

STRATEGIZING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC POTENTIAL OF ENTERPRISE: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

©2018 DORONINA M. S., DORONIN A. V.

UDC 005.93:005.336

Doronina M. S., Doronin A. V. Strategizing the Development of the Socio-Economic Potential of Enterprise: Problems and Prospects

The article is aimed at analyzing the theoretical-methodical prerequisites of constructive strategizing in the development of socio-economic potential of enterprise, on the results of which the basis for substantiation of the whole paradigm of this process can be created. According to the results of generalization of a considerable number of scientific works, the main directions of development of researches on the topic are defined. Among them is updating of the terminological support for this scientific direction; formation of reliable technologies of information support and quantitative-qualitative technologies of measurement and modeling of development of the socio-economic potential of enterprise; increasing attention to social aspects of strategizing the development of the socio-economic potential of enterprises. Using the interdisciplinary approach, the essence and content of the concepts of «socio-economic potential of enterprise», «strategic management», «strategizing», «strategy» and «stratagem» have been clarified. Prospect for further researches in this direction is substantiation of a picture of the world together with educational-professional support of construction of practical methods for strategizing the development of the socio-economic potential of enterprise, usage of culturodidactic ideas and the case-study method to research unique situations.

Keywords: enterprise, socio-economic potential, development, strategic management, strategizing, culturodidactic, case-study.

Bibl.: 19.

Doronina Maya S. – D. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Chief research scientist of the Research Centre of Industrial Problems of Development of NAS of Ukraine (2 floor 1-a Inzhenernyi Ln., Kharkiv, 61166, Ukraine)

E-mail: 07051942@ukr.net

Doronin Andriy V. – D. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Head of the Department of Economics and Marketing, National Aerospace University «Kharkiv Aviation Institute» named after M. Ye. Zhukovskiy (17 Chkalova Str., Kharkiv, 61070, Ukraine)

E-mail: andrej.doronin@khai.edu

УДК 005.93:005.336

Дороніна М. С., Доронін А. В. Стратегування розвитку соціально-економічного потенціалу підприємства: проблеми та перспективи

Метою статті є аналіз теоретико-методичних передумов конструктивного стратегування розвитку соціально-економічного потенціалу підприємства, результати якого можуть створити основу для обґрунтування цілісної парадигми цього процесу. За результатами узагальнення значної кількості наукових праць визначено головні напрями розвитку досліджень за темою. Серед них – уточнення термінологічного забезпечення цього наукового напрямку; формування надійних технологій інформаційного забезпечення та кількісно-якісних технологій вимірювання і моделювання розвитку соціально-економічного потенціалу підприємства; посилення уваги до соціальних аспектів стратегування розвитку соціально-економічного потенціалу підприємств. З використанням міждисциплінарного підходу виконано уточнення сутності та змісту понять «соціально-економічний потенціал підприємства», «стратегічне управління», «стратегування», «стратегія», «стратгема». Перспективою подальших досліджень у даному напрямі є обґрунтування картини світу і освітньо-професійного забезпечення побудови практичних методик стратегування розвитку соціально-економічного потенціалу підприємства, використання ідей культуродигми і методу кейс-стаді для вивчення унікальних ситуацій.

Ключові слова: підприємство, соціально-економічний потенціал, розвиток, стратегічне управління, стратегування, культуродигма, кейс-стаді.

Бібл.: 19.

Дороніна Майя Степанівна – доктор економічних наук, професор, головний науковий співробітник Науково-дослідного центру індустріальних проблем розвитку НАН України (пров. Інженерний, 1-а, 2 пов., Харків, 61166, Україна)

E-mail: 07051942@ukr.net

Доронін Андрій Віталійович – доктор економічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри економіки і маркетингу, Національний аерокосмічний університет ім. М. Є. Жуковського «Харківський авіаційний інститут» (вул. Чкалова, 17, Харків, 61070, Україна)

E-mail: andrej.doronin@khai.edu

УДК 005.93:005.336

Доронина М. С., Доронин А. В. Стратегирование развития социально-экономического потенциала предприятия: проблемы и перспективы

