18]. The theoretical foundations of competitive leadership in the era of globalization, including both the synthesis of competing theories and the paradigmatic premises of global competitive leadership, are developed in [19] and [20]. Taken together, this body of research establishes that a systematic analysis of new business models as an integrated adaptive response to geopolitical fragmentation and digitally differentiated competitive landscapes remains underdeveloped, and it is precisely this gap that the present study addresses.

## FORMULATION OF THE ARTICLE'S OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the article is to investigate the patterns of business model transformation in international business under the influence of geoeconomic fragmentation and to substantiate the concept of a differentiated competitive landscape as an analytical framework for assessing companies' adaptation strategies in a reconfigured global economic environment.

## THE PAPER'S MAIN BODY

The central intellectual trap of contemporary discussions about the world economy is the equation of geoeconomic fragmentation with deglobalization. A large-scale study by economists from US universities and the IMF, covering the period 2015—2023, convincingly refutes this narrative: despite the sustained formation of trading blocs and the reorientation of a significant share of states toward trade with geopolitical allies, global trade volumes did not contract but grew, including in the United States, China, and the European Union [3]. The choice of 2015 as the starting point is methodologically justified: that year preceded the key shocks that launched the fragmentation cycle, namely the British referendum on EU membership, the election of D. Trump, and the onset of trade rivalry between the United States and China, while also allowing researchers to separate the legacy of the global financial crisis of 2008—2009 and the European debt crisis of 2010—2012 from the effects under examination.

The distribution of 187 states into three groups, the US bloc, the China bloc, and the neutral group, reflects not merely geopolitical preferences but fundamentally distinct positioning strategies in a reconfigured global environment. Within each bloc, trade costs declined; between blocs, they rose. For the US bloc, the internal cost reduction almost entirely offset its increase in cross-bloc trade, yielding a neutral net effect for bloc members. For the China bloc, this compensation proved insufficient, and some participants incurred absolute losses. The neutral group recorded declining costs simultaneously in trade with all three blocs and emerged as the direct beneficiary of fragmentation. The quantitative dimension of this asymmetry is as follows: the median real GDP gain in the global aggregate was 0.6%. For countries in the US bloc, the median gain was 0.5%, with variation from 0.1% to 0.7%; for the China bloc, approximately 0.3%, with some states experiencing losses. Neutral countries increased real GDP by an average of 0.8%, with a range from near zero in the bottom quartile to 1.4% in the top quartile [3].

This picture carries fundamental implications for international business strategy. Neutral countries became beneficiaries of fragmentation not because of greater size or technological advantage but because of the absence of rigid geopolitical alignment in their value chains and sales markets. From this follows the first structural conclusion: institutional and logistical flexibility constitutes a standalone competitive asset. Companies that preserved a buffer between the blocs, maintaining diversified market presence and supply networks without dominant attachment to a single center, obtained a structural advantage regardless of their sectoral specificity. Mergers and acquisitions during this period increasingly follow this logic precisely: the acquisition of assets in neutral jurisdictions and regions has become an instrument of insurance against bloc lock-in rather than merely a means of expanding market share.

Equally important is the conclusion regarding the nature of fragmentation itself: it does not cancel globalization but reconfigures its architecture, redirecting flows rather than reducing their scale. For international business, this means that a strategy of reshoring or full regionalization of supply chains carries risks no smaller than those of the preceding hyperglobalized model. The differentiated competitive landscape that is taking shape rewards flexibility rather than maximum concentration at either pole.

Goeconomic fragmentation unfolds in parallel with another transformation: a deep restructuring of business model architecture driven by digitalization. Digitalization, however, is not a technologically neutral process. In different regions, it is realized through distinct institutional scenarios determined by combinations of regulatory environments, infrastructural capabilities, and market structures. This differentiation explains why successful business models from one region cannot be mechanically transferred to another, and why competitive rivalry in digital markets acquires a pronounced regional dimension.

