

Strategic and business planning as a mechanism to ensure the competitiveness of domestic organizations: theory and practice

Alexander A. Kiselev

Candidate of psychological sciences, Professor
Yaroslavl State Technical University, Yaroslavl, Russia
E-mail: kiselevaa@ystu.ru

Abstract. One of the modern needs of Russian companies is strategic and business planning. People studying it often talk about strategic planning as planning to achieve some long-term goals, and the concept of business planning «substitutes» tactical planning in an organization. As a consequence, given the lack of specific scientific developments in this area, based on the provisions of Russian classic management theory, company experts interpret the concepts of strategic planning and business planning at their discretion and as they see fit. For example, in 2006, when A. Khloponin was the Governor of Krasnoyarsk Krai, at the meeting of the State Council on strategic planning, he accurately noted that many officials, including federal and regional ones, talk a lot about strategies and concepts, strategic planning and business planning, but do not understand the true meaning of these concepts. And to date, the situation on this issue has not changed much. It does not help make strategic planning and business planning serve as an effective mechanism for Russian organizations to compete against each other timely and appropriately. But to solve this problem, it is necessary to define the meaning of these concepts from scientific positions and develop specific recommendations to actually use them. This paper stimulates the relevant research to form clear and scientifically sound decisions on strategic planning and business planning that can provide the Russian organizations with an effective mechanism to ensure the necessary level of competitiveness in a timely manner.

Keywords: strategic and business planning, competitiveness, domestic organizations, concepts.

JEL codes: D 21, L 02, M21

For citation: Kiselev A. A. (2021). Strategic and business planning as a mechanism to ensure the competitiveness of domestic organizations: theory and practice. *Journal of regional and international competitiveness*, 5(4), 13-24. https://doi.org/10.52957/27821927_2021_4_13

DOI: 10.52957/27821927_2021_4_13

Introduction

With Russia's transition to a market economy, domestic organizations keenly felt the «hunger» for mechanisms to ensure the desired level of competitiveness. In practice, Russian companies at that time did not understand the importance of strategic planning and, accordingly, were losing to foreign organizations in the competition, taking today's result for success, losing in the long run. It is similar to chess, when your opponent gives you pieces, creating a sense of your success. At the same time, he actually creates the conditions to checkmate you and win the game. And it is the kind of strategic vision that organizations often lacked. Not only that, many entrepreneurs believed that in market conditions it is no longer necessary to plan their activities as before, but in order to succeed it is necessary to «know how to hustle» (Kukushkin, Pozdnyakov & Vasilieva, 2012). At the same time, unfortunately, the Russian company management theory started growing with new concepts, which were borrowed from foreign literature but were not tested properly from the perspective of the Russian company management theory and adapted to Russian companies. This also applies to such concepts as strategic management, important components of which are strategic planning and business planning. For example, back in 2002, Russian researchers L. Zaitsev and M. Sokolova were talking about the essence of strategic management and noted that «to date, there is no unambiguous interpretation of this concept and a unified view of its components... Thus, authors who offer individual models, schemes, and postulates as a panacea for all troubles are clearly deceiving» (Zaitsev & Sokolova, 1998). We believe that the main reason for this is that Russian researchers, when disclosing the essence of strategic management,

mainly focus on the definitions of foreign authors without the necessary adaptation. For example, the Russian specialist on company management R. Fatkhutdinov wrote in his textbook «Strategic Management» that «one of the famous books on this problem is ‘Strategic Management’ by A.A. Thompson and A.J. Strickland, but after reading the book, one feels a constant lack of a system, looking for and not finding a chain of values» (Fathutdinov, 2005). This indicates that today it is time to start addressing these issues professionally, to clearly define the essence and content of the concepts of «strategic management», «strategic planning», «business planning» in the Russian management theory of commercial organizations and their role in the real activities of Russian organizations in market economic conditions to timely provide the necessary level of competitiveness (Fathutdinov, 2005). At the same time, as S. Shkiotov points out, there are currently a number of paradoxes characterizing the competitiveness of the Russian economy, which should be taken into account using research by foreign management specialists, and even the need to rethink such a category as «national competitiveness» (Shkiotov, 2013; Shkiotov, Markin & Shcherbakova, 2021).

Considering competition as a factor of market economic conditions, it can be assumed that it stimulates the scientific and technological progress and manufacturing of new, more technologically advanced products; forces for-profit organizations to be more responsive to consumer demands: expand their range of products, improve the quality of goods, look for ways to reduce production costs; forms fair market prices as opposed to monopolists’ pricing policies; prevents the shortages of goods and services, etc. However, practice shows that problems in ensuring timely and appropriate level of competitiveness of organizations generate new problems, including business closures and bankruptcy, which at the same time affects the growth of unemployment. For example, B. Litvak points out that according to the statistics of the world business, about 80% of all newly created organizations cease to exist during the first five years, and in the next five years another 80% of the organizations that survived during the first five years go bankrupt (Litvak, 2004). The reason for this situation tends to be deficiencies in strategic planning and a lack of understanding why business planning for business operations is important in a competitive environment. But this reason is simultaneously a consequence of the fact that the domestic science of management failed to «arm» commercial domestic organizations with appropriate science-based and reliable mechanism to ensure their successful operation in market conditions.

