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ABSTRACT
This study intends to ascertain how food and beverage product innovation and creativity affect marketing performance via competitive advantage for MSMEs that are Aspemtari members. A questionnaire was used to collect data for this study, which was conducted using a quantitative methodology. Members of MSMEs make up both the population and sample in this study. The Aspemtari person has 45 members. Sampling method utilizing saturated samples and SmartPls analysis as a support tool. The findings of this study, product innovation has a positive and significantly effect on competitive advantages. However, creative output does not significantly and negatively effect competitive advantage. Innovation product and innovation and creativity product not has a positive and significant effect on marketing performance. Competitive advantage has an effect positive and significant on marketing performance Aspemtari MSMEs.
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INTRODUCTION

MSMEs, or Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, are crucial to a nation's economy. However, numerous MSMEs struggle with a variety of issues related to marketing effectiveness. One of the issues that frequently arises is the absence of product innovation and inventiveness. MSMEs frequently encounter obstacles and hurdles in enhancing marketing performance because of these issues.

In MSMEs, a lack of product innovation can be a significant barrier to marketing success. MSMEs could find it challenging to satisfy the expanding wants and preferences of customers without innovation. Customers may occasionally become disinterested in the same goods or services or search for more appealing alternatives. Because MSME players create products that are relatively new to the market, unheard of in a number of market segments, new to the company, never before created within the company, new to the company and the market, and products that have never been owned by the company, product innovation is said to be good. company, which is not yet available on the market (Harini et al., 2022).

In addition, a lack of inventiveness in product development can harm MSMEs' marketing results. In a market with severe competition, less appealing or less inventive products typically struggle to stick out. Customers today frequently seek out goods that are distinctive, intriguing, and clearly beneficial. MSMEs run the danger of losing market share and even consumers if they are unable to satisfy customer expectations with innovative products. Food MSMEs maintain authenticity in product updates, updated products are not imitations, products have varying levels of changes, frequently make product changes, the products produced are suitable and safe for consumption, and the products have good quality, all of which are said to indicate that product creativity is very good (Harini et al., 2022).

Other facets of marketing success might be impacted by limitations in MSMEs' ability to innovate and be creative with their products. For instance, a product's unattractiveness can interfere with advertising and marketing campaigns. Marketing efforts may fail to successfully draw in customers when marketing an unattractive product.

Lack of product innovation and product creativity can also make MSMEs less competitive in a market that is constantly changing. MSMEs are encouraged to innovate and produce more enticing products by fierce competition. Without it, MSMEs risk getting stuck using outmoded or irrelevant business models, which will lead to lower sales and slower business growth. Innovation can aid SMEs in enhancing operational efficiency and developing competitive advantages that are comparable to or superior to those of other companies (Lestari et al., 2020). Several MSMEs who are a part of the Kediri City Food and Beverage Entrepreneurs Association (Aspemtari), a community of food and beverage producers, have experienced this.

The Kediri City Cooperatives and MSMEs Service is in charge of incorporating this producer community. The government of Kediri City
frequently provides coaching and business support to producers who are a part of this community.

In order to improve their marketing performance, MSMEs must comprehend product innovation and product creativity in light of the various issues mentioned above. MSMEs must learn how to innovate and be creative in order to create new products or services that can satisfy consumer needs and preferences. MSMEs can boost their competitiveness, increase market share, boost sales, and succeed in business by continuously developing new products and increasing product creativity. The 2 (two) key competencies of creativity and innovation allow businesses to use specific resources to their advantage and perform better (Ferreira et al., 2020). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to ascertain how product innovation, and product creative food and beverage effect marketing performance, the role competitive advantage.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Innovation Product

A business needs to be able to innovate in order to adapt to a dynamic environment, which means it needs to be able to develop fresh viewpoints and concepts, offer novel products, and enhance performance that pleases customers (Utaminingsih, 2016). Innovation is one of the most important tools for boosting market share and giving businesses a competitive edge, which positively affects business performance and puts them in a better position in the market (Ferreira et al., 2021). To put it another way, innovation is a valuable tool that can be employed to enhance and support business in order to build a competitive advantage that is equal to or greater than that of foreign competitors and thereby achieve sustainable economic development (Distanont & Khongmalai, 2020).

