

# GENESIS OF THE CONCEPT AND PROCESS OF STRATEGIZING AT ENTERPRISES

©2023 IASTREMSKA O. O.

UDC 330.368

JEL Classification: L10; L29; L69; M29; O29

Iastremska O. O.

## Genesis of the Concept and Process of Strategizing at Enterprises

The aim of the article is to summarize theoretical proposals on the definition of the concept of strategizing, to study its genesis and the need to use it in the complex modern conditions of life of enterprises, to clarify the components and stages of the strategizing process and their features, to determine the purpose of strategizing in the conditions of the experience economy as the most progressive model of economic relations, which ensures the growth of added value and profit of enterprises. The object of the research is a complex socioeconomic phenomenon of strategizing and the process of its implementation; the subject is theoretical provisions, conceptions, methodology of enterprise strategizing and their application in the conditions of the experience economy. The following main methods were used in the research process: system approach, method of structural-logical analysis, theoretical generalization, scientific abstraction, concretization and comparative analysis, historical and logical analysis, process approach, theoretical generalization. The article presents the modern features of the internal environment and the external environment of enterprises, which determine the development of the concept of strategizing and the process of its implementation. The main stages of development of strategic management of enterprises with identification of strategizing have been proposed. In chronological order, the definition of the concept of strategizing and its stages and components from its origin to the present (2023) in the scientific works of foreign and domestic scholars is examined and systematized, taking into account the latest trends in changes in economic relations and the feasibility of using in the model of the experience economy. On the basis of generalization of the proposals of scholars and the existing economic realities, an understanding of the concept of strategizing enterprises as the main way of strategic thinking about the future of enterprise is proposed, the main components and stages of the process of its course include the definition of the mission, vision, goals of the enterprise's life, analysis of factors of the internal and external environment in accordance with the set goals, determination of the strategic instruments (system of strategies) of the enterprise's life, substantiation of criteria for the selection of strategies, which in the conditions of the experience economy are aimed at highlighting the attractiveness of the enterprise, the strength and value of its brand and the level of reputation, making decisions on the final composition of the set of strategies, forecasting the trajectories of the enterprise in accordance with the adopted strategies and taking into account possible scenarios of the course of events, the implementation of organizational and communication foresightings, the implementation of adopted strategies in accordance with the approved strategic plan of the enterprise.

**Keywords:** strategizing, internal environment, external environment, way of strategic thinking, experience economy, stages and components of strategizing

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-0712-2023-4-165-174>

**Bibl.:** 41.

**Iastremska Olesia O.** – Candidate of Sciences (Economics), Associate Professor, Candidate on Doctor Degree of the Department of Management and Business, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics (9a Nauky Ave., Kharkiv, 61166, Ukraine)

**E-mail:** [iastremska.o@gmail.com](mailto:iastremska.o@gmail.com)

**ORCID:** <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1865-0282>

**Scopus Author ID:** <https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57221952427>

УДК 330.368

JEL Classification: L10; L29; L69; M29; O29

## Ястремська О. О. Генезис поняття та процесу стратегування на підприємствах

Мета статті полягає в узагальненні теоретичних пропозицій з визначення поняття стратегування, дослідженні його генезису та необхідності використання у складних сучасних умовах життєдіяльності підприємств, уточненні складових та етапів процесу стратегування та їх особливостей, визначенні призначення стратегування в умовах економіки вражень як найбільш прогресивної моделі економічних відносин, яка забезпечує зростання доданої вартості та прибутку підприємств. Об'єктом дослідження є складне соціально-економічне явище стратегування та процес його здійснення; предметом – теоретичні положення, концепції, методологія стратегування підприємств та їх застосування в умовах економіки вражень. У процесі дослідження використано такі основні методи: системний підхід, метод структурно-логічного аналізу, теоретичного узагальнення, наукової абстракції, конкретизації та порівняльного аналізу, історико-логічний аналіз, процесний підхід, теоретичного узагальнення. У статті представлено сучасні особливості внутрішнього середовища і зовнішнього оточення підприємств, які зумовлюють розвиток поняття стратегування та процесу його здійснення. Запропоновано основні етапи розвитку стратегічного управління підприємств з ідентифікацією стратегування. У хронологічній послідовності досліджено та систематизовано визначення поняття стратегування та його етапів і складових від виникнення до цього часу (2023 р.) у наукових працях зарубіжних і вітчизняних учених з урахуванням новітніх тенденцій змін економічних відносин і доцільності використання у моделі економіки вражень. На основі узагальнення пропозицій вчених та наявних економічних реалій запропоновано розуміння поняття стратегування підприємств як основного способу стратегічного мислення про майбутнє підприємства, а до основних складових і етапів процесу його перебігу віднесено визначення місії, бачення, цілей життєдіяльності підприємства, аналізування факторів внутрішнього

і зовнішнього середовищ відповідно до поставлених цілей, визначення стратегічного набору (системи стратегій) життєдіяльності підприємства, обґрунтування критеріальних показників для відбору стратегій, які в умовах економіки вражень спрямовані на висвітлення атрактивності підприємства, сили і вартості його бренду та рівня репутації, ухвалення рішень про остаточний склад набору стратегій, прогнозування траєкторій руху підприємства відповідно до прийнятих стратегій з урахуванням можливих сценаріїв перебігу подій, здійснення організаційного та комунікаційного форсайтингу, реалізацію прийнятих стратегій згідно із затвердженим стратегічним планом життєдіяльності підприємства.

**Ключові слова:** стратегування, внутрішнє середовище, зовнішнє оточення, спосіб стратегічного мислення, економіка вражень, етапи і складові стратегування.

**Бібл.:** 41.

**Ястремська Олеся Олександрівна** – кандидат економічних наук, доцент, докторант кафедри менеджменту та бізнесу, Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця (просп. Науки, 9а, Харків, 61166, Україна)

**E-mail:** iastremska.o@gmail.com

**ORCID:** <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1865-0282>

**Scopus Author ID:** <https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57221952427>

**Introduction.** In the current conditions of life activities of enterprises, the latter face a difficult task – to provide management of economic activity and interact with the subjects of the internal and external environment in the strategic aspect in accordance with the challenges, the pace of their changes, characterized by nonlinearity, complexity, and probability of consequences. Management theories respond to urgent challenges by generating new and developing existing conceptual and methodological approaches to strategic management: dynamic competencies, organizational knowledge, behavioral management, intellectual capital management, talent management, emotional capital management, impression management. The given directions of management development, which are taken into account in one of its fields – strategic management, are a response to gradual changes in the internal and the external environment of enterprises, which are undergoing changes and require the appropriate development of the conceptual, methodological, methodical, and practical basis.