Main Part

Today, strategic management is recognized as the most important part of the theory of management of organizations in a competitive environment. But not always the concept of strategic management is interpreted by domestic researchers based on the provisions of the organization management theory.

First. Speaking about strategic management and its key function – strategic planning, it should be noted that today there are a number of definitions of «strategic management» given by various Russian experts in organizational management, which are «borrowed» from worldwide literature and often translated without taking into account the professional specifics of foreign terms. For example, V. Vesnin writes that strategic management «is the activity of developing and implementing strategy in real time. It solves the problems of overcoming the crisis state of the firm, caused by the discrepancy between its capabilities and the requirements of the environment; occupying a leading position in the market (industry) in the long term; to ensure resilience in any unexpected situation; creating conditions for long-term development taking into account external and internal opportunities. In contrast to operational management, such management is not reactive, but proactive. It is about actions in the present that predetermine the survival of the firm in the future» (Vesnin, 2004). It is impossible to understand the specific meaning of strategic management and its connection to the management of organizations from such an interpretation.

E. Vergiles (2003) writes that strategic management can be defined «as such control over an organization, which relies on human potential as the basis of the organization, focuses production activities on the needs of consumers, carries out flexible regulation». But even here there is no clarity in defining the meaning of strategic management, because once again management is equated with control, and the object of control is always employees, i.e. people.

L. Zaitsev and M. Sokolova (1998) provide a definition of strategic management as a method of control:

«Strategic management is essentially a way of control used in the face of the emergence of new, more complex challenges due to the dynamism and uncertainty of the environment». But the questions are, what do complex tasks mean and from what level of complexity of tasks can management be reclassified as strategic?

Y. Maslechenkov and Y. Tronin (2012) write that «understanding of the essence of strategic management lies in the following main provisions: thinking and activity of the company's manager is implemented (exists) as a single whole — a system; effective feedback to the market is ensured; effective information logistics are used; the system of «task-objectives» is implemented in three main areas: tasks – responsibilities – time; when implementing the principles of strategic management, major trends are identified: from centralization to decentralization of implementation of individual functions; from a hierarchical structure to a systemic structure; orientation towards long-term goals» (Maslechenkov & Tronin, 2012). And there are quite a few such «fuzzy» notions.

But such a «discord» in defining the meaning of strategic management shows that at present there is no unified and clear definition of the concept of «strategic management» among Russian researchers. At the same time, all the researchers equate management with control, which, according to them, has «better» qualities than management. For example, O. Volkogonov and A. Zub (2006) write that «in the most general sense, management (the closest equivalent of this word is «control») means the rules or implementation of «good» control of an organization». But at the same time, Russian researchers do not interpret the concept of «management» precisely. For example, O. Vikhanskiy (1998) writes about the multiple options in interpreting «management». He notes that «management is a multidimensional phenomenon, covering the processes occurring in the organization, related both to its internal life and to its interaction with the environment, and, depending on what processes are put at the center, it can be considered from different perspectives». Thus, it follows from this definition that, from the point of view of these researchers, anything in the company activity can be called management. To show that management can be classified as strategic, Russian researchers and practitioners, firstly, simply add the word «strategic» to a number of terms, getting such word combinations as strategic goals, strategic analysis, strategic tasks, strategic decisions, strategic control, etc. And secondly, not being able to explain the essence of the notion «strategic» from scientific positions, it is interpreted simply as something long-term, for example, as long-term goals and objectives. However, the «long-termism» in this case is not fundamentally important for companies in terms of providing the level of competitiveness they need in time, as long-termism is defined by the time horizon. And in this case, it is not clear: if the goal is long-term, it should take a long time to get to it, or with this goal it takes a long time to get to the desired result. But the competitors are acting «now and today». And here the researchers talk about needing a «long-term» strategy. This somewhat distorts the concept of long-termism, as it should be understood as follows: as long as we provide the right level of competitiveness to the organization, it will live on.

It is not clear why Russian researchers «switch» the Russian concept of «control» with the foreign concept of «management» without sufficient scientific justification. After all, if one studies worldwide sources more closely, one can see that they link management to the efficient use of resources in an organization (Ansoff & McDonnell, 1988; Drucker, 1999). In other words, the object of management is resources, while the object of control is the organization's employees. In this case, management has something in common with control, their functions are similar: it is necessary to make decisions on the use of the organization's resources, to plan the use of resources, and to monitor their use. And from the perspective of «human resource management», when the employees of an organization are considered as the key resource in ensuring the effectiveness of the organization, all other things being equal.

