

Philosophy Behind Strategy: Reconstructing the Theoretical Foundation of Strategic Management in a Disruptive Era

Gerson Manurung¹, Robertus Suraji², Adler Haymans Manurung³, Lukman Hakim Sangapan⁴

Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya¹²³⁴

monroegery@gmail.com¹, robertus.suraji@dsn.ubharajaya.ac.id²

adler.manurung@dsn.ubharajaya.ac.id³, lukayhakim80@gmail.com⁴



Sejarah Revisi Artikel :
Received on 8 June 2025
1st Revision on 18 June 2025
Accepted on 5 July 2025

Doi :

<https://doi.org/10.61597/jbe-ogzrp.v3i3.114>

Creations are distributed below :



[Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

Abstract : The era of disruption challenges the relevance of conventional strategic management theories built on assumptions of stability, predictability, and structural rationality. This study aims to identify and examine the philosophical assumptions ontology, epistemology, and axiology underlying mainstream strategic theories, as well as evaluate their limitations in responding to the dynamics of the VUCA world.

Objective : As a contribution, this study offers a new, more flexible, and contextual framework to address today's disruptive challenges. Its implications include the redesign of strategic theory and recommendations for more reflective and ethical organizational policies.

Methodology : Using a critical conceptual review and philosophical inquiry approach, this study deconstructs the foundational frameworks of theories such as Porter and Mintzberg and proposes an alternative epistemology based on pragmatism.

Research results : The findings reveal that the absence of explicit philosophical foundations leads to theoretical fragmentation and weakens the theories' ability to adapt.

Keywords : Strategic Management, Philosophy Of Science, Ontology, Epistemology, Pragmatism.

1. Introduction

In the last decade, the business world has experienced tremendous turbulence caused by digital disruption, geopolitical crises, and technological developments such as artificial intelligence and blockchain. Data from the [\(Forum 2024\)](#) shows that 85% of global executives believe their organizations are not strategically prepared to deal with ongoing technological disruption. This reflects the failure of most strategic management theories to respond to exponential changes that are non-linear and complex in nature.

Most current strategic approaches are still rooted in assumptions of environmental stability and market predictability that no longer apply in the context of a VUCA (Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, Ambiguity) world. In practice, frameworks such as Porter's Five Forces or Mintzberg's Strategic Planning School tend to rely on assumptions of rationality and linearity in decision-making, which are losing relevance when faced with the fluid and rapidly changing realities of business [\(Mintzberg et al. 2009\)](#).

However, the deeper issue with the adaptation of these theories lies in their philosophical foundations: ontological assumptions about organizational reality, epistemological assumptions about how strategic knowledge is acquired, and axiological assumptions about the values that determine management objectives. [\(Burrell and Morgan 1979\)](#) demonstrate that various approaches in the social sciences, including management, have different paradigmatic foundations and understanding this is crucial for assessing the validity of theory in changing contexts. Unfortunately, strategic management studies tend to overlook this philosophical reflection. A recent study by [\(Parola 2025\)](#) shows that strategic theories are built on implicit philosophical assumptions that are often inconsistent with one another, leading to theoretical fragmentation and difficulties in accumulating strategic knowledge. Such studies underscore the importance of reconstructing theories based on explicit and contextual philosophy of science.

Previous research has discussed pragmatic paradigms such as those proposed by [\(Dewey 2008\)](#) and [\(Rorty 1979\)](#), which advocate epistemic flexibility and a focus on

solving real-world problems. However, this approach has not been widely integrated into mainstream strategic management theory. Most of the literature remains focused on managerial frameworks and tools, rather than on deep reflection on the ontological and epistemological assumptions that accompany them (Mir and Greenwood, 2024).

This gap is not only methodological but also conceptual. Existing literature reviews rarely systematically explore the philosophical implications of science for the resilience and relevance of strategic theory in the face of disruption. There is no conceptual analysis that critically and normatively links contemporary crises with the need for a paradigm shift in strategic theory.

This research aims to fill this gap by reconstructing strategic management theory through a philosophy of science approach. Using critical conceptual review and philosophical inquiry methods, this research will re-evaluate the basic assumptions of popular strategic theories and develop an alternative framework that is more adaptive and contextual.

