

Magdalena Rosińska-Bukowska<sup>1</sup>

## SYSTEMIC COMPETITIVENESS – NEW CHALLENGES FOR ENTERPRISES IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

---

### *Abstract*

*The presented study notes that in the period of ongoing globalization, it is necessary to look at the new rules of building competitiveness for the enterprises. Consequently, it is reasonable to present the basic assumptions of the overall international competitiveness paradigm adapted to the challenges of modern knowledge-based economy. In this study, the author undertook a critical analysis of five models of international competitiveness and attempted to identify the basics upon which, any organization wanting to meet the demands of the changing global environment, should be based on. In the paper is to draw the attention on the necessity of deepening analysis of new factors which are dedicated to assess competitiveness of modern business systems. The organizations implementing such a business model are determined to hold leading positions in the global system, because due to the use of the multidimensional potential of capital they are capable of continuous creation of added value. According to the author the concept of creating added value with the use of CSR is very important and it requires dissemination.*

---

JEL Classification Code: F23, D85, L14, M14.

**Keywords:** competitiveness, Corporate Social Responsibility, CSR, creating added value, globalization, knowledge-based economy, corporate strategy, sustainable development, development of enterprises.

### **Introduction**

In the period of ongoing globalization, it is necessary to look at the new rules of building competitiveness for the enterprises – systemic competitiveness. Reasonable is to present the basic assumptions of the overall international competitiveness paradigm adapted to the challenges of modern knowledge-based

---

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, University of Lodz, Faculty of Economics and Sociology, Department of International Economic Relations.

economy. An attempt was made to identify the basics upon which, any enterprise wanting to meet the demands of the changing global environment, should be based on. It is emphasized that such actions demand continuous improvement of competitiveness and must apply to all areas – areas of capital organization. The challenge the 21<sup>st</sup> century is to shape international competitiveness in systemization terms. The concept of this challenge is considered appropriate in the case of suitable model of development of enterprises in this new world.

The purpose of this paper is to highlight the need for a new look at the issues of international competitiveness in the era of globalization and to focus efforts on creating a competitive system, which results from actions at the micro-, mezzo-, macro- and meta-economical levels. The presented study notes that in the period of ongoing globalization similar challenges with regard to creating competition, stand against all types of entities – states, groups, other types of organizations, including businesses. Consequently, it is reasonable to present the basic assumptions of the overall international competitiveness paradigm adapted to the challenges of modern knowledge-based economy. In this study, the author undertook a critical analysis of five models of international competitiveness and attempted to identify the basics upon which, any organization wanting to meet the demands of the changing global environment, should be based on. It is emphasized that such actions demand continuous improvement of competitiveness and must apply to all areas – areas of capital organization. In the paper is to draw the attention on the necessity of deepening analysis of new factors which are dedicated to assess competitiveness of modern business systems. It is due to the fact that building creative international teams also made direct competitors in the whole global market has become a requirement, not a choice. Changes in the global economy meant that enterprises have been forced to build their competitiveness on the basis of multi-layered cooperative network structures. This resulted in the need to find a way to take into account new parameters in models for assessing their competitiveness. The paper presents the concept of the rate of creation of value added measure as a project of multidimensional assessment of network systems with international structures competitiveness. The measure of creation of value added is using multivariable statistical analysis to take into account the qualitative dimension of building international competitiveness based on available quantitative data. The essence of the presented method is to highlight the impact of all five separate layers of company capital on the effectiveness of cooperative systems.

The paper is divided into five parts: introduction, three general parts and conclusion.

