

On Competitiveness of Enterprise

Galina Viktorovna Vlasyuk

Moscow State University of Means of Communication, Moscow, Russia

Abstract: The article discusses mechanisms and peculiarities of development of enterprise competitiveness in terms of resource approach as a proposal oriented at demand of targeted social group. Social origin of competitiveness phenomenon is substantiated. Peculiar features of competitiveness potential and its transformation into a practical proposal are reviewed in details. The focus is given to peculiarities of structure of competency architecture as well as of strategic architectures aimed at provision of enterprise competitiveness in the future. It is demonstrated that in information society in addition to conventional architectures, oriented at internal competencies and creation of knowledge, new information architectures appear, dynamical in their essence, oriented at external competencies and capabilities of agents. Network resources are reviewed as a background of support for competitiveness and agents inside the enterprise and as a mechanism of amplification of the enterprise influence in social space. Much attention is given to peculiarities of enterprise management, in particular, as a system of autonomous agents.

Key words: Competitiveness • Social competitiveness • Image • Competencies • Competency architecture • Competency bundle • Support resources • Network resources • Perception • Quasi-establishment • "soft" and "rigid" management forms • Feedback • Information flow • Pressure • Cooperation • Autonomous agent

INTRODUCTION

An enterprise in terms of resource approach is a restricted rational acquirer of external resources based on available *resource bundles*, capable to reprocess incoming resource flows and to transform them on the basis of human capital into new assets, presented outward as *bundles of competencies*. Herewith, the enterprise competitiveness is determined by its capability to create such a proposal, which corresponds to demand of a targeted social group, thus facilitating statement about sociality of this phenomenon.

The works by A.Ya. Flier make it possible to state that the background of social competitiveness of enterprise is the creation of proposal, fulfilling professionally significant organizational assets, which are based on human capital, capabilities and competencies of organizational agents referring to the scope of direct activity [1]. On the other hand, social competitiveness, according to S.A. Khazova [2], is related with accumulation of social capital

due to usage of sophisticated technologies of interaction in certain points of contact and support of management proposal, involving network resources.

At this, combination of professional and social components in real proposal of the enterprise can be versatile, which makes it possible to speak about orientation of real proposal at natural replenishment or support of image. Following K. Polanyi, it can be stated that under conditions of free market, when tools of formation of social competitiveness are not controlled, the gap between natural and real competitiveness can be so high that it is transformed into *imitation* [3]. Exactly this imitativity is the background for transition of reality into *hyper-reality*, when, according to J. Baudrillard, by means of concealing the symbols, reflecting true reality of proposal, are transformed into the symbols not correlated with it. Thus, it is possible to speak about probability of occurrence in information world as the world of symbols of *imitative proposals* beyond reality, that is, images, which have nothing to do with natural proposal [4].

Enterprise in Social Space: Within operation of an enterprise there occurs continuous process of changes of situational states. Herewith, as a result of increased instability and complexity of social medium such shift of situation is unpredictable. Following M. M. Bakhtin it is possible to state that, on the one hand, the existing activity of the enterprise is *chronotopic* [5] with regard to the state of other actors and on the other hand according to P. Shtompka is aimed at obtaining of future results. Then, any activity of the enterprise, on the one hand, is determined by its existing position in space and on the other hand initiates shift of situation, alteration of its position in space and hence, varies the existing alignment of forces in social field. "Bilateral determination takes place, when actions create structures and structures determine content of actions " [6]. Herewith, being an active actor of social space, the enterprise, according to R. Dahrendorf, takes up a kind of conflict struggle, where its resource provision, its force are the arguments in opposition [7]. At this, following Dahrendorf that such conflicts cannot be prevented, Manuel Castells emphasizes that a pause in them is temporal agreements and contracts, which are unstable, since the forces of the parties are asymmetric and their interests and values remain subordinated, however, exactly such temporary alliances based on coincidence of purposes vary situation in space [8].

Then, at any instance of time the enterprise is interested in certain relations with other actors: cooperation, collaboration, competition and the perception of its force by specific partners in interaction is differentiated. It is developed, on the one hand, on the basis of accumulated data arrays and on the other hand, with consideration for integrated data flow [6] arriving from the enterprise at certain instant and success of perception is in many respects determined by correspondence between arriving data flows and expectations based on experience. On the one hand, this results in suggestion about capability of the enterprise to manage impression, creating targeted data flows and on the other hand, makes it possible to state that competitiveness is a social phenomenon.