Theoretically, this research will enrich the discourse on the epistemology of strategy and open space for a new, more inclusive paradigm synthesis. Practically, the findings of this research are expected to assist organizational leaders and academics in designing strategies that are more responsive to change and in developing organizational policies that are more in line with today's disruptive realities.

1.2 Justification for the Philosophical Hermeneutic Approach

1. What are the main philosophical assumptions (ontological, epistemological, and axiological) underlying modern strategic management theories, and how do these assumptions influence the way theories respond to disruption?
2. Why do most mainstream strategic management theories—such as Porter's and Mintzberg's approaches—fail to capture the complexity and uncertainty in the context of a VUCA world?

3. How can the integration of pragmatist philosophical approaches (Dewey 2008) provide an alternative epistemology that is more adaptive to exponential changes in strategy practice?
4. What are the consequences of the lack of explicit philosophical assumptions in strategic management theory development for the fragmentation of knowledge and the weakness of theory accumulation?
5. How can new theoretical frameworks be designed through philosophical reconstruction to be more responsive to disruptive technological, social, and geopolitical dynamics?

1.3 Objective

1. Identify and critically examine the philosophical assumptions (including ontology, epistemology, and axiology) underlying modern strategic management theories, and assess the extent to which these assumptions influence the relevance of the theories in dealing with disruption phenomena.
2. Evaluate the limitations of conventional strategic approaches such as Porter's Five Forces and Mintzberg's Strategic Planning School in responding to the dynamic, complex, and unpredictable business realities of the VUCA era.
3. Explore the potential integration of pragmatic philosophical approaches especially the thoughts of (Dewey 2008) and into the strategic management framework as an alternative epistemological basis that is more flexible and contextual.
4. Analyze the impact of the lack of explicit philosophical foundations on the fragmentation and stagnation of strategic management theories, and how this hinders the accumulation of holistic and applicable strategic knowledge.
5. Reconstructing a more adaptive strategic management conceptual framework to disruptive challenges through a philosophy of science approach, in order to produce meaningful theoretical contributions and practical recommendations for strategic decision-making in a constantly changing business environment.

1.4 Benefit

1.4.1 Theoretical Benefits

This research makes a significant contribution to the development of strategic management theory in the following ways :

- a. Expanding ontological and epistemological understanding in strategy theory, through a philosophical analysis of basic assumptions that have not been explicitly studied in mainstream theories (such as Porter's Five Forces or Mintzberg's Strategy Schools).
- b. Providing a new conceptual framework that is more responsive to disruptive, complex, and unpredictable business realities. By integrating a pragmatic philosophical approach (Dewey 2008) and (Rorty 1979), this research helps develop a more flexible and problem-solution oriented epistemology of strategy.
- c. Filling the literature gap in the philosophy of management science, especially on the issue of how the crisis of theory relevance can be overcome through a paradigm shift in science in strategic management.
- d. Encouraging the accumulation of strategic knowledge systematically, by highlighting the importance of paradigm clarity as a basis for consistency and synthesis between theories.

1.4.2 Practical Benefits

The results of this study also offer benefits that can be implemented by strategy practitioners and organizational leaders :

- a. Help strategic decision makers (such as CEOs, senior managers, and business consultants) understand the limitations of conventional strategic approaches, so that they can use alternative, more contextual and adaptive thinking frameworks.
- b. Become the basis for formulating more realistic and dynamic strategic policies, especially in facing challenges such as technological change (AI, blockchain), global market uncertainty, and geopolitical disruption.
- c. Provide a conceptual reference for executive training and business strategy curriculum development, especially in advanced management education (MBA

or doctoral programs), by incorporating reflective and philosophical dimensions into strategy teaching.

- d. Concrete application examples: technology or manufacturing companies operating in a VUCA environment can use the framework from this study to conduct strategic sense-making and design adaptive scenarios.

1.4.3 Social Benefits

Socially, the impact of this research contributes to systemic changes in the practice and understanding of business strategy :

- a. Encourage the formation of more value-conscious organizations, which consider ethics, sustainability, and social interests in formulating strategies.
- b. Strengthen strategic accountability to the wider community, by making organizations aware that strategy is not only about competitiveness and profit, but also about social and environmental contributions.
- c. Become a basis for more contextual and responsive public policies or economic regulations, because the theoretical framework developed emphasizes the importance of sensitivity to structural changes in society and the global economy.