The second part outlines the theoretical concept of systemic competitiveness. It is the explanation of the assumptions of the new model of competitiveness strategy for enterprises – the requirement of international competitiveness in the

21<sup>st</sup> century. The author discusses the five basic models of international competitiveness of states. The purpose of this part is to highlight the need for a new look at the issues of international competitiveness strategy for enterprises in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The analysis of selected models of international competitiveness of states would indicate basic requirements of the general model of competitiveness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The third section shows Corporate Social Responsibility as a way to create value-added. The author is underlined requirement of inclusion CSR in strategy enterprise which would be still competitiveness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The purpose of this part is to highlight that innovative development based on the creation of added value, which means creating multiple values. It requires consideration of many areas of activity of the organization – the organizational, innovation and institutional aspects of corporate capital. This should be reflected in models for sources of market advantages and principles of creating competitiveness.

The next part of the article proposes an original approach for assessing the competitiveness of enterprises. It seems necessary to take into account the analysis of multiple layers of capital organizations, including those whose value, due to their qualitative nature, is difficult to quantify. For the purpose of this analysis the author takes into account the division into five basic subsystems: market, financial (two other subsystems determine the strength of economic capital) innovation, organizational and institutional (three other subsystems determine the strength of intellectual capital). Its advantage is the use of the available quantitative data to achieve the fullest possible picture of all layers of capital of the organization (including intangible assets). The indicator is based on quantitative indicators (measurable and comparable), which, as a result of proper configuration, make it possible, at least to some extent, to take into account quality measurement conditions for building competitiveness.

The final section it is conclusion, which is an attempt to present a model for the assessment of the competitiveness of enterprises in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The author shows the general assumptions of the target model of competition for subjects/areas that want to meet the demands of a changing global environment, seeking long-term competitive position.

### **The requirement of international competitiveness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century**

The thesis put forward is that in a period of deepening globalization and liberalization, to build competitiveness, in essence means confronting competition throughout the global market. This requires treating competition as a dynamic phenomenon. Competitiveness is associated with the continues building of competitive advantage – the search for its sources, assessing the significance of market position and the potential of existing resources for obtaining competitiveness

and finally, consolidating it. [Krzyżanowska, 2007a and 2007b]. The total amount of resources results from the current position, that is the location of the surrounding structures and is the competitive capital, which determines the choice of a competitive strategy. It includes the measured values of market and financial capital and the hardly quantifiable intellectual capital, including human, organizational and institutional [Rosińska-Bukowska, 2012]. The analysis of the surrounding environment should thus encourage individual enterprises to reinforce the foundations of the competitive potential that will allow them to systematically maintain specific advantages of stability and as a result, improve competitiveness in the long run. Competitiveness is thus the need to build a competitive system, allowing continues adaption to dynamic changes.

One must consider competitiveness in systematic terms, that is as a system of four elements [Gorynia & Łaźniewska, 2008; Gruszecki, 2002]: potential of competitiveness (resources), the ability to compete (instruments and tactics available and used to multiply its potential) competitive advantage (values which stand out in relation to other competitors) and long-term competitive position (strong, stable position in a particular area). The competitiveness building model, in any modern organization – of course, also the enterprise, should be based on the full analysis of the changing global environment, including the diagnosis of economic and intellectual capital. As a result, the competitiveness system consists of four related types of competitiveness [Rosińska-Bukowska, 2012]:

- competitive base – gathered resources;
- operational competitiveness – specific, 'technical' skills;
- competitiveness competence – permanent strengthening of core capabilities;
- systemic competitiveness – the ability to meet high quality standards, and even the creation of added value.

Thusly perceived, systemic competitiveness is the challenge of modern times – challenge to modern enterprises, which wants to meet the growing demands of the dynamic global economy.

In order to indicate new foundation for general model of competitiveness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century in article were discussed the five basics models of international competitiveness of states. The purpose of this analysis would indicate basic requirements of systemic competitiveness and to highlight the need for a new look at the issues of international competitiveness strategy for enterprises. The analysis includes five models of international economic competitiveness [Radło, 2008]:

- the model by World Economic Forum (WEF);
- the model by Business Environment Group (BEG);
- the model International Institute for Management Development (IMD);
- the model by W. Bienkowski (American Model – AM);
- the model by K. Esser, W. Hildebrand, D. Messner and J. Meyer-Stamer (Systemic Model – SM).

