

## MODEL OF FORMATION OF THE OPTIMAL HIERARCHY FUNCTIONING GOALS OF INTEGRATED BUSINESS STRUCTURES



### ***Liudmyla Hanushchak-Yefimenko***

*Professor, Dr.Sc. in Economics,  
Vice-Rector for Research and Innovation,  
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design,  
Kyiv, Ukraine  
ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4458-2984>*



### ***Svitlana Arabuli***

*Associate Professor, Ph.D. in Technology,  
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design, Kyiv,  
Ukraine  
ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1049-8255>*

**Abstract.** Currently, setting goals for integrated business structures (IBS) or its individual divisions is usually not seen as a problem, however, the need for an objective definition of goals is becoming an increasingly important task for modern enterprises, since management is always aimed at achieving them.

If the task is to improve the organizational structure of the management of the information security system without specifying its goals, then there is a risk of suggesting better ways to perform unnecessary functions or better ways to achieve unsatisfactory final results.

**Keywords:** *Integrated business structures, cooperation, corporatization, economic development, modeling, innovation, integration processes.*

### **Introduction**

The goal is the desired state of the HMB in the future. In management, it is necessary to evaluate each function and activity within the enterprise, based on their contribution to achieving the goals of the enterprise. The goals form the criteria for evaluating the feasibility of proposed management actions, set standards for assessing the effectiveness achieved, and provide a general guideline for the activities of the ISB as a whole.

Goals refer to the future; sometimes this is the short term, but as a rule, they can be accurately determined using indicators of time and quantity, so they are often called "immediate". Such goals should be linked to longer-term goals set for a period of one to five years. The latter, in turn, must be aligned with even longer-term goals, say for a period of 5 to 20 years. All of them must be aligned with each other to eliminate the conflict between short-term and long-term goals.

The goals are based on hypotheses of development in the future. Therefore, their validity depends on the accuracy of these hypotheses. The more distant the period is considered, the higher the uncertainty of the future, hence the goals are formulated in a more general form.

The ISF is not in a position to give an exhaustive list of its goals. This is due to the fact that they can only be natural that is, shared by all employees of the enterprise. In this case, managerial actions will be coordinated without a special agreement on their goals. However, there are advantages to formally setting goals. Namely:

- if the goals are not formulated or not clear, there is a danger committing managerial actions that do not correspond to the goals. Formalization of goals encourages their discussion within the enterprise, which reduces the risk of misunderstanding or incomplete understanding;
- if the goals are clearly defined, then possible conflicts between them can be more likely to be detected and eliminated in the process of their reconciliation;
- precise definition of criteria for assessing the activities of the enterprise in general, it is necessary in all cases, except, perhaps, with the exception of the case when their formal announcement is made for "propaganda" that hides the true goals.

**Literature review.** In market conditions of management, the main goal of the ISB is to obtain a stable profit. In this regard, social goals, such as the level of well-being of its employees, do not follow directly from the profit motive, but usually correspond to a certain range of its level. Similarly, individual enterprises must take into account national priorities and the level of societal well-being, which can act as limiting factors.

However, top managers rarely justify low profits by referring to the priority of other goals, except when those other goals are forced upon them.

In any case, the growth of profits for most enterprises is the main meaning of their activities.

In order to perform the only function – ensuring the profit of the enterprise – special divisions are created, methods are developed to reduce costs and increase profits. Therefore, profit remains the main goal, even if the management of the enterprise considers it simply as one of the goals.

**Research methodology.** Modernization of the Ukrainian economy on an innovative basis, which is a prerequisite for increasing its competitiveness, involves the structural development of existing corporations in accordance with current global trends in organizational development and taking into account the peculiarities of market transformations in the country. Changes in the socio-economic system in recent years have led to significant changes in the organization of economic activity and the emergence of new types of structural transformation of corporations, the specifics of many of which are related to the transition state of the national economy (Ansoff, 2004). The emergence and development of new types of corporate interaction is especially important for the industrial complex, where the corporate sector is the basis for the development of highly efficient production and competition in domestic and foreign markets. In the future, it becomes clear that not all the predicted advantages of conglomerates are confirmed in practice, and most integrated structures of the conglomerate type undergo a new stage of transformation, which for most of them is the separation of non-core industries into separate companies and return to the standard vertical chain. Thus, over time, under the influence of external and internal factors, one type of structural transformation of the corporation turns into another (Budaeus, 1998).

