

Evaluation of Financial Stability of Russian Companies

¹A.A. Ajupov, ¹D.A. Kurmanova, ³R.G. Khabibullin and ⁴L.R. Kurmanova

¹Institute of Management, Economics and Finance, Kazan Federal University, 420008 Kazan, Russia

²Ufa State Aviation Technical University, 450024 Ufa, Russia

³Bashkir State University, 452683 Neftekamsk, Russia

⁴Bashkir State University, 450024 Ufa, Russia

Abstract: The study considers the modern approaches to the analysis and evaluation of financial stability of Russian companies to study the effectiveness of cash flow management. A comparative analysis of the financial stability of organizations of the Russian Federation and the Republic of Bashkortostan is conducted by using a system of indicators based on the coefficient method. Identified trends show a decrease in the deficit of financial stability and its own funds which hinders the development of investment activity and the expansion of the productive capacity of Russian companies.

Key words: Financial stability, investment attractiveness, factors, solvency, financial resources, Russia

INTRODUCTION

In modern realities of market relations, financial stability of an economic entity is a condition for anti-crisis policies and implementation of the company's development strategy, acquiring particular urgency. It also generates economic sustainability of factors for territories and regions which together provide the financial security of the state as a whole.

The financial stability of the enterprise can be achieved when certain conditions are met. One of the most important conditions is the solvency of the enterprise, describing the financial condition in which the timely repayment of obligations is provided (Bagautdinova *et al.*, 2013). Ensuring solvency is the result of effective cash flow management, aimed at synchronization of cash receipts and payment of financial liabilities (Yusupov *et al.*, 2014).

The following condition for financial stability is the availability of financial resources for the development of the company, denoting the amount and condition of its own funds to finance investments and implementation of financial strategies of the enterprise (Ajupov, 2013).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Theory: For an objective assessment of the successful functioning of enterprises using the category "financial stability" could serve as an evaluation criterion which is

able to determine a specific adequacy of financial capacity of the organization in relation to its development and to reflect the investment attractiveness (Ajupov *et al.*, 2015). It can be said that financial stability means a stable state of a company that has solvency, a recommended ratio of its own and borrowed funds, the possibility of further stable development and minimal dependence on the constantly changing internal and external environment.

Despite, the apparent simplicity of the problem of quantitative estimation of financial stability, a single commonly accepted approach to building relevant algorithms evaluation does not exist. The indicators included in various analysis techniques can vary significantly both in terms of quantity and methods of calculation (Artamonova and Ajupov, 2015). This is due to the natural presence of analysts differing priorities to different indicators.

In the future, our study of the financial stability of Russian enterprises was based on the coefficient method, that is calculation and analysis of capital structure ratios and coefficients of liabilities.

The main indicator characterizing the degree of financial independence of an enterprise with a coefficient method is the ratio of its own current assets. If the coefficient of autonomy (financial independence) is <0.5 , then the financial condition of the organization may be unsatisfactory and it is likely that it will be difficult for the organization to pay in full with all creditors within a reasonable time. The increase in autonomy shows a rise

in the financial independence of the enterprise and reduce the likelihood of financial distress in the future (Ajupov and Polteva, 2014).

Advantages of the coefficient method are the availability of information support, the possibility of conducting a comparative analysis of various economic entities due to the fact that the method operates with relative indicators (Ajupov and Ponomareva, 2015).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Coefficient method allowed us to analyze and compare the financial stability of organizations of the Russian Federation and the Republic of Bashkortostan.

For the analysis on the basis of the information base and composition of balance sheet items, the ratio of own current assets and the autonomy ratio were used in this case. The ratio of own current assets reflect the following: what part of the company’s current assets is formed from its own funds, respectively, determines the level of coverage of obligations (Parr, 2014). The coefficient of autonomy characterizes the independence of the enterprise from borrowed funds and shows the share of own funds in the total value of all enterprise funds that is reflects the structure of capital (Ajupov and Ponomareva, 2015).

The main coefficients of financial stability of organizations in the Russian Federation as a whole are given in Table 1. The main coefficients of financial stability, calculated by the organizations of the Russian Federation as a whole (Table 1) indicate an ongoing decline in financial stability.

In the mid 90-ies of the last century the proportion of own funds of enterprises reached 70-80%, despite the fact that the lower limit of this index is usually taken at the level of 50-60%. Last but not least in our opinion, the value of the coefficient of autonomy in this period was influenced by the revaluation of fixed assets according to a system of coefficients previously set by the state which is very far from real market prices. Accordingly, the “bloated” additional capital in terms of the increase in the value of property revaluation was the main component of equity capital of Russian organizations (Ajupov, 2013). An undistributed profit organization in fact was not a factor in increasing equity capital. Consequently, the quality of equity has left much to be desired.