Целью статьи является анализ теоретико-методических предпосылок конструктивного стратегирования развития социально-экономического потенциала предприятия, результаты которого могут создать основу для обоснования целостной парадигмы этого процесса. По результатам обобщения значительного количества научных работ определены главные направления развития исследований по теме. Среди них – уточнение терминологического обеспечения этого научного направления; формирование надежных технологий информационного обеспечения и количественно-качественных технологий измерения и моделирования развития социально-экономического потенциала предприятия; усиление внимания к социальным аспектам стратегирования развития социально-экономического потенциала предприятий. С использованием междисциплинарного подхода выполнено уточнение сущности и содержания понятий «социально-экономический потенциал предприятия», «стратегическое управление», «стратегирование», «стратегия», «стратгема». Перспективой дальнейших исследований в данном направлении является обоснование картины мира и образовательно-профессионального обеспечения построения практических методик стратегирования развития социально-экономического потенциала предприятия, использования идей культуродигмы и метода кейс-стади для изучения уникальных ситуаций.

Ключевые слова: предприятие, социально-экономический потенциал, развитие, стратегическое управление, стратегирование, культуродигма, кейс-стади.

Библ.: 19.

Доронина Майя Степановна – доктор экономических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Научно-исследовательского центра индустриальных проблем развития НАН Украины (пер. Инженерный, 1-а, 2 эт., Харьков, 61166, Украина)

E-mail: 07051942@ukr.net

Доронин Андрей Витальевич – доктор экономических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой экономики и маркетинга, Национальный аэрокосмический университет им. Н. Е. Жуковского «Харьковский авиационный институт» (ул. Чкалова, 17, Харьков, 61070, Украина)

E-mail: andrej.doronin@khai.edu

The processes of functioning and development of modern domestic enterprises have become much more complicated, the nature and content of the reserves for their restoration are still difficult to forecast. The market economy generates non-standard risks in work and requires new mechanisms for adapting business entities to them. Among such mechanisms, certain hopes are still laid on strategizing, which is gaining popularity among scientists and practitioners, although at the same time requiring specification of the theoretical and methodological support. As for the modern enterprise, for a long time science has presented the evidence of the need to consider it not as a mechanical formation, the ordering of which is provided by rational technologies, but as a complex socio-economic system, whose existence depends on continuous development of techniques of its creative management with the use of a humanized mechanism enriched in nature. Practice shows that although the strategies, strategic management, strategic forecasts were always within sight of business leaders, today their traditional techniques do not work, they need to be clarified taking into account new factors and conditions of management.

The theoretical and methodological basis for studying development of social and economic potential of a production organization using techniques of strategizing is, firstly, the recommendations of scientists, who in their time drew attention to regularities in development of social and economic potential. Among them are I. Zverkovich, O. Koval, O. Kozyreva, N. Kukharska, M. Saltan, O. Stepanova, and others. Secondly, publications on the problems of strategizing of S. Vovkanych, L. Yemelianenko, A. Zeldner, V. Kvint, N. Kukharska, Yu. Misharin, N. Patrikeev, and others.

Despite a significant amount of scientific research on the subject of the article and the high importance of the scientific achievements obtained, a comprehensive methodological justification of the paradigmatic bases of research of the social and economic potential of enterprises, the ability to predict the system dynamics of its structural elements and its development using strategic tools still remain unaddressed.

The *aim* of the paper is to analyze the theoretical and methodological prerequisites for a constructive strategizing of development of social and economic potential of an enterprise, the results of which can be used to create a holistic paradigm of this process.

Before presenting general conclusions on the subject of the article, it is appropriate to define the context of the key concepts and categories that will be used in it. Working with the terminological support will allow, first, to specify their content, and secondly – to create the constructive basis for discussing or opposing the authors' ideas. With this regard, we will consider successively the concepts of "social and economic potential of an enterprise", "strategic management", "strategizing", "strategy", "stratagem".

Generally, potential refers to possibilities, capabilities, hidden, unrealized reserves of a studied object,

which, when the surrounding conditions change, can be transformed into reality and solve its problems. Social and economic potential can be defined as a dynamic part of the overall potential of an enterprise, reflected in a balanced system of its economic and social resources that can be used to ensure sustainable development of an enterprise as a socio-economic system under instability of the internal and external environment of its functioning. Social and economic potential is formed and developed upon condition of parallel implementation of two processes. One of them is socialization of capital, where economic resources are spent not only to ensure the circulation of capital, but also to replenish the social security of the collective, the formation of its aggregate labor force on the basis of consent, trust, mutual responsibility. The second process is capitalization of social resources. It is ensured by conscious purposefulness of behavior of members of the collective to restore the capacity of economic resources, the capital of the enterprise that provided them with modern high-quality workplaces. The potential of any object necessarily has several uses. Its assessment depends on the urgency of the problem for the solution of which it will be used.