Every management action should be aimed at solving the problem. The correct solution to the problem is the solution that gives the maximum to achieve certain goals. Without defining goals, one cannot formulate a problem, and without it there is no need for solutions. The fact that the activity of the head of the enterprise is to make decisions means that managers always have their own internal goals, if they are not set by a higher authority.

The goals we are trying to achieve are too often not well understood. Setting the wrong goals means solving poorly formulated problems, which can lead to more wastage of resources than an inefficient solution to a well-formulated problem (Burgelman, Maidigue, 2004).

If we consider the problem of setting goals as a statement that a management decision is a choice from several alternatives and the chosen management decision should correspond to the set

goals more than all others, then with such a formulation of the problem of setting goals, the following complications arise, namely:

- provided that if the goals serve as intermediate guidelines, ensuring the achievement of goals of a higher level and at the same time a continuous chain of goals and means of achieving them is formed, then the chain of goals is considered broken if the goals of one level do not agree with the goals of the next level, such inconsistency is tantamount to the fact that some part of the enterprise goes special way. However, this danger should not be exaggerated. Each employee of the enterprise is aware that profitability is a necessary condition for his survival, and this in itself serves as a well-known guideline;
- provided that if the goals are intermediate benchmarks, and at the same time, lower-level goals are never absolutized, equally effective alternative goals can be found. At the same time, the attitude to the goals of the lower level can lead to an inadequate assessment of the ways to achieve the final goal;
- provided that if the goals of each unit can be consistent with the goals of the enterprise, but considered together, these goals may be contradictory. then their general coordination is required, for example, the prevention of mutual competition between departments;
- provided that if the goals are multiple and conflicting, then when in achieving one goal, efficiency in relation to another may decrease, either due to limited resources, or because some goals are logically incompatible. For example, when setting goals for a product distribution system, it is proposed to have the cheapest, fastest, simplest, most productive distribution network. But these goals contradict one another, hence a compromise is necessary between such goals as speed and cheapness. Ideally, it can be found on the basis of the maximum profit criterion. However, it may not be possible to "link all of these goals into a single maximizable objective function. Where the consequences of competing goals cannot be measured and compared using one common scale (for example, money), there is no way to determine which combination of goals will give the greatest effect, that is, which combination is optimal (Hanushchak-Iefimenko, 2010, 2013, 2014; Ganushchak-Efimenko, Shcherbak & Nifatova, 2018).

We offer several options for resolving conflicts of goals:

- the first option – only one goal is chosen, which leads either to a possible loss of achievements in other areas, or to a complete disregard for other goals. To select one of the two goals, it is proposed to use the calculation presented in Table 1. This approach is possible when the goals under consideration are intermediate, that is, means of achieving higher-level goals. In this case, the ratio of their weights may reflect the relative expected effectiveness of achieving higher-level goals. Table 1 illustrates the situation of the choice of goals for the sale of products by an enterprise: between expanding the network of its own branches and renting them from other enterprises. Factors that differ in the impact of these two goals on profit should be considered the consequences of achieving the goals and are given in column 1. Estimates of these consequences for the profit of the enterprise are given in column 2. In column 3, two competing goals are ranked on a scale from 1 to 3 in depending on their probable contribution to various consequences (3 points mean the highest probable contribution). Column 4, which is obtained by multiplying columns 2 and 3, gives an assessment of each goal for each of the consequences. In this example, the total score for the "rent" goal is 28 points, compared with 19 points for "own branches". Of course, such a table contains a number of controversial prerequisites for obtaining a final answer. For example, estimates of the consequences of the implementation of goals, which can be varied in order to study their impact on the final estimates. However, such a "sensitivity analysis" is useful and can underlie the discussion of goals;
- the second option - the relative usefulness of the goals is estimated.

Table 1.

**Justification for choosing one of two mutually exclusive goals for expanding the company's own branches for product marketing**

Consequences of the implementation of the goals of the enterprise	Assessment of the consequences of the implementation of the goals of the enterprise	Goal ranking		Goal assessment	
		Target: Expansion of own branches of the enterprise	Target: extension own branches by renting from other companies	Target: Extension own branches of the enterprise	Target: Expansion of own branches by renting from other companies
1	2	3		4	
1.Competitive	3	2	3	6	9

advantages					
2.Minimum risk	2	2	3	4	6
3.Minimization expenses	2	1	3	2	6
4.Strengthening market capacity	2	3	2	6	4
5. Minimum problems on employment	1	1	3	1	3
Total	10	-	-	19	28