Throughout the 2000s, the autonomy ratio declined, that is, the growth rate of own funds lagged behind the growth rate of borrowed funds. In 2012, the ratio ceased to meet the recommended value of 50% and amounted to 48.2% that is the enterprises of the Russian Federation preferred loan financing, rather than financing from own

Table 1: Dynamics of indexes of financial stability of organizations (excluding small business entities) in the Russian Federation (according to the financial statements) (%)

Years	Working capital to current assets ratio	The coefficient of autonomy
1995	14.200	76.5
1996	(-) 1.000	80.7
1997	(-) 5.600	73.9
1998	(-) 17.000	65.5
1999	(-) 11.900	62.2
2000	(-) 7.400	59.9
2001	(-) 7.000	60.9
2002	(-) 6.600	60.1
2003	(-) 8.200	57.7
2004	(-) 10.600	54.4
2005	(-) 12.500	56.2
2006	(-) 13.300	57.1
2007	(-) 10.500	55.9
2008	(-) 14.100	50.5
2009	(-) 18.800	51.6
2010	(-) 14.100	52.4
2011	(-) 17.800	50.8
2012	(-) 25.500	48.2
2013	(-) 30.700	45.3
2014	(-) 41.200	40.1
2015	(-) 42.600	39.9

The Federal State Statistics Service

funds (Safiullin *et al.*, 2012). The decline in the coefficient continued in 2015. The own funds of Russian enterprises were already <40%.

No less depressing picture draws us the ratio of its own working capital. Since, 1996, the value of the ratio of own current assets is permanently negative. This means that not only the current assets of Russian organizations are fully formed at the expense of raised funds but also part of fixed assets (Safiullin *et al.*, 2013). Hence, investment activity is carried out by Russian enterprises in recent years due to the increase in short-term liabilities. So, the deficit of own current assets for the last time is already over 40%.

The dynamics of the coefficients of financial stability in the Republic of Bashkortostan in general is similar to the dynamics of the coefficients for the Russian Federation (Table 2).

The value of the autonomy ratio has ceased to meet the recommended value of 50% in 2011, amounting to 49.3%. In 2015, the share of own funds of enterprises of the Republic of Bashkortostan was only 37.2% that is lower than in Russia as a whole.

Working capital to current assets ratio of the enterprises of the Republic of Bashkortostan was not permanently negative until 2008 in contrast to the level of provision for the Russian Federation as a whole.

But since 2008, due to the onset of the financial crisis, the enterprises of the Republic of Bashkortostan have been experiencing a deficit of their own working capital, although not as profound as enterprises in Russia as a whole. In 2015, the value of the ratio of own circulating assets was (-) 8.4%.

Table 2: Dynamics of the financial stability of organizations (excluding small business entities) in the Republic of Bashkortostan (according to the financial statements) (%)

Years	Working capital to current assets ratio	The coefficient of autonomy
1996	7.2000	75.1
1997	2.2000	68.6
1998	(-) 5.3000	64.1
1999	4.1000	64.3
2000	11.2000	64.8
2001	10.3000	64.6
2002	9.9000	64.6
2003	(-) 0.6000	61.2
2004	4.7000	62.5
2005	3.6000	64.3
2006	(-) 5.6000	60.3
2007	4.6000	58.6
2008	(-) 12.4000	57.8
2009	(-) 9.2000	60.1
2010	(-) 14.2000	56.5
2011	(-) 18.6000	49.3
2012	(-) 12.9000	48.2
2013	(-) 12.2000	44.8
2014	(-) 16.9000	38.2
2015	(-) 8.4000	37.2

The Federal State Statistics Service

CONCLUSION

The conducted research of the financial stability of enterprises in the Russian Federation and the Republic of Bashkortostan with application of the estimated coefficients of the coefficient method and their dynamics has shown that at present the level of financial stability of the enterprises of the Russian Federation as a whole and the Republic of Bashkortostan continues to decline. Preservation or further strengthening of such a negative trend of the financial condition of Russian enterprises can lead to insolvency and the lack of funds for the stable development of production and as a consequence to the bankruptcy of organizations. If the external environment in which the organization operates is subjected to negative changes then a set of measures for state regulation of the institutional environment for the functioning of Russian companies is necessary.

REFERENCES

- Ajupov, A. and T. Polteva, 2014. Handling depositary receipts for global financial markets. *Life Sci. J.*, 11: 464-468.
- Ajupov, A.A. and I.V. Ponomareva, 2015. Structured financial products as the instrument of financial credit assurance for the companies involved into foreign economic activities. *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, 6: 117-125.
- Ajupov, A.A., 2013. Risk-engineering, as an element of financial engineering in the market of innovative financial products. *World Appl. Sci. J.*, 27: 5-9.
- Ajupov, A.A., A.A. Kurilova and R.S. Ozernov, 2015. Issues of coordinated cooperation for forming leasing payments schedules. *Asian Soc. Sci.*, 11: 23-29.
- Artamonova, A.A. and A.A. Ajupov, 2015. The problem of social-psychological maladjustment of people in today's economic conditions. *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, 6: 24-29.
- Bagautdinova, N.G., G.S. Tsvetkova and A.Z. Novenkova, 2013. The interaction of formal and informal market institutes. *World Appl. Sci. J.*, 27: 58-61.
- Parr, J.B., 2014. The regional economy, spatial structure and regional urban systems. *Reg. Stud.*, 48: 1926-1938.
- Safiullin, L.N., G.N. Ismagilova, D. Gallyamova and N.Z. Safiullin, 2013. Consumer benefit in the competitive market. *Procedia Econ. Finance*, 5: 667-676.
- Safiullin, M.R., L.A. Elshin and A.I. Shakirova, 2012. Evaluation of business and economic activity as a short-term forecasting tool. *Herald Russ. Acad. Sci.*, 82: 290-294.
- Yusupov, K.N., A.V. Yangirov, R.R. Akhunov and Y.S. Toktamysheva, 2014. The region reproductive potential structure pyramid. *Life Sci. J.*, 11: 403-408.