As regards the concept of "strategizing", unfortunately, many publications on this topic, actually return to the perception of it as a standardized process of constructing plans for periods of 20 or 10 years by traditional techniques. Focusing on such standardization, it should be noted that the practice confirms the limited reliability of the implementation of such plans, even upon condition of increasing the informational support.

As subjects of strategizing, scientists choose structural reforming of the economy [1, 2], social and economic development of a region [3], an enterprise [4], innovation activities [5], and others. Each time scientists align the goal, content of their research, and scientific results with the nature of the research subject and state problems that require urgent solutions. Among them, the most frequently mentioned are

- 1) inconsistent, unclear terms related to this research area [1, 6-8];
- 2) lack of reliable technologies of informational support to provide research of strategizing as well as quantitative and qualitative methods for its measuring and modeling [6; 9; 10], etc.;
- 3) insufficient attention to social aspects, characteristics of the process of strategy and its factors [6; 8; 11].

The analysis of the arguments regarding the content of the first problem from the above list shows that this variant of the conceptual definition of the concept of "strategizing", which would ensure exchanging results of theoretical as well as practical and methodological research of representatives of various scientific disciplines and scientific schools, requires justification. Though, some recommendations for solving this problem, both in the context of defining the theoretical essence of this pro-

cess and its practical content, have been proposed. For example, almost all researchers of strategizing use the definition given by A. Zeldner – a system of mechanisms and institutions that are coordinated in terms of time, finances, material and technical resources and aimed at implementing national priorities, which ensure sustainable development of the economy and standards of living of the population by achieving the ultimate goals and the multiplier effect [6, p. 15]. From the standpoint of the theory, this variant of definition can be adapted to social and economic potential of an enterprise as well. However, the lack of specification of the content of mechanisms and institutions creates problems with using this variant of understanding the concept in practice, and, consequently, with building practical methods for strategizing development of social and economic potential of an enterprise. Another scientist, S. Bukreev, conducts a detailed analysis of the practice of regional strategizing, gives useful generalizations, the orientation to which will allow avoiding mistakes in attempts of using his recommendations for other practical situations [9, p. 96-97]. However, this author, first, does not give his own variant of the definition of the essence and content of strategizing. Secondly, similar generalizations of successful practices of strategizing social and economic potential of enterprises are difficult to implement. Documents, in which strategies used by corporations are presented, are almost completely classified [8, p. 156].

With regard to the above-mentioned, to solve the problems of clarifying the content of strategizing development of social and economic potential of an enterprise, it is advisable to use the opinion of philosophers, who recommend defining the content of the new specific subject of research at three levels: “general – particular – singular”. Based on the results of the analysis of the literature at the level of “general”, one can choose the definition of Yu. Tiunnikov. “Strategizing is awareness of the meaning, purpose, content, and technology of the modeled process” [12, p. 53]. To determine the concept at the level of “particular”, the definition of A. Zeldner can be used [6, p. 15]. As for the level of “singular”, one can rely on the option proposed by L. Artemenko [4, p. 3], which contains a clarification: “Strategizing is the practical use of strategies, the effectiveness of which depends on knowledge and compliance with the rules for realizing strategic changes in real time”.

It is noteworthy that the authors of all the analyzed definitions do not take into account, first, that the urgency of strategizing is generated by increasing risks in the work of an enterprise, and therefore it must be aimed at overcoming or preventing them. Secondly, no definition takes into account the fact that strategizing is always implemented unconventionally. This position is well illustrated by the monograph of Robert W. Jacobs, in which the author gives a lot of examples of strategic changes, each of which is unique in terms of content, duration of implementation, and resources involved [13].

To study the strategizing of development of social and economic potential of an enterprise at the level of “singular”, this management tool can be defined as follows: “Strategizing is a method of the practical use of strategies by the management system, which is aimed at preventing or overcoming risk situations in the interaction of social and economic resources in an enterprise’s potential, the efficiency of which depends on the knowledge of and compliance with the rules for realizing strategic changes in real time”.