Speaking of strategic management, it is necessary to define the meaning of «strategic» in relation to management. There is no doubt that the term «strategy» is borrowed by the theory of management of organizations in market conditions from the military science, where it meant the «art of the general» to find the right ways to achieve victory, as well as to occupy a more advantageous position in relation to the enemy (Borisov, 2003).

Given the fact that the competitive struggle of organizations today is precisely a «war» for their position in the market, this term has been actively used to define the way organizations behave for taking and holding

a more advantageous position in the market compared to their competitors.

However, the ambiguity of interpreting the term «strategy» by researchers worldwide in relation to management is reflected in the understanding of its essence by Russian researchers, who mostly take foreign definitions as the basis for understanding the essence of strategy. For example, economists S. Kukushkin, Y. Pozdnyakov, and E. Vasilieva (2012) write that «strategy is the integration of an organization's main goals, policies, and actions into some coherent whole». They argue that «the strategy consists of several important elements: goals (objectives), policies, programs, tactics», interpreting «strategic goals» as «those which the organization sets itself for each strategic period» (Kukushkin, Pozdnyakov & Vasilieva, 2012). But they do not provide the meaning of the strategic period and the content of the goals as strategic.

A. Porshnev, Z. Romyantsev, and N. Salomatin (2009) understands an organization's strategy as «a general plan of action, which defines the priorities of strategic objectives, resources, and the sequence of steps to achieve strategic goals». But this raises the question of what should be understood by strategic objectives and strategic goals. In other words, they simply include the phrases «strategic objectives» and «strategic goals» to denote the meaning of «strategy». And it's not clear why the plan should be called a strategy.

Some researchers give several interpretations of «strategy». For example, Y. Maslechenkov and Y. Tronin (2012) define strategy on the one hand as «top management's plans to achieve long-term results consistent with the goals and objectives of the organization... a guide, a benchmark or direction for development, a road from the present to the future.» On the other hand, according to them, «strategy is a method of behaving or following a certain line of behavior» (Maslechenkov & Tronin, 2012). But an involuntary question arises: «So is strategy a plan or a method?» After all, a plan is a document and a method is a guiding rule of conduct.

Unfortunately, even the Modern Dictionary of Economics (1999) gives the following interpretation of the term «economic strategy»: «Economic strategy is a long-term, general guidelines, plans, intentions of the government, regional administration, management of enterprises, firms on production, revenues and expenditures, budget, taxes, capital investments, social protection prices; the art of leadership; an overall plan for the conduct of this work, based on the prevailing reality at this stage of development». From this definition, it is difficult to understand, for example, whether strategy is long-term plans or principles, a general work plan or the art of leadership, etc.

There are many similar definitions. But such interpretations of strategy as certain action programs developed for the successful functioning of an organization in a rather aggressive external environment do not provide an understanding of its specific meaning (Kiselev, 2020). In fact, the essence of strategy is the definition of common approaches to the task of providing the organization with the necessary level of competitiveness. In this case, the concept of strategy is linked not to any long terms of its implementation, but is determined by the need to solve the problems of maintaining (ensuring) its competitiveness, the ability to maintain its market position in active opposition to competitors, both at present and in the future. And here we cannot say that the strategy is what kind of competitive position one will need to have in some abstract long-term perspective. This timing is determined by the life cycle of the organization's products and the actions taken by competitors to strengthen their market position, and, accordingly, can be determined even by months and weeks. For example, for smartphone manufacturers, the product life cycle may be 3 to 6 months, while for shipbuilders, it may take 3 to 6 years to build ocean-going ships, etc. And it is within this timeframe that organizations will face the challenge of securing their competitive position, i.e., implementing their chosen strategy.

Consequently, strategic management is linked to the need for organizations to address their competitive position. And the strategy should be understood not as some abstract «long-term strategic perspectives», the general idea and probably the philosophy of how the organization intends to ensure its competitiveness in order to meet the market conditions of today, tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, etc.

However, not understanding this feature of strategy, Russian researchers often single out the organization's mission as the key factor of strategic management. Thus, for example, A. Orlov (1999) writes that «in the most general terms, strategic management is a means of ensuring that the company fulfills its mission». At the same time, he understands the mission of an organization as «its strategic goals, i.e., the

goals for a long-term period, say, for 10 years». But scientifically, are a goal and a mission the same thing?

Nevertheless, for example, S. Vigman (2004) believes that «the mission of an organization is the main goal of the organization, expressing the meaning of its existence». V. Lyasko (2005) understands mission as «the goal for which an organization exists and which must be reached in the planning period». But does the organization exist for a goal, rather than the goal determines the nature of the organization's activities? After all, a goal is always a reference point to strive for in an activity. At the same time, when revealing the essence of the mission, S. Vigman, notes that «the mission of an organization includes the philosophy and purpose, the meaning of existence of the organization, which manifests the difference between this organization and similar organizations» and comes as «a formulated statement as to why and for what reason the organization exists» (Vigman, 2004). But no matter how a commercial organization positions itself in the market or formulates its mission for consumers, its goal is to make the necessary profit. In addition, no matter how beautiful the organization's mission may sound, it is not able to provide organizations with the necessary level of competitiveness in a competitive environment.