The American model is built on a platform-centric innovation ecosystem. Powerful IT clusters, where universities, technology companies, venture funds, and small and medium-sized enterprises form dense interaction

networks, create an environment for the rapid deployment of innovations across production and service activities. R&D in artificial intelligence occupies a central place: US technology companies develop algorithmic systems for large-scale data analysis, automated managerial decision-making, and digital service personalization, transforming algorithmic models into a key source of economic value alongside software products. Notably, these solutions diffuse horizontally: small and medium-sized businesses are increasingly integrating IT services into their own processes, promoting innovation diffusion across a broad range of sectors and raising the overall productivity of the ecosystem.

The EU model unfolds according to a regulatory-oriented scenario. The cross-border spread of business models is enabled through the construction of a shared digital space with unified approaches to digital trade, platform regulation, data governance, and the protection of consumer digital rights. Regulation here functions not as a constraint but as a condition for scaling: interoperability standards, common requirements for digital infrastructure, and unified mechanisms for financial inclusion create a predictable environment for international business, reducing the transaction costs of entering the markets of 27 states. International organizations serve as institutional intermediaries between global technological unification and regional specificity, accounting for differences in levels of digital development and the structure of national markets. Their coordinating function acquires strategic significance as digital platforms and payment systems increasingly operate across jurisdictional boundaries and require supranational institutional support.

The Asian model, represented most prominently by India, demonstrates a third scenario: public digital infrastructure as the foundation of entrepreneurial inclusion. The rapid spread of mobile payment systems shifted a substantial share of financial transactions to digital formats, stimulating the development of fintech and new e-commerce business models. This public infrastructure serves as a point of entry for small and medium-sized businesses, lowering barriers to digital markets and enabling broad financial inclusion without requiring them to build a technological base in-house. Active attraction of foreign direct investment, large-scale state programs supporting the IT sector, and the development of technology clusters reinforce the Asian region's role in shaping the new architecture of the global digital economy.

The IT sector occupies a distinctive place in this architecture: it serves simultaneously as an infrastructural foundation, an innovation core, and a catalyst for business model transformation in a fragmenting goeconomic environment. Competition among the United States, the European Union, and Asia for leadership in artificial intelligence, cloud computing, and semiconductors has acquired the character of technological rivalry with pronounced containment dimensions. Export controls on chips, restrictions on access to international R&D networks, and sanctions pressure on specific companies have transformed IT services from a neutral traded good into an instrument of geopolitical competition. In response,

international business is accelerating the restructuring of value chains: mergers and acquisitions in the IT sector are increasingly motivated not only by operational synergy but by the need to secure technological sovereignty within one's own bloc. Digital conglomerates are expanding vertical integration from R&D and chip production to platform economy operations and end-user IT services, converting network effects and ecosystem control into the primary structural barrier for competitors. At the same time, IT clusters in Bangalore, Shenzhen, Warsaw, and Tallinn demonstrate that open innovation ecosystems are capable of forming powerful centers of technological development beyond the perimeter of traditional giants, and it is precisely these centers that are becoming new nodes of the differentiated competitive landscape, where regulation, digital infrastructure, and human capital determine who captures the benefits of digitalization and achieves genuine inclusion in the global platform economy. A comparison of the three regional models confirms that digitalization restructures relations among the market, the state, technology companies, and small and medium-sized enterprises, but does so through regionally specific mechanisms. It is this differentiation that explains why the differentiated landscape of competitive positions reproduces itself not only at the country level but also at the firm and industry levels.