2. Theoretical review

2.1 The Paradigm of Science According to Kuhn (1962)

(Thomas Kuhn 1962), in his monumental work *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, introduced the concept of “paradigm” as the dominant scientific framework of thought in a given period. A paradigm is not merely a theory, but encompasses methods, values, and basic assumptions accepted by the scientific community. A paradigm shift, or scientific revolution, occurs when old theories can no longer explain new phenomena, triggering a comprehensive change in the framework of thinking. In the context of the digital age, (Sangapan et al. 2025) asserts that new challenges such as artificial intelligence and technological disruption demand a reinterpretation of Kuhn's work, which is now relevant not only in pure science but also in strategic management and organization. The emphasis on the “paradigm crisis” becomes increasingly clear in strategic theory as classical theories

fail to explain uncertain, ambiguous, and complex realities. Therefore, Kuhn's thinking serves as a strong foundation for reconstructing a more contextual and reflective strategic theory.

In the context of strategic management, paradigm shifts are highly relevant. Strategic theories dominated by rational, predictive, and market stability approaches (such as the Porterian approach) are now being displaced by more flexible, adaptive, and complex approaches. Digital disruption and the VUCA reality have challenged the validity of old assumptions in strategic theory, much like the crisis in science according to Kuhn.

The old paradigm in strategic management is rooted in positivism and reductionism, risking failure to explain the complexity of contemporary organizations. Conversely, new approaches such as emergent strategy or adaptive strategy indicate a profound epistemological shift.

Kuhn's thinking provides an argumentative foundation for questioning the foundations of current strategic management theory: Are we in transition toward a new paradigm? If so, philosophical reconstruction becomes an urgent necessity.

The new paradigm must be able to accommodate exponential change and the uncertain reality of organizations. Therefore, re-examining the ontological and epistemological foundations of strategic theory is crucial as the basis for this paradigm shift.

2.2 Ontology, Epistemology, and Axiology in Management Science

(Burrell and Morgan 1979) classify four main paradigms in the social sciences based on the dimensions of ontology (reality), epistemology (sources of knowledge), and axiology (values): Functionalist, Interpretive, Radical Humanist, and Radical Structuralist. Each has significant implications for how organizations and strategy are viewed.

The functionalist paradigm, which dominates mainstream management theory, views organizations as rational and predictable systems. In contrast, the interpretive

paradigm views organizations as complex social constructions. Meanwhile, the radical approach emphasizes structural change and liberation from hegemonic structures.

The choice of paradigm determines how strategy is formulated. For example, a data-driven rational approach aligns with positivism (functionalist), but a meaning-based (sensemaking) strategy is more relevant in the interpretive paradigm.

This research adopts this framework to explore the hidden assumptions within dominant strategic theory. By unpacking ontological and epistemological assumptions, we can assess whether the strategic approach used is relevant to a world full of disruption.

Furthermore, the values (axiology) upheld by a paradigm determine the purpose of strategy: is it solely for economic efficiency, or for social sustainability, ethics, and stakeholder diversity? This is a dimension often overlooked in conventional strategic theory.

2.3 Pragmatism as an Alternative Epistemology

Pragmatism, as an alternative epistemology, is rooted in the thought of (Dewey 2008) and further developed by (Rorty 1979). Dewey viewed inquiry as a process of problem-solving that is situational and contextual. Knowledge is not a representation of objective reality but a tool for effective action.

Richard Rorty rejects foundationalism in the philosophy of science and emphasizes that truth is contingent, context-dependent, and not absolute. This perspective allows for epistemic flexibility in the development of strategic theory.

In strategic management, pragmatism implies that theory should be designed not based on universality, but on its usefulness in addressing real challenges. Strategy is not merely the implementation of a plan, but a dynamic response to ever-changing problems.

This approach is relevant to digital disruption, which requires organizations to innovate continuously without fixed guidelines. Therefore, strategic theory based on pragmatism is more suitable for an era of high uncertainty.

This research uses pragmatism as an alternative epistemological framework to reconstruct strategic theory to be more contextual and adaptive.

2.4 Previous Studies

This research, as the researcher describes briefly, is the result of previous research that is relevant to this research topic.

