



*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

# Evaluation on the Competitiveness of the Agribusiness with Plateau Characteristics in Yunnan Province Based on AHP

Yingmei GUO<sup>1\*</sup>, Xiaoli ZHU<sup>1</sup>, Yu ZHANG<sup>2</sup>

1. College of Economics and Management, Yunnan Agricultural University, Kunming 650201, China; 2. Yunnan Plateau Agricultural Industry Research Institute, Yunnan 650201, China

**Abstract** The development of agriculture with plateau characteristics is a market-oriented strategic choice, made by Yunnan Province, of agricultural economy with regional characteristics, on the basis of resources and location advantages, as well as geographical division of the national economy. The characteristic agribusiness is an important carrier for building a new agricultural management system with plateau characteristics, and also a key way to promote characteristic agricultural industrialization. In this paper, with 26 agribusinesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province as samples, we establish the competitiveness evaluation system for the agribusiness with plateau characteristics, and use the operating data (2012-2014) and AHP to calculate and the sample business competitiveness index and sort these businesses. Finally, we make a comprehensive analysis on the competitiveness of sample agribusinesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province, in order to provide decision-making basis for promotion of the competitiveness of the agribusiness with plateau characteristics.

**Key words** Plateau characteristics, Agribusiness, Competitiveness, Yunnan

## 1 Introduction

Characteristic agriculture refers to the market-oriented agriculture with regional characteristics, which makes full use of various economic and geographical advantages, and is formed based on the geographical division of the national economy. In September 2012, Yunnan Provincial People's Government issued *Decisions on Accelerating the Development of the Agriculture with Plateau Characteristics*, which clearly stated that the development of the agriculture with plateau characteristics was of great significance to improving the quality and efficiency of agricultural development in Yunnan Province, enhancing the market competitiveness of agricultural products, improving rural people's livelihood, promoting the socialist new rural construction, and pushing forward the province's scientific, harmonious and great-leap-forward development. With the acceleration of agricultural industrialization, the characteristic agriculture in Yunnan Province has shifted from sporadic development to large-scale development and then to initial formation of characteristic industry belt, from traditional extensive cultivation to the cultivation relying on science and technology. The cultivation scale, industrial base and market impact of the agriculture with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province are increasingly expanding, and the integration advantages of the industries with plateau characteristics loom large. The agribusiness with plateau characteristics is an important carrier for building new agricultural management system, and a key link to promote agricultural industrialization. As of December 2013, the number of lead-

ing agribusinesses reached 2734 in Yunnan Province, and the sales income reached 155.6 billion yuan. In 2013, there were 558 leading agribusinesses above the provincial level in Yunnan Province, and the sales income reached 99.2 billion yuan. In the new normal economic context, the business environment is becoming increasingly complex and dynamic, and the "inferiority" of agriculture is enlarged, so the business risk is increasing, and the enhancement role of business competitiveness is becoming increasingly prominent. In this paper, we study the evaluation system for the competitiveness of the agriculture with plateau characteristics, evaluate the competitiveness of the agribusiness with plateau characteristics, identify the key factors that restrict business competitiveness, and explore the strategies for promotion of the competitiveness of the agribusiness with plateau characteristics, which is of practical and important significance.

## 2 Definition of related concepts

**2.1 The competitiveness of the agribusiness with plateau characteristics** The competitiveness of the agribusiness with plateau characteristics is the irreplaceable, heterogeneous, dynamic, value-added and integrated comprehensive ability of the agribusiness engaged in the agricultural production and operation with plateau characteristics compared with its competitors. It includes not only real competitiveness, but also potential competitiveness, covering corporate financial management, marketing, technology research and development, production management, organizational management, human resource management, corporate social responsibility and many other capacity dimensions.

**2.2 AHP** The analytic hierarchy process (AHP) is a structured technique for organizing and analyzing complex decisions, based on mathematics and psychology. It was developed by Thomas L. Saaty in the 1970s and has been extensively studied and re-

Received: May 25, 2016 Accepted: July 14, 2016

Supported by Research Project of Yunnan "Three Rural Issues" and New Rural Construction Research Base in 2016; Youth Social Science Project of Yunnan Agricultural University (2015SK01).

\* Corresponding author. E-mail: 867727250@qq.com

financed since then. It has particular application in group decision making, and is used around the world in a wide variety of decision situations, in fields such as government, business, industry, healthcare, shipbuilding and education. AHP helps decision makers find one that best suits their goal and their understanding of the problem. It provides a comprehensive and rational framework for structuring a decision problem, for representing and quantifying its elements, for relating those elements to overall goals, and for evaluating alternative solutions.