It should be noted that in terms of process approach, any commercial organization always has only one goal – making profit, allowing it to actively operate on the market as long as possible. And to do this, it must always ensure the level of competitiveness that it needs at a given time in relation to real and possible competitors.

Other organizational goals can only be viewed from a situational perspective. Let us consider, for an example, a hypothetical situation in a company: the boiler room broke down during the winter. The management of the organization believes the main goal is to restore it as quickly as possible in order not to stop the company operation. But still, in general, it is done so that the organization can continue to operate, i.e., to make a profit and maintain the desired level of its competitiveness. But the goal does not define management as strategic.

In order to «settle» such inconsistency in the concepts, Russian researchers even «invented» a specific stage of strategic management: developing the company's mission. At the same time, the mission is understood as some «main goal» of the organization.

As a consequence, Russian researchers often «spew» general statements about the mission of an organization as the most important component of strategic management. For example, a cafe might have the following mission: «We offer delicious food and good service at affordable prices so that our customers are always in a great mood,» as this may attract more people to visit this café at lunchtime. But the goal of cafe is not the desire to provide people with cheap and tasty food; the task is to get more profit by doing so and thereby provide a necessary level of competitiveness, which depends on the desire of people to visit this particular cafe.

All this testifies to the fact that, unfortunately, Russian researchers simply try to emphasize the strategic nature of management with the notion of «mission» in the absence of other factors and to show the difference between strategic management and ordinary control, as if it is manifested in the presence of an organization's mission (Kiselev, 2020). And as a consequence, we can conclude that the concept «mission» is just a «pretty wrapper» to designate management as strategic, and determine the organization as attractive to consumers who can bring the organization the desired profit.

Second. Considering the functions of management, we can say that in a competitive environment, it is the function of planning that is strategic in company management. Often researchers, for example, when talking about the function of control in strategic management, distinguish control as strategic. However, the definitions of control as strategic by Russian researchers «suffer» are not clearly justified and formulated, and are not linked with the basic provisions of the Russian theory of organization management.

Analysis of various studies shows that when considering the function of control, it is difficult to classify it as strategic. However, a number of researchers in the scientific literature use the concept of strategic control. A number of researchers, probably having borrowed the idea from Kotler, link strategic control with marketing. For example, V. Fedko believes that «strategic control performs the function of determining the compliance of an enterprise's marketing strategy with the market conditions». R. Nozdrev writes that «strategic control

involves assessing the main objectives, strategies, marketing operational activities, marketing organization to identify challenges and positive prospects for the production, sales, scientific, and technical activities of the firm and develop recommendations for their improvement». According to V. Kritzkaya, «strategic control is an activity aimed at making sure that marketing objectives, strategies, and programs of a firm correspond optimally to requirements of the existing and forecasted marketing environment». A. Belokon believes that «strategic control is the evaluation of strategic marketing decisions in terms of their compliance with the external conditions of the enterprise.» Y. Morozov points out that «strategic control is intended to answer the questions: whether the organization is actually using the best marketing opportunities available to it and how effectively it is doing so» (Kiselev, 2012). Consequently, Russian researchers reduce the strategic control to «conformity of marketing strategies to market conditions» and «marketing tasks to the predicted marketing environment» etc. But who and how should conduct such control and what its specific nature will be manifested in, they have no answer.

In another case, Russian researchers argue that strategic control covers a sufficiently long period of time (5, 10, 15 years) and is the main type of control over the final results of financial and economic activities of organizations. In doing so, they distinguish three types of control in the organization's activities: strategic (performance over a year), tactical (6-12 months), operational (up to 6 months)». But then what is the point of such control as strategic? And it is not clear whether the control of current activities of the organization should be performed not earlier than in 5, 10, 15 years, or whether this control should be performed continuously within the specified terms.

In the third case, Russian researchers argue that «the corporate level is mainly characterized by strategic control, with the main focus on maintaining a balance between different types of business». As a consequence, it turns out that the strategic control is the control exercised by the top management of the organization. But no specific attribute is shown other than the level of management, which cannot characterize control as strategic. At the same time, a careful consideration of all these definitions shows that none of the interpretations of «strategic control» has a clear and specific semantic load. Because of that, it is not clear what value such a definition of control as a strategic control would have for the practical management of the organization. Probably, «strategic control» has simply become a modern buzzword. From practice, we know three types of control – preliminary, current, and final control, which, among other things, help the organization to react timely to changes in the external environment, including competitors, and take timely measures to ensure (maintain) the desired level of competitiveness of the organization. Of course, it is theoretically possible to classify control as strategic in some way. Unfortunately, Russian researchers, as we believe, are not yet able to present any specific and practical meaningful indicators to classify control as strategic. Consequently, we conclude that the concept of strategic control currently has no practical value for organizations, as it is contrived, scientifically unreasoned, and has no specific indicators of its implementation in its essence.