The basis for referring to the international competitiveness strategy for enterprises model is describing in its fullest range, factors of competitiveness and conducting the analysis on four levels [Esser, Hillebrand, Messner & Meyer-Stamer, 2008]: meta – socio-cultural, macro – state policies, mezzo – priorities of specialized areas, micro – enterprise activity – (systemic).

The WEF model distinguishes eight groups of factors existing „in the area” that affects the level of competitiveness: the degree of openness for cooperation, the role of the central body (the state, its parent corporations, supranational institutions) as a regulators of processes within the system under construction; the assessment of the stability of the market situation of the organizations created this way within the world economy system; infrastructure development factors; the quality of production and service base and its structural diversity; the ability to engage in an international system of innovation, creation and dissemination of new standards; the quality of management methods, or the ability to meet the demands of different interest groups; evaluation of the structure and potential of human resources; the managing institutional system – (regulatory).

The BEG model lists five determinants of competitiveness. The factors taken into consideration also apply to all subsystems of organization: market, financial, organizational, technological and institutional. The strength of production and service assets (physical infrastructure) and organizational and structural assets (information and communication networks) and acquired „infrastructure potential” are identified as a type of investment mood, essential for improving the position of the subject in the future.

Within the IMD model the following are identified as the basis for building competitiveness: the image of the initial „economic situation”, basic „infrastructure”, technical and scientific support underlying the decisions within the areas and the instruments of competition, and the „efficiency of government and management”, (institutional model), principles and mechanisms for building the system and the control of intra-organizational flows (financial, human, knowledge). In addition, it is pointed out that the choice of a competitive strategy encourages the „infrastructure of followed values” as reflected in the rules setting out the general framework of building relationships (separate for the EU, U.S. and China). The model includes: basic resources, competence and skills, mechanisms and institutions.

The AM model indicates the following as key: the size and structure of productive resources, efficient use of these resources by selecting the right tools to compete, culture of the organization – a set of values, objectives and principles, reflecting the socio-economic, policy to combat the competition – a model of gaining advantage (cost, awards), the international position of the subject at a particular time – starting point for assessing the prospects of development, taking into ac-

count the openness of the system and its global engagement. The model also emphasizes the „overlap” of particular groups of factors and their interactions.

The SM model underlines the importance of these interactions between different areas and organizes elements of the system, by assigning them to further levels of regulation: the meta – cultural and social conditions, ability to adapt to different requirements of individual areas of global space, the macro – the impact of institutional settings (policies shaping the economic environment), the mezzo – conditions resulting from the specific nature of the area/sector, and the micro – factors related to current activities of the system components.

The advantage of the international competitiveness strategy for enterprises model is to draw attention to the need of considering all levels of the environment as determinants of long-term competitiveness – the systematic approach. Moreover it emphasizes the role of cultural and political environments as motivating competition, creating a social „mood” enforcing competitiveness. Furthermore, emphasis is put on quality, a flexible approach to change and the building of integrated networks.

### **Corporate Social Responsibility as a way to create value-added – inclusion of CSR with strategy enterprise in 21<sup>st</sup> century**

The purpose of this part of the paper is an attempt to draw attention to the growing importance of CSR in business strategies as a consequence of the fact that the creation of added value is that which decides about the competitive ability of the company. This means that any organization wishing to secure long-term development is obliged to add new values to the generally applicable standard or otherwise create goods and services (economic value), while maintaining standards of „best practice”, allowing its social actions to be dubbed responsible (socially valuable). In an attempt to identify areas in which projects implementing added value may be realized, certain theoretical issues related to corporate social responsibility were named, with reference to the latest guidelines in this area. Its essence is an indication that CSR is a new way of thinking, which is based on understanding the effectiveness of corporate social responsibility strategies and, more broadly, what one should pay attention to when assessing the development potential of different organizations. It is vital to mention that resources (financial and market capital), used for the creation of economic value are only competitive potential, which needs to be constantly refined and adjusted to the changes occurring in the environment; this happens thanks to its innovative capital, organizational and institutional, in order to be able to consistently deliver value, which is socially acceptable. That is how the concept of socio-economic value is created, as a new category of goods that customers require. In this way, the