### 3 Competitiveness evaluation of the agribusiness with plateau characteristics

**3.1 Design of survey and research materials** Based on the literature research and early interviews, we develop Questionnaire about the Competitiveness of the Agribusiness with Plateau Characteristics in Yunnan Province, which consists of 4 parts, and 241 questions. The first part is the survey of basic information, involving property rights organization form of sample business, product unit, business level and agricultural industrialization mode. The second part shows the qualitative evaluation items of competitiveness of agribusiness with plateau characteristics, and multiple-choice is used to collect the information about corporate strategic ability, organizational design and division of labor, improvement degree of management system, organizational ability to expand outward, corporate culture adaptability, reasonable proposal adoption and employee's satisfaction. The third part shows the quantitative evaluation items of competitiveness of agribusiness with plateau characteristics, and the form is used to collect the sample business data about human resources, corporate culture, technology devel-

opment, finance, agricultural marketing, agricultural production and social responsibility performance during 2012-2014. The fourth part uses the open-ended questions to get sample businesses' additional remark about business competitiveness.

**3.2 Survey and research object** The agriculture with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province refers to the market-oriented agriculture with regional characteristics, which is formed on the basis of national economic and geographical division of labor, including flowers, tea, coffee, herbs, plateau animal husbandry and other industries. Yunnan Plateau Characteristic Agricultural Industry Research Institute made a survey of 76 sample businesses from January to March 2015, recovered the questionnaires regarding 48 sample businesses, and selected 26 businesses as the key samples for the competitiveness evaluation of the agribusiness with plateau characteristics. For the principle of confidentiality, we omit the real name of the businesses, and only use the code. The information about the 26 sample businesses can be shown in Table 1. For the 26 agribusinesses with plateau characteristics, the form of property rights organization is dominated by private business and limited liability company, accounting for more than 90% of the total samples. There are 4 national leading enterprises, and 9 provincial agricultural enterprises, accounting for half of the total samples. In terms of agricultural product category, there are 6 product units with plateau characteristics (Yunnan medicine; Yunnan flower; Yunnan tea; Yunnan coffee; mushroom; characteristic chicken). As to the agricultural industrialization mode, the majority of businesses adopt the "leading enterprises + base + farmers" mode, accounting for 76.38% of total sample businesses.

**Table 1 Basic information of 26 sample agribusinesses with plateau characteristics**

| Business code | Property right organization form | Nature of company         | Leading enterprise level | Agricultural industrialization mode                        |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| A             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Provincial level         | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| B             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | National level           | Leading enterprises + specialized cooperatives + farmers   |
| C             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Prefecture or city level | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| D             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | National level           | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| E             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Provincial level         | Leading enterprises + specialized cooperatives + farmers   |
| F             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | National level           | Leading enterprises + specialized cooperatives + farmers   |
| G             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Prefecture or city level | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| H             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Provincial level         | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| I             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Provincial level         | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| J             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | National level           | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| K             | Private business                 | Shareholding system       | Non-leading enterprises  | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| L             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Prefecture or city level | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| M             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Prefecture or city level | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| N             | Private business                 | Sole corporation          | County level             | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| O             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Non-leading enterprises  | Enterprises + specialized cooperatives + brokers + farmers |
| P             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Provincial level         | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| Q             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Provincial level         | Leading enterprises + specialized cooperatives + farmers   |
| R             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Non-leading enterprises  | Leading enterprises + order farmers                        |
| S             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Non-leading enterprises  | Leading enterprises + order farmers                        |
| T             | Others                           | Limited liability company | Non-leading enterprises  | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| U             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Non-leading enterprises  | Enterprises + specialized cooperatives + brokers + farmers |
| V             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Provincial level         | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| W             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Provincial level         | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| S             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Provincial level         | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| Y             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Prefecture or city level | Leading enterprises + base + farmers                       |
| Z             | Private business                 | Limited liability company | Prefecture or city level | Leading enterprises + specialized cooperatives + farmers   |

Data source: Questionnaire about the Competitiveness of the Agribusiness with Plateau Characteristics in Yunnan Province.

4 Competitiveness evaluation of the agribusiness with plateau characteristics based on AHP

4.1 AHP steps

4.1.1 Establishing the judgment matrix for competitiveness evaluation hierarchy. Based on literature research, business survey and expert advice, we establish the competitiveness hierarchy evaluation indicator structure for the agribusiness with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province, which consists of 6 first-level indicators and 22 third-level indicators. According to the relative importance between indicators at various levels, we establish the judgment matrix of criteria layer and indicator layer.