Management of impression Óassumes that in each point of contact such configuration of competencies is created, which presumably will be interpreted by specific partner in interaction in the required for the enterprise manner. Then, on the one hand, the most important tool of impression creation is awareness of partner and on the other hand, the required level of impression can be

achieved by means of application of various combinations of competencies, *bundles*, which makes it possible to suggest variation of creation of integrated proposal.

Consideration of stratified structure as subjective establishment, where apparent and formalizable are intersected with insensuous and interpretable, makes it possible to state that a specific actor determines status position of the enterprise on the basis of *impression about its competencies*. Then the existence of similar in presentation integrated bundles of competencies makes it possible to suggest ascribing of enterprises to one group and ranking as "detachment from" occurs on the basis of distinctiveness. Herewith, consideration of *competencies* as a unique proposal of what the enterprise can do better than the other actors, different to them, makes it possible to suggest that the distinctiveness of the enterprise can be determined also by differential competencies presented in the bundle [9]. They exactly, being required by a targeted social group, are decisive for creation of success, that is, act as a tool of increase in competitiveness.

Competencies are not developed at a moment's notice, are not acquired, but are formed in time, being as a rule not a spontaneous establishment but rather a result of targeted managerial efforts. Being the basis of assets of the enterprise, *internal competencies* enable suggestion about potential difference from competitors. The tools of creation of direct impression are *external competencies*, which are the product of transformation of internal assets. Herewith, the external competencies are the combination of *operational* ones, embodiment of direct proposal and *marketing* ones-competencies of support, highly dissimilar and versatile in composition. Internal competencies, being hidden inside the enterprise, in fact cannot be simulated. External competencies, being in their essence interpretation of the internal ones, are visible and hence, can be copied by third actors. Then, exactly the development of rational complex *competency architecture* as a combination of internal and external competencies can be considered as a chance to obtain competitiveness, "slightly more than prerequisite for an action, though still less than real actions" [7].

Conventional architectures of architecture ы competencies are oriented at creation of framework of internal competencies and based on reprocessing of data arrays into knowledge. This assumes long-term formation, however, guarantees stability for the system in long-term periods due to possibility to use internal competency of knowledge and diversification of external competencies

on its basis. Currently principally new competency architectures are developed, which are oriented at external competencies and having minimum internal replenishment. Such architectures, built on possibility of human capital to quick reprocessing of information, have shorter intervals of creation. At the same time, due to high rate of information updating, which according to D. Bell [11] is related with constant development of new data volumes corresponding to new situation in social space, that is, more relevant for reprocessing, such architectures are more successful when they are more dynamic. Herewith, dynamism of situation in information space makes it possible to suggest instability of proposal based on these architectures in long-term periods and hence, necessity of its continuous updating, which in its turn determines its dynamism.

Then it is possible to suggest that eternal competency architectures are oriented at specified parameters of situation, specified partner in each point of contact and occurrence of actors--carriers of various competency architectures in space makes it possible to speak about their competition with each other, which is not always in favor of conventional architectures.

Taking into account that status position of the enterprise can be provided by means of application of various competency bundles, its competitiveness is determined by skill to respond correctly and duly to changes in social field, generating requested resources and competencies.

According to G. Hamel and C. Prahalad, the absence of actors with similar competencies in space makes it possible to exercise *the right of Pioneer*, thus facilitating additional increment in status, which can be defined as scarcity rent [10]. Then, the distinctiveness of proposal can be provided either by conventional architectures, capable to transform accumulated knowledge into unique external competencies, or by external competency architectures, distinctive with capability of quick reprocessing of information or its interpretation.

It should be emphasized that by virtue of the interval of knowledge accumulation and its reprocessing into specified operational proposals, conventional architectures are sufficiently inert in their essence. Then, within shift of situation, they can vary significantly their relative competitive position with variation in demand of targeted social group or replenishment of integrated proposal of other actors, including due to imitation of innovative competencies. Thus, it is possible to state that in order to support competitiveness of enterprise it is necessary to

continuously monitor situation and to adjust replenishment of the proposal. Taking into account that variation in replenishment of operational competencies cannot occur at once, such adjustment because of dynamism of the proposal should be reasonably executed by the use of marketing competencies. Herewith, to a certain extent the case in point is the shift of actual proposal from natural one into the region of image creation, however, exactly this tactics can help enterprises--carriers of conventional architectures to provide their *adaptiveness* under conditions of dynamic changes in social space as a possibility to optimize the proposal in terms of specified situation.