special role of intellectual capital (soft) as a value is shown, without which the accumulated economic capital (hard) is rapidly devalued. It can therefore be said that in the course of economic development and especially the growth of social knowledge, progress has been made as a result of which competition moved to a new, higher level – added value to the already existing standard, yet it is a fact that at this stage it's not technology innovation but rather, organizational, social, environmental, etc.

The conception of strategic congruence is necessary to compete and develop in long term – companies must operate according to requirement of sustainable management. This conception includes: opportunities and threats in the environment, values and resources of the enterprise, which must be balanced to create good, successful corporate strategy. The congruence with the environment is the foundation for the creation of a permanent capacity for added value. Majority of the companies think that strong and socially responsible relations with the stakeholders increase their competitiveness [Coulter, 2005].

Actually the relations with the stakeholders have strong influence on the international competitiveness of company. From the point of view of the corporate strategy, the most important will be the stakeholders which operate in the competitive environment that is the closer the external ones such as competitors, suppliers, intermediary clients, final clients, partners. A certain importance can be also played by the external further stakeholders such as e.g. a government. Apart from the external stakeholders (the closer and the further ones), there are also internal stakeholders (president, board, accountant, employees, trade unions and so on). Another division is into primary stakeholders (in other words active stakeholders) who have a direct influence on the company and into secondary stakeholders (passive stakeholders) who have an indirect influence [Wheelen & Hunger, 2006]. We can additionally indicate two groups of stakeholders: current stakeholders (already existing) and the potential stakeholders (the so-called amorphous). Both groups should match up and can be created as a result of joining the different stakeholders if it is required by a market situation [Penc-Pietrzak, 2014].

Most important is to identify the stakeholders and describe their type. It is strength of the pressure exerted by them on the companies and present a possible evolution of this influence on the closest future. From this point of view one can differentiate [Johnson & Scholes, 1999]:

- the stakeholders who are not very much involved in the company issues and who have little influence on it and who require the minimum attention from the management;
- the stakeholders who are very much interested in the issues of the company but those which exert small impact and those who must be informed about the company's issues on an ongoing basis;

- stakeholders with very low interest in the company's issues but who exert significant influence on it which means that it is necessary to take care of a proper level of their satisfaction from the operation of the company;
- key stakeholders, very much interested in the company issues who have a lot of influence on it, who require a lot of attention from the management as well as taking their needs and requirements in the company's strategy.

In conclusion, CSR is an expression of a kind of innovative development based on the creation of added value, which means creating multiple values: economic, social, ecological, for all stakeholders. It appears that one may use the concept created by M. E. Porter and M. R. Kramer, which refer to creating socio-economic value – model: Creating Shared Value (CSV) [Porter & Kramer 2011]. The external stakeholders must focus on not only the implementation of the tasks which refer to the effectiveness and profitability (investors) but also the implementation of social activities (clients, employees, local communities). The company should get to know their features, aims, motives and mechanisms of the stakeholders activities and react properly to the needs and expectations. It is a concept of inclusive management (Mączyńska, 2015). Key areas for this modern approach to corporate strategy are:

- organizational order – principles of contracts, building intra-organizational relationships, safety and health, approaches to professional development and non-professional staff;
- fair practice – action with regard to anti-corruption education, promoting social responsibility programs creating standards of „good practice”;
- human rights – constant monitoring of human rights of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd generation (freedom, equality, solidarity), that is, not only fundamental rights, but also social and living rights and cultural-educational ones; detecting situations which may give rise to danger of breaking any of these laws, especially taking constant supervision of vulnerable groups (gender, nationality, religion, etc.);
- the environment – refers to the prevention of pollution, mitigating the effects resulting from the organizations activity and adapting production systems to occurring climate change;
- consumer issues – honest marketing, including the implementation of educational promotional and advertising campaigns excluding those that mislead the consumer, the implementation of programs aimed at promoting sustainable patterns of consumption, protection of the consumers or even care about the availability of products and product-related services, spare parts and consumables for goods already sold;
- commitment to social and community development – activity in the region (such as creating new jobs and improving the quality of life of employees already working for the organization), to support local initiatives, philanthropic activities targeted especially at the most vulnerable members of the community.



The basic rules of inclusive management as the new approach to corporate strategy must include: accountability – proceedings in accordance with the highest adopted standards; transparency – transparent policy in all areas of activity; ethically – covering matters of governed behavior, including respect for customary and statutory law; congruence – indicating the formation of economic and social value.

The new approach shows that most important are:

- the systematic implementation of international standards, with emphasis on respect for human rights;
- the protection of vulnerable and socially sensitive areas;
- the use of so-called good practice and promoting that among partners and the creating more and more new models of such behavior,
- the overtaking the competition, thanks to the introduction of pro-social innovation;
- the effect of reconciling divergent objectives of many diverse groups of stakeholders, building on the model of common values.

The key issue seems to be the issue to highlight the need to integrate social responsibility in a strategy of modern enterprise. The second principle is that organizational excellence at one point can not be a „cover” for breaking the rules in other areas. The third rule, it should be noted that the incorporation of CSR into the strategy of an organization is not a single act, but is usually a complex and multilayer process. The most important is awareness – pointing the attention of every department and labor group in the organization to the issues of CSR as way to build its competitive advantage. The implementation of CSR in corporate strategy must be systematic and planned activity in further areas of the organization. It is characterized by the uneven emphasis on relations with different stakeholders, which means that there are areas of outstanding „ethics” and areas of business activity with lower levels of social engagement. The already rooted CSR action in the identity of the organization, its organizational culture of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The recognition of the fulfillment of CSR standards as one of the key competencies of modern enterprises. This organization that can create added value and through such actions become an industry leader. The approach can be called innovative or interactive as it is based on formation of distinctive competence through actively obtaining information coming from the environment and using that to generate permanent value. The multi-level environment, both internal and external causes that impulses are generated continuously, which allows for continuous improvement of the business model [Jonker, Rudnicka & Reichel, 2011].

It would appear that the guidelines for CSR as a part of corporate strategy are in fact a set of recommendations adapted to the new requirements of the world economy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In dynamically changing environments it needs

to be mentioned that they are the standard for a new management system. The most important challenge is found a new way to identify general principles of an international competitiveness of enterprises.

### **The concept of evaluation of systemic competitiveness of enterprises**

In the modern world the ability to construct a system of interconnections, generating knowledge and innovation and thereby improving the skills of individual members are of paramount importance. Competitiveness must be based on the initial position of the enterprise (core competitiveness). In order to maintain competitive position it is necessary to be creative and innovative (operational competitiveness). This shows the need to improve and consolidate core competence, which is a combination of cooperation and competition (competition competence). Only this allows for long-term advantages enterprise in terms of dynamic changes within the environment – systemic competitiveness. Gathering resources, enabling effective competitiveness in a global environment requires the adoption of the idea of the „interaction of resources”, that is to develop different types of business relationships with other entities that control specific resources and/or can provide needed information for adaptation models in a given market. What followed was the reorganization of company structures in such a way that the actual boundaries inside and outside the organization became blurry [Cia-buschi, Perna & Snehota 2012].