4.1.2 Determining the weight of indicators at various levels. In April 2015, we develop *Expert Judgment Matrix Questionnaire on the Competitiveness Evaluation of the Agribusiness with Plateau Characteristics in Yunnan Province*, and combine expert interviews with questionnaires, to consult nine agricultural economics and business management experts from Yunnan Agricultural University and Yunnan University of Finance about the weight of indicators at various levels. By matrix operation and consistency test, we get the weight of criteria layer and indicator layer of agribusiness competitiveness evaluation. The analysis results are shown in Table 2 to 8.

Table 2 The criteria layer judgment matrix A-B

| Business competitiveness evaluation | Financial operation ability | Marketing capability | Technology development capability | Production capacity | Human resource and organizational management capacity | Corporate social responsibility | Weight |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------|
| Financial operation ability         | 1.0000                      | 1.4918               | 2.2255                            | 2.2255              | 2.7183  | 4.0552                          | 0.2979 |
| Marketing capability                | 0.6703                      | 1.0000               | 1.4918                            | 2.7183              | 3.3201  | 4.0552                          | 0.2607 |
| Technology development capability   | 0.4493                      | 0.6703               | 1.0000                            | 1.4918              | 1.8221  | 2.2255                          | 0.1581 |
| Production capacity                 | 0.4493                      | 0.3679               | 0.6703                            | 1.0000              | 2.2255  | 3.3201                          | 0.1384 |
| Human resource capacity             | 0.3679                      | 0.3012               | 0.5488                            | 0.4493              | 1.0000  | 1.8221                          | 0.0868 |
| Corporate social responsibility     | 0.2466                      | 0.2466               | 0.4493                            | 0.3012              | 0.5488  | 1.0000                          | 0.0582 |

Note: Consistency ratio of judgment matrix (0.0199); weight of overall goal (1.0000).

Table 3 The indicator layer judgment matrix B<sub>1</sub>-C

| Financial operation ability                        | Rate of return on common stockholders' equity | Turnover of total capital | Annual profit growth rate of agricultural industry | Asset-liability ratio | Current ratio | Weight |
|--|---|---------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------|--------|
| Rate of return on common stockholders' equity      | 1.0000  | 2.7183                    | 4.0552   | 3.3201                | 4.9530        | 0.4544 |
| Turnover of total capital                          | 0.3679  | 1.0000                    | 2.2255   | 1.8221                | 2.7183        | 0.2125 |
| Annual profit growth rate of agricultural industry | 0.2466  | 0.4493                    | 1.0000   | 0.3679                | 2.2255        | 0.0994 |
| Asset-liability ratio                              | 0.3012  | 0.5488                    | 2.7183   | 1.0000                | 2.7183        | 0.1672 |
| Current ratio                                      | 0.2019  | 0.3679                    | 0.4493   | 0.3679                | 1.0000        | 0.0666 |

Note: Consistency ratio of judgment matrix (0.0347); weight of overall goal (0.2979).

Table 4 The indicator layer judgment matrix B<sub>2</sub>-C

| Marketing capability                                      | Market share of main characteristic agricultural products | Rate of return on sales of major agricultural industry | Brand value of main characteristic agricultural products | Proportion of salesman of main agricultural products | Weight |
|---|---|--|--|--|--------|
| Market share of main characteristic agricultural products | 1.0000  | 2.7183   | 4.0552   | 4.9530   | 0.5299 |
| Rate of return on sales of major agricultural industry    | 0.3679  | 1.0000   | 2.2255   | 3.3201   | 0.2503 |
| Brand value of main characteristic agricultural products  | 0.2466  | 0.4493   | 1.0000   | 2.7183   | 0.1444 |
| Proportion of salesman of main agricultural products      | 0.2019  | 0.3012   | 0.3679   | 1.0000   | 0.0754 |

Note: Consistency ratio of judgment matrix (0.0359); weight of overall goal (0.2607).

Table 5 The indicator layer judgment matrix B<sub>3</sub>-C

| Technology development capability      | Proportion of R&D expenditure to sales | The number of patents granted | Proportion of R&D personnel | Weight |
|--|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| Proportion of R&D expenditure to sales | 1.0000                                 | 2.7183                        | 4.0552                      | 0.6112 |
| The number of patents granted          | 0.3679                                 | 1.0000                        | 2.2255                      | 0.2569 |
| Proportion of R&D personnel            | 0.2466                                 | 0.4493                        | 1.0000                      | 0.1319 |

Note: Consistency ratio of judgment matrix (0.0171); weight of overall goal (0.1581).

**Table 6** The indicator layer judgment matrix  $B_4$ -C

| Production capacity                          | Product percent of pass | Standardization level of business production | Efficient utilization of production capacity | Weight |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Product percent of pass                      | 1.0000                  | 0.3012                                       | 1.8221                                       | 0.2348 |
| Standardization level of business production | 3.3201                  | 1.0000                                       | 2.7183                                       | 0.5970 |
| Efficient utilization of production capacity | 0.5488                  | 0.3679                                       | 1.0000                                       | 0.1682 |

Note: Consistency ratio of judgment matrix (0.0688); weight of overall goal (0.1384).