The differentiated competitive landscape carries one systemic side effect that rarely enters the analytical focus of business model research: it generates structural incentives for the shadowization of international trade. The phenomenon in question is not traditional smuggling or customs evasion but institutionally motivated shadowization that emerges as a rational response of international business to asymmetric regulatory and trade regimes between blocs. Fragmentation raises trade costs between blocs through tariffs, sanctions, export controls, and non-tariff barriers, yet it does not eliminate demand for goods and technologies subject to restrictions. Under these conditions, schemes of re-export, transit trade through neutral jurisdictions, and multi-stage supply arrangements with obscured end recipients emerge as

operating norms. Research records a sharp increase in trade flows through the UAE, Turkey, Kazakhstan, and Armenia in commodity categories subject to sanctions control, pointing directly to institutional arbitrage as the driving force of this process. The platform economy and network-driven commerce reinforce this tendency: decentralized trading channels complicate the identification of the end consumer, while IT services and digital content have no physical border, rendering traditional customs and sanctions enforcement mechanisms structurally insufficient. AI-native platforms are capable of optimizing logistics routes in real time by selecting jurisdictions with the lowest regulatory burden, which constitutes a digital form of regulatory arbitrage. The regulatory response must be systemic: requirements for supply chain transparency and end-user verification should become an integral condition of platform operator licensing, and the European Union is advancing in this direction through its Due Diligence instruments and the expansion of sanctions compliance obligations to platform operators. Accordingly, the shadowization of international trade is not an anomaly but a structurally embedded consequence of geoeconomic fragmentation and a distinct node within the differentiated competitive landscape, where regulatory asymmetry between blocs is converted into a source of quasi-rent for companies and jurisdictions that navigate it effectively.

At the intersection of geoeconomic fragmentation and regionally differentiated digitalization, qualitatively new business models are taking shape. Their defining distinction from previous waves of corporate innovation lies in a dual nature: they are simultaneously globally scalable technological architectures and regionally specific in their institutional realization. This duality allows them to be understood not merely as technological phenomena but as forms of institutional adaptation of international business to a differentiated competitive landscape, an adaptation that converts regional specificity from a constraint into a strategic asset.

The six models presented in Table 1 share a common strategic logic: each converts regional specificity,

**Table 1. The emerging business models as globally scalable technological architectures**

| Business model                        | Connection with local or regional markets  | Economic mechanism   | Competitive effect in conditions of fragmentation   |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Emotion-first products                | Cultural proximity, local identity, and regional consumer symbols                          | Demand is driven by emotional attachment and cultural meaning rather than purely functional attributes | Stabilizes demand and strengthens loyalty within regional markets even as global market conditions shift                                |
| Network-driven commerce               | Local digital communities, regional influencers, and social commerce ecosystems            | Sales channels integrate communication and commerce inside regional digital networks                   | Reduces dependence on global intermediaries and increases resilience to external trade restrictions                                     |
| Microsegments and microproducers      | Targets narrow consumer niches emerging within specific countries or regional markets      | Data analytics enables rapid adaptation of production to local demand patterns                         | Enhances the flexibility of supply chains and reduces risks associated with global disruptions  |
| Knowledge-driven customer acquisition | Uses localized educational content adapted to regulatory, linguistic and cultural contexts | Information reduces uncertainty and builds trust between firms and consumers                           | Facilitates market entry and strengthens long-term relationships with clients   |
| Conglomerates 3.0 digital ecosystems  | Regional service ecosystems integrating payments, logistics, retail, and digital services  | Platform integration creates network effects within a regional user base                               | Reduces reliance on external partners and increases control over customer data  |
| AI-native consumer platforms          | Regional behavioral data, languages, and consumption patterns                              | Algorithms enable mass personalization while maintaining scale efficiency                              | Generate cumulative barriers to entry through the accumulation of regional behavioral data that competitors find difficult to replicate |

Source: compiled by the authors.

whether cultural, institutional, or behavioral, into a competitive asset. This distinguishes them fundamentally from the business models of the hyper-globalization era, which sought to neutralize regional differences in pursuit of scale. In the reconfigured geoeconomic environment, the advantage belongs not to those who achieved the greatest standardization, but to those who most effectively capitalized on local specificity through a globally scalable technological architecture.