New products for the business world, new product lines, additions to existing product lines, revisions to existing products, and redetermination or reduction of costs are all examples of innovation in this context, according to (Sarjita, 2017). Products that have undergone the addition of numerous new product variations as well as new products that copy the same design and raw materials as goods produced by other manufacturers are indicators of the product innovation variable.

H1: Effect of Product Innovation on Competitive Advantage.

Creativity Product

In order to think freely and generate new creative ideas or ideas that can result in useful innovations, a person must connect and, at the same time, reassemble knowledge in their mind (Hasbiadi et al., 2021). Because there is no variation in the emergence of ideas and because it only happens when someone is in a complex situation, creativity is the result of the desire to satisfy needs for novelty, boredom, or saturation (Harini et al., 2022).
According to Alma (2014), creativity is the capacity to produce novel works. The new products that are variations of old products while maintaining the authenticity of the original product, the new products that go through several testing stages to produce variations of products that consumers are interested in, and the new products that continue to pay attention to good quality and product ideas that are currently in demand are examples of indicators of the product creativity variable.

H2: Effect of Product Creativity on Competitive Advantage

**Competitive Advantage**

According to Afsharghasemi (2013), a company's competitive advantage is its ability to generate distinctive and superior value in comparison to its current or potential rivals. According to Suwarman et al. (2010), marketing performance is a gauge of how well the organization as a whole performs its marketing process activities. Each MSME has chosen its own approach. MSMEs strive to develop the best strategy and stand out from rival or similar-product producing businesses.

Indah and Devi (2013) claim that new products with competitive prices, better quality than the competition, the ability to precisely meet customer demand in terms of quantity, product types, and timing, as well as new products that accommodate shifting consumer needs and preferences are all examples of competitive advantage indicators.

H3: Effect of Competitive Advantage on Marketing Performance

**Marketing Performance**

According to Morgan (2012), marketing disciplines have paid a lot of attention to how marketing contributes to a company's financial performance. According to Kurniawan (2019), marketing effectiveness is a factor that is frequently used to gauge the effectiveness of a company strategy.

The new products that have seen an increase in sales compared to previous products, the new products that have seen an increase in sales strategy compared to previous products, the new products that have never seen returns, and the new products that have been marketed make up the indicators of the marketing performance variable in a larger region than the prior product (Sarjita, 2017).

H4: Effect of Innovation Product on Marketing Performance

H5: Effect of Creativity Product on Marketing Performance

**Research Model**

A research model is described by Misno et al. (2021) as an overall picture or representation of the variables raised and hypotheses examined in a study. The goal of the research model is to make the study easier to understand. Research models typically take the form of charts or diagrams that show the
relationship between variables. The following is a study model relevant to the subject at hand:

![Figure 1. Research Model](image)

**METHODOLOGY**

Primary and secondary data sources are used in this study's quantitative research techniques. Primary data was collected by distributing questionnaires, testing marketing performance variables as dependent variables, competitive advantage variables as moderating variables, and product innovation and product creativity variables as independent variables. Books and journals served as secondary data sources in the meantime. The 45 MSMEs who are Aspemtari (Kediri City Food and Beverage Entrepreneurs Association) members comprise both the population and sample in this study. This study employed a saturated sampling technique for data collection. The SmartPLS analysis tool is used to conduct data analysis. Using a Likert scale with assessment points ranging from 1 to 5, questionnaires were distributed as part of the data collection process.