**Table 7** The indicator layer judgment matrix  $B_5$ -C

| Human resource capacity                 | Overall quality of management personnel | Per capita labor productivity | Clarity of strategic goal | Improvement level of management system | Weight |
|---|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--------|
| Overall quality of management personnel | 1.0000                                  | 2.7183                        | 1.8221                    | 1.0000                                 | 0.3402 |
| Per capita labor productivity           | 0.3679                                  | 1.0000                        | 0.4493                    | 0.3679                                 | 0.1132 |
| Clarity of strategic goal               | 0.5488                                  | 2.2255                        | 1.0000                    | 0.5488                                 | 0.2063 |
| Improvement level of management system  | 1.0000                                  | 2.7183                        | 1.8221                    | 1.0000                                 | 0.3402 |

Note: Consistency ratio of judgment matrix (0.0075); weight of overall goal (0.0868).

**Table 8** The indicator layer judgment matrix  $B_6$ -C

| Corporate social responsibility                         | Total annual remuneration paid by business per employee | Number of contracting farmers | Per capita annual taxes paid by business | Weight |
|---|---|-------------------------------|--|--------|
| Total annual remuneration paid by business per employee | 1.0000  | 0.3679                        | 0.5488                                   | 0.1721 |
| Number of contracting farmers                           | 2.7183  | 1.0000                        | 2.7183                                   | 0.5713 |
| Per capita annual taxes paid by business                | 1.8221  | 0.3679                        | 1.0000                                   | 0.2567 |

Note: Consistency ratio of judgment matrix (0.0386); weight of overall goal (0.0582).

4.1.3 Building hierarchical evaluation indicator system for the competitiveness of the agribusinesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province. Based on the revision and perfection of

experts' opinions, we form the hierarchical evaluation indicator system for the competitiveness of the agribusinesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province, as shown in Table 9.

**Table 9** Hierarchical evaluation indicator system

| Goal layer (A)   | Criteria layer (B)                          | Criteria layer weight | Indicator layer (C)  | Indicator layer weight | Indicator properties   |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------|
| Competitiveness evaluation of the agribusinesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province | Financial operation ability ( $B_1$ )       | 0.2978                | Rate of return on common stockholders'equity ( $C_{11}$ )              | 0.1353                 | Positive, quantitative |
|  |   |                       | Turnover of total capital ( $C_{12}$ )                                 | 0.0633                 | Positive, quantitative |
|  |   |                       | Annual profit growth rate of agricultural industry ( $C_{13}$ )        | 0.0296                 | Positive, quantitative |
|  |   |                       | Asset-liability ratio ( $C_{14}$ )                                     | 0.0498                 | Moderate, quantitative |
|  |   |                       | Current ratio ( $C_{15}$ )   | 0.0198                 | Moderate, quantitative |
|  |   |                       | Market share of main characteristic agricultural products ( $C_{21}$ ) | 0.1381                 | Positive, quantitative |
|  | Marketing capability ( $B_2$ )              | 0.2607                | Rate of return on sales of major agricultural industry ( $C_{21}$ )    | 0.0653                 | Positive, quantitative |
|  |   |                       | Brand value of main characteristic agricultural products ( $C_{22}$ )  | 0.0376                 | Positive, qualitative  |
|  |   |                       | Proportion of salesman of main agricultural products ( $C_{23}$ )      | 0.0197                 | Positive, quantitative |
|  |   |                       | Proportion of R&D expenditure to sales ( $C_{31}$ )                    | 0.0966                 | Positive, quantitative |
|  |   |                       | The number of patents granted ( $C_{32}$ )                             | 0.0406                 | Positive, quantitative |
|  | Technology development capability ( $B_3$ ) | 0.1581                |  |                        |                        |

(to be continued)