The Conglomerates 3.0 model deserves particular analytical attention. Unlike traditional diversified corporations, which are also characterized by broad sectoral reach and active mergers and acquisitions, new digital conglomerates build dominance not through vertical integration of production chains but through horizontal control over platform interaction points: payment gateways, logistics hubs, loyalty systems, and consumer data. Network effects here operate at the level of a regional rather than a global user base, making such structures resilient to external competition while remaining difficult to replicate outside their natural regional environment. For regulators, this poses a fundamental methodological problem: traditional antitrust instruments that assess market power through vertical concentration and market share are inadequate for measuring power grounded in control over interaction infrastructure. The digital economy requires a new regulatory framework, and it is the European Union that has advanced furthest in this direction through the Digital Markets Act and the Digital Services Act.

The phenomenon of AI-native platforms equally warrants separate analysis. Unlike companies that add artificial intelligence to existing processes, these structures are designed from the outset around an algorithmic core: competitive advantage is embedded not in the product or price but in the quality and volume of regional behavioral data. This resource is cumulative in nature; it accumulates over time and is difficult to replicate by new entrants, even technologically sophisticated ones. Combined with network effects, this generates structural barriers to entry whose resilience to competitive pressure and regulatory containment represents one of the central challenges of the contemporary digital economy. Notably, AI-native platforms are the most active in leveraging regional differentiation as an advantage: algorithms trained on local behavioral data deliver a level of personalization that global competitors without equivalent regional presence cannot match.

Taken together, the six models reflect the transition of international business from universalized global operating schemes toward adaptive, segmented, and technologically controlled modes of organizing economic activity. Emotion-first products and the knowledge-driven customer acquisition model strengthen companies' ties to domestic and regional markets; network-driven commerce creates alternative channels of market access; microsegmentation and microproduction enhance production flexibility amid the restructuring of supply chains; Conglomerates 3.0

and AI-native platforms provide higher levels of control over data, infrastructure, and customer interaction. Each of these models is, in essence, a response to a specific node within the differentiated landscape of competitive positions.

## CONCLUSIONS

The analysis conducted allows for the formulation of several interconnected conclusions that reveal the scientific novelty of the concept of a differentiated competitive landscape.

First, geoeconomic fragmentation is not a symmetric shock and does not signify deglobalization. It transforms the architecture of the global economy by redistributing gains according to participants' capacity to preserve strategic flexibility. Empirical evidence is unambiguous: neutral countries that avoided hard bloc alignment achieved a median real GDP gain of 0.8%, higher than the participants of either major bloc. This result refutes the logic of forced alignment and substantiates strategic neutrality as a rational positioning in conditions of great power rivalry.

Second, digitalization unfolds through regionally differentiated institutional scenarios: platform-centric in the United States, regulatory-oriented in the European Union, and grounded in public digital infrastructure across Asia. This differentiation precludes the mechanical transfer of business models across regions and implies that competition between regions is conducted not only at the level of technologies and markets but also at the level of institutional standards. The actor that sets regulatory norms for the platform economy and digital markets effectively determines the conditions of competition for all others.

Third, the IT sector has been transformed from a neutral traded good into a key dimension of geoeconomic rivalry. Containment instruments, including export controls, sanctions, and restrictions on R&D cooperation, structurally reshape value chains in technology industries and accelerate consolidation through mergers and acquisitions driven by the logic of technological sovereignty rather than operational synergy.

Fourth, the six identified business models, from microsegments and microproducers to Conglomerates 3.0 and AI-native consumer platforms, represent structural responses of international business to the differentiated competitive landscape rather than merely technological innovations. They capitalize on regional specificity as a strategic asset and generate new types of market power for the assessment of which traditional regulatory frameworks require fundamental conceptual revision.