At the same time, while its *turbulence* increases, expedience and adequacy of *responses to variations* in social space become more significant. At this, the most valuable resource of the enterprise is the skill to develop strategic responses with accounting for increasing rate of changes, planning of activity as "strategic hypothesis of success" [12] and quick adaptation to new conditions, "since the most important in the environment of uncertainty is to minimize the cost of error as much as possible" [7]. Herewith, *the adaptiveness* is determined not only and no so much by massive *competency portfolio* [13], but rather by capability to consolidate competencies at a required instant of time in order to develop an appropriate bundle, "since only at initially embedded capability of transformation the cost of error remains minimum" [7].

Bearing this in mind within increase in dynamism of social space, more and more significant tool of support of competitiveness is not high, aiming at absolute, quality of solution, but rather its expedience. In this relation it should be emphasized that, according to L.A. Rastrigin, the alternatives, selected by *random search optimization* [14], are not extreme, that is, absolute; however, with involvement of deep knowledge of the system they provide adaptiveness of the system and its resource efficiency. This makes it possible to state that success of architectures, oriented at external competencies, is related with accumulation of deep knowledge and hence, with certain increment in internal competencies.

Therefore, competitiveness of the enterprise is related with capability of organizational intelligence to create such hybrid architectures, which makes it possible for the enterprise to achieve its purposes by correct combination of accumulation of internal competencies and development of external ones, by joining together advantages and disadvantages of various types of competency architectures. Herewith, development of

intelligent architecture of competencies is *the potential of competitiveness of the enterprise* and hence, can be considered as a basis of variation of status, that is, social mobility.

At the same time, the enterprise, caring about its competitiveness in future, should continuously review and develop its portfolio of competencies, forming a new proposal oriented into tomorrow, providing possibility of adaptiveness in future. And such proposal should not only expect for a chance of difference in the longer term, providing for the enterprise *the advantage of Pioneer* possessing unique proposal, but to be formed on the basis of supposed expectations from social space, thus providing demand. Creation of future competencies can be defined as *strategic architecture of competencies* [12], which in its turn can be considered as a tool for support or increment of status position of the enterprise in future, provision of its status passage [15].

It is obvious that creation of strategic architecture of competencies involves high portion of risk related with unpredictability of alterations in social space. Herewith, the level of risk is determined by period of advance, level and completeness of informational competence of the enterprise, which can serve as a basis for passage of the situation "from the discourse of randomness to the discourse of subjectivity" [6].

Then, the basis of support of the enterprise competitiveness is the capability of its management not only to provide distinctiveness today, but to foresee, to perceive, to forecast a new challenge and to accumulate competencies oriented into future, to develop strategic architecture of competencies.

Formation of Competitive Proposal: Formation of correct architecture of portfolio competencies by the enterprise is possible only within correct understanding of its real position in space, direction of shift of situation, which, on the one hand, facilitates formation of situational profitable proposal based on available portfolio of competencies and on the other hand to adopt measures on preparation of responses to variations, that is, to initiate creation of new competencies.

Herewith, formation of proposal in a specified point of space as a bundle of operational and marketing competencies, corresponding to demand of the partner in cooperation and comparable with proposals from other actors, turns to be a tool of support of relative competitiveness. A tool to increase relative competitiveness is formation of proposal distinct from the others and such distinctiveness can be related both with integrated proposal, that is, a bundle of competencies and

with any of its differentiated components, distinguished by targeted social group. Thus, it is possible to suggest motivation of formed proposal as of background of success, based on flows of *feedback*, which are more productive when they are more complete and reliable. At this, at a specified instant of time in specified contact for creation of situational advantageous proposal a particular focus is given to on-line information about impression, which can be defined as *on-line feedback*, which highlights efficiency of development of a bundle of competencies in specified point of contact.

Taking into account that modern informational paradigm is based on network logic of data transfer [16], insurance of competitiveness of enterprise is, on the one hand, a purposeful formation of distinctive proposals in specified points of contact and on the other hand, occurrence in network establishments of informational flows about such contacts, which are more organizationally advantageous when they are more positive. Thus, it is possible to state that the enterprise is interested in initiation of contacts, positively interpreted by partner, as *the network of distribution of positive experience*.

Herewith, it is possible to assume that the most important value of any interaction is reliability of the used information, which according to P. Shtompka forms *relations of confidence* and vice versa, the use of corrupted information promotes creation of non-confidence environment and hence, negative experience of contact, translated via the network as *information background*. Therefore, *confidentiality* of actors is the most important social resource of the enterprise, which mainly determines its competitiveness, irrespective of its ground: "goodwill, actual achievements and image, secondary grounds: references" [6]. Herewith, taking into account variability and unpredictability of social space, exactly the confidence decreases risks related with orientation of any action of the enterprise into the future.