Thirdly, as practice shows, in market conditions, the role of organizational planning has increased due to the need to respond to the actions of competitors that may adversely affect the competitive position of the organization. Initially, with the transition to a market economy, Russian entrepreneurs came to understand that in a market economy, there is no need to engage in planning, because the main component of success is the organization's ability to quickly adjust to the situation. As rightly pointed out by E. Vais (2011), «there is a serious logical fallacy at the heart of putting plan and market against each other. The antithesis to the market regulation of the economy is not only and not so much the plan as the administrative system of directive, command disposition from above». And the practice of Russian for-profit companies has shown that it is the careful planning of organizations' activities that can ensure their survival in a competitive market environment.

Of course, planning alone is not a panacea for all the woes of business organizations in the competition. But planning is the tool that contributes to the effectiveness of a for-profit organization, especially in terms of ensuring (maintaining) its competitiveness. For example, management specialist R. Ackoff rightly noted that «planning is the weapon of the wise, but planning is one of the most difficult jobs available to man» (Kiselev, 2012).

In this case, the specific aspect of planning in a competitive market environment is that organizations have to plan their activities not only according to the results of their work, as in normal conditions, but also specifically and separately to plan activities to ensure (maintain) their competitiveness in a timely manner depending on the actions of competitors. And such planning can be called strategic planning. For example, V. Verhoglazenko (2006) argues that «for international corporations, especially those engaged in international business activities, strategic planning is a means of ensuring coordinated and balanced development in an environment of broad diversification and fierce competition. Planning and implementation of strategies help corporations survive with short product life cycles and dynamic environment».

During the last decade, more and more Russian organizations have come to understand the importance of strategic planning through their experience. And, as V. Markov writes: «The interest of the heads of Russian enterprises in the issues of strategic development (today) is explained by the fact that the period of easy «earning» of money on the wave of inflation and market formation... has passed» Markova, & Kuznetsova, 2008 . As a consequence, it can be argued that without effective strategic planning, many Russian organizations at present will not be able to survive in competition, especially with foreign organizations.

However, the analysis of scientific and educational literature on strategic planning allows us to say that, unfortunately, the concept of «strategic planning» as a scientific category has no universal interpretation among Russian researchers and practitioners.

For example, most frequently, strategic planning in scientific and educational literature is formulated as follows.

Strategic planning is the managerial process of creating and maintaining alignment between an organization's goals and its potential capabilities.

Strategic planning is defining the goals of an organization, defining the main directions in which this development should take place.

Strategic planning is carried out for the long term and implies the formulation of goals, objectives, scale, and scope of activities of the organization.

Strategic planning consists of determining the mission of the organization at each stage of its life cycle, the formation of a system of activity goals and delivery strategies.

Strategic planning is the process of determining the future position of an organization in relation to the external operating environment. It is based on a system and situational approach. The starting point is to consider the organization as an open system.

Strategic planning is a tool used to form a system of goals for the functioning of an organization, and to unite the efforts of the entire team.

Strategic planning is done top-down: vision, long-term strategic plan for 10-15 years, medium-term strategic plan for 5 years, operational plan (1-3 years) linked to the financial plan.

Strategic planning involves management selecting a general line of conduct and developing a strategic plan – a program to guide the organization over an extended period of time.

Strategic planning is a plan for the general development of the business and long-term structure of the organization. It determines the most important indicators and rates of expansion of reproduction and is the main form of implementation of goals. As part of the master strategy, a strategic financial plan is developed, including investment strategies, financing strategies. The objectives of the financial strategy should follow the overall development strategy and be aimed at maximizing the market value of the enterprise.

These formulations of strategic planning given by Russian researchers, unfortunately, do not reveal the real essence of strategic planning.

Firstly, the conducted analysis still allows us to believe that Russian researchers often interpret «strategic planning» as something significant, large-scale, available only to the heads of large organizations. Thus, for example, in Article 3 of the Federal Law «On Strategic Planning in the Russian Federation» dated 28.06.2014, strategic planning is defined as the activity of its participants on goal-setting, forecasting, planning, and programming of socio-economic development, including the Russian regions, aimed at solving the problems of sustainable socio-economic development of the regions. But this attribute defines only the level of

management at which planning is carried out and no more.