**RESEARCH RESULT**

The outcomes of the data analysis, the testing tools and hypotheses (if any), the responses to the research questions, the findings, and the interpretation of the findings are all included in this section. To make sure that all of the question items are supported by evidence and that all of the variables have a high level of reliability, validity and reliability checks must be performed prior to analyzing the structural relationship. By examining the table below, it is possible to confirm:
Table 1. The Result of The Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Djikstra-Henseler Rho (ρA)</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation Product (X1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.1</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.2</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity Product (X2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2.1</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2.2</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2.3</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitive Advantage (Z)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z3</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z4</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing Performance (Y)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Researcher from SmartPLS, 2023

The loading scale’s dependability must be more reliable than 0.708 in order to evaluate the measurement model (Hair et al., 2018). The validity of all the test items from each variable can be determined if the loading scale value is greater than 0.708. Each question item on the variables Innovation Product (X1), Creativity Product (X2), Competitive Advantage (Z), and Marketing Performance (Y) produces a Cross Loading value > 0.708, according to the results of the measurement model table above. As a result, it is evident that each variable’s question items are all valid.

Depending on the Cronbach Alpha value, the reflective measurement for the reliability test entails examining the loading indicator under the condition that the value is > 0.708 (Hair et al., 2018). This set value demonstrates that the construct adequately accounts for item reliability by explaining more than 50% of the indicator variance. The indicator value for each Innovation Product variable is 0.761 > 0.708, Creativity Product is 0.855 > 0.708, Competitive Advantage is 0.916 > 0.708, and Marketing Performance is 0.834 > 0.708, according to the results of the measurement model table above. This
demonstrates that every variable has complied with the criteria for the Cronbach Alpha value, leading us to draw the conclusion that every variable has a high level of reliability.

The average extracted variance (AVE) must be higher than 0.50. According to Hair et al. (2018), when a construct explains 50% or more of the item variance, it can be said to have good validity. The AVE values of the Innovation Product variable is 0.807 > 0.5, the Creativity Product variable is 0.771 > 0.5, the Competitive Advantage variable is 0.799 > 0.5, and the Marketing Performance variable is 0.669 > 0.5, according to the table above. If the AVE value is greater than 0.5, which denotes good discriminant validity, then all variables have discriminant validity. To strengthen the size of the discriminant validity value, it can be seen in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fornell-Larcker criterion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Researcher from SmartPLS, 2023

The Fornell-Lacker criteria can also be used to gauge discriminant validity. However, this criterion does not work well, particularly when the correlation between latent variables and the indicator loading on the construct are not exactly the same, as they are when all indicator loadings are between 0.65 and 0.85 (Henseler et al., 2015). According to the discriminant validity table above, each variable's values are seen to range between 0.65 and 0.85. This demonstrates that the research data's discriminant validity value is functioning well.

Examining the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio's performance is another way to gauge discriminant validity. In this situation, HTMT values should not rise above 0.90. However, a threshold value, such as 0.85, is recommended when the constructs are conceptually distinct, lower, and more conservative (Henseler et al., 2015). According to the table above, none of the variable values have values higher than 0.90. Because it is consistent with HTMT expectations, the value is kept below 0.90.
Table 3. Structural Model Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Variance Explained (R²)</th>
<th>R² adjusted</th>
<th>Effect Size (f²)</th>
<th>Confidence Interval (95%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 = IP • CA</td>
<td>0,313</td>
<td>0,280</td>
<td>0,438</td>
<td>[0,143;1,203]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 = CP • CA</td>
<td>0,005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,005</td>
<td>[0,000;0,650]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 = IP • MP</td>
<td>0,060</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,060</td>
<td>[0,000;0,495]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 = CP • MP</td>
<td>0,088</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,088</td>
<td>[0,000;0,851]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5 = CA • MP</td>
<td>0,705</td>
<td>0,684</td>
<td>0,111</td>
<td>[0,510;3,130]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Researcher from SmartPLS, 2023

The R² value can be used to forecast the sampling power (Rigdon, 2017). R² values range from 0 to 1, and higher values denote stronger relationships. R² values of 0.75, 0.50, and 0.25 are generally regarded as strong, moderate, and weak, respectively (Hair et al., 2018). The value of innovation and creativity on competitive advantage is 0.313 or 31.3%, according to the above table. Additionally, the contribution of innovation, creativity, and competitive advantage to marketing performance is 0.705, or 70.5 percent. As a result, at 31.3% and 70.5, respectively, the percentage of R² value indicates the medium and weakness of this study’s sampling.