In connection with the problems of defining the concept of “strategizing”, such related concepts as “strategy” and “stratagem” need to be clarified and compared in terms of essence and content. In this context, we can agree with the opinion of O. Kudinov, who believes that strategic thinking sometimes leads to blind imitation of fashionable tendencies and extra-contextual use of the term “strategy” [7, p. 114]. Although the meaning of this term is considered in many publications, none of them contains such definition that would fully reflect the aspect of strategizing development of social and economic potential of an enterprise. Therefore, we consider it expedient based on the analysis of the definitions given in the literature to formulate our own one. “A strategy is a way of realizing an enterprise’s goal, which determines its behavior in the space of critical parameters of its functioning and development, formulates problems that are generated, first, by risks in the interaction of an enterprise and the market environment; secondly, by risks in the interaction of internal components of social and economic potential of the enterprise, which are at different stages of their life cycle”.

A variety of strategies objectively requires a critical review of their classifications when choosing a strategy for a particular situation. This task is taken into account by many scientists, who submit various versions of them differing in their content, purpose, subject, and situation of use. Among them, in the context of the topic of the article, the proposals offered by R. Akmayev [14] and V. Frolov [15] deserve attention. The last author gives a description of the varieties of strategies and argues that the quality strategy of an enterprise provides it with significant competitive advantages. Moreover, he presents their list arranged by foreign experts, which includes the following: a) developing and selecting the type of strategy encourages managers to constantly think ahead; b) choosing a strategy facilitates a clear coordination of efforts undertaken by the company; c) the strategy allows to set critical performance indicators and further control them; d) the chosen strategy forces the company to clearly define its tasks; e) strategic management contributes to the company’s preparedness for sudden changes and crises; g) the strategy demonstrates the interrelation of the competences of all officials [15, p. 181].

In business, an effective strategy is usually perceived as the highest form of realization of entrepreneur-

ial potential. Its success is ensured not only and not so much by rational perception and analysis of the situation, as by a non-standard intuitive vision of the world. The uniqueness of strategies built on this vision is reflected by the concept of “stratagem”. Practically, stratagem is a plan for implementing an appropriate strategy, the distinguishing feature of which is original ways of achieving the goal. The homeland of the art of using stratagems to manipulate consciousness in order to obtain the desired result in communication is China. This way of strategizing is oriented towards a certain mentality, philosophy of perception of the world. For its successful use, it is necessary to have special knowledge and skills. Wikipedia presents the artistic image of a stratagem as follows: “The Stratagems are like invisible knives, which are hidden in the mind of man and flash out only when they are put to use. [...] he who understands Stratagems will always hold the initiative in his hand”. Certain techniques of such behavior can be borrowed by domestic enterprises from marketing practices.

In the process of strategizing development of social and economic potential of an enterprise, the effectiveness of the stratagem technique will depend on the socio-psychological characteristics of members of a collective, the use by leaders of collectives tools of coaching and leadership to streamline the behavior of their subordinates. Reliability of stratagems created in this way is ensured, first, by the level of skills in using reflection methods of those who apply them, and secondly, by the level of development of their social responsibility. The second condition of reliability is related to the fact that stratagems are largely manipulative.

The use of stratagems provides both advantages and problems. The advantages are in the practical impossibility of copying this tool by competitors. The problem is that a stratagem is an instrument of one-time use and until its practical implementation must kept in secret, have the form of know-how. Recently, the attention of practitioners to the stratagem technique has been increasing. T. Shamgunova believes that it is expedient to consider stratagems not only as ambitious algorithms for achieving the set goal. They have a deeper meaning, which can be traced in the specific use of stratagems by modern businessmen of eastern countries. As for the prospect of using this tool to strategize development of social and economic potential of domestic enterprises, the examples of its successful practical application in the Russian business system presented by T. Shamgunova are encouraging [16, p. 268].

If appropriate conditions are not created for using stratagems in managing social and economic potential of an enterprise, one can test the possibility of applying techniques of logical incrementalism. In certain situations, implementation of the strategy of logical incrementalism gives advice on how to solve complex problems in the work of enterprises by moving gradually from general

ideas to more specific provisions, while preserving flexibility and taking into account the previous experience. The more remote in time the moment of making the final decision will be, the more opportunities will appear for managers of an enterprise to use more up-to-date information, and consequently – to adapt to new circumstances of doing business. This is the main idea of logical incrementalism. A step-by-step movement toward the goal, which it implies, has nothing to do with chaos. Conscious, purposeful, active management, on which this technology is based, makes it possible to combine analysis, an organization’s policy with individual needs of the staff, to orient the collective to meet new challenges without creating a critical climate in it.

