

ECONOMICS, MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS ACCOUNTING

658.114:657.6

DOI: 10.18413/2409-1634-2021-7-3-0-5

..



« , 72, , 210035, »,

e-mail: [gruzs@mail.ru](mailto:gruzs@mail.ru)

« », « », « », « », « », « », « »  
».  
- - - , -  
,  
« - -  
».  
- -  
.  
- -  
.  
:  
- ; -  
;  
:  
:  
//

2021. . 7. 3. . 61-70. DOI: 10.18413/2409-1634-2021-7-3-0-5

**Katerina S.  
Gruznevich**

**ASSESSMENT OF THE SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL AND ECO-  
NOMIC EFFICIENCY OF THE ORGANIZATION: THE  
ESSENCE AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

Vitebsk State Technological University, 72 Moskovsky Ave.,  
Vitebsk, 210035, Republic of Belarus,

e-mail: gruzs@mail.ru

**Abstract**

The article considers the essence and developed criteria for comparing the definitions of “assessment”, “analysis”, “performance evaluation”, “performance analysis”, “performance evaluation”. The author proposes a new approach to the definition of efficiency - socio-ecological-economic, which in contrast to the traditional representation, is consistent with modern economic trends and the global imperative of sustainable development. The author's definition of the category “assessment of socio-environmental and economic efficiency of the organization” was formulated. The methodical approach to the assessment of socio-environmental and economic efficiency of the enterprise based on the factor analysis was developed. For each aspect of efficiency the key indicator was determined. The advantage of the author's approach is the opportunity to establish the relationship between the individual components - to include indicators of the economic aspect in the social and environmental aspects, thereby investigating the relationship between them.

**Key words:** assessment of the effectiveness of the organization; socio-ecological and economic efficiency; key performance indicators; factor analysis

**Information for citation:** Gruznevich K. S. “Assessment of the socio-ecological and economic efficiency of the organization: the essence and methodological approach”, *Research Result. Research*, 7(3), 61-70, DOI: 10.18413/2409-1634-2021-7-3-0-5

« »  
 ,  
 [ . . ., 2006; -  
 . . ., 2010; . . ., 2003] ( 1):  
 , -  
 1  
 « » « »

Table 1

-		,
		( - )

, « -  
 », « -  
 . « -  
 », « -  
 , -  
 ». -  
 , -  
 . [2020], . . .  
 [2020], . . .  
 ( . 1), [2019], . . . [2008], . . . -  
 , - [2010]  
 , -  
 , -  
 . [ . . ., 2019], -  
 - , [ . . ., -  
 . . ., 2020], -  
 , -  
 . [ . . ., 2008].  
 « » « -  
 », , , -  
 , -  
 , -  
 , -

« » [ , 2017]. [ , 2019; , 2020; , 2008; , 2010] 1): 2 « » « »

Table 2

		-
-	,	-
	-	,
	-	-



Fig.1. An approach to assessing socio-ecological-economic efficiency based on factor analysis



$$= \frac{1}{3} (X_1 + X_2 + X_3) = \frac{1}{3} (X_1 + X_2 + X_3) \quad (6)$$

The text below the equation is extremely faint and largely illegible. It appears to contain several lines of text, possibly describing the variables or the context of the equation. Some fragments are visible, such as "1 3", "3;", and "3).".

Table 3

, %	6,71	4,82	-1,89
, / .	0,02	1,98	1,96
-	0,174	0,133	-0,041

4

Table 4

	-2,52
	0,15
	-0,15
	0,59

	-0,44
	0,48
	-1,89
	1,97
	-0,20
	-0,10
	0,29
	1,96
	-
	-0,004
	0,002
1 . 3	0,004
	-0,009
	-0,035
	-
	0,001
	-0,041

4,82 %.

1,89 . . .

;

(-2,52 . . .),

(-0,15 . . .)

(-0,44 . . .).

1,98 . . . / . . ., 1,96 . . .

. / . . . ,

0,20 . . . / . . .

0,10 . . . / . . .



0,041 0,133,

0,02),

1 3 ( 0,04),  
 ( 0,001),

1. , 2008.

2008: 463.

2. , 2003.

3- „ /

3. 2003: 1280.

2017.

4. 2017. 2(33): 123 - 131.

2010. 12: 11-18.

5. , 2010.

20 000 , 1200  
 / : ACT. 2010: 699.

6. „ , 2010.

7. / : 2010: 465.  
 „ , 2020.

8. 2020: 208.

2006.  
 80 000

9. 2006: 944.