Fifth, the differentiated competitive landscape simultaneously places new demands on corporate strategy, in the direction of preserving institutional flexibility, diversifying value chains, and building regionally embedded ecosystems, and on the industrial and regulatory policy of states seeking to benefit from neutrality in the reconfigured global economy. Future

research should focus on the quantitative assessment of regulatory arbitrage between blocs, the dynamics of mergers and acquisitions in strategic digital sectors, and the mechanisms through which new competition standards in the platform economy are formed and diffused.

## Література:

1. Kumra G. The great trade realignment: Asia rising. McKinsey & Company. 2026. URL: <https://www.mckinsey.com/~ /media/mckinsey/featured%20insights/future%20of%20asia/insights/the%20great%20trade%20realignment%20asia%20rising/the-great-trade-realignment-asia-rising.pdf?shouldIndex=false>
2. Yakovlev S., Davis J. Six breakthrough business models reshaping global growth. McKinsey & Company. 2026. URL: <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/six-breakthrough-business-models-reshaping-global-growth>
3. Kim H.M., Li P., Lee Y.R. Observations of deglobalization against globalization and impacts on global business. *International Trade, Politics and Development*. 2020. Vol. 4 (2). Pp. 83—103. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITPD-05-2020-0067>
4. Bonadio B., Huo Z., Kang E., Levchenko A., Pandalai-Nayar N., Tomar H., Topalova P. Playing with blocs: Quantifying decoupling. CEPR Discussion Paper No. 20664. CEPR Press. 2025. URL: <https://cepr.org/publications/dp20664>
5. Artemenko Y., Hovorov Y., Maksymova I., Kostyuk V., Zienkin M. The impact of conflict on contemporary global dynamics: integration, globalisation, and polarisation trends. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*. 2024. Vol. 7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.-2024spe030>
6. Lee K. Smart specialization with short-cycle technologies and implementation strategies to avoid target and design failures. In: Radosevic S. et al. (Eds.), *Advances in the theory and practice of smart specialization*. Academic Press, 2017. Pp. 201—224.
7. Сіденко В.Р. Виклики і ризики цифрової трансформації: світовий та український контексти. *Економіка України*. 2021. № 5. С. 40—58. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/economyukr.2021.05.040>
8. Izmaylov Y., Yegorova I., Maksymova I., Znotina D. Digital economy as an instrument of globalization. *Scientific Journal of Polonia University*. 2018. Vol. 27 (2). Pp. 52—60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23856/2706>
9. Отенко І., Птащенко О. Тенденції розвитку високотехнологічної сфери в умовах глобалізації. *Вісник Тернопільського національного економічного університету*. 2020. № 4. С. 65—76. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35774/visnyk2020.04.065>