Based on research, the author attempted to identify general principles of an international competitiveness paradigm, understood in terms of a „standard model of organization” capable of building a strong competitive position. The basic requirements are as follows:

- ongoing compliance with the criteria, which measure the ability to compete on a global level;
- functioning on the basis of value principles added on the account of solid, internal interactions of all subsystems;
- the local approach – effective combination of global and local (e.g. respect for „local” cultural and social organization);
- transparency of structures and activities – creating regulatory institutions as centers of competence;
- the model of „knowledge organization” – treating intellectual capital as the basis for multiplying accumulated potential (economic capital);
- expansion strategy based on assumptions, adequate to the requirements of economical knowledge – innovation, sustainable development, cooperation
- an active meta-economic policy – consistent with the principles of Corporate Social Responsibility.

Changes in the global economy meant that companies have been forced to build their competitiveness on the basis of multi-layered cooperative network structures. Their essence is to combine cooperation with competition, which based on CSR-strategy. This resulted in the need to find a way to take into account new parameters in models for assessing competitiveness of enterprises in 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The aim of this part of paper is to present the concept of the rate of the creation of added value, using multivariable statistical analysis to take into account the qualitative dimension of building international competitiveness based on available quantitative data. The essence of the presented method is to highlight the impact of all five separate layers of company capital on the effectiveness of organization. The company business systems were division into basic subsystems: market, financial, innovation, organizational and institutional.

The market subsystem reflects the possible combinations of the most efficient allocation of scarce resources in the production and sale of goods and services – production systems used at any given time. The financial sub-system is used to evaluate the effectiveness through the prism of current profits, market value and the ability to maintain liquidity. These subsystems are the pillars of the economic capital.

Three other subsystems determine the strength of intellectual capital. The innovation subsystem is a source of improving the quality of individual proposals, especially on key competences (eg. specializing in handling specific segments). It's analysis is based on an examination of expenditures for research and development activities, to provide innovative solutions in terms of products and operations (eg. the production organization techniques). The essence of the organizational subsystem is, in turn, transforming their resources into capital by building pathways for company structures to adjust, based on opportunities offered by its surroundings. The choice of organizational forms that are adequate to the place of business, contribute significantly to improving the effectiveness of the system [Claver-Cortés, Pertusa-Ortega & Molina-Azorín, 2012]. The result of its performance is to change resource (quantifiable) in capital, generating added value (quality approach). The subsystem is responsible for the systematic modification of the value chain and must be taken into account in the study of competitiveness. It is also responsible for the creation of linkages adequate to the situation, including cooperative competitiveness. The creative use of multi-institutional potential of the surroundings is the role of the institutional subsystem. 'Institutions' create external (with business partners) and internal relations – eg. good practice in relation to employees that allow for more efficient use of their talents [Kim et. al., 2012].

The analysis of five subsystems is multidimensional and allows one to include a number of new factors integrated into the competitive strategies that were previously overlooked. This means analysing architectural relationships established

among the various subsystems (internal conditions) and the congruence principles with the surroundings (external conditions).

Within the proposed concept the element reflecting the state of the economic capital of the company is Return On Equity (ROE), which combines elements describing the area of finance, production and sales. This indicator considers the impact on the profitability of committed capital of three important factors: operational efficiency, expressed by return on sales, efficient use of acquired assets and leverage, reflecting the impact of the involvement of foreign capital to increase profit per equity unit: Equity multiplier.

When selecting elements that represent the intellectual capital, so called direct methods of valuation were used [Sveiby, 2015]: *Holistic Value Approach* [Pike & Roos, 2000], *Intellectual Capital Dynamic Value* [Bounfour, 2003], *Intellectual Capital Benchmarking System* [Viedma, 2001] and *Estimated Value Via Intellectual Capital Analysis* [McCutcheon, 2008]. It was found that the ability for the creation of added value is often connected with the strength of intellectual capital, but emphasizing that it is a potential for growth, which requires adequate implementation and support of adequate economic capital.

