

UDC 640.432:331.522

Kryvoshei V.V.

*Doctor of Economics, Professor of Finance
Kharkiv State University of Food Technology and Trade*

MONITORING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE RESTAURANT INDUSTRY: THE PLACE AND ROLE OF HUMAN CAPITAL

Statement of the problem and its relationship with the most important scientific and practical tasks. Research in the restaurant business is mainly focused on the study of economic conditions, the development, the definition of financial stability, the strategizing, planning, identifying factors increase competitiveness and so on. Monitoring is an important element of the mechanism of enterprise performance management restaurant management and includes two management functions: assessment of the current state of the process and the dynamics of its development and monitoring of tasks within performance management firms restaurants.

Question analysis and evaluation of enterprises catering farms are reflected in the writings of L. Agathon [1, p. 56-58], A. Agathon [1, p. 60-65], V. Antonova [2], L. Baskov [3], I. Careful [4], V. Karsekina [5], K. Korovin [6], V. Pivovarova [6], G. Pyatnitska and N. Pyatnitska [7] and others. However, the problem of determining factors of efficiency, the development of mechanisms, techniques and methodologies effectively manage effective restaurant business activities of enterprises are not sufficiently investigated.

The article aims to monitoring the efficiency of enterprises restaurants where actual results may be obtained under certain requirements for its realization: the collection and processing of information within the performance management that should be systematic; indicators that reflect the results of performance management should be organized according to specific areas, which in turn can be updated, if necessary, evaluation of performance management should be carried out not only quantitative, but also qualitative criteria, monitoring results should serve as an information base for decision making in the field of performance management.

The main material research. As the object of monitoring performance management we have identified a group of enterprises restaurants. The only summary measure of estimation performance management company restaurants can be considered an indicator of profitability. Model performance at different levels of the hierarchy of socio-economic systems investigated in detail by foreign and domestic scholars and repeatedly passed testing in books and several research papers [8].

As an indicator of performance management resulting in economic terms can be determined by productivity, and social - the expected duration of a specific length. We believe that the rate of performance management in restaurants and catering enterprises should count as current prices and for the effects of inflation to assess the actual results performance management. Dynamics of indicator "profitability in current and constant prices for 18 companies selected restaurants representative population for years 1999-2011 are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Enhanced differentiation of enterprises restaurants state that is unfavorable trend Ukrainian economy, but it allows us to observe the results of management, both in economic and in social terms.

However, we also see negative trends in socio-economic efficiency. Thus, the reduced rate of profitability of the company restaurants. Almost half of the surveyed enterprises are concentrated in the sector of low socio-economic efficiency, which justifies the need for performance management at the enterprise restaurants.

The statistical correlation between the average return on practically observed: the correlation coefficient is less than 0.18 doing analysis of the socio-economic efficiency of enterprises respondents' restaurant management of the target population for the summary measure, we consider it necessary to thoroughly evaluate the effectiveness of the basic units of management.

The development of social and economic efficiency of enterprises restaurant business is largely dependent on the sectoral structure of its economy. To ensure the highest possible performance share its products exceed the share of purchased goods. However, the concept of performance management firms restaurants does not imply efficiency by any means, therefore, important to consider not only the specifics of the company, but also its place and role in the economy.

To determine the mechanism of influence of the structure of enterprises restaurants on the cost-effectiveness of its development we have constructed a regression equation according to the sample of firms restaurants included in the study group constituency in 1999 and 2010, which is as follows:

$$y = 437,1 x_1 + 4346,2 x_2 + 2367,2 x_3$$

where y - the economic efficiency of enterprises restaurants, UAH, x_1 - material consumption enterprises, x_2 - complexity of products, x_3 - labor productivity.

Free Member equation a_0 is not statistically significant, the coefficient of determination R^2 is 0.71, indicating a high distress communications. Results of correlation and regression analyzes of economic efficiency confirming the theoretical assumptions about the most preferred business structure restaurants.

In order to determine the impact of traffic patterns on our individual performance was held group studied a group of enterprises restaurants were divided us into three equal groups: primary turnover of its products, from purchased goods and companies balanced trade structure.