Fundamental changes in managing development of social and economic potential of an enterprise are quickly updated. Their implementation requires updating the conceptual framework for obtaining knowledge in this area of management. To clarify the prerequisites for creating the paradigm of development of social and economic potential of an enterprise, it is expedient to analyze the possibility of using ideas of the socio-cultural paradigm (culturedigm) and the monographic method of studying unique situations. Their content and methods of application are presented in the previous author’s monograph [17]. The variant of scientific and methodological support in the form of a culturodigm has significant advantages. First, it is formed on the principles of science and practice, implies the existence of multiple specific forms for solving problems of the subject area, which co-exist, develop, and complement each other. Secondly, such a paradigm is more technological in comparison with traditional ways of constructing paradigms, since it is oriented towards poly-disciplinary formation of instruments of cognition of the world. The most significant advantage of the culturedigm is its inherent features. Creating the image of the world on the basis of the culturedigm, the scientist directs attention to the development of a model corresponding to the needs of practice under specific conditions. The tools they offer to solve problems are perceived by practitioners positively, since they meet their expectations.

The need to make strategic decisions in real time requires managers to master new methods of express diagnostics of non-standard situations. The most promising of these is the monographic one (*case study*). Its effectiveness is ensured by the ability of performers to combine theoretical knowledge into an original system that takes into account the unusual nature of a problem and the possibility of attracting creative workers to its solution. The peculiarities of implementing the monographic method are the study of an object (*case*) as a unique integrity, consideration of reality in various aspects and details, with regard to its uniqueness, multidimensionality, and integrity. The case study method ensures qualitative results provided that there is a relationship of trust with the contingent under study and in which the results will

be implemented in practice. This method involves using a flexible diagnostic system at different stages of the study.

Many scientists in their publications define the problem of informational support for the analysis of the process of strategizing, its factors and conditions, while offering certain options for its solution. The generalization of such options creates prerequisites for the formulation of ideas for solving this problem concerning development of social and economic potential of an enterprise. For example, such ideas can be obtained by analyzing the variants of socio-economic indicators of development of municipalities reflected in the work of A. Sidorov. The methodology of integral assessment of social and economic development proposed by him unites models of statics, dynamics, and its effectiveness is certified by practical approbation [18, p. 42]. The algorithm for selecting the main criteria for constructing an integral system of indicators of social and economic development can be created using the conclusions of S. Sokhanevich [19, p. 21].

CONCLUSIONS

Now the internal and external environment of the functioning and development of production organizations are filled with non-standard risks, which require their managers to develop new mechanisms for permanent analysis of reserves for increasing reliability in work and their effective practical use. Among such mechanisms, strategizing is gaining popularity. The carried out analysis of the relevant literature has demonstrated that strategizing requires further development of theoretical and methodological support by clarifying the essence and content of the system of concepts and categories, the formation of informational support for diagnosing non-standard situations, appropriate models for making strategic decisions in real time. Further research should be focused on the justification and practical approval of the methodologies for development of social and economic potential of an enterprise using the ideas of the culture-digm and the case study method, as well as on the determination of reserves for the development of educational and professional support for an effective implementation of functions of strategizing. ■

LITERATURE

1. **Васіна А. Ю.** Стратегування як механізм структурного реформування національної економіки. *Економічний вісник Запорізької державної інженерної академії. Сер.: Економіка та управління національним господарством*. 2017. Вип. 2 (1). С. 34–39.
2. **Ємельяненко Л.** Стратегування в системі державного управління національною економікою // Модернізація управління національною економікою : зб. матер. IV Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. (м. Київ, 25–26 листопада 2016 р.). Київ : КНЕУ, 2016. С. 81–87.
3. **Кухарская Н. А.** Идеология стратегирования социо-эколого-экономического развития региона. *Економічні інновації. Потенціал підприємства в парадигмі сталого розвитку регіонів України*. 2012. Вып. 51. С. 243–250.

4. **Артеменко Л.** Научный концепт стратегирования предприятий. *Zarządzanie: Teoria i praktyka*. 2016. Nr. 15 (1). S. 3–8.

5. **Мишарин Ю. В.** Модель организационно-экономического механизма стратегирования в инновационной деятельности. *Российское предпринимательство*. 2013. № 22. С. 45–53.