Researchers can report the f² effect size to explain the presence of, for example, partial or complete mediation when comparing the path coefficient size and the f² effect size (Nitzl, 2014). A general rule of thumb is that small, medium, and large f² effect sizes correspond to values higher than 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35. According to the aforementioned table, the f² value for the Competitive Advantage Innovation Product variable is 0.438 (large). The competitive advantage's creativity product's f² value is 0.005 (extremely small). The Innovation Product variable's f² value on the Marketing Performance scale is 0.060 (small). A small value of 0.088 (f²) is found for the creativity product on marketing performance. Additionally, the Competitive Advantage variable's value of f² on the Marketing Performance is 0.111 (medium). This value is included in the small predictive.

Source: Processed Researcher from SmartPLS, 2023

Figure 2. Inner Model
It is clear from the above figure that the Innovation Product significantly affects MSMEs Aspemtari Competitive Advantage directly. By having a statistical T value of 4.369 > 1.96, it can demonstrate this claim.

Additionally, the Competitive Advantage of MSMEs Aspemtari is not significantly affected directly by Creativity Product. The existence of a T statistic of 0.228 < 1.9 supports this claim.

Innovation Product does not significantly affect MSMEs Aspemtari marketing performance directly. The existence of a T statistic of 1.434 < 1.96 supports this claim.

Creativity Product does not significantly affect MSMEs Aspemtari marketing performance directly. The existence of a T statistic of 1.257 < 1.96 supports this claim.

The marketing performance of MSMEs Aspemtari is significantly directly impacted by competitive advantage. The existence of a T statistic of 6.841 > 1.96 supports this claim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T Statistic</th>
<th>Confidence Interval (95%)</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 = IP • CA</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>4.369</td>
<td>[0.340;0.801]</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 = CP • CA</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>[-0.475;0.517]</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 = IP • MP</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td>[-0.087;0.402]</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 = CP • MP</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>6.841</td>
<td>[0.521;0.936]</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5 = CA • MP</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>[-0.075;0.454]</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Researcher from SmartPLS, 2023

Based on the table above, MSMEs Aspemtari competitive advantage is positively and significantly impacted by innovation products, according to the above table. The existence of a positive Beta value of 0.575 and p values of 0.000 < 0.05 serve as evidence for this claim.

Additionally detrimental, creativity product does not significantly directly affect MSMEs Aspemtari competitive advantage. A negative Beta value of -0.060 and p values of 0.820 > 0.05 support this claim.

Innovation Product also has a favorable impact on the marketing performance of MSMEs Aspemtari while not having a sizable direct impact. A positive Beta value of 0.167 and p values of 0.152 > 0.05 support this claim.

Creativity Product also contributes positively to the marketing performance of MSMEs Aspemtari while having a minimal direct impact. A positive Beta value of 0.691 and p values of 0.209 > 0.05 support this claim.

The marketing performance on MSMEs Aspemtari is positively and significantly impacted directly by competitive advantage. A positive Beta value of 0.170 and p values of 0.000 < 0.05 support this claim.
DISCUSSION
1) Prediction of the Effect of Product Innovation on Competitive Advantage in Aspemtari MSMEs.

According to the analysis's findings, which include a positive Beta value of 0.575 and p values between 0.000 < 0.05, Product Innovation has a positive and significant direct effect on Competitive Advantage on Aspemtari MSMEs. This demonstrates how product innovation can help MSMEs that are Aspemtari members maintain their competitive advantage because different product variations can do so. The competitive advantage of a company is significantly impacted by innovation (Ferreira et al., 2021). Product innovation is crucial for SMEs' competitiveness and aids in meeting customer and market demands, in particular (Castillo-Vergara & Garca-Pérez-de-Lema, 2021). According to Samsir Samsir (2018), innovation affects competitive advantage in SMEs producing Riau food in the Meranti Islands Regency.

2) Prediction of the Effect of Product Creativity on Competitive Advantage in Aspemtari MSMEs.