At the same time, according to E. Stroeker, the space of interaction is not anything qualityless and measurable, this is "the space of our past and future, hopes and disappointments, an environment which cannot be perceived but can be cognized. Herewith, travelling in space makes it possible to replace one environment with another without losing it" [17]. Then, the impression is a source of transfer of environment of personalized experience of mutual creation of value, which has no concern with reliability of information but reflects what, according to G. Simmel, can be denoted as *sensual closeness* [18].

With such approach the most successful enterprises are those, which within the framework of their interaction with contact actors can create atmosphere of confidence and sensual closeness, translated via networks as positive informational background of contacts with them. Herewith, exactly the skill of the enterprise to manage informational resources is one of the most important components of activity, which maintain competitiveness of the enterprise.

According to the Actor--Network theory by B. Latour, an enterprise can be presented by human actors and non-human actors, creating and translating inter-objective sociality [19]. Then, an enterprise is a complex network establishment which acts in the space, where the players are differently filled (human and non-human actors) quasi-establishments with various resource potentials. Herewith, formation of integrated informational flow in the network of experience distribution can occur with direct participation of the agents. Thus, it is possible to suggest necessity of implementation of principally new forms of management of informational flows, which can be influenced by an agent only indirectly and which nevertheless are an efficient tool of creation of enterprise image and hence, influence, though indirectly, on its competitiveness.

At the same time, simultaneous consideration of an enterprise as quasi-establishment and as a constituent part of other quasi-establishments makes it impossible to consider its activity without accounting of direct or indirect influence of other actors of social space on this enterprise. On the one hand, this rises an issue on necessity of skill to create and to use resources, presented by new realities, that is, network resources and on the other hand, about necessity to develop mechanisms of management of such network establishments.

Enterprise as a Network of Agents: An enterprise "can be considered as a living organism, the functions of which depend on independent intrasystem and external links" [20]. At this, all parameters of the enterprise (material, non-material and human assets) are quasi-objects and possess a specific property of *inseparability* into primary and secondary properties. "They are too real to be imaginations and too disputable, undefined, collective, varying, inducing to play the role of permanent, frozen, dull primary properties, with which the Universe is equipped once and for ever" [20].

At the same time an enterprise consists of separate agents, each of them possesses their own competency potential, more or less corresponding to demand of the

enterprise. Herewith, cumulative competitiveness of the enterprise is the integration of personal resource--competency sets of agents, competencies of group activities and overall enterprise as quasi-object [21]. At this, integrated competitiveness is a vector variable and thus, the vector sum of existing competency sets of agents is variable and is related with persons involved into the organizational structure. Then, the concern about correspondence between the competencies of agents and preset targets is the scope of management of enterprise.

Following W. Lazosnick, it is possible to state that the enterprise aims at formation of distinctive competency [22], into development of which the agents are involved more or less. Then, the value of an agent in the enterprise is higher when his contribution to creation of distinctive competency is high. Then, the agents are stratified in this or that way in the framework of the enterprise in accordance with their competency potentials and, hence, in a certain manner are differentiated, automated, competing with each other. Accordingly, an individual agent is interested in increase in personal resource potential. At the same time, success of the enterprise in general, its competitiveness, depends on skills of agents to interact in order to achieve preset purposes, which requires for integration of their efforts. At this, provision of integration of an agent into the system is the scope of management of enterprise.

In the space of enterprise there exist certain areas, related with partition of activity scope of the agents, which makes it possible to suggest their predefined position in the space of enterprise [23]. Therefore, such areas are also ranked in a certain manner in the enterprise and possess specified competitiveness, then the involvement into them determines personal competitiveness of agent by management of enterprise, thus facilitating suggestion that the agent is interested in increase in status of such microworld (according to R. Collins [24]) as a tool to increase his status in the enterprise as macroworld.

In addition, in the enterprise various integrations of agents take place, various associations and coalitions are formed, which make it possible, by means of merging of resources of participants, to achieve status of group, belonging to which provides resource support of each participant. Such merging is possible both in terms of occupation and in terms of attitude.

Therefore, internal space of the enterprise can be presented as a complex configuration of internal social spaces, formed by persons, groups, autonomous or intersecting with each other, with numerous appearing,

transforming and disappearing centers, each of them can be surrounded with its own periphery, that is, the field of agents of various hierarchical structure, possessing various dynamically varying resource potentials. According to J. Urry [25], such dynamic space can be considered as network. Following A. Amin and N. Thrift, it is possible to state that existence of such networks is based on transitivity reflecting spatial and time openness of the enterprise; regularity related with repeating contacts and experience; "footprints" as embodiment of development pathway in regular practices and relations implemented at the present time [26]. According to N. Thrift, high rate of dynamism of network space is the reflection of moving structures [27].