The result of the grouping of enterprises restaurants showed that the highest efficiency is observed in the prevalence of turnover on purchased goods, hereinafter - the company with the products of their own production, and only then - companies with balanced trade, since such companies are few. This leading company restaurants twice the level of economic efficiency overtake lagging. Slight differentiation observed among groups in terms of the average length of the business (6,5-6,1 in 2010). Performance indicators of labor as most effectively used in enterprises where trade prevails for the purchase of products, the average labor productivity exceeds that of other groups throughout the test period. Fixed assets, by contrast, most effectively used in plants with a high productions, few surpassing the performance of the other two groups.

The next block monitoring of business performance management restaurant management should be efficient use of human capital. So, at our enterprise surveyed restaurants were found following paradox: the share of university graduates is increasing (Table 3),

Dynamics of socio-economic efficiency PWG in 1999 to 2011. *

Table 1

Factor

PWG	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
1	812,73	862,88	921,30	1208,92	1379,81	1494,79	1671,45	1848,87	2270,92	2561,83	2879,82	3318,55	3847,77
2	696,13	689,33	712,44	874,35	1061,28	1181,76	1313,17	1432,69	1554,71	1777,19	2010,30	2270,08	2540,56
3	708,27	748,79	789,13	997,17	1156,24	1309,36	1431,49	1600,13	1765,99	1927,93	2217,10	2561,56	2821,13
4	718,68	767,83	787,13	994,88	1164,08	1283,55	1514,49	1672,59	1818,44	1951,36	2180,37	2560,53	2933,35
5	658,29	645,72	669,03	785,97	943,93	1091,08	1203,34	1347,41	1493,87	1578,31	1758,63	2122,3	2293,35
6	743,33	765,35	787,17	983,61	1200,87	1393,01	1513,27	1742,42	1909,59	2116,47	2352,01	2718,21	3190,58
7	768,36	822,34	850,25	1062,81	1185,99	1369,43	1484,05	1589,42	1811,17	1981,32	2203,40	2490,06	2778,16
8	776,12	828,99	892,49	1059,50	1243,63	1377,05	1539,95	1731,36	2029,18	2173,69	2375,21	2708,07	3108,15
9	891,34	908,09	948,92	1298,70	1615,24	1654,42	1960,60	2287,50	2791,23	2843,71	3261,37	3468,6	3899,38
10	795,67	826,47	909,97	1139,82	1320,92	1519,24	1753,05	2013,00	2301,40	2648,69	3064,10	3612,31	4123,04
11	713,56	762,06	847,77	1089,56	1284,73	1436,78	1640,53	1789,15	1880,92	2032,36	2234,89	2504,19	2803,68
12	757,91	811,85	817,28	1013,32	1196,54	1383,02	1542,96	1762,28	1933,06	2132,26	2390,58	2605,56	2922,35
13	736,30	766,65	823,46	1086,27	1274,26	1446,52	1569,89	1710,68	1845,69	2005,67	2234,51	2491,85	2824,59
14	631,62	662,73	727,52	939,98	1114,87	1300,23	1461,10	1615,77	1797,78	1913,70	2159,93	2538,75	2757,25
15	736,56	769,64	832,15	1022,19	1200,48	1386,21	1516,75	1699,76	1945,22	2049,73	2376,43	2679,72	3042,05
16	729,78	741,82	814,98	1022,74	1237,97	1396,68	1564,36	1652,60	1843,89	2129,44	2405,39	2676,1	3103,52
17	875,33	912,66	966,80	1240,36	1394,45	1680,84	1864,77	2066,89	2309,06	2509,65	2795,02	3077,21	3362,59
18	1220,58	1421,33	1537,75	2217,62	2841,16	3058,66	3457,35	3839,22	4406,56	5322,63	5950,71	6818,35	7663,15

* At current prices.