The internal environment is characterized by a focus on achieving innovation in all functional areas, increasing attention to socialization as one of the modern trends in maintaining the interests of owners and staff, enhancing their competence, ensuring the development of enterprises on the basis of digitalization, increasing the rate of change in the managerial factors of the internal environment, i. e. technologies, quality of resources, lists of tasks, goals, requirements for personnel, adaptability and decentralization organizational structures; all this helps to ensure the attractiveness of enterprises, increase the strength of their brand and the stability of their reputation.

The external environment of enterprises, as recognized by world scientific authorities, in modern conditions is considered by scholars either as a VUCA-world or a BANI-world. The essence of the VUCA-world is the perception of the external environment as unstable, ambiguous, difficult to make long-term forecasts, combine social roles and implement plans and achieve goals [1]. In such an environment, it is important to have emotional intelligence, communication skills, demonstrate empathy, master soft skills, constantly learn throughout life and forget what is unnecessary, be open to new information and be able to perceive the problem comprehensively, have the ability to adapt to a new environment, and acquire dynamic

competencies [2]. That is, emotionality in such an environment plays a leading role for effective strategic management. However, the VUCA-world gradually turns into the BANI-world, a fragile, disturbing, non-linear, incomprehensible environment that does not have a permanent structure. That means, the BANI-world is the next step in development, as noted by Professor Jamais Cascio of the University of California [3]. This environment can create such destructivities as the rupture of social, economic, and political arrangements, for an individual country – the onset of a socioeconomic and political crisis, for enterprises – a reduction in production and progressive bankruptcy. These destructivities are considered in relation to the war in Ukraine in the latest fundamental international research [4]. To be able to function constructively in the chaotic modern BANI-world environment [5], enterprises need to develop and use the latest modern theories and conceptions of strategic management, develop and use the appropriate strategic instruments and strategies, implement market innovations, invest in employees and form teams, possess skills and talents to surprise partners and consumers, that is, focus their efforts on meeting active needs, which corresponds to the perspective model of economic relations – the experience economy [2].

Modern characteristics of the internal environment and the external environment confirm the need to revise the theoretical foundations of strategic management in the direction of using emotional models of decision-making.

**Literature analysis.** The objective conditions of changes in the internal environment and the external environment of enterprises necessitate the continuation of research on the theories of strategic management and its development, that facilitated the allocation of the theory of strategizing, which in some aspects was considered in the publications of well-known scholars who began the study of strategizing: J. Mathews [6], J. L. Bower [7], O. E. Williamson [8], C. Shapiro [9], and their contemporary followers L. Carlsson [10], C. G. Asmussen, K. Foss, N. J. Foss, & P. G Klein [11], P. Wadström [12]. As for domestic scholars, the process of strategizing has been studied in the publications of O. S. Vyshnevskiy [13], O. V. Banar, N. O. Petrenko [14], L. S. Shevchenko [15], Yu. B. Ivanov [16], O. Zhehus [17], E. M. Zabarna [18], R. V. Yankovyi [19], L. A. Nekrasova [20] and many others. However, the scholars considered certain economic levels and aspects of strategizing –

macroeconomic, regional, limited territorial (from the point of view of decentralization of territories) and certain functional features of the application of strategizing, which will be summarized in the article further on. However, the synergistic idea of the essence of the concept, the need for its development and use in the current conditions, and the sequence and features of the stages of implementation require a closer definition, thus determining the purpose of the presented article.

So, the aim of the article is to summarize the theoretical proposals for the definition of the concept of strategizing, to study its genesis and the need for use in the complex modern conditions of the life activities of enterprises, to define closer the stages of the strategizing process and their features, to determine the purpose of strategizing in the conditions of the experience economy as the most progressive model of economic relations, ensuring the growth of added value and profit of enterprises. The object of the article is a complex socioeconomic phenomenon of strategizing and the process of its implementation. The subject of the article is the theoretical provisions, conceptions, methodology of strategizing and their application in the context of the experience economy.

**Methods.** In the process of research, the following main methods were used: system approach, structural and logical analysis, theoretical generalization, scientific abstraction, concretization and comparative analysis – to summarize the achievements of domestic and foreign scholars on the problems of scientific research, improvement and filling with modern content of the definition of the concept of «strategizing»; historical and logical analysis – in the study of the evolution of the conceptions of strategic management and the formation of strategizing; process approach – to define closer the sequence and features of the stages of strategizing to ensure the development of enterprises; theoretical generalization – to form the conclusions of the study.

**Research results.** Scientific and practical interest in strategic management directly and the process of its development, change of content and transformation rely upon the following:

- enterprises are the open economic and social systems and are operated under the influence of factors of the internal and external environment, the rate of change of which is growing; strengthening competition requires paying attention to strategic management and its use for survival, achievement of success and securing the effectiveness of enterprises;
- traditional methods of forecasting to determine the goals and objectives of strategic management, such as extrapolation, can be used only in a stable external and internal environment, which limits the use of strategic management and requires a change in its strategic instruments for the use of nonlinear forecasting methods, the theory of neural networks, fuzzy sets, that are close to human thinking by implementation algorithms, to take into account the effect of rapidly changing factors of influence on the part of internal and especially of external environment;
- in order to ensure the success of the enterprise's life activities, the management system should be sensitive, flexible, adaptive to level the vulnerability to-

wards risks, which requires the use of clarification and a further development of strategic management methodology;

- step by step, strategic management requires the expansion of the object, subject, methods, and transformation into the philosophy of life of the enterprise regarding strategic thinking and conversion into strategizing, which has a complex nature and, accordingly, changes both the process of strategic management and its content, expanding it in accordance with objective realities and subjective ideas.

The allocated factors, features of manifestation and influence of rapidly changing internal environment and external environment of enterprises are the objective basis for the need to change views on the implementation of strategic management. In the development of the theoretical perception of strategic management as a part of management theories, scholars [20; 21] identify the main stages which it is possible to agree with, clarifying their essence in accordance with the main objective factors of the development of economic relations, also clarifying them in relation to strategic management, and not only its functions of strategic planning, as indicated in [20; 21]. This is caused by the expansion of the modern understanding of strategizing from a separate function of strategic planning to a comprehensive set of basic functions of strategic management. Thus, the stages of development of strategic management from the beginning of its spread to its transformation into strategizing are as follows.

Stage 1. From the establishments such as workshops, manufactories (from the 17th century to the end of the 19th century, the beginning of the 20th century), when scientific management first claimed his rights, inciting to carrying out such measures as consideration of rationing, individual specialization, scientific organization of the management process, when the first proposals for taking into account the long-term perspective appeared, and planning as a management function was commenced.