According to the author, the field inside the enterprise is characterized by combination of two essentially different structures in one space. The first strictly structured system with rigid links based on codes and standards is *the network of formal corporate relations*. The second *informal network* of relations and interdependences without single center is characterized with "soft" variable interaction of participants. Such networks are imposed on each other, overlapped, thus forming management network. The informal network in its turn is heterogeneous and segmented in enterprise space, thus facilitating suggestion of numerous areas or even individual informal networks, which in fact cannot be separated due to involvement of the agents into many of them. It should be emphasized that professional network, significant for any enterprise and occupying its total space, is also informal, which makes it possible to speak about zonation in the enterprise. At the same time interpretation of professional network as informal one lets us speak about actually unavoidable imposition of the informal network onto formal organizational structure, thus defining its network essence.

Herewith, intra-organizational distribution of flows takes place on the network principle, that is, according to M. Castells, between the nodes in the framework of this or that network structure the flows either have equal distance to the nodes or this distance is zero, the frequency and intensity of interactions are determined by proximity of the nodes [16]. Taking into consideration that in a social network information is transmitted mainly by experts, in each node of transmission the information is inevitably distorted. Then, physical proximity to information source, that is, minimal number of transmitting units, determines the amount of received reliable information and sensual proximity determines the attitude

to it. Herewith, in formal network, where the number of transmitting units is determined by the difference in hierarchical levels and in theory official information exchanges are possible, that is, with minimum distortion, as well as information exchanges between the nodes, determined by sensual proximity, that is, informal ones. Herewith, the attitude to information, supplied via official channels, is essentially different from information which is distributed in informal networks due to sensual proximity and, hence, level of confidence to source. Thus, it is possible to speak about certain adjustment of activity of formal network, determined by involvement of its agents into informal networks. On the other hand, in theory the enterprise can include agents of formal network not involved into informal networks. Then their activity is directed exclusively by formal network and can be defined as *formalized*.

Formalism, peculiar for the Weberian bureaucracy, is related with "rigid" managerial structures, contrary to "soft" forms based on informal relations.

As a consequence of irregular imposition of networks, the social field of enterprise is heterogeneous, its characteristics are different for different areas, which is mainly attributed to possibility of dominancy of any network structure in certain part of the space. Such condition assumes continuous dynamics of situation, grouping and re-grouping of certain elements and in the segments with dominating network of informal relations such movements are more noticeable due to "softness" of formations.

"Soft" segments are characterized with autonomation of agents, enabling them to move, to increase their internal competency asses, to generate new external competencies, thus increasing general level of competitiveness and organization. At the same time the autonomation of agents, freedom of their travel, inevitably violates the existing balance of forces in the field of organization, leads to redistribution of positions and hence, to changes, which, on the one hand, initiate new increment of force potential of certain agents and on the other hand increase differentiation of between positions of the agents in the enterprise. Herewith, in the course of increase in dynamism of the processes the differentiation of the agents becomes more and more noticeable, thus initiating certain conflicts in the enterprise field [7]. Such conflicts, on the one hand, initiate mobility of autonomous agents and hence, are positive and on the other hand they absorb certain amount of internal resources of the enterprise, up to occurrence of crisis situations. Thus, it is possible to state

that any changes deplete resource basis of system. Hence, within excessive autonomation of the agents the enterprise takes the risk to be in permanent conflict, which violates dynamic equilibrium of the system, absorbs its resources, decreases competitiveness, which in fact is negative.

At the same time, rigid structures, serving to provide preservation of permanence of the system, that is, stability of the enterprise, assume avoidance of relocations and, respectively, minimization of presence of autonomous agents, reduce the field dynamism. However, reduction of internal autonomy is inevitably related with increase in external autonomy of the enterprise, its closeness, including external informational impacts. It is obvious that in developed informational space the enterprise cannot exist separately, it needs informational inputs in order to adjust proposal and to maintain relative competitiveness, dynamism in presentation of proposal, thus raising a question about inevitability of changes, hence, about necessity of internal autonomation. Therefore, the absence of changes also leads to violation of dynamic equilibrium of the system, occurrence of crisis situation, decrease in relative competitiveness, stipulated by formation of proposals inadequate to situation. Then, a challenge of management is to comply with dynamic equilibrium between autonomation of the agents who provide changes, characteristic for informal contacts and "soft" structures and the use of "rigid" frames of formality in order to support preservation of the system and its stability.