Dynamics of socio-economic efficiency PWG in 1999 to 2011. *

Table 2

Factor

PWG	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
1	812,73	811,29	669,08	739,64	767,55	761,07	789,28	824,59	957,84	1018,65	1095,72	1191,06	1295,71
2	696,13	640,48	499,83	519,59	579,01	595,07	611,64	628,37	641,56	693,14	748,60	737,95	825,88
3	708,27	709,96	569,91	617,40	658,66	679,24	696,09	724,95	750,86	778,72	856,58	872,36	960,76
4	718,68	721,91	561,34	607,37	641,45	653,13	721,24	753,88	768,65	787,54	844,56	869,90	996,56
5	658,29	615,73	480,54	478,43	532,14	561,65	576,19	602,71	631,38	639,86	675,71	712,89	770,35
6	743,33	728,02	567,84	615,25	689,59	731,43	732,99	789,50	810,70	852,28	905,75	917,83	1077,33
7	768,36	782,57	616,15	662,56	670,96	707,49	711,94	715,74	767,63	803,31	857,99	858,60	957,94
8	776,12	774,00	636,02	623,26	670,22	669,04	693,02	722,98	808,45	828,15	856,76	839,40	963,41
9	891,34	848,29	697,54	793,01	893,32	845,11	939,52	1029,21	1181,50	1143,28	1252,59	1162,22	1306,56
10	795,67	797,10	649,58	702,05	737,50	769,01	818,01	888,66	959,00	1045,68	1163,19	1217,61	1389,76
11	713,56	736,77	632,57	688,38	743,93	769,64	819,02	843,50	839,01	866,05	918,46	914,41	1023,77
12	757,91	765,76	575,56	604,30	656,40	694,66	732,22	780,37	810,39	852,16	917,31	864,05	969,11
13	736,30	718,65	580,58	636,08	674,08	708,30	713,55	732,36	741,94	761,04	811,53	785,32	890,19
14	631,62	622,23	524,09	561,79	607,37	658,80	692,62	729,16	758,69	770,53	831,73	861,65	935,81
15	736,56	719,72	594,75	618,62	657,85	695,83	710,05	749,83	812,17	812,61	908,13	909,23	1032,17
16	729,78	703,62	593,79	630,54	691,70	720,73	753,25	736,52	769,69	844,71	917,54	881,91	1022,76
17	875,33	861,83	694,86	772,15	792,21	868,50	894,37	937,10	990,73	1016,39	1077,47	1040,73	1137,25
18	1220,58	1345,11	1004,73	1196,11	1387,85	1360,91	1419,59	1496,01	1626,24	1869,91	2004,99	2061,14	2316,52

* Prices in 1999.

while the business is growing shortage of skilled workers, engineers and technicians.

The problems of low productivity, of course, lies not only in managing the efficient use of labor resources. In place of performance also affects the structure of the enterprise, material and technical equipment of enterprises, the application of innovative technologies of the restaurant business where HR policy is more flexible and more efficient labor and many other factors. But performance management should begin working directly with manpower.

Productivity is influenced by several factors, among which we consider may include the average number of employees, return on labor costs in the restaurant business enterprises and the share of employees with higher professional education. The average number of employees per one enterprise indicates the degree of flexibility

of management regarding workforce. HR system for small enterprises by number rather rebuilt according to external changes and therefore more stable and effective. Rate of return on costs is also an important indicator of the efficiency of human capital in restaurants and catering enterprises, and increase the share of employees with higher education have a positive affect on productivity.

The third factor - the proportion of employees in enterprises restaurants with higher professional education - shows that the task of performance management is to create conditions under which the performance of employees with higher education would be high enough. To date, the labor market does not work effectively in this area, the same can be said about the distribution of young graduates. There is a certain imbalance jobs in restaurant industry: lack of employees with engi-

Table 3

Dynamics of fate its products in 2000-2011 in the studied group of enterprises restaurants

