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**Technique of assessment of competitiveness of the enterprises of the forest complex on the basis of the system and synergetic process approach**

*In this article scientific techniques of competitiveness assessment of the enterprises of different authors taking into account their application in different branches of the economy are considered, the analysis of techniques is made, the generalizing conclusions and remarks to their use are created, the basic principles and requirements of creation of the system of indicators for a complex assessment of competitiveness on the basis of the system and synergetic process approach are developed. Groups of indicators for their use in the assessment of a multiple-factor integrated indicator of competitiveness are formulated, the assessment model is developed.*

**Методика оценки конкурентоспособности предприятий лесного комплекса на основе системно-синергетического процессного подхода**

*В статье рассмотрены научные методики оценки конкурентоспособности предприятий различных авторов с учетом их применения в разных отраслях экономики, выполнен анализ методик, сформированы обобщающие выводы и замечания к их использованию, выработаны основные принципы и требования построения системы показателей для комплексной оценки конкурентоспособности на основе системно-синергетического процессного подхода. Сформулированы группы показателей для использования их в оценке многофакторного интегрального показателя конкурентоспособности, разработана модель оценки.*
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For the solution of the problem of increase of competitiveness it is necessary to develop a technique of assessment and the analysis taking into account specifics of the branch of the economic entity. The assessment will serve as the instrument of comparison of the indicators of competitiveness of the branch enterprises and initial parameter of development of actions for an increase of competitiveness and the analysis of their efficiency upon the realization [1]. As the economic category, competitiveness has the relativistic nature, that is has to be considered rather competitive market or competitive goods; the goods, competitive in one markets, can be noncompetitive on the others [2, p. 12].

The system and synergetic process approach has been created proceeding from the analysis of places of emergence of the factors of competitiveness, sinergizm of the integration processes and competitive advantages of the enterprise. Considering the factors of competitiveness of the forest complex enterprises, their interrelation with the internal business processes of the enterprise as the sources of competitive advantages is created [3, 4]. The process campaign as the administrative technology allows consider the process of functioning of the enterprise and the sources of the origin of elements of competitiveness. The revealed competitiveness factors taking into account the branch and the regional features [5, 6] have been systematized, classified in the plane of business processes of the forest complex enterprise of the region [3, 4].

In the view of integration development of the forest complex enterprises of the Khabarovsk terrtoryi (the vertically integrated companies) [8, 9, 10], we understand that in the internal business processes of the enterprise certain competitive advantages due to the influence of synergetic effect [11, 12] on the factors of competitiveness of business processes are formed [13, 14]. The sinergizm received in the course of integration of the enterprises exert impact on the competitive advantages. Thus, in the business processes sinergizm which, in turn, the influence competitive advantages through the system of factors of competitiveness of the enterprise are formed. The revealed sinergizm of integration processes [8, 15] and competitive advantages have also been considered in the places of their formation at the level of business processes of the enterprise [13, 14].

Systemically considering the formation of sinegizm and competitive advantages at the level of business processes of the enterprise, relying on the process approach, system and synergetic process approach to the assessment and the analysis of competitiveness of the enterprise [1, 3, 14] has been created. The created approach allows: in details consider the analyse formation of synergetic effects (sinergizm) and competitive advantages in the places of their origin at the level of business processes of the enterprise; o reveal and strengthen formation of the synergetic effects (sinergizm) at the level of business processes; make the analysis of business processes of the enterprise regarding the efficiency of their realization concerning the formation of competitiveness of the enterprise; make the analysis of formation of competitive advantages of the enterprise in the plane of business processes; consider specific branch and regional factors of the competitive environment.

During the analysis we have considered scientific techniques of the assessment of competitiveness of the enterprises in relation to the various objects: classical economic theory [16, 17]; to the forest complex [8, 18, 20, 21, 24, 26]; to the fishery [19]; to the enterprise structure [22]; to the production of construction materials [23, 25, 27]; to the fishery [28]; to the production of bread [29]; to the sphere of trade [30, 31, 32] and the others.