At this an agent involved into many informal networks is under their influence. Therefore, his activity is determined not only by formal network, but also by dominating informal one, the influence of which can be so strong that is able to adjust proposal formed by it.

Following R. Dahrendorf, it is possible to state that every which where exists authority of relations and groups, coordinated and managing, quasi-groups always exist, characterized by various aims, conflicting explicit and hidden interests [7]. Herewith, within increase in resource potential of quasi-group its competitiveness increases, the extent of its influence in enterprise grows, as well as resource potential of those players who declare themselves as involved in this group, which initiates some agents to join such quasi-groups.

It should be emphasized that quasi-groups can be outside enterprise space, indirectly influencing on events in the enterprise via agents who joined them. At this, the actions of the agents under the influence of the quasi-groups can comply not with the aims of the enterprise.

Thus, it is possible to suggest existence of both structures of formal authority in the enterprise and forces of indirect influence on the agents from outside, internal informal networks and quasi-groups, including third parties. At this, a problem of management is either to preserve its dominating role which provides undisputable execution of its orders, or to create environment of interest in achieving of the enterprise purposes by all enterprise agents, which is related with implementation of socially oriented management.

It is obvious that creation of environment of common interest in achievement of enterprise purposes is related with such proposal of the enterprise to the agents, networks, quasi-groups, which seems to be equivalent within exchange for loyalty. At this, such proposal from the enterprise should be continuously adjusted on the basis of actual demands of the agents, which makes it possible to suggest that in the framework of enterprise aimed at social oriented management there exists the mechanism of subjective mutual control based on feedback, its correct operation is a significant method to provide competitiveness of the enterprise [28]. In the enterprises, based on soft structures with high level of autonomy and opened to changes, the socially oriented principle of management is implemented to a higher extent.

Then, competitiveness of the enterprise is provided by maintaining of dynamic equilibrium in internal space of the enterprise, which facilitates combination of autonomy of the agents and compliance with interests of the enterprise, which, on the one hand, is aimed at preservation of its parameters today and on the other hand, being aimed at future, is ready for changes. Herewith, competitiveness of the enterprise is mainly determined by orientation and controllability of such changes and resource approach enables their targeted design, arrangement and implementation. Maintaining of internal medium of the enterprise in dynamic equilibrium is provided by intelligence of management.

Peculiarities of Management of Enterprise as a System of Autonomous Agents: It should be emphasized that the management of acting agents, operating in the frameworks of prescribed scenarios, characteristic for "rigid" structures, differs from the management autonomous agents.

According to P. Bourdieu, an autonomous agent does not have "absolute independence on external laws" [29]. He operates in the enterprise on the basis of participation and the enterprise in its turn has its *resource obligations* with regard to him in the form of stated and unstated agreements. It is obvious that

management of enterprise with existing autonomous agents inside is possible only in situation of social confidence, when both parties, while fulfilling their obligations, assume also mandatory fulfillment by the other party. Non-fulfillment of obligations by the enterprise leads most probably to self-rejection of agent and non-fulfillment of obligations by the agent initiates certain managerial actions by the enterprise, which guide his activity.

At the same time mutual undertaking of obligations makes it possible to speak about possibility of the agent operation in autonomous mode, that is. without managing actions, provided that he demonstrates such proposal which satisfies the enterprise.

Herewith, an autonomous agent, using the mechanism of subject-subject management, can in a certain manner adjust resource obligations of the enterprise, thus varying his proposal. At this, in enterprise oriented at "soft" structures, such adjustment takes place more readily, which implies their inclination to implement technologies of cooperation. In many respects this can be attributed to the fact that "soft" structures provide possibility to vary the scope of application of managerial actions, including mechanisms of personal adjustment [30].

Decision of the enterprise to apply managerial action to autonomous agent is in fact violation of its resource obligations, which leads either to rejection of the agent or to his agreement to work in the enterprise under new conditions, which in its turn is relate with the interests of the agent in new organizational proposal.

It should be emphasized that in situation, when the enterprise does not manifest social orientation within formation of its proposal, its managerial action tends to be pressure. In this case, as a rule, the autonomous agent generates *protective responses*, varying from self-rejection to internal dismissal, thus resulting in creation of image of proposal, requested by the enterprise and simulating the desired variations. Any protective responses inside the system decrease integrated competitiveness of the enterprise, thus leading to avoidance of pressure on autonomous agents. At the same time development of any socially oriented managerial action for the benefits of both parties requires high amount of resource expenditures and is not always profitable for the managerial system [30]. Therefore, the enterprise, uninterested in protective responses of autonomous agents, often faces the situation of *formal management*, when a proposal of the enterprise more or less satisfies the autonomous agents and his proposal is sufficient for the enterprise.