6. **Зельднер А. Г.** Место стратегирования в понятийно-категориальной системе прогнозирования. *Экономические науки*. 2012. № 8. С. 7–15.

7. **Кудінов О. І.** Понятійний аналіз стратегії в політиці. *Культурологічний вісник*. 2013. Вип. 30. С. 114–119.

8. **Алимурадов М. К., Власюк Л. И.** Стратегирование – новая область профессиональных знаний. *Управленческое консультирование*. 2017. № 11. С. 154–159.

9. **Букреев С. А.** Стратегирование структурных преобразований в экономике регионов России: новые тенденции и направления. *Вестник ВГУ. Серия : Экономика и управление*. 2015. № 1. С. 91–98.

10. **Цвигун И. В., Чепинога О. А., Балашова М. А.** Региональное стратегирование: необходимость и реальность // Активизация интеллектуального и ресурсного потенциала регионов: новые вызовы для менеджмента компаний : материалы 2-й Всерос. конф. (Иркутск, 19–20 мая 2016 г.) : в 2 ч. Иркутск, 2016. Ч. 2. С. 133–140.

11. **Вовканич С. Й.** Суспільні трансформації цінностей української ідеї: новітні виклики і загрози. *Соціально-економічні проблеми сучасного періоду України*. 2015. Вип. 1. С. 144–151.

12. **Тюнников Ю. С., Мазниченко М. А.** Стратегирование как прогностическая процедура педагогической инноватики. *Стандарты и мониторинг в образовании*. 2004. № 1. С. 53–57.

13. **Джейкобс Р. В.** Стратегические перемены в реальном времени: Эффективное внедрение метода стратегических перемен – путь к успеху / пер. с англ. Днепропетровск : Баланс-Клуб, 2004. 408 с.

14. **Акмаева Р. И.** Стратегический менеджмент : учебное пособие. Астрахань : Астраханский университет, 2009. 200 с.

15. **Фролова В. Ю.** Стратегічний підхід в управлінні конкурентоспроможністю підприємства. *Вісник Донецького національного університету*. 2012. № 1. С. 177–182.

16. **Шамгунова Т. А.** Стратегемы и их применение в конкурентной борьбе. *Документ. Архив. История. Современность*. 2006. Вып. 6. С. 267–274.

17. **Доронін А. В., Дороніна М. С.** Активність персоналу виробничої організації (поведінкова модель). Харків : ТОВУ «ТО Ексклюзив», 2015. 268 с.

18. **Сидоров А. А., Силич М. П.** Методические подходы к оценке социально-экономического развития муниципальных образований. *Известия Томского политехнического университета*. 2008. Т. 313. № 6: Экономика. Философия, социология и культурология. С. 38–44.

19. **Соханевич С. В.** Основные подходы к формированию методов оценки социально-экономического состояния городов. *Региональная экономика: теория и практика*. 2008. № 30. С. 21–25.

REFERENCES

Akmaeva, R. I. *Strategicheskiy menedzhment* [Strategic management]. Astrakhan: Astrakhanskiy universitet, 2009.