10. Reznikova N., Ptashchenko O., Chugayev O., Ivashchenko O. Y-Reality as a Shift From "Great Moderation" to "Global Chaos": Assessment of Global Macroeconomic and Crisis Processes Through the Prism of Generational Dialogue and Development Issues. *Журнал стратегічних економічних досліджень*. 2022. № 6 (11). С. 9—20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30857/2786-5398.2022.6.6>
11. Резнікова Н.В., Панченко В.Г., Русак Д.М., Іващенко О.А. Промислові екосистеми в глобальних ланцюжках створення вартості та поставок: кластери, інноваційні та екоіндустріальні парки як чинник сталого розвитку. *Вісник Маріупольського державного університету. Серія: Економіка*. 2022. № 12 (23). С. 5—16. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34079/2226-2822-2022-12-23-5-16>
12. Резнікова Н.В., Булатова О.В., Шлапак А.В., Іващенко О.А. Платформізація цифрової економіки чи техноглобалізм цифрових платформ? Трансформаційний потенціал діджиталізованих екосистем для міжнародного бізнесу і торгівлі. *Ефективна економіка*. 2023. № 6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32702/2307-2105.-2023.6.1>
13. Резнікова Н.В., Шлапак А.В., Іващенко О.А. Від промислових екосистем до екосистем цифрової економіки: нові бізнес-моделі і моделі конкуренції в умовах діджиталізації міжнародної торгівлі товарами і послугами. *Вісник Хмельницького національного університету. Серія: Економічні науки*. 2023. № 2(316). С. 332-340. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31891/2307-5740-2023-316-2-52>
14. Резнікова Н.В., Булатова О.В., Шлапак А.В., Іващенко О.А. Інновації як драйвер цифрової трансформації світової економіки в умовах техноглобалізму: вплив нових бізнес-моделей на розвиток міжнародної торгівлі товарами і послугами. *Інвестиції: практика та досвід*. 2023. № 12. С. 5—12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6814.-2023.12.5>
15. Panchenko V., Oliinyk K. Conceptual approaches to researching the impact of digital transformation processes on the global business environment. *Інвестиції: практика та досвід*. 2025. № 18. С. 66—72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6814.2025.-18.660>
16. Karp V., Krysovaty I., Oliinyk K., Nazarova S., Semenchenko Y. Reengineering business operations within the digital economy. *AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*. 2024. Vol. 14 (1), Special Issue XLII. Pp. 164—168. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11995558>
17. Птащенко О.В. Особливості "злиття" та "поглинання" компаній у міжнародному бізнесі. *Бізнес Інформ*. 2021. № 1. С. 34—39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-4459-2021-1-34-39>
18. Птащенко О.В. Ризик-орієнтована система фінансового забезпечення в умовах розвитку інформаційних технологій. *Бізнес Інформ*. 2021. № 11. С. 172—178. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-4459-2021-11-172-178>
19. Шлапак А.В. Конкурентне лідерство країн в епоху глобалізації: узагальнення теорій та ідеологій. *Вчені записки ТНУ ім. В.І. Вернадського. Серія: Економіка і управління*. 2018. Т. 29 (68). С. 1—5.
20. Шлапак А.В. Парадигмальні засади глобального конкурентного лідерства. *Бізнес Інформ*. 2019. № 2 (493). С. 30—36.