Such estimates provide an answer to the question to what extent goal A and goal B are achieved within a given time frame with limited use of resources. By asking this question while varying the resources offered, it is easier to assess their relative usefulness. At each stage of achieving one of the goals, possible changes are evaluated in relation to other goals in order to approach their optimal combination. Judgments of this kind are close to the economic theory of marginal utility, which proposes the achievement of such a combination of factors when further redistribution of resources no longer increases the overall utility. However, it should be borne in mind that it is not always possible to easily reallocate resources from one goal to another, since the resources themselves may not be interchangeable;

- the third option – one goal is chosen as the main one, and all others are considered as restrictions. We will call a restriction such a requirement that cannot be violated in any case and the excess of which does not bring a useful effect. On the other hand, a requirement can be violated (albeit at the cost of higher costs) if it is a "goal" or if exceeding it has an effect (Porter, 1998).

Based on the assumption that the HMB seeks to survive and be profitable, we can think of the process of setting the goals of the HMB as determining a state of affairs that is both desirable and achievable. In our opinion, this process includes:

1. A retrospective review of the management situations of the enterprise to build a picture of its likely future in the absence of pre-planned changes. This retrospective projection is the basis for identifying opportunities as well as likely problems and difficulties.

Such a retrospective review of the management situations of the enterprise may cover:

- a) trends and environmental factors that can affect the enterprise, such as government regulation of the economy, demographic and social changes;
  - b) trends in the development of the industry, for example, changes in demand, production capacity, costs and competitive conditions;
  - c) the performance of the enterprise, including an assessment of its market share, trade trends, competition and costs.
2. An enumeration of possible targets, called the "target projection".
  3. Develop a strategy to bridge the gap between target and hindsight. Depending on the developed strategy that overcomes this gap, the degree of necessary adjustment of the target projection is determined to turn it into a feasible set of goals.
  4. Enumeration of the main elements of strategy development. Where the fundamental knowledge about the future is sufficiently reliable, it is advisable to strictly follow the developed strategy. On the other hand, if there is a set of possible managerial situations, it is recommended to draw up managerial situational plans. In other words, if uncertainty can be reduced to a strictly limited number of possible management situations, then separate plans can be developed for each of them. Finally, if the future is completely uncertain, more flexibility is required. If the unknown future is regarded as a temporary phenomenon, the rule of maximum resource mobility must be followed. If the uncertainty is to begin at some definite point in the future, then preference should be given to short-term goals that can be achieved before the managerial situation becomes uncertain (1-8).

Using the word "strategy", we define its meaning. Strategy is a broad concept of how resources should be used to maximize the achievement of goals. The incompleteness of a strategy is the extent to which it fails to achieve the goal; relevance – the degree of compliance of the strategy with the goals; redundancy – the degree of redundancy of resources to achieve goals.

Thus, if a strategy is a means to achieve goals, which in turn at each level are a means to achieve a goal of a higher level, then the question arises, what is the difference between strategy and goals. We see the answer in the following, goals emphasize the state, while the strategy emphasizes the process of achieving it.

In parallel with the identification of common problems of the organizational structure of management, the development of a hierarchy of goals within the enterprise is carried out, in accordance with which a balanced organizational structure of management should be built.

When developing the organizational structure of enterprise management, the main goal acts as a derivative, a multi-stage system of goals is formed from them, which determines the nature of the activity of the main functional blocks and divisions of the enterprise. The goal system has the structure of a connected open graph that does not have cycles (a tree of goals).

Each level of the goal tree can be, with a certain degree of conventionality, compared with the corresponding level of management at the enterprise: the main goal corresponds to the highest level of management – the director of the enterprise; subgoals of the first level determine the system of functional blocks in the organizational structure (the level of deputy directors); subgoals of the second level correspond mainly to the level of departments in the organizational structure, subgoals of the third level correspond to the level of workshops, laboratories.

However, it should not be assumed that the goal tree automatically determines the composition and subordination of departments and senior positions in the management apparatus, although one should strive to ensure that departments are singled out based on the principle of homogeneity of the goals that are set for them. Along with the goals, the status of the unit and its leader in the organizational structure is determined by the amount of activity that is necessary to achieve the goal, the degree of complexity and importance of the tasks arising from it, and other factors.

For the construction and functioning of the organizational structure of enterprise management, the formulation of the totality of the main goals is important.

Goal I – technical, occupies the most important place in the system of enterprise goals, since it is it that carries out, on the basis of a unified technical policy, all stages of generating and implementing technical innovations in production.

