Внутренняя диагностика компании, определение сильных и слабых сторон
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Introduction

Market forms of managing in the conditions of a rigid competition lead to an inconsistency of separate subjects of managing or their time insolvency. Any situation in which the enterprise has not time to be prepared for changes, it is possible to consider crisis. That it has not occurred, it is necessary to understand in time the reasons on which the enterprise economy has appeared in crisis, and to take measures even before external display of difficulties (financial complexities).

Search of ways of an exit from an economic crisis is directly connected with elimination of the reasons promoting its occurrence. The careful analysis of the external and internal environment of business is carried out, those components which really matter for the organisation are allocated, gathering and information tracing on each component is spent and on the basis of an estimation of real position of the enterprise the crisis state reasons are found out. Exact, complex, timely diagnostics of a condition of the enterprise - the first stage in working out of strategy of anti-recessionary management by enterprise activity.

It defines my interest to the given theme.

The purpose of the given work is consideration of a problem of internal diagnostics of the company, definition strong and weaknesses

In this connection research problems are:

- Consideration of stages of carrying out of the given analysis

- Definition of a role of each stage in the general analysis

Literature review

Among foreign scientists it is necessary to note: H.Anderson, E.A.Arens, R.Mautts, J. Лоббек, Z.Rishar, J. Robertson, G.Muller, P.Fridman, X. Шараф and others.

The considerable contribution to a domestic science was brought by such visible scientists as R.A.Alborov, M.A.Azarskaja, Н.П. Profiteers, И.А, Belobzhetsky, V.V. Burtsev, А.В. Shouters, O.A.Mironov, M.F.Ovsijchuk, L.N.Ovsyannikov, ST. Pankova, V.I.Podolsky, A.M. Pronin, A.N.Pytkin, V.V. Skobara, Century П Sujts, A.D.Sheremet, WITH. Shokhin.

The special attention is deserved by O.Lavizinova's devoted to questions article, connected with life cycle of the organisation considered through a prism social components, published in №5 magazines «Management in Russia and abroad» for 2009. In work imperfections of evolutionary views on development of the organisation, existing in the theory of management and not giving accurate representations about substantial filling of separate stages of its life cycle, and also criteria of reference of the organisations to categories "young", "growing", "mature" were fairly marked. The author has offered own concept of typification of stages of life cycle, leaning against known biological approaches and allocating stages of "formation", "development", "maturity" and "old age" by criteria of development with the organisation of the market niche (similarly ecological niche) and to level of an "intraspecific" competition in it. It is possible to agree that the similar approach to a problem gives a number of the new objective criteria, allowing to identify a stage of evolution of the organisation. However the concept offered by O.Lavizinova, does not introduce basic changes in a paradigm of life cycle according to which development is schematic sequence of conditions of the organisation divided by the moments of transformation, allowing to allocate the various periods in its development. In other words, the main focus of research in the majority of the works devoted to life cycles, — character of evolutionary changes, quantity of stages, their features and duration.

The theory of life cycle of the organisation requires today serious revision from the new system-integration positions, allowing to receive not only answers to questions as well as why the organisation evolves, but also that in it undergoes changes.

The understanding of the organisation as systems is an axiom of the modern administrative theory. The organisation in theories of life cycles appears as conditionally primary element of the analysis, dynamics of its internal structure is system is not studied. Now it is possible to speak about a number of the approaches purposefully investigating transformation of separate components of the internal environment of the organisation eventually. In this connection it is necessary to note G.Mintsberg's devoted to organizational structures [3] the products; model of evolution of organizational abilities of K.Kristensen [4]; the concept of evolution of culture and E.Shejn's leadership [5]. O.Lavizinova, doing the demand for the system approach and defining the organisation as social system, narrows then a spectrum of research before studying of organizational culture and development of ideas of Shejn, being actually limited to the answer to questions is present or there is no organizational culture at different stages of life cycle of the organisation? And how much it is consistent and divided?. Such approach does not consider that the organizational culture itself acts as the system characterised by certain internal structure, including (on Shejn) levels of the base representations, proclaimed values and artefacts [5, c. 36]. Further, the organisation as a whole is not settled cultural or (in a more comprehensive sense) by social measurement, being the multidimensional and multispatial system [6] simultaneously presented in various functional measurements.

Therefore it is necessary to offer working out of the new approach to the theory of life cycle of the organisation in which frameworks it is necessary to subject to studying of life cycles of the internal environment of the organisation with the account of structure and features of its separate elements and an emphasis on character of evolution.

Such statement of a problem will allow to replace understanding of development of the organisation as changes of stages of life cycle by interpretation of interaction of elements of the internal environment of the organisation, own life cycles being at different stages.

Estimated results

Starting point of the offered approach is structurization of the internal environment of the organisation with allocation of primary system elements. Organizational paradigms contain the different points of view on a problem of the internal environment of the organisation. Technologies, contracts, resources, «key the competence», «dynamic abilities», possibility — here it is far not the full list of the categories used for the description of internal potentialities.

On this background the evolutionary theory which occurrence is initiated by R.Nelson and S.Winter's [8] which have enriched categorial the device of the theory of the organisation by concept the works «organizational routine» is allocated. The term is entered for habitual, predicted, repeating samples of activity. Unlike others «primary elements», organizational routines introduce stability in the organisation, but simultaneously act as a principal cause of changes occurring in the organisation at formation of new external operating conditions. On this basis it is possible to assert that the category «organizational routine» acts as the most adequate basis for construction of evolutionary model of life cycle of the internal environment of the organisation.

From the point of view of the routine approach, the organisation appears as the object consisting from different qualitatives of elements, defined in various under the maintenance and functions spaces, but, simultaneously, and as the system including organizational routines. It is investigatory, the organisation assumes not only difficult interaction of routines of the various nature, but also permanent interosculation of arising, mature and becoming outdated routine ways.

The question of principle defining prospects of practical use of offered evolutionary model, definition of the factors influencing duration of life cycle of different organizational routines, duration of separate stages of life cycle, and also indicators of return of organizational routine is. Two groups of the factors acting as catalysts of rooting or destruction of organizational routines, defining size and dynamics of return from their use are obvious:

•Internal — size of costs of routine, that is expenses of the enterprise forming new organizational routine, supporting its steady functioning and destroying it at aging;

•External — the factors of an environment defining ability of organizational routine to provide the organisation competitive advantage (for example, whether the given organizational routine competitors can to be easily copied that levels its potential of a source of competitiveness).

Then the new judgement is received by a multilayered pyramid of the internal environment of the organisation. The fundamental levels formed by values of the organisation, its mental features and intrafirm institutes, live longer. They are connected not with resources or market behaviour of the organisation, and with cultural aspects. For culture of the organisation it is characteristic casual uncertainty that does it not to the full realised and not always clear even for direct carriers. Such routines practically do not give in to copying, creating long-term strategic advantage and «corporate identity» [13].

Summary

System-integration representations about functioning the organisations enriched by model of life cycle of organizational routine, allow to expand today's representations about a phenomenon of organizational evolution. Its character and mechanisms, on the one hand, are defined by specific features of evolution of separate organizational routines, and with another — co-evolution of routines of various substantial levels. The account of a principle of polydynamism at the analysis of the internal environment of the organisation allows to formulate the new actual problems of strategic management assuming working out of strategy of management by a portfolio of routines of the organisation with the account of a stage of their life cycle.
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