Second, a number of Russian researchers have an approach to the classification of planning as a strategic planning on the basis of planning horizon. For example, M. Bukhalkov interprets strategic planning as «the choice and justification of long-term goals and objectives of further development of the company and the necessary means to achieve the planned ideals (goals) (Kiselev, 2012). At the same time, E. Vais and V. Vasil'tsova (2011) note that «strategic planning can be rightfully interpreted as a system of all the variety of planning activities in an enterprise. It includes and summarizes long-term, medium-term, annual, operational, and functional planning. The main strategic planning burden is clearly placed on long-term planning. That is why strategic planning is often interpreted as modeling the future, which needs specific definitions of goals and concepts of long-term development». For example, E. Kantor, G. Makhovikova, V. Kantor (2010) write that strategic planning, as a rule, is long-term. V. Goremykin (2010) distinguishes three types of planning – long-term strategic (forecasting), medium-term prospective (five years), short-term (operational). At the same time, these Russian researchers and practitioners believe that strategic planning is something general and distant, designed for more than 20-25 years. It is necessary to consider which characteristic of planning is defined as long-term and which is defined as strategic. Planning in the organization in the long term is naturally defined by the planning horizon, i.e., by the period length for which the planned activities are envisaged. But the most important feature of strategic planning is not the planning horizon (the duration of the planning period), but the tasks to be solved to ensure the desired level of competitiveness of organizations in a competitive market environment.

Thirdly, many Russian researchers note that «strategic planning is an image of an organization in the future, its place and role in the economy and socio-economic structure of the country, as well as determining the main ways and means of achieving this new state. They see the strategic planning as not expressed in a plan with detailed indicators, but in an outline, a look into the future made on the basis of various forecasts (economy, science and technology, politics, demography, etc.)». As a consequence, Russian organizations often do not engage in strategic planning and operate according to the principle: «The main thing is to finish the (fiscal) year.»

This approach to the definition of strategic planning allows us to believe that strategic planning in an organization is the definition of activities caused by the actions of competitor organizations and based on the results of their activities to be done in the organization with the definition of specific timing of their implementation and allocation of resources for them so that they allow the organization to provide the necessary level of competitiveness in time. Otherwise, there will be no one to implement the organizational development activities planned for 20 years in advance. Consequently, any for-profit organization must respond to changes in the market and the actions of its competitors in time for its «self-preservation». Naturally, this needs to be done constantly so that the existence and continuous operation of a company could be ensured, as well as a vision of what it can do and a «laying down» of the foundations for this today. This is where the illusion of «commonality» between the concepts of strategic planning and long-term planning comes from. Thus, for example, nobody needs to call strategic management as long-term, although it is strategic planning that allows management to be defined as strategic.

A special aspect or principle of strategic planning is «reverse planning», i.e., from possible or already obtained results of competing organizations. In a competitive environment, organizations must make changes that are required to maintain their competitive position, rather than changes that they can make based on their current capabilities.

In strategic planning, the definition of activities and necessary resources comes from the achieved or expected performance of competitor organizations. And if the organization does not have enough resources to implement the necessary activities, it must attract investment or obtain investment (credit) for their implementation. Otherwise, the organization will not be able to provide the level of competitiveness it needs. Thus, it needs another plan, which is a business plan.

Third. It is clear that the actions of competing organizations are not coordinated with the tactical (current) planning in the organization in which they see their competitor. Consequently, the organization

needs to monitor the possible actions of competitors and respond to them in a timely manner, conducting countermeasures, reducing the risk of losing the position in the market (Kiselev, 2021). However, the organization may need to raise debt capital in order to implement the necessary measures (countermeasures) in a timely manner in response to the actions of competitors. But how does one get potential investors interested in giving the organization the funding it needs? This is where a business plan comes in. Essentially, a business plan is evidence of the effectiveness of a proposed project presented in a certain format to an investor (lender) in order to get them interested in participating in the proposed project. Therefore, it should contain information that will familiarize the potential investor (lender) with the economic justification and calculations confirming that the money invested in the organization project will be returned to him with the estimated profit

Unfortunately, today, researchers and managers of for-profit companies, especially small ones, often understand a business plan as a general and detailed plan of the organization's activities. But for this purpose, a for-profit organization develops separate plans, such as production plan, raw material procurement plan, sales plan, etc., which together constitute a tactical plan. In other words, a business plan is needed to convince investors (lenders) of making sense in supporting the project (business idea) proposed by a for-profit organization. Undoubtedly, it can also be useful internally to consider using its resources for internal change projects. But it is up to the management of the organization to create it or not. The main purpose of a business plan for a for-profit organization is to attract investment to implement projects ensuring the desired level of competitiveness associated, for example, with the purchase of new technologies and equipment, development or modernization of the organization's product.

Thus, we can realize that, first, a for-profit organization needs to prepare a business plan, as a rule, only when the organization is forced to make changes, plans to implement innovative and other projects, and its own money and resources are not enough for this. And the main purpose of a business plan is to attract investment or obtain loans for new projects related to providing the organization with the level of competitiveness it needs. Such a plan is provided to investors and lenders so that, after reviewing it, they can assess their benefits from the investment or loan and allow the organization to implement the organization's proposed project, such as a business expansion. As a consequence, an important part of the business plan should be to justify the interest of investors and lenders in the proposed project and the attractiveness of the organization for cooperation.