PWG	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
1	34,5	38,6	38,0	34,8	32,9	37,0	36,7	23	23,1	25,2	23	22,2
2	20,2	17,6	19,7	21,2	19,9	18,7	18,2	17,9	21,7	20,1	21,5	21,1
3	36,5	37,9	39,4	42,1	43,9	37,2	35,7	33,2	34,3	35	33,4	34
4	27,7	26,4	24,9	25,9	23,8	29,4	26,4	22,9	20	19,8	18,4	17,7
5	33,2	30,9	30,3	32,2	33,2	31,2	32,5	28,1	20,7	20,1	22,5	24
6	28,8	25,7	26,0	36,2	37,4	30,3	29,7	28,4	27,8	29	29,8	32,1
7	26,4	28,3	29,3	30,6	30,8	25,9	23,5	18,6	21,3	23	28,3	28,2
8	38,7	37,5	36,1	32,5	33,0	26,9	29,1	11,8	11,9	12,2	13,7	14,4
9	45,7	41,3	54,0	59,5	50,5	54,9	58,2	63,2	55,4	58,5	52,4	52,9
10	23,6	20,3	30,5	29,2	27,6	30,5	29,3	27,4	25,2	26,9	25,4	23,2
11	26,1	22,7	21,5	23,5	23,4	22,7	22,1	23,4	23,7	24,8	23,7	21,8
12	31,8	32,6	28,4	25,0	27,2	26,6	32,1	23,6	23,1	23,6	26,6	25,4
13	33,4	35,5	30,1	31,8	30,9	30,9	29,1	19,7	22,3	23,1	24,5	23,1
14	24,5	21,1	20,9	20,9	18,6	16,9	15,6	16,6	14,9	15,8	12,9	12,3
15	35,2	30,5	31,8	32,8	32,5	29,9	28,3	21,2	22	22,8	21	21,9
16	29,9	30,7	37,3	40,4	41,5	38,8	35,7	33,9	36,6	32,7	33	36
17	32,1	35,4	42,1	42,9	43,0	39,2	39,6	36,6	32,1	28,9	28,3	26,4
18	13,6	13,0	11,6	8,2	9,4	8,7	7,8	13,1	12,1	12	15,6	15,3

neering background, technical workers, professionals excess of social and humanitarian spheres. Employees with higher professional education, which have great potential, can't implement it in the circumstances and hence labor productivity in enterprises restaurant business is not growing properly on the growth of the number of employees with higher education.

Together, we have considered three factors have a significant impact on labor productivity in enterprises restaurants. The regression equation is:

$$y = -2,35x_1 + 40,05x_2 + 4,2x_3,$$

where y - productivity in restaurants and catering enterprises, thus. / People.; x_1 - average number of employees per one company restaurant industry people.; x_2 - return on labor costs mln.; x_3 - share of employment in the economy with higher professional education, %.

Coefficient of determination R_2 is 0.77, indicating a high pas - note communication. Free Member equation a_0 is not statistically significant.

The third control unit monitoring the performance of enterprises restaurant industry is capital efficiency. Important role in the vast majority of businesses have fixed assets. Their cost way acquisition, technological level, efficiency depends largely on the final results (revenue enterprise, profit, production, etc.), as well as some performance indicators, such as productivity. The presence of such differentiation, in our opinion, may be due to increasing the specific economic development. To test this hypothesis, we suggest grouping by previously defined groups of enterprises restaurants, with estimates as to take the following: 1) capital productivity of fixed assets in enterprises restaurants, % 2) capital- enterprises restaurants, per person, 3) the share of investment in fixed assets in GRP, % 4) received volume of direct investment in staff development, USD / person.

The highest capital-labor ratio in the sampled enterprises restaurants of 2007-2011 observed in the group with a predominance of turnover for purchased goods, the lowest - with balanced trade. The low capital-labor ratio in enterprises dominated its products to some extent contradicts the theoretical position. We believe that this fact can be explained by saturation of capital and labor to his work in traditionally small number of companies. It is noteworthy that the share of fixed investment income increased rapidly in enterprises with

balanced trade. The importance of this area is climbing unattractiveness of the sector for investors in the development of working capital, as well as the results of clustering.

The relationship between the considered parameters for the target population of enterprises restaurant business for years 1999-2009 can be defined by the equation:

$$y = 0,16 + 0,53x_1 - 0,003x_2 + 0,0002x_3$$

where y - capital assets, %, x_1 - capital-labor ratio, x_2 - the share of investment in fixed assets in GRP, %, x_3 - investments in the development of working capital USD/People.

Coefficient of determination, which was 0.57, indicating a significant relationship between indicators. We consider it necessary to draw attention to the fact that the increase in the share of investment in fixed assets reflects negatively on assets. Theoretically, this relationship is justified: the rising cost of fixed assets reduces their impact. However, from the standpoint of performance management investments made in fixed assets must necessarily positively affect efficiency.

Little impact of investments in working capital on assets fixed assets of enterprises restaurant business, in our view, raises some doubts about the rationality of their involvement. We consider it appropriate to do additional independent research efficiency investments in working capital and the effectiveness of their involvement and if the results are unsatisfactory. Business Administration recommend restaurants which were investigated, redirect the money spent on these activities to investors, development and implementation of investment schemes on mutually beneficial terms.