Table 1. Previous Research

No	Researcher	Objective	Method	Result
1	(Neesham 2020)	Analyzing the role of paradigms in responsible management	Conceptual study	Finding an explicit need for ontological and axiological reflection in strategy learning
2	(Kaushik and Walsh 2019)	Examining pragmatism in social research	Reflective qualitative study	Pragmatism strengthens social sensitivity and practical relevance in theory
3	(Mir and Greenwood 2024)	Developing a philosophical roadmap in management	Literature review	Highlighting positivistic bias and the need for reconceptualization of theory
4	(Goles and Hirschheim 2000)	Reviewing paradigms based on Burrell & Morgan	Post-analysis	Demonstrates the challenges of paradigm integration in strategy theory
5	(Wahab et al. 2016)	Proposing pragmatism for educational research	Theoretical studies	Concludes that the pragmatic approach is more flexible and adaptive

The table above shows a tendency of increasing awareness of the importance of philosophical foundations in organizational and strategy theory. However, none of these studies explicitly reconstructs dominant strategy theory with a comprehensive philosophical approach. This study is here to fill this gap through a reflective approach to the basic ontological, epistemological, and axiological assumptions of strategy theory, and offers an alternative framework based on pragmatism.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

This research, as the researcher describes briefly, is the result of previous research that is relevant to this research topic.

The main issue raised in this study is the incompatibility of mainstream strategic management theory with the context of rapid and uncertain disruption. These theories tend to be rigid because they are rooted in a positivistic paradigm that emphasizes objectivity, linearity, and prediction.

Based on (Kuhn 1962) theory of scientific revolution, this framework places paradigm changes as the foundation for understanding the transformation of strategy theory. Referring to (Burrell and Morgan 1979), a classification of four paradigms is used to map the philosophical foundations of existing theories.

To enrich and adapt the theory to contemporary challenges, this study adopts Dewey and Rorty's pragmatic epistemology, which emphasizes contextuality, flexibility, and orientation towards solving real problems, not just theoretical generalizations.

This framework connects the main variables, namely the philosophical assumptions of strategy theory (independent) with the relevance and flexibility of strategy theory in the disruptive era (dependent). This relationship is mediated by the scientific paradigm and strengthened by the pragmatic approach as a new epistemological foundation.

3. Research Methodology

This study uses a qualitative approach based on critical conceptual review and philosophical inquiry to re-analyze the philosophical foundations of dominant strategic management theories. The research design is explorative-reflective with a focus on epistemological and ontological reconstruction through a critical review of key literature in the fields of strategic management and philosophy of science.

The subjects in this study are not individuals or organizations, but rather corpuses of texts and major academic works. Literature samples were selected purposively from representative primary sources in each school of strategy theory, such as the works

of (Porter 1985), (Mintzberg et al. 2009), and philosophical literature such as (Kuhn 1962), (Burrell and Morgan 1979), (Dewey 2008), and (Rorty 1979). The number of primary texts reviewed was 15 works, including journal articles and theoretical books.

The research instrument is in the form of conceptual analysis guidelines developed from (Burrell and Morgan 1979) taxonomy, which includes dimensions of ontology (realism vs nominalism), epistemology (positivism vs anti-positivism), and axiology (neutral vs normative). The data collection procedure is carried out by critical reading, annotation of key ideas, and mapping the logic of arguments from each text. The analysis was conducted through three stages :

1. categorization of paradigms and philosophical assumptions of each strategy theory
2. identification of incompatibilities of these assumptions with disruptive conditions
3. preparation of a new philosophical framework based on a pragmatic and reflective approach.

Validation was carried out through theory triangulation and cross-comparison between literature to ensure consistency of arguments.

4. Research Result

This research resulted in a remapping of the philosophical assumptions of major strategic theories. The following are the main findings classified based on a three-dimensional framework: ontology, epistemology, and axiology.

4.1 Ontology of Strategy Theory

(Porter 1985) assumes that the business environment is objective and can be analyzed deterministically. Strategy is considered a response to a fixed industry structure. "Porter's view of competition is fundamentally objectivist and structure-driven, assuming a stable industry logic." (Mintzberg et al. 2009).

(Mintzberg et al. 2009) demonstrate a more dynamic orientation. They view strategy as an emergent process and organizations as open social systems. “Real strategy is formed through learning, not planning. It emerges.” (Mintzberg et al. 2009).