Goal II – production. It is associated primarily with the release of products in accordance with a given volume, quality and on time. Along with this, this goal is associated with the commissioning of new and rational use of existing production capacities.

Goal III is economic. It is included in the number of the main goals of the enterprise, since the production, expansion and reconstruction of production capacities should be carried out on the basis of increasing the efficiency of the use of all types of resources, increasing labor productivity, identifying and implementing savings reserves in all areas of the enterprise.

Goal IV is social. It reflects the conditions for increasing the professional, cultural development of the employees of the enterprise, as well as their growing material and spiritual needs.

The formulation of the main goals of the enterprise allows us to single out four main functional blocks in the organizational structure of management: technical, production, economic, social.

In this regard, the main goals serve as the basis for concretizing the goals of the next levels, according to which the management activities of the enterprise are structured in more detail.

How balanced the organizational structure of enterprise management is from the point of view of ensuring its goals, determines the analysis of each variant of the organizational structure based on the system of goals. Combining the existing organizational structure with the goal tree allows you to establish whether all goals are organizationally provided in the management structure, for which goals it is impossible to clearly define the system of responsibility for their achievement, which unit is the main executor of work to achieve the goal, and which ones only provide conditions for their work (1-9).

In this regard, the system of goals is one of the main tools for solving various problems related to the functioning of the organizational structures of enterprise management. Hence, the process of flexibility of organizational structures of enterprise management is iteratively connected with the dynamic process of forming an optimal hierarchy of goals for the functioning of enterprises.

Based on the foregoing, we propose to recognize that the flexibility of the organizational structure of enterprise management, corresponding to the stage of its creation, can be determined on the basis of the classification of lower-level goals (works) in accordance with the chosen criterion of

belonging to a particular class. Moreover, each work is determined by a set of resources necessary for its implementation.

Then, in a fairly general form, the problem of optimizing the hierarchy of goals for the functioning of enterprises can be represented as follows.

Let  $U = \{u_i(t) = (r_{i1}(t), r_{i2}(t), \dots, r_{in}(t)), i \in M\}$  - finite set of numbered  $\{M = (1, 2, \dots, m)\}$  tasks that are expected to be completed within the selected period of time.

Each element of the set  $U$ , that is, the work is determined by the corresponding set  $(r_{i1}(t), r_{i2}(t), \dots, r_{in}(t))$  normalized parameters,  $r_{ik}(t)$ ,  $k = \overline{1, n}$ , time-dependent and characterizing various aspects of the performance of work: the mode of consumption of resources of various types, the state of technical, economic parameters and relationships of the organizational structure of enterprise management. On a given set of jobs  $U$  the task of determining a flexible organizational structure for managing an enterprise can be considered as a task of distributing work into certain classes based on a selected criterion. In other words, if  $Z$  - the set of all possible partitions of the set of jobs  $U$  into classes, then each  $z \in Z$  defines some organizational structure of enterprise management (distribution of performers into groups) and the corresponding relationship of parameters  $r_{ik}(t)$ . The numerical characteristic of this connection can serve as an assessment of the effectiveness of the organizational structure of enterprise management. Considering  $u_i(t)$  as accompaniment of parameters  $r_{ik}(t)$ , this estimate can be specified as a function  $\varphi_z(t)$ ,  $\forall z \in Z$

$$\varphi_z(t) : u_1(t) \times u_2(t) \times \dots \times u_m(t) \rightarrow R^+, (1)$$

Where:  $R^+$  - set of non-negative real numbers. Then the task of determining the flexible organizational structure of enterprise management  $z^*$  has the following form.

$$\text{Find } z^* \in Z : \text{extr}_{z \in Z} \varphi_z(u_1(t), u_2(t), \dots, u_m(t)). (2)$$

In practice, as a function of efficiency  $\varphi_z$  - structures can be used, for example, to estimate the value of the relationship of jobs combined in one class and to estimate the change in the value of a certain parameter of jobs when they are grouped.

However, a simple combinatorial count of the number of possible structures  $z \in Z$  even without taking into account the fact that the parameters of work  $r_{ik}(t)$  when grouping the latter, they can change depending on the structure, shows that even when  $\tau = 10$  task (1) - (2) becomes extremely large ( $\sim 10^5$  various combinations).

In this regard, we propose to introduce a preliminary stage in the problem of forming an optimal hierarchy of goals for the functioning of enterprises, at which some initial structure is determined -

$z_0^*$  and thereby solves the problem of high dimensionality.