Stage 2. From the beginning of the 20th century to its middle, associated with the significant development of scientific management, its expansion to administrative management with a bias towards behavioristic theories of taking into account human relations to increase labor productivity. Emergence of the objective need to use the strategic functions of management: planning, organizing, motivating and controlling, where there was an increase in the complexity of technological processes of production and management, the post-war state of the economies of most European countries, the expansion and complication of relations with partners. Strategic management acquires significant importance with the predominance of the function of strategic planning due to the formation of corporate strategies, allocation of strategic centers of economic management as part of organizational structures, the use of proposals of economic cybernetics with the use of quantitative mathematical methods for making strategic decisions and substantiating strategic plans and the implementation of strategic transformation of organizational structures.

Stage 3. From the middle of the 20th century to the 1970s, 1980s, because of the growing complexity of internal and external relations of enterprises, the increase in the need to

take into account external challenges, which began to manifest themselves more often, at a faster rate. These very factors have led to the use of systematic and process approaches in planning and management, economic and mathematical methods of substantiating strategic decisions, increasing the strategic period of their development and implementation.

Stage 4. From the 1980s to the beginning of the 21st century, when the situational approach in management began to spread widely, with the growth of instability in the actions of the subjects of the external environment, i. e. market conditions, a strategic approach to leadership, the formation of interactive strategic plans, strategic sets of various types of strategies, the transition from resource to competence approaches, the use of the theory of synergetics in strategic planning and management, a significant interest in strategic marketing, expansion and confident use of information systems in all areas of strategic management, strategic risk management, reduction of the time for the development of strategic plans, their acquisition of a stable, pronounced dynamic indicative character. During this period, one can observe the first manifestation of strategizing as a new methodology of strategic management, which is manifested not so much in strategic planning as in taking into account the risks of economic management, a scenario approach to the formation of strategies, an attempt to use the provisions of synergetics in enterprise management.

Stage 5. From the beginning of the 21st century to the present, when strategizing is confidently integrated and reformed within the framework of strategic management as a new type of economic strategic thinking, an art, a mechanism for achieving the goals set by enterprises with emergent properties aimed at self-development. There have been some proposals as to replacing or equating strategic management with strategizing. Such proposals for the transformation of strategic management can be partly explained by significant changes in the economic and social spheres of enterprises regarding the growing importance of social responsibility of the business, the use of a competency-based approach in the management process, methods of brand management and reputation management to create additional impressions about the capabilities of enterprises, the benefits of cooperation with them, taking into account their attractiveness, changing the conditions for making managerial decisions, that become mixed in terms of rational and emotional benefits. This is especially obvious in the context of functioning of the model of economic relations, which corresponds to the experience economy, the volume of which is estimated at \$6.5 trillion.

This is a significant result according to the preliminary assessment of monetary spread, however, in terms of development prospects and sectoral feasibility, this model is distinguished by one of the best distribution results and projected prospects [22]. The main objective factors of the application of strategizing are: the functioning of enterprises in the VUCA-world, which turns into the BANI-world, being a fragile, disturbing, nonlinear, incomprehensible environment that does not have a permanent structure; socialization and consumerization, digitization and digitalization; use of artificial intelligence; focus of management on the implementation of the main goals of Industry 4.0 and Industry 5.0.

The allocated stages, their main features characterize the features and different perception and use of strategic management, explain the existence of objective conditions for gradual embedding, and sometimes attempts to replace strategic management with strategizing.

For the first time, the concept of strategizing was introduced into the theory of management by the Nobel Prize winner in economics O. E. Williamson [8], who, according to the English discourse, considered strategizing as everything related to the process of developing and implementing a strategy. He believed that strategizing refers relatively fundamentally to a firm that is obsessed with having power over the market. Due to this interpretation of the term in the scientific literature, at the beginning of its application, the concept of «strategizing» was used as a synonym for strategic planning. Moving further along the time axis, not be missed is the interpretation of the concept of strategizing by J. Mathews [6], who considered this term as maneuvering enterprises in positioning and differentiating them from each other and searching for a competitive advantage over each other in conditions of disequilibrium. He also drew attention to the matter that strategizing is based on three fundamental categories that explain the strategic choices of enterprises: their resources; actions with these resources, and procedures that would combine the two previous categories [6]. That is, J. Mathews understood strategizing as the formation of a strategy and its implementation to ensure the profit of the enterprise and the prevalence in competitiveness on the basis of the resource approach.

The evolution of the understanding of the concept of strategizing can be clearly traced in the suggestions of J. L. Bower [23] and R. A. Burgelman [24], who hold common views and propose to interpret this term on the basis of the process approach as multiple, simultaneous, interrelated and sequential actions of managers at different levels of the organizational hierarchy in order to form and implement strategies. That is, the use of the process approach in the management of economic activities of enterprises influenced the formulation of the concept of strategizing.

Carrying on with the consideration of the genesis of strategizing in accordance with the chronology of publications and a significant change in its understanding, it makes sense to note the following scientific works of other researchers.

From 2005 onwards (until about 2011), most researchers suggest that strategizing should be considered «as a process of forecasting and shaping the future; the ability to describe reality in a multiaspectual way. That is, strategizing is an aggregate of strategic planning, forecasting and management». As an initial expansion of the understanding of strategizing, it is advisable to agree with the idea of expanding strategizing not only to planning, as his predecessors have pointed out, but to strategic management in general. As for the level of management, the researches dwell on the regional level, but their ideas can be applied to enterprises, such as the process of forming their strategic sets (portfolios) of vital activity.

It was also proposed to understand strategizing as the process of «forecasting and shaping the future, the ability to describe reality in a multiaspectual way, taking into account all the laws of changes that occur as a result of influencing reality, those factors that will appear as a result of influencing reality».

In his work, strategizing is also considered at the level of region. The advantage of the proposed definition is the emphasis on its multiaspectual nature, that is expedient to agree with.

A significant breakthrough in the understanding of strategizing and the stages of its implementation during the chronological period is the proposition of introduction of concept of «foresight» as a complex phenomenon that characterizes the process of strategizing in a new organizational context in terms of content as «scenario forecasting of socioeconomic development, which determines possible options for the development of the economy, industry, society and organization and procedure as a process» in which all market entities function. The expediency of including foresight in the process of strategizing in the further publications is supported by other scholars, for example, by L. S. Shevchenko [15].

An essential step towards revealing the essence of understanding strategizing is the position of J. Malgan (2011) [25], who understands strategizing (from the root word «strategy») «as a plan of action, an art, a mechanism for achieving goals... in order to achieve socially significant goals» and includes a mechanism in its composition, also compares it with art, meaning that the subjective emotional nature has to be accounted, thus corresponding to the model of economic relations of the experience economy. Although the author does not directly point to this, since he studies strategizing at the macroeconomic level, explaining its essence as a whole.