In the modern science among the authors various choice of indicators and techniques of the assessment depending on the research objectives, specifics of the branch, the object of research prevails. According to the classical theory, it is necessary to apply the system, complex and standard approaches to the integrated assessment of competitive advantages [16]. From a position of system approach, it is necessary to evaluate separately the factors of external environment and internal structure of the system, and from a position of standard approach it is necessary to organize the rationing and monitoring of concrete factors of advantage of the concrete objects.

From the position of integrated approach [16, 17], at the assessment it is necessary to consider the technical, legal, market, economic, organizational, psychological and the other aspects of ensuring competitiveness.

Some researchers specify that the feature of assessment of competitiveness of the considered object consists that it (assessment) has the complex, system character, that is all the parties of the studied phenomenon are analyzed in their interrelation, at the same time, both the economic, and the other factors influencing the competitiveness are considered [2]. The others emphasize that the methods of assessment of competitiveness pay special attention to the production factors and don't consider the factors of external environment or, on the contrary, investigate competitiveness depending on the market structure and the competition on it, without paying due the attention to internal potential [22].

With the different units of change to the uniform dimensionless sizes apply the standard transformations [2] to the reduction of indicators: interval method of scaling; rank method of scaling; ball method of assessment; relative method of assessment; relative method of assessment and the interval method of scaling are more often applied.

After the reduction of indicators to the uniform look aggregation of private indicators of the factors of competitiveness in the integrated indicator or in the indicator of higher level is carried out at the several levels of calculation. The most widespread method of aggregation of the received values of factors of the competitiveness in the integrated indicator wears additive uniforms and is carried out on the following formula (the other name of formula as the average value of single indicators) [2, 33]:

$f=\sum\_{i=1}^{n}a\_{i}x\_{i},$ (1)

where $a\_{i}$– weight coefficients (or the importance of i indicator), with which an initial private indicator enters the integrated indicator;

$x\_{i}$– dimensionless rated private indicators;

n – number of indicators.

For the determination of weight coefficients the authors most often use a method of equal scales (the weight of all indicators is equal to 1) or an expert method of definition of the scales. The expert assessment of scales – a subjectivity sign which can strongly distort the turned-out result and provokes adoption of the incorrect administrative decisions.

Some authors in the works on the technique of assessment of competitiveness, investment appeal, sustainable development suggest to refuse a use of "weight coefficients" and to proceed from the equivalence of all factors. The argument in favor of equivalence of the factors and not differentiation of the scales of separate indicators is a lack of strict and rather reasonable technique of such differentiation. The authors believe that the lack of "scales" is much better, than existence subjective expert than the evaluations [7, 21]. With it it is necessary to agree and accept the equivalence of factors or potentials of the objects in the conditions of transitional economy as the major initial parcel by the evaluation of difficult objects.

The other authors incline to the assessment of competitiveness of the enterprise as the competitiveness of its goods [16, 24, 32]. Common fault of these methods of the assessment of competitiveness is the fact that the authors completely identify competitiveness of the enterprise as the competitiveness of its production, without the all other factors. Competitiveness of the enterprise takes the wider area, than the competitiveness of production as the object of its appendix is the all production economic activity of the organization.

The made analysis of techniques of the assessment of competitiveness has allowed draw the following generalizing conclusions and remarks to their use: the assessment of competitiveness of the enterprise has to be executed in the form of a complex integrated assessment; complexity of indicators for the assessment of competitiveness isn't defined therefore each author understands complexity in the own way; absence at many authors of the indicators of assessment of the external, competitive environment of the enterprise; lack of the important indicators characterizing internal state of the enterprise; selection of indicators for the assessment often has subjective character; many indicators of assessment it is groundless aren't considered by the authors; lack of a complex assessment of influence of the internal environment of the enterprise; lack of the accounting of the branch and regional features; excessive attachment of assessment of competitiveness to the branch factors, lack of universality of the technique; at selection of indicators the balance of standard indicators of assessment is necessary; selection of indicators for then assessment at some authors is so small that the assessment of competitiveness of the enterprise is reduced to a usual technique of the assessment of efficiency; as a result of the factorial analysis of the reasons of low competitiveness of the enterprise it is impossible to come to the true reasons influencing the competitiveness; presence at most of the authors of a large number of expert evaluations that increases a subjective component of the indicator of competitiveness.