Secondly, a business plan drawn up for changes in the organization provides an opportunity to detect problems in the implementation of projects, as the professionals say – to check them «on paper». It is as if to look at the possibility of implementing a new idea «from the outside», the possibility of implementing the project by changes, to see a scenario of possible developments, strengths and weaknesses of the for-profit organization to implement the project, as well as to determine the approximate amount of costs.

Thirdly, the business plan can be considered an element of the image of the organization, as it can indicate that the management of the for-profit organization is aware of its development prospects and understands what and how it needs to do. At the same time, organizations worldwide believe that «good» organizations should have such business plans for development and in case of interaction with Russian organizations they will definitely want to get acquainted with such a plan.

Practice shows that working on a business plan has certain rules. For example, L. Tsiferblat (2012) identifies the following rules as universal, which are advisable to follow when drafting business plans in Russian organizations, taking into account their target specifics.

1. Given that the business plan provides information to potential investors (lenders) on the nature of the business entity and the use of the investment, it should be drafted so that the investor has a clear understanding of its benefits from the investment and a clear understanding of how the organization will use invested funds. The business plan should be specific and accurate, with an economic rationale for the organization's actions. It is not acceptable to use «vague» statements such as «Sales volume will grow rapidly next year» or «New products are remarkably promising,» etc.

2. It should be understood that the investor (lender) does not care to know in detail which employee

of the organization, at what time, and what will be doing. It is clear that if the business plan is very large and describes in detail all the technological processes in the organization, the investor (lender) will simply refuse to cooperate, because he will have no desire to study a too lengthy document with a lot of unnecessary information. As a consequence, it can be argued that the business plan should be fairly brief, typically around 20-25 pages, but no more than 40 pages. This is already considered a «good tone» of the organization's culture abroad.

3. It is imperative that the business plan has a brief but informative summary, usually no more than one page. This is because it will be read much more often than the business plan itself. And it is imperative that the following information is briefly and accurately spelled out in the business plan summary: the main business idea (project idea), the necessary funds and the schedule for providing these funds, areas of investment of funds, the main parameters of the project effectiveness and the expected schedule of return of investment after completing the project by the organization.

4. The business plan should not include background and non-important information behind which the main information on the effectiveness of the project gets lost. If any information on the organization is required by the investor (lender), they can request it. But working proactively, some information can be given in appendices so that the investor can make use of it if they wish. This increases the flexibility of the project.

5. The material in the business plan should be presented using common terms understandable to the investor (lender). Economists, as a rule, will consider the business plan and make a decision on it, and they may not understand some technical and professional terms, and, therefore, understand the attractiveness of the project for them.

6. Certainly, the business plan should be based on honest analysis, based on realistic assumptions and forecasts, justified by references to various sources of information, such as market studies (surveys), statistical data on the industry, as well as on the conclusions of partners who will work with the organization to implement the project. At the same time, the business plan should show all possible risks of the project. Otherwise, the investor (lender) may question the organization's intentions.

7. The business plan should include a description of the organization's strategy for seizing opportunities and overcoming potential challenges.

8. There should be enough copies of business plans so as not to delay the process of reviewing the plan by stakeholders.

Following such guidelines for business plans significantly increases the possibility of their acceptance by investors (lenders).

The business plan must ultimately provide the right answer to important market questions, such as the likely cost of the project and the projected revenues from the project and the timing of its breaking even.

Thus, it can be argued that it is necessary to consider the strategic planning and the essence of business planning from such positions, so that they together become a reliable mechanism for organizations to ensure their competitive position in the market in a timely manner.

Conclusion

It should be noted that strategic planning in business planning of Russian organizations cannot be an end in itself, but should «work» to provide them with the necessary level of competitiveness in a timely manner. At the same time, it is important that researchers offer evidence-based recommendations for organizing strategic planning and business planning in Russian organizations that practitioners need, as there is a lot of practical work in background on timely provision of organizations with the necessary level of competitiveness in a competition tightening and constantly emerging market changes, which can be difficult to predict in advance. Consequently, practitioners need a clear and specific understanding of the essence of what constitutes both the strategic plan of the organization and the business plan, which the theory of management of organizations should provide them. These plans, developed in close relation to each other taking into account the proposed evidence-based recommendations, will help organizations perform a complex and difficult task – provide the necessary level of competitiveness in time, give an adequate

response to the actions of competitor organizations, and ensure their prospective development in conditions of increased competition.