References:

1. Kumra, G. (2026), "The great trade realignment: Asia rising", McKinsey & Company, available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/featured%20insights/future%20of%20asia/insights/the%20great%20trade%20realignment%20asia%20rising/the-great-trade-realignment-asia-rising.pdf?shouldIndex=false> (Accessed 1 March 2026).
2. Yakovlev, S., and Davis, J. (2026), "Six breakthrough business models reshaping global growth", available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/six-breakthrough-business-models-reshaping-global-growth> (Accessed 1 March 2026).
3. Kim, H.M., Li, P. and Lee, Y.R. (2020), "Observations of deglobalization against globalization and impacts on global business", *International Trade, Politics and Development*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 83—103. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITPD-05-2020-0067>
4. Artemenko, Y., Hovorov, Y., Maksymova, I., Kostyuk, V. and Zienkin, M. (2024), "The impact of conflict on contemporary global dynamics: integration, globalisation, and polarisation trends", *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, vol. 7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2024spe030>
5. Bonadio, B., Huo, Z., Kang, E., Levchenko, A., Pandalai-Nayar, N., Tomar, H. and Topalova, P. (2025), "Playing with blocs: Quantifying decoupling", CEPR Discussion Paper No. 20664, CEPR Press, available at: <https://cepr.org/publications/dp20664> (Accessed 1 March 2026).
6. Lee, K. (2017), "Smart specialization with short-cycle technologies and implementation strategies to avoid target and design failures", in Radošević, S. et al. (Eds.), *Advances in the theory and practice of smart specialization*, Academic Press, pp. 201—224.
7. Sidenko, V.R. (2021), "Challenges and risks of digital transformation: world and Ukrainian contexts", *Ekonomika Ukrainy*, no. 5, pp. 40—58. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/economyukr.2021.05.040>
8. Izmaylov, Y., Yegorova, I., Maksymova, I. and Znotina, D. (2018), "Digital economy as an instrument of globalization", *Scientific Journal of Polonia University*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 52—60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23856/2706>
9. Otenko, I. and Ptashchenko, O. (2020), "Trends in the development of the high-tech sector under globalization", *Visnyk Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho ekonomichnoho universytetu*, no. 4, pp. 65—76. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35774/visnyk2020.04.065>
10. Reznikova, N., Ptashchenko, O., Chugayev, O. and Ivashchenko, O. (2022), "Y-Reality as a Shift From 'Great Moderation' to 'Global Chaos': Assessment of Global Macroeconomic and Crisis Processes Through the Prism of Generational Dialogue and Development Issues", *Zhurnal stratehichnykh ekonomichnykh doslidzhen*, vol. 6, no. 11, pp. 9—20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30857/2786-5398.2022.6.6>
11. Reznikova, N.V., Panchenko, V.H., Rusak, D.M. and Ivashchenko, O.A. (2022), "Industrial ecosystems in global value and supply chains: clusters, innovation and eco-industrial parks as a factor of sustainable development", *Visnyk Mariupolskoho derzhavnoho universytetu. Serii: Ekonomika*, vol. 12, no. 23, pp. 5—16. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34079/2226-2822-2022-12-23-5-16>
12. Reznikova, N.V., Bulatova, O.V., Shlapak, A.V. and Ivashchenko, O.A. (2023), "Platformization of the digital economy or technoglobalism of digital platforms? The transformational potential of digitalized ecosystems for international business and trade", *Efektivna ekonomika*, no. 6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32702/2307-2105.-2023.6.1>
13. Reznikova, N.V., Shlapak, A.V. and Ivashchenko, O.A. (2023), "From industrial ecosystems to digital economy ecosystems: new business models and competition models in the context of digitalization of international trade in goods and services", *Visnyk Khmelnytskoho natsionalnoho universytetu. Serii: Ekonomichni nauky*, no. 2 (316), pp. 332—340. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31891/2307-5740-2023-316-2-52>
14. Reznikova, N.V., Bulatova, O.V., Shlapak, A.V. and Ivashchenko, O.A. (2023), "Innovations as a driver of digital transformation of the world economy under technoglobalism: the impact of new business models on the development of international trade in goods and services", *Investytsii: praktyka ta dosvid*, no. 12, pp. 5—12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6814.2023.-12.5>
15. Panchenko, V. and Oliinyk, K. (2025), "Conceptual approaches to researching the impact of digital transformation processes on the global business environment", *Investytsii: praktyka ta dosvid*, no. 18, pp. 66—72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6814.2025.18.660>
16. Karp, V., Krysovaty, I., Oliinyk, K., Nazarova, S. and Semenenko, Y. (2024), "Reengineering business operations within the digital economy", *AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, vol. 14, no. 1, Special Issue XLII, pp. 164—168. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11995558>
17. Ptashchenko, O.V. (2021), "Features of mergers and acquisitions in international business", *Biznes Inform*, no. 1, pp. 34—39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-4459-2021-1-34-39>
18. Ptashchenko, O.V. (2021), "Risk-oriented financial security system in the development of information technologies", *Biznes Inform*, no. 11, pp. 172—178. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-4459-2021-11-172-178>
19. Shlapak, A.V. (2018), "Competitive leadership of countries in the era of globalization: generalization of theories and ideologies", *Vcheni zapysky TNU im. V.I. Vernadskoho. Serii: Ekonomika i upravlinnia*, vol. 29(68), pp. 1—5.
20. Shlapak, A.V. (2019), "Paradigmatic principles of global competitive leadership", *Biznes Inform*, vol. 2(493), pp. 30—36.

Отримано редакцією журналу / Received: 30.03.26

Прорецензовано / Revised: 10.04.26

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 21.04.26