A. G. Zeldner (2012) [26], believes that «strategizing, in contrast to strategic planning, is characterized not only by fixing the ultimate goals, but also by the mechanism for achieving them, including monitoring the step-by-step achievement of the planned indicators», which significantly expands strategizing in terms of its stages of implementation and differs from the previous definitions and composition of stages.

T. V. Bochkareva, S. E. Samartsev (2013) [27], explain strategizing through its instrumentarium, i. e. methods of development, they also point out that this is «not a separate means, but an aggregate and a system of means of managing the development of a non-linear representation and construction of the Future in relation to the Past». It is sensible to agree with such an interpretation and a suggestion to use the instruments of strategizing, taking into account the current features of the state of the internal and external environments of enterprises, their complexity, variability, riskiness, and fractality.

A significant proposition concerning the period under review is to consider strategizing as a process system that includes the following components: logical-emotional (perception of what is happening and the perspective); institutional; sociocultural; managerial (development strategies); instrumental (a set of procedures and instruments for strategizing) is proposed by Myasnikova T. O. (2015) [31], which significantly expands and determines its complex nature, the expediency of taking into account its features in the emotional and logical, social and cultural contexts, which is important in modern conditions of development of the experience economy.

Directly at the enterprise level, strategizing is considered since 2015–2016, pointing out that strategizing is «a voluminous and direct process of implementing the selected system of the corporation's strategy, that combines integrated procedures

for continuous strategic analysis of the trajectory of development of the economic system, as well as its adaptive system adjustment in the context of comprehensive transformations between profound changes in technologies, institutions, social communications, managerial and business processes and both material and non-material capital». And so, this definition combines almost all stages, processes of strategic management and resources of the enterprise, that significantly expands the phasing of strategizing.

E. M. Zabarna and E. Y. Shchyokina (2016) [18] consider strategizing more broadly than planning and highlight it as «a scientific category that is used in the study of complex socioeconomic systems as the most adequate tool for solving problems that allow creating the necessary conditions for long-term development on the basis of strategic goals that can consolidate the efforts of government, business and society». The drawback of the proposed definition of strategizing is its application only to levels of region, otherwise the authors understand this term quite broadly. That is, strategizing is understood as a continuous process of development, implementation and «monitoring of programs and documents of socioeconomic development». As for the strategizing components, the authors in the publication referred to the following: scientific principles/conception, forecasting, modeling, planning, programming, practical implementation, controlling, which significantly expand the understanding of strategizing as strategic planning and bring it closer to strategic management, but do not identify with it.

Almost all the main functions of strategic management, except for motivation, are proposed to be included in strategizing by N. O. Kukharska (2017) [28], who considers strategizing as «an aggregate of processes of conceptualization, forecasting, strategic scanning, modeling, planning, design, programming, implementation and control, the process of creating a strategy, communicative foresight, analysis of the situation and consequences of actions, strategy implementation and controlling», thus significantly expanding the understanding strategizing and the composition of its stages and giving more freedom of action to managers of the strategic level of enterprise management.

V. A. Chemerys and L. P. Kazmir (2018) [29], support the opinion of N. O. Kukharska that «the modern ideology of strategizing the socioeconomic development of units of different hierarchical levels is based on the system paradigm of the process of formation of an integral multi-level multi-object system of strategic management with a clear internal structure covering all components of the strategic process (objects and subjects of strategic planning, strategic institutions, strategic stakeholders, holistic and interrelated strategies for the functioning of facilities at different levels – from an enterprise to a city, region or country as a whole, as well as mechanisms for their implementation)». In their opinion, among the main functions of strategizing, innovative development is the synthesis of existing potential, qualitatively new prospects and the function of generating qualitatively new resources for diversification of development directions. The authors' proposed changes to the process of strategizing clarify and expand the direction of actions of the enterprise management system.

O. S. Vishnevsky (2018) [13], in the monograph on strategizing, almost clearly does not distinguish between strategizing and strategic management, but examines these processes

according to the main elements: mission, vision, values, goals, strategies, and also considers them in the psychological aspect from the standpoint of introversion and extroversion of the subjects of strategic management, which is important in the conditions of the experience economy. The author also notes the fundamentality of strategizing and the reasons for its spread, which are connected, on the one hand, with its focus on solving universal human problems that have an ontological, epistemological, and axiological character, and on the other hand, with the formation of a worldview paradigm. Further development of strategizing, in his opinion, will be due to new paradigm shifts in strategic management and factors of internal and external environments. An important suggestion, which is relevant in the conditions of the experience economy, is the established postulates of strategizing: universality for all individuals and organizations, totality regarding the absence of restrictions; concentration of knowledge, i. e. strategy, is the quintessence, the concentrate of knowledge of human civilization, ensuring subjectivity, and the focus on change. Such informative content contributes to the deepening of the understanding of strategizing and its further development and practical application.

The same terminological problem of clear non-separation of strategic management and strategizing is inherent in many publications, for example [34; 35; 36; 37; 38], although in each of them there is a positive aspect of strategizing according to its subject area. Thus, N. S. Sytnyk and Yu. V. Shushkova (2019) [30] justly note that when strategizing, «conceptual requirements and theoretical and methodological sequence should be observed. In particular, first of all, it is necessary to carry out a thorough analysis of the internal and external environment of the problem: the current state, dynamics, efficiency of innovation activity, the modernity of technologies, the prerequisites and environment for the development, creation, commercialization, and use in business of new modern advanced technologies, the state and potential of development, its basic, most productive segments». Taking into account the epistemological and innovative aspect in strategizing allows adapting the process of its application to the conditions of modern realities and the experience economy directly.

L. A. Nekrasova (2019) [31], relying on the complexity of the manifestation of strategizing, emphasizes that «in its composition and spectrum it is a synthetic category that goes beyond the traditional approach or representation only as a management function, and turns into an element of the mechanism of complex influence». It makes sense to agree with this statement, since it is confirmed and further developed in the publications of other scholars. Thus, V. V. Gurochkina (2020) [32] outlined her own vision of the theoretical and methodological foundations of strategizing through «activation of emergent properties that are aimed at the self-development of enterprises», which are manifested through financial, integration, socio-psychological and technical-technological vectors of development. Such a view of strategizing significantly develops its understanding in the aspect of a system approach. Also, referring to the monograph of M. I. Zveryakov, N. O. Kukharska, N. A. Klevtsevich, O. S. Sharag (2019) [33], V. V. Gurochkina supports their vision of strategizing as a set of «forecasting, staging, designing, goal-setting, programming, planning, communicative foresighting, modeling, analysis of the situation and analysis of

the consequences of action in the situation, implementation of strategy and controlling, that can be considered as a system resource for the application of anticipatory management in the industry of socioeconomic development for the mobilization of internal reserves and the formation of conditions for the development of entrepreneurship on the basis of a constructive dialogue between business, government and society». Such a definition and content of strategizing in relation to its components, which should be considered as certain stages of implementation, increases the expediency of its application in the model of relations of the experience economy, since it includes communicative foresight, which should be supplemented with organizational foresight. Such a significant expansion of the content of strategizing allows it to be used in the process of enterprise management to harmonize economic management, resource provision, and the development processes used in the strategic perspective. In this sense, strategizing ceases to be comprehended as strategic planning, but is understood as the main way of thinking about the future of the enterprise, which makes adjustments to the behavior of the latter [33].