The search for this structure is carried out on the basis of a preliminary selection of work classes with subsequent optimization of their distribution over the found equivalence classes. Then, an appropriate group of specialists can be organized and other types of resources allocated to perform the work united in a certain class. If necessary, taking into account the decrease in the dimension of the problem obtained by grouping, further structuring can be carried out by solving problem (1) - (2) for the selected classes of work equivalence.

The mathematical formulation of the problem of determining the initial organizational structure of enterprise management is based on the system of work parameters  $u_i(t) = (r_{i1}(t), r_{i2}(t), \dots, r_{in}(t))$ , presented in the form of a feature matrix,

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \\ \dots \\ u_m(t) \end{pmatrix} = \|r_{ik}(t)\|_{m \times n} \quad (3)$$

where, each column corresponds to some resource used by the enterprise, and each row corresponds to some work. Признак  $r_{ik}(t)$  characterizes participation  $i$ -ой work in use  $k$ -resource.

The solution of the problem under consideration is based on the following assumptions:

– many works  $U$  in terms of quantitative and qualitative composition, it is set by the management of the organization in approximate quantitative accordance with the composition of employees and other types of available resources on the basis of a long-term work plan within the selected period of time;

– signs  $r_{ik}$  within this period do not depend on the time of the structural occurrence of the work and are set by the responsible executors of the work. And

$$\forall ik : r_{ik} \in \{0,1\}, \quad i = \overline{1, m}, \quad k = \overline{1, n};$$

– each responsible executor sets the indicator of the importance of the  $k$ -th resource for execution  $i$ -work,

$$p_{ik} \in [0,1], \quad \sum_{k=1}^n p_{ik} = 1.$$

Importance indicators also do not depend on time and structure.

Within the framework of these assumptions, the task of determining the initial organizational structure of enterprise management is proposed to be divided into two stages:

– allocation of classes of equivalence of works on the basis of the use of the same resources. Each class is defined and named after the representative work that uses the largest number of resource types in that class;

– optimization of the distribution of works by classes on the basis of maximizing the sum of resources “weighted” relative to the work under consideration, the importance of resources, according to which a decision is made to classify this work to a particular class. -  $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  you can designate a set of numbers of resources.

This implies :

**Definition 1.**

Job  $u_j$  can be said to belong to the class  $K_{u_i}$ ,

$$u_j \in K_{u_i} \text{ если } \forall l \in N_j = \{k \in N \mid r_{jk} = 1 \mid : r_{il} = 1\}, \text{ то есть } N_j \subset N_i = \{k \in N \mid r_{jk} = 1\}.$$

If  $\forall j \neq i \in M : u_i \notin \overline{K_{u_j}}$ , then work  $u_i$  will be called a representative of the class  $K_{u_i}$

**Definition 2.**

Finite set of numbers of jobs representing classes  $G = \{i \in M \mid \forall j \neq i \in M : u_i \notin \overline{K_{u_j}} \wedge u_i \in K_{u_i}\}$

will be called the set of group numbers of the formed organizational structure of enterprise management.

**Definition 3.**

If  $u_j \in K_{u_i}$  that number  $s_{ij} = \sum_{i \in N_j} (r_{jl} \cdot p_{jl}) \cdot p_{il}$  will be called the degree

accessories work  $u_j$  class  $K_{u_i}$ .

Forms the membership matrix  $S_{ij}$  forms the membership matrix

$S = \|s_{ij}\|$ . It is easy to see that in the columns corresponding to the numbers of the obtained groups, all elements, with the exception of those located along the main diagonal and close to it, are equal to zero. This indicates mutual belonging  $s_{ij} = s_{ji}$ , hence  $s_{ij} = 0$  while saving the value  $s_{ji}$ .

Using the introduced concepts and notation, the task of determining the flexible organizational structure of enterprise management  $z_0^* = (k_1^*, k_2^*, \dots, k_f^*, \dots, k_m^*)$  can be represented as:

1. Find all  $j \in M$ , forming a set  $G$ , for which

$$\min \sum_{i=1}^m s_{ij}; j \neq i; j \in M; \quad (4)$$

2. Find all  $k_j = i, f = \overline{1, m}$ , for which

$$\max_{i \in G} s_{if} \quad (5)$$

The algorithm for solving the indicated optimization problem uses the importance matrix as input data  $X = \|x_{ik}\|_{m \times n}$

Where:  $\forall i, k \ i = \overline{1, m}; k = \overline{1, n}; x_{ik} = r_{ik} \times p_{ik}$ .