( continued )

| Goal layer (A)  | Criteria layer (B) | Criteria layer weight | Indicator layer (C)   | Indicator layer weight | Indicator properties   |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------|------------------------|
| Production capacity (B <sub>4</sub> )                                   |                    | 0.1384                | Proportion of R&D personnel (C <sub>33</sub> )                                      | 0.0209                 | Positive, quantitative |
|   |                    |                       | Product percent of pass (C <sub>41</sub> )  | 0.0325                 | Positive, qualitative  |
|   |                    |                       | Standardization level of business production (ISO certification) (C <sub>42</sub> ) | 0.0826                 | Positive, qualitative  |
|   |                    |                       | Efficient utilization of production capacity (C <sub>44</sub> )                     | 0.0233                 | Positive, qualitative  |
| Human resource and organizational management capacity (B <sub>5</sub> ) |                    | 0.0867                | Overall quality of management personnel (education level, title) (C <sub>51</sub> ) | 0.0295                 | Positive, qualitative  |
|   |                    |                       | Per capita labor productivity (C <sub>52</sub> )                                    | 0.0098                 | Positive, quantitative |
|   |                    |                       | Clarity of strategic goal (C <sub>53</sub> )  | 0.0179                 | Positive, qualitative  |
| Corporate social responsibility (B <sub>6</sub> )                       |                    | 0.0581                | Improvement level of management system (C <sub>64</sub> )                           | 0.0295                 | Positive, qualitative  |
|   |                    |                       | Total annual remuneration paid by business per employee (C <sub>61</sub> )          | 0.0100                 | Positive, quantitative |
|   |                    |                       | Number of contracting farmers (C <sub>62</sub> )                                    | 0.0332                 | Positive, quantitative |
|   |                    |                       | Per capita annual taxes paid by business (C <sub>63</sub> )                         | 0.0149                 | Positive, quantitative |

4.2 AHP evaluation results

4.2.1 Competitiveness evaluation results of the sample agribusinesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province. According to expert judgment matrix, we calculate the weight of competitiveness evaluation indicators for the agribusiness with plateau characteristics, and calculate the score of 6 second-level indicators regarding the 26 agribusinesses (financial operation ability; marketing capability; technology development capability; production capacity; human resource and organizational management capacity; corporate social responsibility), respectively, as well as the weight of the 6 second-level indicators. Then we calculate the comprehensive competitiveness index of the 26 characteristic sample agribusinesses. In order to compare the indicator values of the sample businesses, we conduct dimensionless processing on the single competitiveness index and comprehensive competitiveness

index of 26 sample businesses with plateau characteristics. The dimensionless processing formula is as follows:

$$y_i = \begin{cases} \frac{x_{max} - x_i}{x_{max} - x} & x_i > x \\ 1 & x_i = x \\ \frac{x_i - x_{min}}{x - x_{min}} & x_i < x \end{cases} \quad (x \text{ is the optimal value; current ratio is 2; asset-liability ratio is 50\% )}$$
$$y_i = \begin{cases} \frac{x_i - x_{min}}{x_{max} - x_{min}} & x_{min} < x_i < x_{max} \\ 1 & x_i = x_{max} \\ 0 & x_i = x_{min} \end{cases}$$

Ultimately, the index of different levels of competitiveness evaluation indicators for 26 sample agribusinesses with plateau characteristics and the ranking are shown in Table 10.

Table 10 Index of different levels of competitiveness evaluation indicators and the ranking