According to the current trends in changing models of economic relations, strategizing researchers develop proposals for their consideration in the components and stages of this complex process. Thus, regarding the components and methods of strategizing, Iryna Ignatieva, Alina Serbenivska, Anna Orel, Mariia Bieloborodova and Liudmyla Bondarenko (2022) [39] suggest using benchmarking, allowing to compare the achievements of enterprises in the process of forming and implementing strategies. The authors specify that the use of benchmarking in the management system allows a systematic finding and evaluating all the benefits of the best practices and creating possibilities for their use. Solving the problem of improving strategizing, taking into account the backbone factors and the need for a flexible response to modern challenges, is the most effective lever of influence on socioeconomic processes. Therefore, the main scientific task today, according to the authors, is to develop the methodological foundations of situational monitoring, as well as to create conditions for its implementation. Of course, the present requires the improvement of strategizing methods, their expansion, with inclusion of not only benchmarking and strategic monitoring, but all components of strategizing.

According to the trends of globalization and the European integration, the process of concentration of capital and unification of enterprises into integrated business structures becomes actuated. Therefore, in the process of strategizing, the issue of developing an organizational foresight arose regarding the feasibility of hiring central corporate non-executive strategy specialists to manage its development in multi-commercial companies, which, according to P. Wadström, (2022) [40], provides three advantages: the ability to coordinate strategizing for the entire enterprise, ensuring participation in strategy development, and expanding ownership of the content of the strategy in business. The presented proposals expand the understanding of the organization and the role of strategic managers in the process of strategizing and its organizational foresight, that appears extremely important in the conditions of the experience economy, letting combine and coordinate rational and emotional impressions in the process of forming and

implementing a strategy.

Since digitalization is an important direction in the development of economic relations and its impact on strategizing is beyond doubt, that is why J. Morton, A. Amrollahi, and A. D. Wilson, (2022) [40] examined the relationship between information systems and strategy and provided an in-depth evaluative review of 71 selected documents on this issue, allowing to explore the features of the research area of «digital strategizing» and to suggest a research program to continue its knowledge and theorizing. Such a perspective of strategizing research will allow to modernize its tools for the formation of strategies as a multi-variant product. L. Carlsson (2023) [10] takes a further step in his research on strategizing in the context of digitalization, identifying three aspects that affect strategizing in strategy formation in the context of accelerating industrial digitalization: affective collectivism, affective individualism, and structural framing. These questions are particularly important in the context of the experience economy, as they show how cognitive aspects can be taken into account in shaping the organizational structure of an enterprise and influence how managers collect, recognize, and use the organizational abilities of other strategists. It is possible to agree that all employees should be able to identify themselves and be involved in the cognitive process of strategizing. The usefulness and significance of participation in the formation of strategy should be realized by employees through structural and emotional ties within the enterprise. Individual employees of the enterprise should, in accordance with the need to use digital technologies in each position, possess dynamic digital competencies, and the staff as a whole must have common assumptions, expectations and knowledge about the perceived changes caused by the latest technologies.

Taking into account the ideas of the subjects of the external environment and comparing their expectations with the capabilities of the internal environment of the enterprise will allow to resolve the contradictions between the real and emotional perception. Solving this important issue in the context of the experience economy will be of particular urgency. Therefore, in this case, it is expedient to consolidate the efforts of strategy developers taking into account the challenges of the market, directing the life activities of the enterprise towards ensuring efficiency and including this aspect in the components and stages of strategizing, which requires the solved issues of choosing types and applying models of relationships between the enterprise and the subjects of the external environment. Such an important problem is emphasized by C. G. Asmussen and N. J. Foss (2022) [41], who underline that the distribution of issues of ensuring and determining the efficiency of the enterprise and strategizing is a serious conceptual oversight. The integration of these two issues will not fundamentally change the conceptions and ideas of the global strategy, but rather expand the set of its ideas and forecasts. So the authors underline that not only efficiency, or strategizing, but also bargaining power are interrelated, which indicates the importance of communication foresight for achieving the effectiveness of strategizing. It is worth agreeing with this proposal, since the inclusion of communication foresight in the form of a negotiation process based on communication interaction to ensure the growth of the company's reputation, its brand value and attractiveness as

criteria for the course of strategizing will increase the effectiveness of the latter.

**Conclusions.** The study of the genesis of the concept of strategizing allowed us to conclude that there is a variety of understanding of this concept: from the planning function and up to a new type of strategic thinking. In the scientific literature, one still cannot find a stable unambiguous understanding of the term «strategizing», but there is a tendency to transform this concept into a scientific category in order to study complex socioeconomic systems, i. e. as the most adequate tool for solving strategic problems. Scientists both simplify the concept of strategizing and identify it with strategic management, while strategizing is the main way of strategic thinking about the future of the enterprise and includes the process of forming strategies, consisting in determining the mission, vision, goals of the enterprise's activities, analyzing the factors of the internal and external environment in accordance with the set goals, determining the strategic set (system of strategies) of the life activities of the enterprise, substantiation of criteria indicators for the selection of strategies, decision-making on the final composition of a set of strategies, forecasting the trajectories of the enterprise's course in accordance with the adopted strategies, taking into account possible scenarios of development of events, implementation of organizational and communication foresightings, implementation of the adopted strategies in accordance with the approved strategic plan of the life activities of the enterprise.

Such a definition of strategizing, taking into account the process of its implementation, will cut off unnecessary components and stages and allow focusing on the process of forming strategies in accordance with the capabilities of the enterprise, the expectations of the subjects of the external environment for their transformation into realities and obtaining rational and emotional satisfaction from interaction with the enterprise, which will contribute to the growth of added value and profit in the context of the development of the latest model of economic relations – the experience economy.

Prospects for further research are the development of the conception of strategizing and its methodology for use in the conditions of the experience economy, taking into account the main directedness towards obtaining rational and emotional satisfaction by the subjects of the internal and external environments of enterprise, the basis of which is the attractiveness, strength, and value of enterprise brands and their reputation based on trust.