It is obvious that formalization of relations between the enterprise and the agent is unstable and impermanent. Within shift of the situation one of the parties can be unsatisfied with the existing state of affairs. Thus, in the framework of the enterprise certain changes can occur: more attractive proposals from third actors, which enables alteration of organizational structure, that is, replacement of problem agent, accumulation of resources for socially oriented action and so on. This enables suggestion that formal management is a measure which helps to find complete solution of the problem.

At the same time, formal management has certain significant disadvantages. Firstly, within insufficient supply of resources from the enterprise for achievement of internal purposes the agent, remaining formally an agent of the enterprise, comes under the influence of various quasi-establishments and acts for their benefits rather than for the benefits of the enterprise, that is, reduces the level of his external autonomy. Secondly, without control and directions from the enterprise the agent starts to act on the basis of his own interests and, hence, the degree of his internal autonomy increases. Both this and that are undesirable in terms of competitiveness of the enterprise and hence, the formality of management is undesirable measure in long-term intervals.

Therefore, the management of autonomous agents requires special technologies, which is related with appropriate competencies of formal network of the enterprise and the absence thereof leads to "rigid" forms of management, which in its turn decrease internal autonomy of the agents and transforms them into scenario acting agents.

Enterprise as an Agent of Networks: The enterprise, interested in supplemental resources for achievement of its internal purposes, enters into various spatial organizations, which provide possibility to apply *network resources of support*, from third quasi-groups interested in its operation. Such quasi-establishments are based on voluntary involvement, thus, according to R. Dahrendorf, they can be defined as *associations* [7]. And according to C. Shapiro and H. Varian it is possible to state that resources of the network support equal to cumulative flow of support from all links of the enterprise [31], that is, associative links. Then the force of the enterprise is higher when its boundaries are the widest.

At the same time, involvement into any association promotes certain disbalance of internal social field, violates dynamic equilibrium, mainly due to redistribution

of powers of influence. Thus, within establishment of any associations an issue arises about necessity to involve certain amount of managerial resources, aimed at support of stability in internal environment.

Therefore, competitiveness of the enterprise is related with the impression of third actors about sizes of its area. And according to M. Katz and C. Shapiro it is possible to state that perception of an enterprise as dominating in space and the strongest initiates contacts of the actors exactly with this enterprise, which makes it really dominating [32]. Therefore, an enterprise interested in domination is aimed at expansion of its boundaries. Herewith, a tool to create impression of a partner about its force can be *image of presentation*.

At the same time, taking into consideration that the process of creation and destruction of any associations evokes discussion of the enterprise as of pulsing in social space establishment, which either penetrates it or confines its internal space, it is possible to state that the boundaries of enterprise are fuzzy. An enterprise interested in confidence of partners applies image of presentation as a tool of stabilization of perception of its force.

Therefore, there exist social relations of different level and different type, which influence in a complex manner on competitiveness of the enterprise. Herewith, integrated informational flow of impressions about the enterprise is formed, on the one hand, on the basis of information about the enterprise as quasi-object and on the other hand, in all points of contact with it, including non-human agents, thus creating informational background.

At this, on the one hand, the enterprise is deemed by third actors as integral whole and on the other hand, impression of interaction with it in each specified point of space depends on specified contact agents, who represent it. Each of these contact agents possesses own competitiveness in social space, determined by his involvement into various network establishments, as well as by such resources of network support, which can be presented to him by the enterprise itself. Thus, a contact agent is interested in increase in competitiveness of the enterprise as a tool of increase in his own competitiveness. At the same time, in the case of complete autonomy of the agent with regard to the enterprise and his interest in activity of any quasi-groups, in the contact point the agent will act not for the benefits of the enterprise but for his own benefits.

It should be emphasized that in a specified contact point there occur changes both of competitiveness of the enterprise and of contact agent and his personal capital varies at higher rates than integrated capital of the enterprise. Thus, it is possible to suggest automation of contact agent and, hence, necessity of special forms of management by the enterprise and, at the same time, particular significance of the contact agent for the enterprise, his distinctiveness and high competitiveness in its frameworks.

Taking into consideration the modern level of development of technical means, which minimizes the distance between the interacting partners, existence of experience distribution in the networks, the highest extent of fuzziness of the enterprise boundaries, a question arises about management of the enterprise competitiveness as a mechanism of creation of impression, occurring in all contact points. Such management requires for special forms, built on understanding of network peculiarities of existence of enterprise.