For the solution of methodological problem of the assessment of competitiveness of the enterprise we underlie the following basic principles and requirements to the creation of a system of indicators for a complex integrated assessment, indicators have to: to represent complete system of factors; to reflect complexity and completeness of an assessment, providing the accounting of the major characteristics of competitiveness of the enterprise; to characterize competitiveness of the enterprise as the integrated, complex, multiple-factor assessment of object of a forest complex as difficult social ekologo-economic system; to give an opportunity of management of competitiveness of the enterprises, according to requirements of a sustainable development of forest sector of economy of the multiforest region (the accounting of indicators of a sustainable development and management of the woods – synthesis economic, social and the ekologo-lesovodstvennykh of indicators); to provide the maximum representativeness of the estimated integrated indicator of competitiveness of the enterprise; to characterize and reflect all factors of competitiveness of the enterprise, a possibility of creation and deduction of competitive advantages which are selected and systematized earlier; to characterize not only current state of the studied enterprise in the direction of competitiveness, but also perspective opportunities of development of competitiveness, capacity of the enterprise in the medium-term period; to include the main indicators, to consider both the external, and internal environment of the enterprise, to bear identical information loading; to be adapted to the operating systems of data collection and processing. Reliability of initial indicators and sources of their formation guarantees reliability of the received results; indicators have to: to provide consistency and to work unidirectionally; to form an adequate total, reliable indicator of an assessment of competitiveness of the enterprise on the basis of which adoption of administrative decisions, carrying out a rating assessment, the plan-faktnogo of the analysis, the factorial analysis, planning and forecasting and other analytical tools will be possible. The chosen indicators have to minimize (better to exclude) need of an expert assessment of their values; indicators which strongly correlate with each other need or to be excluded from a calculation procedure, or to distribute in the different directions, blocks of indicators, that is on different groups of analytical indicators.

Considering the principles and requirements of creation of the system of indicators created above for the assessment (in view of the work on identification of the factors of competitiveness which is carried out earlier taking into account the regional and branch features [5, 6], systematization of factors of competitiveness in the plane of business processes [3, 4], on formation of the system and synergetic approach to the analysis of competitiveness [1, 14]), and also the carried-out analysis of sinergizm of business processes of the enterprise at integration development and their influence on the competitive advantages and competitiveness of the enterprise in general [11, 12, 13], are formulated the most acceptable, in our opinion, groups of indicators for their use in the assessment of multiple-factor integrated indicator of competitiveness of the enterprise (further –CE):

- Production efficiency (further – PE), the main business process – production (logging, woodworking – production of timber and other production), sinergizm: production (operational); integration of production activity leads to the strengthening of competitive advantage due to the effective production. Indicators of formation of competitive advantages, competitiveness: production of round forest products (m3), production of timber (m3), profitability (%), value added (million rubles), capital productivity (rub) and others.

- Supply effectiveness (SE), business process – Logistics (process of ensuring production with raw materials, materials, spare parts for repair, tools, warehouse economy of raw materials), sinergizm: purchasing, logistic and warehouse.

Indicators of formation of competitive advantages, competitiveness: material capacity of realization (rub), profitability of current assets (%), turnover of the stocks (days), share of material inputs in the prime cost (%), turnover of accounts payable (days) and others.