## LITERATURE

1. After VUCA, the transformation to a BANI world. URL: <https://ideasen.llorenteycuena.com/2021/03/16/aftervuca-the-transformation-to-a-bani-world/>
2. Ястремська О. О. Бренд підприємства та формування його стратегії в умовах економіки вражень // Маркетингові та організаційні механізми повоєнного розвитку галузі гостинності та туризму України : зб. тез доп. І Всеукр. наук.-практ. конф. (14–15 листоп. 2023 р., м. Харків). Ч. 1. Харків : НТУ «Харківський Політехнічний Інститут», 2023. С. 274–281.
3. Cascio Jamais. Facing the Age of Chaos. URL: <https://medium.com/@cascio/facing-the-age-of-chaosb00687b1f51d>

4. Відбудова для розвитку: зарубіжний досвід та українські перспективи : міжнар. кол. моногр. / [редколегія, голова – д. е. н. В. В. Небрата] ; НАН України, ДУ «Ін-т екон. та прогнозув. НАН України». Електрон. дані. Київ, 2023. 571 с. URL: <http://ief.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Reconstruction-for-development.pdf>
5. BANI: A new framework to make sense of a chaotic world. URL: <https://thinkinsights.net/leadership/bani/>
6. Mathews J. Strategizing, Disequilibrium and Profit. *Stanford University Press*. 2006. May 16. P. 2–9.
7. Bower J. L. Managing the Resource Allocation Process: A Study of Corporate Planning and Investment. Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration. Boston, MA. 1970.
8. Williamson O. E. Strategizing, Economizing, and Economic Organization. *Strategic Management Journal*. Special Issue. 1991. No. 12. P. 75–94.  
DOI: 10.1002/smj.4250121007
9. Shapiro C. The theory of business strategy. *RAND Journal of Economics*. 1989. No. 20. P. 125–137.
10. Carlsson L. (2023), Strategizing organizational capabilities for industrial digitalization – exploring managers' technological frames. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*. 2023. Vol. 34. No. 9. P. 20–39.  
DOI: 10.1108/JMTM-07-2022-0252
11. Asmussen C. G., Foss K., Foss N. J., Klein P. G. Economizing and strategizing: How coalitions and transaction costs shape value creation and appropriation. *Strategic Management Journal*. 2021. No. 42. P. 413–434.
12. Wadström P. How non-executive strategy professionals in multi-business firms strategize. *Journal of Strategy and Management*. 2022. Vol. 15. No. 1. P. 16–37.  
DOI: 10.1108/JSMA-11-2019-0202
13. Вишневецький О. С. Загальна теорія стратегування: від парадигми до практики використання : монографія. Київ : ІЕП НАНУ, 2018. 156 с.
14. Банар О. В., Петренко Н. О. Концепція стратегування в контексті стратегічного та адміністративного управління соціально-економічним розвитком держави. *Ефективна економіка*. 2021. № 8.  
DOI: 10.32702/2307-2105-2021.8.2
15. Шевченко Л. С. Стратегія організації в умовах обмежень, невизначеності та непередбачуваності. *Економічна теорія та право*. 2020. № 3 (42). С. 8–27. URL: <http://econtlaw.nlu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/8-27.pdf>
16. Іванов Ю. Б. Стратегування економічної політики для України. Звіт з фундаментальної 16 // Науково-дослідної роботи НДЦ ІПР НАНУ. URL: <https://ndc-ipr.org/media/posts/presentations/0116U006999.pdf>
17. Жегус О. Стратегування як драйвер змін в умовах сучасних викликів. URL: [https://ir.kneu.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/2010/39110/sism\\_22-61.pdf?sequence=1](https://ir.kneu.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/2010/39110/sism_22-61.pdf?sequence=1)
18. Забарна Е. М., Щьокіна Є. Ю. Стратегування як інструмент соціально-економічного розвитку регіону. *Моделювання регіональної економіки*. 2016. № 1 (27). С. 215–225.
19. Янковой Р. В. Роль гібридної стратегії в процесі інноваційного стратегування. *Економіка, управління та адміністрування*. 2023. № 2 (104). P. 32–36.  
DOI: 10.26642/ema-2023-2(104)-32-36
20. Некрасова Л. А. Теоретико-методологічні засади стратегування розвитку виробничих підприємств в умовах децентралізації. Schweinfurt: Time Realities Scientific Group UG (haftungsbeschränkt), 2019. 445 с.
21. Магданов П. В. Современный подход к стратегическому планированию. *Ars Administrandi*. 2011. № 1. С. 11–26.
22. Острікова Т. Шість моделей розвитку економіки після пандемії коронавірусу та потенціал їх розвитку // *Економічна правда* 2020. 26.08. URL: <https://www.epravda.com.ua/columns/2020/08/26/664360/>
23. Bower J. L. Managing the Resource Allocation Process: A Study of Corporate Planning and Investment. Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration. Boston, MA. 1970.
24. Burgelman R. A. A process model of internal corporate venturing in the diversification major firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1983. № 28 (2). С. 223–244.
25. Малган Дж. Мистецтво державної стратегії / Дж. Малган. К., 2011. 472 с.
26. Zeldner, A.G. (2019), "Strategic Location in the Concept-Categorical Forecasting System", *Economic sciences*, vol. 8 (93), pp. 7–15.
27. Бочкарева Т. В., Самарцев С. Е. Практика стратегіювання и проведення стратегических сессий – рамка інституціалізації // XIX Чтения памяти Г. П. Щедровицкого, февраль 2013. URL: <https://ppt4web.ru/tekhnologija/praktika-strategirovanija-iprovedenija-strategicheskikh-sessij.html>
28. Кухарська Н. О. Регіональне стратегування – основа формування стратегії розвитку регіону. *Економіст*. 2012. № 1. С. 63–65.
29. Чемерис В. А., Казмір Л. П. Концептуальні засади стратегування інноваційного розвитку сільських територій на регіональному рівні. *Розвиток сільських територій та аграрного сектору економіки*. 2018. Вип. 4 (132). С. 79–84.
30. Ситник Н. С., Шушкова Ю. В. Підходи до стратегування державної політики технологічної модернізації та реіндустріалізації економіки. *Приазовський економічний вісник «Економіка та управління національним господарством»*. 2019. Вип. 6 (17). С. 67–73.  
DOI: 10.32840/2522-4263/2019-6-13
31. Некрасова Л. А. Новітні аспекти стратегування розвитку виробничих підприємств в умовах децентралізації. *Економіка харчової промисловості*. 2019. Т. 11. № 2. С. 38–46.
32. Гурочкіна В. В. Стратегування як інструмент розвитку промислових підприємств в емерджентній економіці. *Економічний вісник. Серія : фінанси, облік, оподаткування*. 2020. Вип. 6. С. 40–53.  
DOI: 10.33244/2617-5932.6.2020.40-53
33. Зверяков М. І., Кухарська Н. О., Клевцевич Н. А., Шапар О. С. Стратегування регіонального розвитку: теорія, методологія, концепція : монографія. Одеса : Атлант VOI COIU, 2019. 241 с.
34. McGee John. Strategizing. In *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management*, edited by Professor Sir Cary L Cooper. 2015.  
DOI: 10.1002/9781118785317.weom120170
35. Банар О. В., Петренко Н. О. Концепція стратегування в контексті стратегічного та адміністративного управління соціально-економічним розвитком держави. *Ефективна економіка*. 2021. № 8.  
DOI: 10.32702/2307-2105-2021.8.2
36. Стратегування. URL: [http://www.uis.kiev.ua/~xyz/6\\_strategation.htm](http://www.uis.kiev.ua/~xyz/6_strategation.htm)
37. Волоснікова Н., Решетняк Н., Абрамов Ф. Стратегування фінансової системи корпоративного забезпечення промислового підприємства. *Вісник Національного технічного університету «Харківський політехнічний інститут» (економічні науки)*. 2023. № 1. С. 10–13.  
DOI: 10.20998/2519-4461.2023.1.10