| Items | Financial operation ability |         | Marketing capability |         | Technology development capability |         | Production capacity |         | Human resource and organizational management capacity |         | Corporate social responsibility |         | Comprehensive business competitiveness |         |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|---|---------|---------------------------------|---------|--|---------|
|       | Index                       | Ranking | Index                | Ranking | Index                             | Ranking | Index               | Ranking | Index   | Ranking | Index                           | Ranking | Index                                  | Ranking |
| A     | 13.815                      | 11      | 3.201                | 11      | 5.183                             | 6       | 4.609               | 23      | 1.531   | 26      | 1.567                           | 5       | 29.907                                 | 14      |
| B     | 20.228                      | 3       | 12.320               | 2       | 6.384                             | 4       | 6.498               | 5       | 5.984   | 2       | 2.768                           | 3       | 54.181                                 | 2       |
| C     | 8.735                       | 18      | 1.589                | 22      | 2.986                             | 13      | 5.095               | 17      | 4.101   | 16      | 0.167                           | 17      | 22.673                                 | 20      |
| D     | 14.232                      | 10      | 5.705                | 5       | 2.134                             | 21      | 5.341               | 16      | 3.109   | 25      | 0.523                           | 10      | 31.045                                 | 12      |
| E     | 14.681                      | 12      | 2.086                | 16      | 3.326                             | 12      | 5.036               | 18      | 4.060   | 17      | 3.007                           | 2       | 30.570                                 | 10      |
| F     | 10.008                      | 16      | 16.298               | 1       | 4.374                             | 8       | 13.125              | 1       | 5.102   | 5       | 3.536                           | 1       | 52.443                                 | 1       |
| G     | 16.498                      | 4       | 3.470                | 10      | 1.882                             | 19      | 4.933               | 20      | 4.515   | 6       | 1.304                           | 7       | 32.602                                 | 7       |
| H     | 10.657                      | 19      | 3.184                | 13      | 0.226                             | 26      | 5.614               | 11      | 2.736   | 20      | 1.154                           | 6       | 23.571                                 | 22      |
| I     | 17.578                      | 5       | 5.822                | 4       | 6.241                             | 5       | 9.557               | 2       | 3.715   | 18      | 0.760                           | 9       | 43.672                                 | 4       |
| J     | 19.114                      | 2       | 9.345                | 3       | 3.520                             | 11      | 5.886               | 9       | 4.161   | 13      | 0.334                           | 11      | 42.360                                 | 3       |
| K     | 8.2810                      | 17      | 2.271                | 17      | 2.862                             | 16      | 5.973               | 8       | 3.499   | 21      | 0.252                           | 13      | 23.137                                 | 17      |
| L     | 11.5980                     | 13      | 3.088                | 12      | 2.907                             | 15      | 3.250               | 26      | 2.866   | 24      | 0.135                           | 21      | 22.220                                 | 21      |
| M     | 5.0370                      | 22      | 1.263                | 23      | 2.645                             | 18      | 4.568               | 24      | 4.478   | 11      | 0.081                           | 26      | 18.072                                 | 25      |
| N     | 5.9050                      | 23      | 3.707                | 8       | 4.234                             | 9       | 4.850               | 19      | 5.564   | 3       | 0.135                           | 18      | 22.770                                 | 18      |
| O     | 5.0160                      | 25      | 1.009                | 25      | 0.817                             | 25      | 4.471               | 25      | 3.623   | 19      | 0.090                           | 25      | 13.400                                 | 26      |
| P     | 5.0570                      | 26      | 2.212                | 15      | 2.238                             | 17      | 5.886               | 10      | 4.765   | 10      | 0.171                           | 15      | 20.329                                 | 24      |
| Q     | 21.1630                     | 1       | 4.112                | 6       | 3.674                             | 10      | 5.580               | 12      | 4.528   | 8       | 2.916                           | 4       | 40.348                                 | 5       |
| R     | 14.3020                     | 9       | 1.597                | 20      | 1.070                             | 22      | 5.580               | 13      | 3.268   | 22      | 0.100                           | 24      | 24.292                                 | 16      |
| S     | 5.4240                      | 24      | 0.505                | 26      | 7.835                             | 3       | 5.580               | 14      | 6.058   | 9       | 0.152                           | 22      | 23.928                                 | 19      |

( to be continued )

(continued)

| Items | Financial operation ability |         | Marketing capability |         | Technology development capability |         | Production capacity |         | Human resource and organizational management capacity |         | Corporate social responsibility |         | Comprehensive business competitiveness |         |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|---|---------|---------------------------------|---------|--|---------|
|       | Index                       | Ranking | Index                | Ranking | Index                             | Ranking | Index               | Ranking | Index   | Ranking | Index                           | Ranking | Index                                  | Ranking |
| T     | 6.7540                      | 20      | 1.506                | 21      | 11.702                            | 1       | 5.580               | 15      | 6.074   | 4       | 0.169                           | 16      | 30.161                                 | 9       |
| U     | 6.0770                      | 21      | 1.152                | 24      | 10.010                            | 2       | 9.251               | 3       | 4.411   | 14      | 0.152                           | 19      | 27.803                                 | 15      |
| V     | 15.2530                     | 6       | 3.527                | 9       | 1.447                             | 23      | 7.721               | 4       | 3.987   | 15      | 0.216                           | 14      | 32.151                                 | 8       |
| W     | 15.2810                     | 7       | 3.795                | 7       | 4.861                             | 7       | 4.721               | 21      | 4.669   | 7       | 0.332                           | 12      | 33.658                                 | 6       |
| X     | 15.2870                     | 8       | 2.410                | 14      | 3.028                             | 14      | 6.498               | 6       | 2.972   | 23      | 0.106                           | 20      | 30.300                                 | 11      |
| Y     | 10.9320                     | 15      | 1.964                | 18      | 2.077                             | 20      | 5.991               | 7       | 7.121   | 1       | 0.984                           | 8       | 27.446                                 | 13      |
| Z     | 10.4230                     | 14      | 1.744                | 19      | 1.152                             | 24      | 4.684               | 22      | 3.938   | 12      | 0.111                           | 23      | 18.802                                 | 23      |
| Mean  | 11.8206                     |         | 3.8032               |         | 3.8006                            |         | 5.99536             |         | 4.2629  |         | 0.8162                          |         | 29.6862                                |         |

4.3 Hierarchical ordering of competitiveness of the sample agribusinesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province

According to AHP and dimensionless treatment results of comprehensive sample business competitiveness index, combined with the survey and research data, the competitiveness of 26 sample businesses is divided into four grades (A, B, C, D), as shown in Table 11.