Based on research, the author attempted to create new concept of evaluation of systemic competitiveness of enterprises. In this model have been used five parameters: profitability index of equity [ROE], the cost of research and development per employee, engagement of intangible assets in the value of sales  $[(MV-SE)/S]$  and internationalization indicators of assets and employment. The key is to emphasize the importance of networks (four levels: meta-, macro-, mezzo- and micro-economic) and the international nature of these systems [Esser et al., 2008], which is intended to draw attention to the necessity to combine cooperation and competition in order to meet today's challenges.

It was equally important to introduce a parameter indicator  $[(MV-SE)/S]$ . In this way, they tried to „measure“ the importance of a business network, entangling the enterprise, for sales volume being carried out by the central subject  $[MV-SE]$ , that is the difference between the market value and own property valuation was considered as a key part of the intellectual capital – valuation of the CSR network system. The network capital is based on a system built by company relationships and business connections, not necessarily visible in materialized form, which includes owned holdings, joint venture or formal cooperation agreements. The company has possession many of these types of assets through a sustainable development. It is an attempt to quantify the hidden factors increasing the competitive potential through implementation of full CSR strategy.

The constructed synthetic indicator is designed to reflect the ability of the company to create added value through power connections of all categories of capital held within the network.

## Conclusion

The proposed elements of the paradigm of international competitiveness appear to be a real challenge – opportunity for modern enterprises seeking ways to build its position in the global economy. Only through the consistent implementation of the following requirements competitiveness of the enterprise can gain the ability to compete effectively in the global space business. Only through consistent in the implementation of the following requirements competitiveness of the enterprise can gain the ability to compete effectively on the global business scene. Company must meet the basic condition for output – accumulated appropriate base growth potential. The next step is to create a system of transnational governance of regulatory nature – as a model of authority seems to be adequate as a mechanism of control of evolutionary networks. The modern enterprise must also function as a cooperation system encouraging competition, cooperation and multiculturalism, which is equivalent to local system structures. Paramount importance is of reform of the organizational structure of the enterprise – first of all the continuous a constant can be regarded as efforts to improve its transparency. Even more important seems to be taken by the enterprise challenges of building a knowledge-based economy. The implementation of an intelligent organization model based on „knowledge organization” is the recognition of intellectual capital as an important growth factor, which is reflected in the emphasis on involvement in innovative projects that contribute to sustainable development and exploitation of synergies and the diversity of 'local' specific regions.

Consequently, by adopting a systemic model of competitiveness, modern states by competing with „soft added value”, such as projects of social responsibility, can improve its chances for development. For the enterprise to be recognized as having the capacity to build a competitive system it is, however, necessary to make wider use of management methods that involve diverse multicultural competence of the environment. The article is an attempt to present a model for the assessment of the competitiveness of enterprises in 21<sup>st</sup> century – as a view combining the properties of positional and resource streams [Gorynia & Dzikowska, 2012], taking into account the importance of the international context. The network capital of organization is based on a system built by company relationships and connections with all stakeholders.

The presented synthetic indicator is designed to reflect the ability of the company to create added value through power connections of all categories of capital held within the relationship network. The concept of synthetic indicator of creating of added value is an attempt to quantify the hidden factors increasing the competitive potential of organization in through implementation of full CSR strategy. Maturity in the field of CSR can attest the overall maturity of organization, which is why the analysis of aspects of corporate social responsibility are

becoming more and more part of the development potential of the assessment and valuation of companies. The purpose of the paper was among others an attempt to draw attention to the growing importance of CSR in business strategies as a consequence of the fact that the creation of added value is that which decides about the competitive ability of the company. Its essence is an indication that sustainable management is a new way of thinking, which is based on understanding the effectiveness of social responsibility strategies and, more broadly, what one should pay attention to when assessing the development potential of organizations.