Conclusions. Thus, making the monitoring of management performance of companies from restaurants summary measure and three blocks of strategic performance management cards: efficiency of production, human capital and total capital - we can draw some **Conclusions.** Built correlation matrix of economic and social aspects of the performance of enterprises restaurants tend to reflect increased differentiation enterprises restaurants and reveal the existence of problems efficiency in several companies.

Monitoring the social and economic efficiency of enterprises restaurants that are included in the study group, the first block of strategic cards - "efficiency of



industrial structure“ - suggests that the most effective structure is characterized by predominant level provided additional services, a certain degree of production and low specific companies with weight -balanced level of production structure. The social aspect of efficiency was dependent on the specific business, human resources most effectively used in the restaurant business enterprises dominated the purchase of products and capital assets - in restaurants and catering enterprises with a high degree of own production.

Monitoring productivity of enterprises restaurants (second unit strategy maps) showed that in practice an increase in the number of employees is accompanied by increased productivity. Increase the number of companies with a small number of employees contributes to the efficiency of the workforce. The results of correlation and regression analysis reflect the lack of enterprise performance management restaurant management, weak link return on labor costs and productivity, not high performance of employees with higher education.

The third block of strategic performance management card is the efficiency of capital. Increase in capital assets of enterprises restaurants in 1999 to 2011 was mainly due to intensive factors. We believe that the solutions identified in the monitoring problem can't be outside the performance management system.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC LIST:

1. Агафонова Л. Г. Туризм, готельний та ресторанный бізнес / Л. Г. Агафонова, О. С. Агафонова. – К. : ЗНАННЯ УКРАЇНИ, 2002.
2. Менеджмент ресторанного господарства : учеб. пособие: [для высш. учеб. зав.] / [Г. Т. Пятницкая, Н. О. Пятницкая, Л. В. Лукашова и др.] ; под ред Г. Т. Пятницкой. – К. : Киев. Нац. торг.-экон. ун-т, 2008. – 374 с.
3. Басков Л. П. Теоретико-методологические подходы к оценке конкурентоспособности предприятий общественного питания / А. В. Котельникова // Развитие предпринимательства в малых городах и поселениях : материалы Регион. науч.-практ. конф. – Бирск : Бирский филиал Уфимской государственной академии экономики и сервиса, 2006. – С. 72–75.
4. Смагина И. Н., Смагин Д. А. Организация коммерческой деятельности в общественном питании. – М. – : ЭКСМО, 2005.
5. Егорова Н. Р., Николаева Т. И. Экономика отрасли: торговля потребительскими товарами [Текст] : учеб. пособие. – Екатеринбург : Изд-во Урал. гос. экон. ун-та, 2004.
6. Кривошей В. В. Механізм взаємодії продуктивності та задоволеності працюю підприємств ресторанного господарства [Текст] // Стратегія розвитку фінансово-економічних та соціальних відносин: регіональний аспект : Матеріали III симпозиуму: Міністерство фінансів України; Харківський інститут фінансів Українського державного університету фінансів та міжнародної торгівлі. – Харків : ХІФ УДУФМТ, 2010. – 50 с.
7. Оптимизация размещения предприятий общественного питания / В. И. Карсекин, В. С. Ковешников, А. А. Мазараки. – К. : Техніка, 1982. – 111 с.
8. Пятницкая Г. Т. Менеджмент общественного питания: учебник для вузов / Г. Т. Пятницкая, Н. А. Пятницкая. – К. : Киев. нац. торг.-экон. ун-т, 2001. – 655 с.
9. Организация общественного питания: резервы и оценка эффективности [Текст] : учеб. пособие / Т. И. Николаева, З. О. Фадеева ; [отв. за вып. В. Ж. Дубровский ; науч. ред. Т. И. Николаева] ; Федер. агентство по образованию, Урал. гос. экон. ун-т, Институт непрерывного образования, Факультет сокращенной подготовки. – Екатеринбург : Изд-во Урал. гос. экон. ун-та, 2008. – 183 с.
10. Кривошей В. В. Трудовий капітал ресторанного господарства: теорія та методологія : монографія / В. В. Кривошей. – Харків : ФОРТ, 2010. – 272 с.