At the first step of the algorithm, by element-by-element comparison of strings  $i$  and  $j$  matrices  $X$  membership matrix is formed  $S = \|s_{ij}\|$ .

$$\text{Where: } S = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n x_{ik} x_{jk}, \quad \forall k \in N : x_{jk} \neq 0 \Rightarrow x_{ik} \neq 0; \quad (6) \right.$$

or  $s = \{ 0, \text{ if } \exists k \in N : x_{jk} = 0 \text{ и } x_{jk} \neq 0. \quad (7)$

At the next step of the algorithm, the set is defined as a list of column numbers with the minimum (equal to 0) sum of elements, excluding diagonal ones.

At the final step of the algorithm, the initial structure is optimized by assigning to each column of the matrix (that is, to each job) the number of the group that is equal to the number of the row with the maximum element for this column.

Hence, the communication, functional, organizational and administrative principles of building an enterprise are determined by its goals and strategy. This principle is justified to the extent that it contributes to the implementation of the goals and strategy of the enterprise.

### Conclusions

If the goals of the enterprise can be divided into independent sub-goals corresponding to separate economic units, this becomes the basis for the decision to divide the enterprise into units that have their own production and marketing services. Delegation of decision-making also involves setting goals, since the criteria for evaluating different courses of action are ultimately related to the achievement of common goals. Similarly, by achieving the highest performance, we mean the best results in relation to the final strategies and goals.

If we talk about the design of communication channels, we mean communication channels that carry useful information for making decisions on established goals and strategies.

Ultimately, the enterprise responds to and adapts to changing environmental conditions primarily through the recognition of the need to change goals and strategies, the change of which in turn leads to the necessary organizational changes.

### References

1. Ansoff, I. (2004). *Strategicheskoe upravlenie [Strategic management]*. Translation from English. Scientific edition and author's foreword by L.I. Evenko. Moscow: Ekonomika. 489 p. [in Russian].
2. Burgelman, R. A., Maidigue, M. A. (2004). *Strategic Management of Technology and Innovation*. Homewood, Illinois. IRWIN.
3. Yermoshenko, M.M., Hanushchak-Iefimenko, L.M. (2010). *Mekhanizm rozvytku innovatsiinoho potentsialu klasteroob'iednanykh pidpriemstv: nauk. Monohrafiia [Mechanism of development of innovative potential of cluster-related enterprises: science monograph]*. Kyiv: National Academy of Management. 236 p. [in Ukrainian].
4. Hanushchak-Iefimenko, L.M. (2014). *Innovatsiinyi rozvytok pidpriemnytstva v Ukraini: stratehichni oriientyry: monohrafiia [Innovative development of entrepreneurship in Ukraine: strategic guidelines: monograph]*. Kyiv: National Academy of Management. 400 p. [in Ukrainian].
5. Hanushchak-Iefimenko, L.M. (2013). *Kontseptualni zasady upravlinnia innovatsiino-investytsiinoiu diialnistiu promyslovykh pidpriemstv [Conceptual principles of management of innovation and investment activity of industrial enterprises]*. *Aktualni problemy ekonomiky = Actual Problems of Economics*, No. 10, P. 93–99 [in Ukrainian].
6. Ganushchak-Efimenko, L., Shcherbak, V., & Nifatova, O. (2018). Assessing the effects of socially responsible strategic partnerships on building brand equity of integrated business structures in Ukraine. *Oeconomia Copernicana*, 9(4), 715–730. doi: 10.24136/oc.2018.035.
7. Porter, M. (1993). *International competition*. Trans. with English. Under ed. and with preface V. D. Bristle. Moscow: Mezhdunar. relations. 896 p.
8. Porter, M. E. (1998). *Competition strategy*. Trans. from English A. Oliynyk and R. Skilsky. Kyiv: Osnovy. 390 p.
9. Budaeus D. (1998). *Public Private Partnerships: Innovative Organisations-Form / D. Budaeus // Neue Märkte, neue Medien, neue Methoden: Road map zur agilen Organisation / [A.-W. Scheer (ed.)]. – Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.*
10. Carter B. Casady, Kent Eriksson, Raymond E. Levitt & W. Richard Scott (2020) (Re)defining public-private partnerships (PPPs) in the new public governance (NPG) paradigm: an institutional maturity perspective, *Public Management Review*, 22:2, 161-183, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2019.1577909