Therefore, competitiveness potential of the enterprise is provided by reasoned formation of organizational proposal and is a result of correct application of managerial actions of formal network inside the enterprise. Actual competitiveness of the enterprise is provided by presentation of required by targeted social group proposal, reasoned technologies of interaction with third actors, as well as skill of the enterprise to gain certain social capital, in particular, as a result of network support.

REFERENCES

1. Flier, A. Ya., 1998. Culture as a Factor of National Security. *Obshchestvennye nauki I sovremennost*, 3: 181-187.
2. Khazova, S.A., 2009. Competitiveness of Future Experts on Physical Training and Sport. Krasnodar-Maikop, Globus.
3. Khazova, S.A., 2011. Development of Competitive Person in Educational System. Doctoral Thesis, Maikop.
4. Polanyi, K., 1992. The economy as instituted process. In: *The sociology of economic life*. Ed. by M. Granovetter and R.S. Swedberg. Oxford.
5. Baudrillard, J., 2008. *Phantom of the Crowd*. Moscow, Algorithm.
6. Bakhtin, M.M., 1986. *Esthetics of Written Word*. Moscow, Iskusstvo.

7. Shtompka, Peter, 2012. Confidence-Basis of Society. Translated from Polish by N.V. Morozova. Moscow, Logos.
8. Dahrendorf, R., 1959. Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp: 241-248.
9. Castells, M., 2009. Communication Power. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
10. Hamel, G. and C.K. Prahalad, 1990. The Core Competence of the Corporation. Harvard Business Review, May-June.
11. Igor Ansoff, H., 2007. Strategic Management: Classic Edition. Palgrave Macmillan, June 2007, ISBN: 978-0-230-52548-1.
12. Bell, D., Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting, ISBN: 0465097138.
13. Vlasyuk, G.V., 2010. Resources of Social Enterprise. Moscow, ACB.
14. Hamel, G. and C.K. Prahalad, 1996. Competing for the Future. HBR Press.
15. Rastrigin, L.A., 1981. Adaptation of Complex Systems. Methods and Applications. Riga, ZINATNE.
16. Popova, I.P., 2011. Turning Points in Biography and Professional Careers of Experts. SOTsIS, 4: 81-92.
17. Castells, M., 2000. The Rise of the Network Society. Second Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
18. Stroecker, E., 1965. Philosophic Studies about Space, pp: 60.
19. Kurt Wolff (Trans.), 1950. The Sociology of Georg Simmel. The Stranger. New York: Free Press, Стp, pp: 402-408.
20. Latour, B., 2005. Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
21. Salmon, R., 1996. Future of Management: All Roads Lead to Man-Wiley-Blackwell, ISBN 0-631-20307-9.
22. Latour, B., 2003. When Things Strike Back: a Possible Contribution of 'Science Studies' to the Social Sciences. Vestnik MGU. Ser. "Philosophy", pp: 3.
23. Lazonick, W., 2002. Innovative Enterprise and Historical Transformation. Enterprise and Society, 3(1): 35-54.
24. Filippov, A.F., 2003. Theoretical Foundations of Sociology of Space. Moscow, Canaon-Press-Ts.
25. Collins, R., 1992. Sociological Insight: An Introduction to Non-Obvious Sociology. Oxford University Press, USA.
26. Urry, J., 2003. Global Complexity. Cambridge: Polity Press, ISBN 978-0-7456-2818-9.
27. Amin, A. and N. Thrift, 2012. The Legibility of the Everyday City. LOGOS, 3-4(34).
28. Thrift, N., 1996. Spatial Formations: London: Sage, ISBN 0-8039-8545-2.
29. Vlasyuk, G.V., 2012. Socially Oriented Management of Enterprise: Resource Approach. Upravlenie megapolisom, pp: 2.
30. Bourdieu, P., 1995. Lecture, College de France, Faculty of Anthropology, Lumiere Lion University, November 14, 1995. © Bourdieu, 1995.
31. Vlasyuk, G.V., 2012. Socially Oriented Management of Enterprise. In: Socially Oriented Management under Conditions of Risk and Uncertainty. Monograph. Moscow. Sputnik, pp: 170-196. ISBN 978-5-9973-1956-4.
32. Shapiro, C. and H.R. Varian, 1998. Information Rules: A Strategic Guide to the Network Economy. Harvard Business School Press.
33. Katz, M.L. and C. Shapiro, 1985. Network Externalities, Competition and Compatibility. American Economic Review, 75(3): 424-440.