References

1. Ansoff, H. I., & McDonnell, E. J. (1988). *The new corporate strategy*. New York: Wiley.
2. Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. New York: HarperBusiness.
3. Borisov, A. B. (2003). *Big Dictionary of Economics*. M.: Knizhnyi mir (in Russian).
4. Vergiles, E. V. (2003). *Strategic management of the organization*. M.: Moskovskij mezhdunarodnyy institut ekonometriki, informatiki, finansov i prava (in Russian).
5. Vesnin, V. R. (2004). *Strategic management*. M.: Prospekt (in Russian).
6. Verkhoglaenko, V. N. (2006). Strategic Corporate Planning: Problems and prospects (analysis of foreign and domestic experience in strategic planning of corporate development). *Konsul'tant direktora*, (6), 10-16 (in Russian).
7. Vigman, S. L. (2004). *Strategic management in questions and answers*. M.: Prospekt (in Russian).
8. Vikhanskii, O. S. (1998). *Strategic management*. M.: Gardarika (in Russian).
9. Volkogonova, O. D., & Zub, A. T. (2006). *Strategic management*. M.: Forum; Infra-M (in Russian).
10. Goremykin, V. A. (2010). *Enterprise planning*. M.: Urait (in Russian).
11. Campbell, A., & Luchs, K. S. (1992). *Strategic synergy*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
12. Kiselev, A. A. (2012). *Strategic planning in the management system of an enterprise (organization): challenges and solutions*. Yaroslavl: Izd-vo YaGTU (in Russian).
13. Koontz, H., & O'Donnell, C. (2005). *Management: A Systems and Contingency Analysis of Managerial Functions*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
14. Litvak, B. G. (2004). *Development of management solutions*. M.: Delo (in Russian).
15. Lyasko, V. I. (2005). *Strategic planning of enterprise development*. M.: Izd-vo "Ekzamen" (in Russian).
16. Markova, V. D., & Kuznetsova, S. A. (2008). *Strategic management*. M.: Infra; Novosibirsk: Sibirskoe soglashenie (in Russian).
17. Maslanchenkov, Yu. S., & Tronin, Yu. N. (2012). *Strategic and crisis management of a company*. M.: Dashkov i K° (in Russian).
18. Makhovikova, G. A., Kantor, E. L., & Drogovitskii, I. I. (2010). *Enterprise planning*. M.: Urait (in Russian).
19. Mescon, M. H., Albert, M., & Khedouri, F. (1988). *Management*. New York: Harper & Row.
20. Mintzberg, H., Quinn, J. B., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). *The strategy process*. London; New York: Prentice Hall.
21. Ozhegov, S. I. (2012). *Dictionary of the Russian Language*. M.: Mir i Obrazovanie: ONIKS (in Russian).
22. Orlov, A. I. (1999). *Management*. M.: Znanie (in Russian).
23. Kiselev, A. A. (2020). *Basics of strategic management and essence of strategic planning in organizations*. Moscow; Berlin: Direkt-Media (in Russian).
24. Vais, E. S., Vasil'tsova, V. M., Vais, T. A., & Vasil'tsov, V. S. (2011). *Enterprise planning*. – M.: KNORUS (in Russian).
25. Porter, M. E. (1998). *On Competition*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
26. Kukushkin, S. N., Pozdnyakov, Ya. V., & Vasilieva, E. S. (2012). *Planning activities in a company*. M.: Urait (in Russian).
27. Kiselev, A. A. (2021). *Management decision-making*. M.: KnoRus (in Russian).
28. Kiselev, A. A. (2020). *Risk Management*. M.: KnoRus (in Russian).
29. Prokhorov, A. M. (Ed.). (1990). *Soviet Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. M.: Sovetskaya enciklopediya (in Russian).
30. Thompson, A. A., & Strickland, A. J. (2001). *Strategic management: Concepts and cases*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, Irvin.

31. Porshnev, A. G. Rumyantseva, Z. P. & Salomatina, N. A. (2009). *Organizational Management*. M.: INFRA-M (in Russian).
32. Fathutdinov, R. A. (2005). *Strategic Management*. M.: Delo (in Russian).
33. Fahey, L., & Randall, R. M. (1994). *The portable MBA in strategy*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
34. Tsiferblat, L. F. (2012). *Business plan: correcting mistakes*. M.: Os-89 (in Russian).
35. Shkiotov, S. V. (2013). Paradoxes of competitiveness of the Russian economy. *Teoriya i praktika obshchestvennogo razvitiya*, (12) (in Russian).
36. Shkiotov, S. V., Markin, M. I., & Shcherbakova, A. A. (2021). The Russian economy's competitiveness paradoxes: 2020 year case. *Teoreticheskaya ekonomika*, (5), 120-123. Retrieved from: <https://elibrary.ru/contents.asp?id=46365482> (in Russian).
37. *Encyclopedia of Economics*. Retrieved from: <https://economy-ru.info/info/110299/> (in Russian).
38. Shkiotov S. V. (2013). M. Porter's National Competitiveness Model Verification: Correlation Between the Level of National Competitiveness, Labor Productivity and the Quality of Life. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 25(4), 684-689.
39. Chandler, A. D. (1962). *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press.
40. Zaitsev, L. G., Sokolova, M. I. (1998) *Strategic management. The art of developing and implementing a strategy: a textbook for universities*. M.: Banks and exchanges, UNITI.

Received 20.08.2021

Revised 20.10.2021

Accepted 10.11.2021