Table 11 Comprehensive evaluation grading of competitiveness of 26 sample agribusinesses

| Grading of business competitiveness   | Business code                            | Number of businesses |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Class A(excellent)                    | B, F                                     | 2                    |
| Class B(good)                         | J, I, Q                                  | 3                    |
| Class C(Average)                      | W, G, V, D, E, Y, A                      | 7                    |
| Class D(to be increased dramatically) | T, U, Z, R, S, H, K, N, C, L, P, X, M, O | 14                   |

5 Comprehensive analysis of the competitiveness of agribusinesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province

5.1 Low level of overall competitiveness and unbalanced business development The average comprehensive competitiveness index of 26 sample agribusinesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province is 29.6862. Only 2 businesses have the comprehensive competitiveness index of above 50, accounting for 5.88% of the total sample companies; 3 businesses have index of 40-50, accounting for 11.11 % of total samples; 7 businesses have index of 30-40, accounting for 25.93 % of total samples; 11 businesses have index of 20-30, accounting for 42.31% of total samples. 80.77% of the sample businesses have comprehensive competitiveness index of below 40, and the overall level of competitiveness is low.

5.2 Weak business profitability and obvious industrial weakness of agriculture Agribusiness has a long production cycle, and the unique "cobweb model" of agricultural products affects the balance of supply and demand of agricultural products. The return on assets of the agricultural industry is generally low, and for the 26 sample agribusiness with plateau characteristics, some key indicators, such as rate of return on common stockholders'equity and rate of return on sales of major agricultural industry, have low mean. Weak profitability highlights the constraints of "Engel's Law" on the agriculture with plateau characteristics and reveals its "weakness".

5.3 Inadequate brand building of agricultural products and weak market impact The marketing capability index mean of

the sample agribusinesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province is 3.8082, and 20 businesses have index below average, accounting for 76.92% of total samples. It indicates that for most sample enterprises, the brand building of agricultural products is backward, the marketing channels are limited, and market development capability is weak, thereby affecting corporate profitability and overall competitiveness.

5.4 Weak technological innovation capability and low added value of products The technology development capability index mean of the sample businesses is 3.8006, and 17 businesses have this index below average, accounting for 65.38% of total samples. For most sample businesses, the technology development capability index is 3.0000 or less. It leads to low overall level of agribusiness industrialization, short industrial chain, low technological content, high degree of homogeneity and low profit margins, and the agricultural products stay mostly at the initial processing stage.

5.5 Lack of human capital and imperfect modern enterprise management mechanism The index mean of human resource and organizational management capacity is 4.26288, and 13 sample businesses have this index below average, accounting for half of total samples. Among 26 sample businesses with plateau characteristics in Yunnan Province, private businesses account for 96.15% of total samples, the business investment is mainly based on the entrepreneurs' funds, and the business scale is small. The internal management system is not perfect, it lacks effective checks and balances, and the management is loose. It also lacks scientific and rational strategic plans, easily forming short-sighted

decisions and blocking sustainable development.

### 5.6 Poor interest combination performance between businesses and farmers and difficulties in farmers' income growth

For the indicator of corporate social responsibility, a third-level indicator ("number of contracting farmers") is set. During 2012-2014, for the 26 sample businesses, the annual maximum, average and minimum number of contracting farmers was 40667, 4858 and 7, respectively, indicating that there was a significant difference in the number of contracting farmers between businesses. Based on AHP evaluation results and normalization, the annual average index of number of contracting farmers for the 26 sample agribusinesses during 2012-2014 was 0.11945, and the mode was 0.0000, demonstrating that the interest combination performance between most sample businesses and farmers is not good, and it fails to effectively increase farmers' income.

## References

- [1] CHI ZX, WANG GH. Performance evaluation of leading agricultural enterprises from the perspective of farmers based on data from Jiangxi Province [J]. Journal of Jianxi Agricultural University : Social Sciences Edition, 2011,10(3):26-33. (in Chinese).

(From page 13)

the competitiveness advantage in the fish production sector. As to fish processing (manufacturing) sector, the provinces with obvious competitiveness advantage are Liaoning, Fujian, Hainan, Anhui, Hubei, Hunan, Jiangxi, and Sichuan. The provinces exhibit both obvious advanced industrial structure and competitiveness in the fish marketing (distribution) sector, such as Tianjin, Jiangsu, Guangdong, Guangxi, Anhui, Hubei, Jiangxi, and Sichuan. This study is one of the first comprehensive studies on the status of regional fishery industrial structure, and the competitiveness of regional fishery industry in China. However, the technique is not designed to explain how a region acquires particular industry mix (fishery industrial mix in this paper) or what attracts particular mixes to a region, therefore, the future research will pay close attention to studying what attracts particular mixes to a region and explaining or predicting the relationship between the fishery industrial structure and regional fishery industry growth.