38. Янковой Р. В. Роль гібридної стратегії в процесі інноваційного стратегування. *Економіка, управління та адміністрування*. 2023. № 2 (104). С. 32–36.

DOI: 10.26642/ema-2023-2(104)-32-36

39. Ignatieva I., Serbenivska A., Orel A., Bieloborodova M., Bondarenko L. Innovative Approaches in the System of Regional Development Strategizing. *Review of Economics and Finance*. 2022. Vol. 20. P. 605–611. URL: <https://refpress.org/ref-vol20-a69/>

40. Morton J., Amrollahi A., Wilson A. D. (2022). Digital strategizing: An assessing review, definition, and research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*. 2022. Vol. 31. Issue 2. [101720].

DOI: 10.1016/j.jsis.2022.101720

41. Asmussen C. G., Foss N. J. Strategizing and economizing in global strategy. *Global Strategy Journal*. 2022. Vol. 12 (3). P. 578–591.

DOI: 10.1002/gsj.1443ASMUSSENANDFOSS591

## REFERENCES

"After VUCA, the transformation to a BANI world". <https://ideasen.llorenteycuena.com/2021/03/16/aftervuca-the-transformation-to-a-bani-world/>

Asmussen, C. G. et al. "Economizing and strategizing: How coalitions and transaction costs shape value creation and appropriation". *Strategic Management Journal*, no. 42 (2021): 413-434.

Asmussen, C. G., and Foss, N. J. "Strategizing and economizing in global strategy". *Global Strategy Journal*, vol. 12 (3) (2022): 578-591.

DOI: 10.1002/gsj.1443ASMUSSENANDFOSS591

"BANI: A new framework to make sense of a chaotic world". <https://thinkinsights.net/leadership/bani/>

Banar, O. V., and Petrenko, N. O. "Kontseptsiiia stratehuvannia v konteksti stratehichnoho ta administratyvnoho upravlinnia sotsialno-ekonomichnym rozvytkom derzhavy" [The Concept of Strategizing in the Context of Strategic and Administrative Management of the Socio-economic Development of the State]. *Efektivna ekonomika*, no. 8 (2021).

DOI: 10.32702/2307-2105-2021.8.2

Banar, O. V., and Petrenko, N. O. "Kontseptsiiia stratehuvannia v konteksti stratehichnoho ta administratyvnoho upravlinnia sotsialno-ekonomichnym rozvytkom derzhavy" [The Concept of Strategizing in the Context of Strategic and Administrative Management of the Socio-economic Development of the State]. *Efektivna ekonomika*, no. 8 (2021).

DOI: 10.32702/2307-2105-2021.8.2

Bochkareva, T. V., and Samartsev, S. Ye. "Praktika strategirovaniya i provedeniya strategicheskikh sessiy - ramka institutsializatsii" [The Practice of Strategizing and Conducting Strategic Sessions - an Institutionalization Framework]. XIX Chteniya pamyati G. P. Shchedrovitskogo, February 2013. <https://ppt4web.ru/tekhnologija/praktika-strategirovaniya-iprovedeniya-strategicheskikh-sessij.html>

Bower, J. L. *Managing the Resource Allocation Process: A Study of Corporate Planning and Investment*. Boston, MA: Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1970.

Bower, J. L. *Managing the Resource Allocation Process: A Study of Corporate Planning and Investment*. Boston, MA: Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1970.

Burgelman, R. A. "A process model of internal corporate venturing in the diversification major firm". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, no. 28(2) (1983): 223-244.

"Cascio Jamais. Facing the Age of Chaos". <https://medium.com/@cascio/facing-the-age-of-chaosb00687b1f51d>

Carlsson, L. "Strategizing organizational capabilities for industrial digitalization - exploring managers' technological frames". *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, vol. 34, no. 9 (2023): 20-39.

DOI: 10.1108/JMTM-07-2022-0252

Chemerys, V. A., and Kazmir, L. P. "Kontseptualni zasady stratehuvannia innovatsiinoho rozvytku silskykh terytorii na rehionalnomu rivni" [Conceptual Principles of Strategizing Innovative Development of Rural Areas at the Regional Level]. *Rozvytok silskykh terytorii ta aharnoho sektoru ekonomiky*, no. 4(132) (2018): 79-84.

Hurochkina, V. V. "Stratehuvannia yak instrument rozvytku promyslovykh pidpriemstv v emerdzhentnii ekonomitsi" [Strategizing as a Tool for the Development of Industrial Enterprises in an Emerging Economy]. *Ekonomichnyi visnyk. Seriya: finansy, oblik, opodatkuvannia*, no. 6 (2020): 40-53.

DOI: 10.33244/2617-5932.6.2020.40-53

Ignatieva, I. et al. "Innovative Approaches in the System of Regional Development Strategizing". *Review of Economics and Finance*. 2022. <https://refpress.org/ref-vol20-a69/>

Ivanov, Yu. B. "Stratehuvannia ekonomichnoi polityky dlia Ukrainy. Zvit z fundamentalnoi 16" [Strategizing Economic Policy for Ukraine. Report on Fundamental 16]. *Naukovo-doslidnoi roboty NDTs IPR NANU*. <https://ndc-ipr.org/media/posts/presentations/0116U006999.pdf>

Kukharska, N. O. "Rehionalne stratehuvannia - osnova formuvannia stratehii rozvytku rehionu" [Regional Strategizing is the Basis of Forming a Regional Development Strategy]. *Ekonomist*, no. 1 (2012): 63-65.

Magdanov, P. V. "Sovremennyy podkhod k strategicheskomu planirovaniyu" [A Modern Approach to Strategic Planning]. *Ars Administrandi*, no. 1 (2011): 11-26.

Malgan, Dzh. *Iskusstvo gosudarstvennoy strategii: mobilizatsiya vlasti i znaniya vo imya vseobshchego blaga* [The Art of Public Strategy: Mobilizing Power and Knowledge for the Common Good]. Moscow: Izd-vo Instituta Gaydara, 2011.