4.2 Epistemology

Classical approaches like Porter’s are based on positivist epistemology, which emphasizes empirical validation, measurement, and generalization. This creates a gap when theory is applied in VUCA conditions. “The assumption that industry structure determines performance reflects a narrow epistemic stance.” (Kaushik and Walsh 2019).

Mintzberg’s approach, on the other hand, opens space for constructivist and interpretive epistemology, though it remains limited to phenomenological observation without normative reflection.

Pragmatic approaches, as proposed by (Dewey 2008) and (Rorty 1979), have not been widely integrated into strategy theory. Yet Dewey’s philosophy, which emphasizes inquiry

4.3 Axiology

The dominant values in classical theory tend to be neutral and economic efficiency, profit, and competitiveness.

Few theories explicitly acknowledge ethical, social, or sustainability dimensions. When disruption demands decisions that impact multiple stakeholders (workers, society, the environment), strategic theory loses its explanatory power.

This research identifies the potential of reflective axiology, which emphasizes value plurality and sustainability, as an important dimension absent from classical theory.

Table 2. Philosophical Reconstruction of Strategic Theory

Strategic Theory	Ontology	Epistemology	Axiology
(Porter 1985)	Objectivism, structural realism	Positivism	Economical, neutral

(Mintzberg 2009)	Social constructivism	Semi-constructive	Neutral
(Dewey 2008) and (Rorty 1979)	Ontological pluralism	Contextual, functional	Contextual, social

4.4 Implication

The findings of this study indicate that the philosophical assumptions underlying classical strategic management theories are no longer adequate to respond to the complexity and dynamics of the era of disruption. This reinforces (Kuhn 1962) argument that when old paradigms no longer explain new realities, paradigm shifts become inevitable.

The functionalist paradigm (Burrell and Morgan, 1979), which dominates Porter's theory and some other managerial approaches, is based on the assumption that the organizational world is objective and can be controlled through analysis. In the context of an unstable environment, such as digital disruption or a global pandemic, this approach has proven to be non-adaptive. This is consistent with the criticism of (Mintzberg et al. 2009) that strategy must be emergent, not merely top-down planning.

However, even Mintzberg's approach, though more flexible, has not fully addressed the deeper axiological dimension. This research suggests that strategy is not only about effectiveness or adaptive agility but also about values: for whom is the strategy designed? On what value foundation is the strategy executed?

The integration of pragmatism into the theoretical foundation of strategy offers a potential answer. (Dewey 2008) and (Rorty 1979) reject truth as objective representation and view it as the result of problem-solving within a social context. Thus, strategy theory should be seen not as a fixed formula but as a contextual and transformative tool for thinking.

Implicitly, strategic theory must be redesigned as design science (Aken 2005), not as a static description. Strategic theory must not only explain phenomena but also offer relevant and ethical interventions for change.

The main limitation of this research is its conceptual and reflective nature—it does not test the application of the new framework on real cases. However, this limitation presents an opportunity for further case-based and action research in organizations facing disruption.

5. Conclusion

This study concludes that dominant strategic management theories today are built on narrow philosophical foundations—particularly in the dimensions of ontology (objectivism), epistemology (positivism), and axiology (value neutrality). In the face of an era of disruption marked by uncertainty, complexity, and the dynamics of social values, these foundations are no longer sufficient.

Using a philosophy of science approach, particularly the ideas of Thomas Kuhn, Burrell & Morgan, and the pragmatism of Dewey and Rorty, this study offers an alternative framework that is more contextual and flexible. This framework views strategy as the result of social inquiry, not merely the application of structural analysis. Strategic knowledge is seen as a contextual dialogical process, while values (axiology) become an integral part of theoretical design.

The main contribution of this research is to open space for the reconstruction of strategic management theory from its philosophical roots. This research encourages the development of a strategic framework that is not only adaptive to change but also capable of responding to ethical and sustainability demands in strategic decision-making.

Further research is recommended to apply this philosophical framework in empirical case studies of disruptive organizations to test the validity and usefulness of the pragmatic approach in strategic practice. A design-based research or case inquiry approach is well-suited to bridge theory and practice directly.