The presence of a negative Beta value of -0.060 and p values of 0.820 >0.05 on the creativity product also has a negative and insignificant direct impact on the competitive advantage on MSMEs Aspemtari. This demonstrates that MSMEs' competitive advantage cannot be boosted by the product innovation of a number of Aspemtari-member MSMEs. This is due to the fact that some MSMEs have been unable to develop novel products that accurately satisfy consumer needs and desires and, as a result, are unable to show their competitive advantage. Since creativity does not significantly affect SMEs' competitive advantage, it is necessary to boost creativity in order to give SMEs a competitive edge and improve their sustainability. Therefore, it is necessary to create new ways and ideas to improve the performance of SMEs (Srikalimah et al., 2020).

3) Prediction of the Effect of Product Innovation on Marketing Performance on Aspemtari MSME

The presence of a positive Beta value of 0.167 and p values of 0.512 >0.05 on the innovation product also has a positive but small direct effect on the marketing performance on the MSMEs Aspemtari. This demonstrates that product innovation cannot improve the marketing performance of MSMEs in several Aspemtari-member MSMEs. This is due to the fact that some MSMEs do not have a wide range of product innovations, which prevents an increase in product sales. As a matter of fact, product innovation ought to be able to give SMEs a competitive edge and enhance their marketing effectiveness (Castillo-Vergara & Garca-Pérez-de Lema, 2021). Performance marketing, which refers to increasing the volume of service use, can be improved by the application of product and service innovation (Ginting et al., 2020).
4) Prediction of the Effect of Product Creativity on Marketing Performance on Aspemtari MSMEs.

Creativity Product also has a positive Beta value of 0.691 and a p value of 0.209 >0.05, though it does not have a significant direct impact on marketing performance on the MSMEs Aspemtari. This demonstrates how MSME marketing performance cannot be encouraged by product creativion in MSMEs that are Aspemtari members. This is due to the fact that some MSMEs are unable to produce goods that satisfy customers' wants and needs, so there is no plan in place to increase sales of new products. Despite the fact that product creativity is the main factor affecting marketing performance. Product creativity is in the very good assessment criteria because food MSMEs maintain authenticity in product updates, updated products are not imitations, products have varying levels of changes, regularly make product changes, the products produced are suitable and safe for consumption and the products have good quality (Harini et al., 2022).

5) Prediction of the Effect of Competitive Advantage on Marketing Performance on MSMEs Aspemtari.

Due to the presence of a positive Beta value of 0.170 and p values of 0.000–0.05, competitive advantage also has a positive and significant direct impact on the marketing performance on the MSMEs Aspemtari. This demonstrates how product innovation and product creativity in MSMEs that are Aspemtari members can enhance the marketing performance of MSMEs because having a variety of products that meet the wants and needs of customers can boost sales and new product development strategies. This is consistent with the idea that applying competitive advantage variables can enhance marketing performance in situations where many competitors are trying to attract as many clients as they can to use their services (Ginting et al., 2020). Creativity and innovation are 2 (two) important capabilities that collectively enable companies to use certain resources to gain competitive advantage and better performance.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We can conclude the following based on the findings of this study:
1) Innovation Product has a positive and significant direct effect on Competitive Advantage on MSMEs Aspemtari.
2) Creativity Product also has a negative and does not have a significant direct effect on the Competitive Advantage on MSMEs Aspemtari.
3) Innovation Product also has a positive and does not have a significant direct effect on the Marketing Performance on MSMEs Aspemtari.
4) Creativity Product also has a positive and does not have a significant direct effect on the Marketing Performance on MSMEs Aspemtari.
5) Competitive Advantage also has a positive and a significant direct effect on the Marketing Performance on MSMEs Aspemtari.

Following are some recommendations for pertinent parties based on the findings and conclusion of the analysis:
1) The use of digital marketing is advised for MSMEs to continue enhancing product innovation and creativity by examining customer needs and desires in light of recent technological advancements and market trends.

2) Recommendations for additional research that includes factors other than product innovation and product creativity that affect marketing performance through competitive advantage.

ADVANCED RESEARCH
The limitation of this study is that it only evaluates competitive advantage, marketing effectiveness, product innovation, and product creativity. In addition, this study only included MSME producers of food and beverages who are Aspemtari community members as its research subjects.
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