## References

- Bounfour, A. (2003). *The IC-dVAL Approach*. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 4, 396–413.
- Ciabuschi, F., Perna, A., & Snehota, I. (2012). *Assembling resources when forming a new business*. Journal of Business Research, 65, 220–229.
- Claver-Cortés, E., Pertusa-Ortega, E. M., & Molina-Azorín, J. F. (2012). *Characteristics of organizational structure relating to hybrid competitive strategy: Implications for performance*. Journal of Business Research, 65, 993–1002.
- Coulter, M. (2005). *Strategic Management in Action*. Pearson Prentice Hall: New Jersey, 49.
- Esser, K., Hillebrand, W., Messner, D. & Meyer-Stamer, J. (2008). *Systemic Competitiveness: a New Challenge for Firms and for Government*. In: Milestones in a Process of Innovation, Change and Development. Special Edition: Buenos Aires/Dortmund, 21–26.
- Gorynia, M., & Łaźniewska, E. (2008). *Kompendium wiedzy o konkurencyjności międzynarodowej*. Wydawnictwo AE, Poznań, 10–37.
- Gorynia, M., & Dzikowska, M. (2012). *Teoretyczne aspekty konkurencyjności przedsiębiorstwa – w kierunku koncepcji eklektycznej?* Gospodarka Narodowa, 4, 1–30.
- Gruszecki, T. (2002). *Współczesne teorie przedsiębiorstwa*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, 191–193.
- Johnson, G., & Scholes, K. (1999). *Exploring Corporate Strategy*. Prentice Hall Europe: London, 215–217.
- Jonker, J., Rudnicka, A., & Reichel, J. (2011). *Nowe horyzonty. Przewodnik po społecznej odpowiedzialności i rozwoju zrównoważonym*. Centrum Strategii i Rozwoju Impact: Łódź, 62–64, 123.

- Kim, K. H., Jeon, B. J., Jung, H. S., Lu, W. & Jones, J. (2012). *Effective employment brand equity through sustainable competitive advantage, marketing strategy, and corporate image*. Journal of Business Research, 65.
- Krzyżanowska, M. (2007a). *Wczesne koncepcje przewagi konkurencyjnej*. Marketing i Rynek, 8, 2–8.
- Krzyżanowska, M. (2007b). *Nowoczesne koncepcje przewagi konkurencyjnej*. Marketing i Rynek, 9, 2–9.
- McCutcheon, G. (2008). *EVVICAE, a valuation model for intellectual asset-rich businesses*. Measuring Business Excellence, 12 (2), 79–96.
- Penc-Pietrzak, I. (2014). *Competitive Strategy in Turbulent Environment*. Lodz University of Technology: Lodz, 51–53.
- Pike S. & Roos G. (2000). *Intellectual Capital Measurement and Holistic Value Approach*. Works Institute Journal (Japan), 42, 11–25.
- Porter, M. E. & Kramer M. R. (2011). *The Big Idea: Creating Shared Value*. Harvard Business Review, 89 (1/2), 62–77.
- Radło, M. J. (2008). *Międzynarodowa konkurencyjność gospodarki. Uwagi na temat definicji, czynników i miar*. In: W. Bieńkowski et al. (ed.), *Czynniki i miary międzynarodowej konkurencyjności gospodarek w kontekście globalizacji – wstępne wyniki badań*. Prace i Materiały, 284, Instytut Gospodarki Światowej SGH, Warszawa, 3–15.
- Rosińska-Bukowska, M. (2012). *Rozwój globalnych sieci biznesowych jako strategia konkurencyjna korporacji transnarodowych*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź, 100–108.
- Sveiby, K. E. (2015 July 16). *Methods for Measuring Intellectual Capital* from [www.sveiby.com](http://www.sveiby.com).
- Viedma, J. M. (2001). *ICBS Intellectual Capital Benchmarking System*. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 2, 148–164.
- Wheelen T. L. & Hunger J. D. (2006). *Concepts in Strategic Management and Business Policy*. Pearson Prentice Hall: New Jersey, 60.