Mathews, J. "Strategizing, Disequilibrium and Profit". *Stanford University Press*, May 16 (2006): 2-9.

McGee, John. "Strategizing". In *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management*, 2015.

DOI: 10.1002/9781118785317.weom120170

Morton, J., Amrollahi, A., and Wilson, A. D. "Digital strategizing: An assessing review, definition, and research agenda". *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, vol. 31, no. 2.[101720] (2022).

DOI: 10.1016/j.jsis.2022.101720

Nekrasova, L. A. "Novitni aspekty stratehuvannia rozvytku vyrobnychkh pidpriemstv v umovakh detsentralizatsii" [The Latest Aspects of Strategizing the Development of Manufacturing Enterprises in Conditions of Decentralization]. *Ekonomika kharchovoi promyslovosti*, vol. 11, no. 2 (2019): 38-46.

Nekrasova, L. A. *Teoretyko-metodolohichni zasady stratehuvannia rozvytku vyrobnychkh pidpriemstv v umovakh detsentralizatsii* [Theoretical and Methodological Principles of Strategizing the Development of Production Enterprises in Conditions of Decentralization]. Schweinfurt: Time Realities Scientific Group UG (haftungsbeschränkt), 2019.

Ostrikova, T. "Shist modelei rozvytku ekonomiky pislia pandemii koronavirusu ta potentsial yikh rozvytku" [Six Models of Economic Development After the Coronavirus Pandemic and Their Development Potential]. *Ekonomichna pravda* 2020. 26.08. <https://www.epravda.com.ua/columns/2020/08/26/664360/>

“Stratehuvannia” [Strategizing]. [http://www.uis.kiev.ua/~xyz/6\\_strategation.htm](http://www.uis.kiev.ua/~xyz/6_strategation.htm)

Shapiro, C. “The theory of business strategy”. *RAND Journal of Economics*, no. 20 (1989): 125-137.

Shevchenko, L. S. “Stratehiia orhanizatsii v umovakh obmezhen, nevyznachenosti ta neperedbachuvanosti” [Organizational Strategy in Conditions of Limitations, Uncertainty and Unpredictability]. *Ekonomichna teoriia ta pravo*. 2020. <http://econtlaw.nlu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/8-27.pdf>

Sytynyk, N. S., and Shushkova, Yu. V. “Pidkhody do stratehuvannia derzhavnoi polityky tekhnolohichnoi modernizatsii ta reindustrializatsii ekonomiky” [Approaches to Strategizing the State Policy of Technological Modernization and Reindustrialization of the Economy]. *Pryazovskiy ekonomichnyi visnyk «Ekonomika ta upravlinnia natsionalnym hospodarstvom»*, no. 6(17) (2019): 67-73.

DOI: 10.32840/2522-4263/2019-6-13

“Vidbudova dlia rozvytku: zarubizhnyi dosvid ta ukraiynski perspektyvy” [Reconstruction for Development: Foreign Experience and Ukrainian Perspectives]. <http://ief.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Reconstruction-for-development.pdf>

Volosnikova, N., Reshetniak, N., and Abramov, F. “Stratehuvannia finansovoi systemy korporatyvnoho ubezpechennia promyslovoho pidpriemstva” [Strategizing the Financial System of Corporate Security of an Industrial Enterprise]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho tekhnichnoho universytetu «Kharkivskiy politekhnichnyi instytut» (ekonomichni nauky)*, no. 1 (2023): 10-13. DOI: 10.20998/2519-4461.2023.1.10

Vyshnevskiy, O. S. *Zahalna teoriia stratehuvannia: vid paradyhmy do praktyky vykorystannia* [The General Theory of Strategizing: From Paradigm to Practical Use]. Kyiv: IEP NANU, 2018.

Wadstrom, P. “How non-executive strategy professionals in multi-business firms strategize”. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, vol. 15, no. 1 (2022): 16-37.

DOI: 10.1108/JSMA-11-2019-0202

Williamson, O. E. “Strategizing, Economizing, and Economic Organization”. *Strategic Management Journal. Special Issue*, no. 12 (1991): 75-94.

DOI: 10.1002/smj.4250121007

Yankovoi, R. V. “Rol hibrydnoi stratehii v protsesi innovatsiynoho stratehuvannia” [The Role of Hybrid Strategy in the Process of Innovative Strategizing]. *Ekonomika, upravlinnia ta administruvannia*, no. 2(104) (2023): 32-36.

DOI: 10.26642/ema-2023-2(104)-32-36

Yankovoi, R. V. “Rol hibrydnoi stratehii v protsesi innovatsiynoho stratehuvannia” [The Role of Hybrid Strategy in the Process of Innovative Strategizing]. *Ekonomika, upravlinnia ta administruvannia*, no. 2(104) (2023): 32-36.

DOI: 10.26642/ema-2023-2(104)-32-36

Yastremska, O. O. “Brend pidpriemstva ta formuvannia yoho stratehii v umovakh ekonomiky vrazhen” [The Brand of the Enterprise and the Formation of its Strategy in the Conditions of the Economy of Impressions]. *Marketynhovi ta orhanizatsiini mekhanizmy povoiennoho rozvytku haluzi hostynnosti ta turyzmu Ukrainy*, part 1. Kharkiv: NTU «Kharkivskiy politekhnichnyi instytut», 2023. 274-281.

Zabarna, E. M., and Shchokina, Ye. Yu. “Stratehuvannia yak instrument sotsialno-ekonomichnoho rozvytku rehionu” [Strategizing as a Tool of Socio-economic Development of the Region]. *Modeliuvannia rehionalnoi ekonomiky*, no. 1(27) (2016): 215-225.

Zeldner, A. G. “Mesto strategirovaniya v ponyatiyno-kategorialnoi sisteme prognozirovaniya” [The Place of Strategizing in the Conceptual-categorical Forecasting System]. *Ekonomicheskiye nauki*, no. 8(93) (2012): 7-15.

Zhehus, O. “Stratehuvannia yak draiver zmin v umovakh suchasnykh vyklykiv” [Strategizing as a Driver of Changes in the Conditions of Modern Challenges]. [https://ir.kneu.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/2010/39110/sism\\_22-61.pdf?sequence=1](https://ir.kneu.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/2010/39110/sism_22-61.pdf?sequence=1)

Zvieriakov, M. I. et al. *Stratehuvannia rehionalnoho rozvytku: teoriia, metodolohiia, kontseptsiiia* [Strategizing Regional Development: Theory, Methodology, Concept]. Odesa: Atlant VOI SOIU, 2019.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 14.11.2023 р.

Статтю прийнято до публікації 04.12.2023 р.