## References

- [1] GE X, ZHUANG XS, FU ZT, *et al.* The analysis of the relationship between fishery production quantities growth and the fishery industrial structure in China[J]. Chinese Fisheries Economics, 2003(5): 9-11.
- [2] ZHOU HJ, HE GS, WANG XH, *et al.* The analysis of ocean industrial structure and the optimized industrial policies in our country[J]. Marine Science Bulletin, 2005(2):46-51.
- [3] HAN ZL, DI DB, LIU K. The analysis of marine fishery industry structure in Liaoning[J]. Journal of Liaoning Normal University (Natural science edition), 2007(1): 107-111.
- [4] SHEN XD, YANG ZY, PAN YJ. The study of fishery industry structure in

- [2] WANG ZD. Evaluation on the competitiveness of agricultural enterprises [D]. Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences, 2006(6):36-37. (in Chinese).
- [3] NIE CX. Study on the evaluation method of enterprise's competitiveness and its application[D]. Tianjin: Tianjin University, 2003:20-25. (in Chinese).
- [4] LI WD. Research on theory and methodology of the evaluation of enterprise's competitiveness [D]. Beijing: Beijing Jiaotong University, 2007: 93-107. (in Chinese).
- [5] WU ZJ. On the developing experience, problems and countermeasures of the industrialization of Yunnan plateau featured agriculture [EB/OL]. View, 2012-08-22. (in Chinese).
- [6] BIAN LL, LIU AJ. Study on the competitiveness of Chinese agricultural listed companies[J]. World Agriculture, 2010(9):51-53. (in Chinese).
- [7] YANG MH. The leading enterprises of agriculture industrialization: Analysis on supporting theories and policies[M]. Beijing: Economic Science Press, 2009,12. (in Chinese).
- [8] TANG XH. Study on the enterprise performance evaluation of agricultural industrialization leading enterprises[M]. Beijing: China Agriculture Press, 2009. (in Chinese).
- [9] JIN B. Report on Chinese enterprise competitiveness (2013)[M]. Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press(China), 2013. (in Chinese).
- [10] GUO HY, WANG ZD. Study on economic performance and enterprise competitiveness of Chinese agricultural listed companies[M]. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2013. (in Chinese).

- Shanghai[J]. Journal of Shanghai Ocean University, 2007(11): 597-601.
- [5] LI NN. The study of fishery industry structure in China: a grey system connection method[J]. Fisheries Economy Research, 2008(6): 3-5.
- [6] HENRY W, HERZOG J, RICHARD JO. Shift-share analysis revisited: The allocation effect and the stability of regional structure[J]. Journal of Regional Science, 1977, 17(3): 441-454.
- [7] CREAMER D. Shift to manufacturing industries[M]. Industrial Location and National Resources, U.S. National Resources Planning Board, Washington, D.C., 1943: 85-104.
- [8] DUNN ES. A statistical and analytical technique for regional analysis[S]. The Regional Science Association, Papers and Proceedings, Vol. VI, 1960: 97-112.
- [9] ASHBY LD. The shift and share analysis: A reply[J]. Southern Economic Journal, January, 1968: 423-425.
- [10] FUCHS VR. Statistical explanations of the relative shift of manufacturing among regions of the United States[N]. Papers of the Regional Science Association, 1962(8): 1-5.
- [11] PARASKEVOPOULOS CC. Regional growth patterns in Canadian manufacturing industry: An application of the shift and share analysis[J]. The Canadian Journal of Economics, 1974, 7(1): 121-125.
- [12] SENF DR. Shift-share analysis of rural retail trade patterns[J]. Regional Science Perspectives, 1988,18(2): 29-43.
- [13] HOPPES, RB. Shift-share analysis for regional health care policy[J]. The journal of Regional Analysis and Policy, 1997, 27(1): 35-45.
- [14] STEVENS BH, C MOORE. A critical review of the literature on shift-share as a forecasting technique[J]. Journal of Regional Science, 1978, 20(4): 419-437.
- [15] SHI CY, ZHANG J, GAO W. The reviews of shift-share method and its expansion model[J]. Inquiry into Economic Issues, 2007(3): 133-136.
- [16] PA XF, LI MZ. The study of the regional agricultural industry structure: a shift-share analysis method[J]. Journal of Agrotechnical Economics, 2008(3): 32-37.
- [17] CHEN W, XU JP. An application of shift-share model to economic analysis of county[J]. World Journal of Modelling and Simulation, 2007, 3(2): 90-99.