- Alimuradov, M. K., and Vlasyuk, L. I. "Strategirovaniye - novaya oblast professionalnykh znaniy" [Strategy is a new area of professional knowledge]. *Upravlencheskoye konsultirovaniye*, no. 11 (2017): 154-159.
- Artemenko, L. "Nauchnyy kontsept strategirovaniya predpriyatiy" [Scientific concept of enterprise strategy]. *Zarzadzanie: Teoria i praktyka*, no. 15 (1) (2016): 3-8.
- Bukreyev, S. A. "Strategirovaniye strukturnykh preobrazovaniy v ekonomike regionov Rossii: novyye tendentsii i napravleniya" [Strategic development of structural transformations in the economy of Russian regions: new trends and trends]. *Vestnik VGU. Ser. : Ekonomika i upravleniye*, no. 1 (2015): 91-98.
- Doronin, A. V., and Doronina, M. S. *Aktyvnist personalu vyrobnychoi orhanizatsii (povedinkova model)* [Activity of production organization personnel (behavioral model)]. Kharkiv: TOVU «TO Ekskliuzyv», 2015.
- Dzheykobs, R. V. *Strategicheskiye peremeny v realnom vremeni: Effektivnoye vnedreniye metoda strategicheskikh peremen – put k uspekhu* [Strategic changes in real time: Effective implementation of the method of strategic change is the way to success]. Dnepropetrovsk: Balans-Klub, 2004.
- Frolova, V. Yu. "Stratehichnyi pidkhdid v upravlinni konkurentospromozhnistiu pidpriemstva" [Strategic Approach in Managing Competitiveness of an Enterprise]. *Visnyk Donetskoho natsionalnoho universytetu*, no. 1 (2012): 177-182.
- Kudinov, O. I. "Poniatiyni analiz stratehii v politytsi" [Conceptual analysis of strategy in politics]. *Kulturolohichnyi visnyk*, no. 30 (2013): 114-119.
- Kukharskaya, N. A. "Ideologiya strategirovaniya sotsio-ekologo-ekonomicheskogo razvitiya regiona" [Ideology of the socio-ecological and economic development of the region]. *Ekonomichni innovatsii. Potentsial pidpriemstva v paradyhmi staloho rozvytku rehioniv Ukrainy*, no. 51 (2012): 243-250.
- Misharin, Yu. V. "Model organizatsionno-ekonomicheskogo mekhanizma strategirovaniya v innovatsionnoy deyatelnosti" [Model of the organizational and economic mechanism of strategic innovation]. *Rossiyskoye predprinimatelstvo*, no. 22 (2013): 45-53.
- Shamgunova, T. A. "Stratagemy i ikh primeneniye v konkurentnoy borbe" [Stratagems and their application in competition]. *Dokument. Arkhiv. Istoriya. Sovremennost*, no. 6 (2006): 267-274.
- Sidorov, A. A., and Silich, M. P. "Metodicheskiye podkhody k otsenke sotsialno-ekonomicheskogo razvitiya munitsipalnykh obrazovaniy" [Methodical approaches to the evaluation of socio-economic development of municipalities]. *Izvestiya Tomskogo politekhnicheskogo universiteta vol. 313, no. 6 : Ekonomika. Filosofiya, sotsiologiya i kulturologiya* (2008): 38-44.
- Sokhanevich, S. V. "Osnovnyye podkhody k formirovaniyu metodov otsenki sotsialno-ekonomicheskogo sostoiyaniya gorodov" [Basic approaches to the formation of methods for assessing the socio-economic state of cities]. *Regionalnaya ekonomika: teoriya i praktika*, no. 30 (2008): 21-25.
- Tsvigun, I. V., Chepinoga, O. A., and Balashova, M. A. "Regionalnoye strategirovaniye: neobkhodimost i realnost" [Regional strategy: the need and reality]. *Aktivizatsiya intellektualnogo i resursnogo potentsiala regionov: novyye vyzovy dlya menedzhmenta kompaniy. Part 2. Irkutsk*, 2016. 133-140.
- Tyunnikov, Yu. S., and Maznichenko, M. A. "Strategirovaniye kak prognosticheskaya protsedura pedagogicheskoy innovatiki" [Strategic as a prognostic procedure of pedagogical innovation]. *Standarty i monitoring v obrazovanii*, no. 1 (2004): 53-57.
- Vasina, A. Yu. "Stratehuvannia yak mekhanizm strukturnoho reformuvannia natsionalnoi ekonomiky" [Strategy as a mechanism for structural reform of the national economy]. *Ekonomichni visnyk Zaporizkoi derzhavnoi inzhenernoi akademii. Ser. : Ekonomika ta upravlinnia natsionalnym hospodarstvom*, no. 2 (1) (2017): 34-39.
- Vovkanych, S. I. "Suspilni transformatsii tsinnosti ukrain-skoi idei: novitni vyklyky i zahrozy" [Social transformations of the values of the Ukrainian idea: new challenges and threats]. *Sotsialno-ekonomichni problemy suchasnoho periodu Ukrainy*, no. 1 (2015): 144-151.
- Yemelianenko, L. "Stratehuvannia v systemi derzhavnogo upravlinnia natsionalnoiu ekonomikoiu" [Strategies in the system of public administration of the national economy]. *Modernizatsiia upravlinnia natsionalnoiu ekonomikoiu*. Kyiv: KNEU, 2016. 81-87.
- Zeldner, A. G. "Mesto strategirovaniya v ponyatiyno-kategorialnoy sisteme prognozirovaniya" [The place of strategy in the conceptual-categorical forecasting system]. *Ekonomicheskije nauki*, no. 8 (2012): 7-15.