- Efficiency of silvicultural activity (further – ESA), SMW – steady management of the woods, business process – silvicultural activity, nature protection and ecology (process of preparation and ensuring the main production regarding silvicultural activity: forest management, reforestation work, fire-prevention work, nature protection and ecological activity of the enterprise), sinergizm: technological (preparatory), ecological. Indicators of formation of competitive advantages, competitiveness: the area of leased forest fund (sq.m), settlement cutting area (m3), share of the certified forest fund (%),index of a forest-environmental pressure (unit).

- Efficiency of preparation and ensuring production (further – EPEOP), business process – preparation and ensuring production (process of preparation and ensuring the main production in part: innovative activity (further – research and development); constructions of infrastructure (including forest roads); technological support; repair and power providing; transport service; quality control on the all production stage); sinergizm: technological (research), production (auxiliary), infrastructure, transport. Indicators of formation of competitive advantages, competitiveness: level of processing of wood (%), costs of construction and the maintenance of roads (thousand rubles), extent of use of the settlement cutting area (%), residual cost of FBA – the fixed business assets (thousand rubles), average distance of removal (km.) and others.

- Efficiency of marketing and realization (further – EMR), business process – advance and sales (process of realization of finished goods on the internal and external markets, market researches of the market, processes of advance of production), sinergizm: market, marketing, logistic and warehouse, administrative (strategic sales). Indicators of formation of competitive advantages, competitiveness: products (realization) of the round wood (thousand rubles), products (realization) of timber (thousand rubles), export share in products (%), share of the market (%), share of commercial expenses in products (%) and others.

- Administrative efficiency (further – AE), business process – business management (management of the enterprise: strategic; tactical; quick; corporate management; management of projects, management of safety of the enterprise: economic; information; legal), sinergizm: administrative, possessory, structural, safety sinergizm. Indicators of formation of the competitive advantages, competitiveness: net profit (million rubles), profitability of realization (ROS, %), profitability of own capital (ROE, %), profitability of assets (ROA, %), share of administrative expenses in products (%) and others.

- Financial and economic efficiency (further – FEE), business process – financial and economic management (management process: activity financing – financial streams, treasury; investment activity; planning, budgeting, key indicators of efficiency; administrative and accounting; analysis of financial and economic activity), sinergizm: financial, investment, administrative (formation of strategic indicators of efficiency). Competitiveness formation indicators: volume of investment (million rubles), growth rate of investments (%), coefficient of financial independence (autonomy), current liquidity, financial leverage and others.

- Efficiency of manpower (further – EM), business process – management of manpower (process of preparation and ensuring the main production and business management in part: reproduction of manpower; management of qualification, training and development of the personnel; managements of motivation of personnel; developments of corporate values and culture), sinergizm: administrative (human resource management), structural, cultural. Indicators of formation of competitive advantages, competitiveness: average number (people), labor productivity (thousand rubles), salary (rub), funds (one thousand rub/people), average monthly salary (thousand rubles) and others.

- Social and budgetary efficiency (further – SBE), business process – management of social and budgetary efficiency (management process: social relations, questions and responsibility; budgetary efficiency of the enterprise), sinergizm: social. Indicators, from the point of view of formation of competitive advantages, competitiveness: coefficient of a salary of the enterprise and an average salary in the region (unit), a salary share of realization (%), operating factor of personnel (thousand rubles), payments for the use of forest fund (million rubles), budgetary efficiency (million rubles) and others.

The general model of calculation of the integrated complex multiple-factor indicator of competitiveness of the enterprise (further – CES) has the following type:

CE = (PE + SE + ESA + EPEOP + EMR + EM + SBE + EM + SBE) ⁄N, (2)

where N – quantity of indicators.

The offered technique of assessment of the competitiveness of the enterprises of the forest complex reflects in itself all imposed modern requirements. Indicators have the complex, system, standard character, consider the branch and regional features of assessment, comprise factors of the assessment of internal competitiveness (potential) and adaptation of the enterprise by external competitive environment. Indicators are built in a section of business processes of the enterprise, reflect the influence of sinergizm and the factors of competitiveness on the competitive advantages.
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