6. References

- Aken, Joan Ernst van. "Management Research as a Design Science: Articulating the Research Products of Mode 2 Knowledge Production in Management." *British Journal of Management* 16 (1) : (2005). 19–36.
- Andion, C., and Serva, M. "Pragmatism, Management and Organization Studies: New Ontological, Epistemological, Methodological and Axiological Avenues for Research". SSRN. (2024).
- Awi, F., and Ikpeh, C. "Ubuntu as the Nexus for Social Capital Building in Academia: Advancing Equity for Marginalised Voices in White Dominated Higher Education Institutions". *Frontiers in Sociology*. (2025).
- Burrell, G., and Morgan, G. "Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis : Elements of the sociology of corporate life". London: *Heinemann*. (1979).
- Dewey, J. "*The Later Works of John Dewey, Volume 12, 1925-1953: 1938, Logic: The Theory of Inquiry* (Vol. 12), *Siu Press*. (2008).
- Forum, World Economic. "Future of Jobs Report 2025". *World Economic Forum*. (2025).
- Goles, T., and Hirschheim, R. "The paradigm is dead, the paradigm is dead...long live the paradigm: the legacy of Burrell and Morgan". *The international journal of management science*. 28 (3) : (2000). 249–268.
- Ihemegbulem, I. "The Role of ISO 55000 in Ensuring Efficient Asset Management in SMEs". *University of Sunderland Repository*. (2024).
- Kaushik, V., and Walsh, C. "Pragmatism as a Research Paradigm and Its Implications for Social Work Research". *Social Sciences*. 8 (9) : (2019). 1-17.
- Khilji, A. B., & Haq, S. U. "From hidden to unhidden: Triple bottom line through the lens of human resources". *Journal of Management Info*, 11 (2) : (2024). 17–34.
- Kuhn, T. S. "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions". *University of Chicago Press*. (1962).
- Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B. W., & Lampel, J. "Strategy Safari: A Guided Tour Through the Wilds of Strategic Management". *Pearson Education*. (2009).

- Mir, R., & Greenwood, M. "Philosophy is everywhere: A much-needed roadmap to finding it. *Philosophy and Management Studies: A Research Overview*". *Taylor & Francis*. (2024).
- Neesham, C. "Paradigms in Responsible Management". *SAGE Handbook*. (2020).
- Qureshi, Haleema, Asad Amjad, Syeda Sana Zainab, Muhammad Irfan Sheeraz, and Ambreen Raza. "The Role of Green Organizational Practices and Environmental Performance for Sustainable Competitive Advantage in the IT Sector of Pakistan." *Journal Of Business and Management Research* 4 (1) : (2025). 254–320.
- Parvaiz, Gohar Saleem, Owais Mufti, and Muhammad Wahab. "Pragmatism for Mixed Method Research at Higher Education Level." *Business & Economic Review* 8 (2) : (2016). 67–79.
- Pinochet, Luis Hernan Contreras, Paula Sarita Bigio Schnaider, and João Vinícius França Carvalho. "Editorial: Pressures and Dilemmas in Scientific Publishing in Management: Building Rigor, Relevance, and Global Impact." *Revista de Gestao* 32 (1) : (2025). 2–6.
- Porter, M. E. "Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance". *Free Press*. (1985).
- Rorty, R. "Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature". *Princeton University Press*. (1979).
- Sangapan, L. H., Suraji, R., Manurung, A. H., & Carlos, G. J. "Thomas Kuhn's Thoughts in the Digital Age: A New Paradigm in Science". *Journal of Business and Economics*. 3 (1) : (2025). 17-29.
- Sim, C. L., Wong, T. A., Sin, K. Y., & Sivakumaran, V. M. "Pragmatism as a paradigm for quality management research in bridging academic-practitioner gaps". *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*. 16 (2) : (2024). 330-342.
- Tsoukas, H., & Knudsen, C. "The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory". *Oxford University Press*. (2003).
- Vaezi, Reza, Hosein Aslipour, Saeed Zarandi, and Leila Shams. "Institutional Capacity Framework of Public Organizations (Study of the Basic Goods of Wheat)." *Public Management Researches* 18 (67) : (2025). 1–30.

YAMPOL, Yurii. "The Problem Of Quality Management In The Modern Educational Context: Analysis, Challenges, And Perspectives. (2024). 585-604.