

<https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2026-2-05>

UDC 005.51/.52:005.334]:658

Petrykiva Olha

*PhD in Economics, Associate Professor
Education and Research Institute "Karazin Banking Institute"
of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
4, Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine
e-mail: o.petrykiva@karazin.ua
ORCID ID: [0000-0002-7169-8667](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7169-8667)*

Dolhov Denys

*Student (Higher Education Level 2)
Education and Research Institute "Karazin Banking Institute"
of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
4, Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine
e-mail: denys.dolhov@student.karazin.ua*

Adapting strategic analysis frameworks for corporate resilience in high-risk and uncertain environments

Abstract. The article examines the problems of applying classical strategic analysis tools in modern economic conditions characterized by a high level of entropy, uncertainty, and war-related risks.

Problem statement. Although researchers have extensively studied the need for flexible approaches, they have all focused on the short term, without considering the conceptual foundations for transforming adaptability into sustainable competitive resilience. Furthermore, there is a need to develop a reliable quantitative tool for measuring marketing adaptability.

Unresolved aspects of the problem. Despite the existence of thorough theoretical research, the issue of developing integrated models of adaptive management that organically combine a strategic vision with mechanisms for the operational adjustment of decisions remains insufficiently explored. The academic literature lacks tools for enterprises to systematically integrate digital analytics into their day-to-day strategic activities.

Purpose of the article. This article establishes the theoretical and methodological foundations for adaptive strategic management in enterprises and identifies practical tools to ensure strategic resilience, flexibility, and adaptation to change amidst uncertainty and military conflict.

Presentation of the main material. The shift from traditional planning to flexible, proactive strategies based on continuous monitoring is justified and proven. Adaptive strategies can improve decision timeliness, optimize resources, and enhance resilience to external challenges.

Conclusions. In the context of military operations and a rapidly changing external environment, traditional models of strategic analysis are losing their effectiveness, giving way to adaptive strategies based on the principles of flexibility, practicality and continuous monitoring.

Keywords: strategic analysis, uncertainty, risk management, SWOT analysis, scenario planning, strategic flexibility, crisis management, martial law.

Formulas: 1; fig.: 0; tabl.: 2; bibl.: 16.

JEL Classification: H25; H61; F23.

For citation: Petrykiva Olha, Dolhov Denys. Adapting strategic analysis frameworks for corporate resilience in high-risk and uncertain environments. Financial and Credit Systems: Prospects for Development. №2(21) 2026. P. 63-72. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2026-2-05>

Introduction. Given the extremely dynamic nature of the external environment, it is important to adapt traditional tools (such as SWOT and PESTLE) in a timely manner, as their static nature means they are losing their predictive value. This is precisely why there is a need to move from rigid strategic planning to the concept of strategic flexibility. To this end, it is proposed to modernise the classic toolkit by integrating dynamic SWOT analysis with quantitative risk assessment methods. The practical recommendations developed for implementing development scenarios (optimistic, realistic and pessimistic) are fundamental to the enterprise management process. The fundamental role of the ‘weak signals’ concept in the early detection of crisis phenomena is also emphasised. The synergy of these approaches significantly enhances the adaptability and resilience of Ukrainian enterprises.

Thus, the implementation of the proposed set of tools will enable management to transform uncertainty from a source of threat into an opportunity to explore new market opportunities, which is extremely relevant for domestic businesses forced to operate under conditions of constant force majeure and rapidly changing security and economic factors. Ultimately, this approach ensures not only the survival of enterprises but also lays the foundations for their post-war recovery and sustainable development.

Literature review. The conceptual foundations of adaptive management and strategic analysis in conditions of change are laid out in works on the theory of dynamic capabilities. In his research, Teece D. [17] demonstrated that, in conditions of high turbulence, a firm’s survival depends not on static resources, but on its ability to rapidly restructure business processes. Schoemaker P. [20] laid the methodological foundations of scenario planning, demonstrating that, in conditions of uncertainty, a range of future scenarios is a more effective tool than point forecasting.

Research into strategic analysis tools in high-risk environments focuses on probabilistic methods. The hypothesis regarding the need to integrate flexibility into investment decisions is developed by Myers S. [19], who formalised the real options method (ROV), which allows management to make decisions on expanding or postponing projects depending on market signals. Mun J. [18] expanded these approaches through the application of Monte Carlo simulation, which allows for the derivation of a probability distribution of outcomes rather than deterministic indicators.

Following the onset of the full-scale invasion, academic works appeared that were directly devoted to the adaptation of Ukrainian business to the challenges of war. In particular, research by domestic scholars has revealed that over 56% of enterprises were forced to change their product portfolio or relocate their facilities, which required the immediate transformation of SWOT and PEST analysis methods into dynamic monitoring models. Despite the robust scientific basis, there remains a need for a critical reassessment of these approaches, as most foreign models were developed for conditions of controlled market turbulence, rather than for conditions of total military force majeure.

Purpose, objectives and research methods. The aim of the study is to establish the theoretical and methodological foundations of adaptive strategic management and to identify a set of practical tools (scenario planning, the Monte Carlo method, real options) that ensure strategic flexibility, resilience and viability of enterprises in the external environment (particularly in conditions of war and the VUCA world). It also aims to justify the need for a transition from deterministic to probabilistic models of strategic analysis.

To achieve this objective, the following tasks have been identified: to investigate the limitations of the traditional linear approach to strategy in the context of non-linear external changes; to justify the role of scenario planning in creating a modular structure for enterprise strategy (optimistic, realistic and pessimistic scenarios), to determine the potential for using the concept of ‘weak signals’ and real options as tools for ensuring strategic flexibility, and to

formulate practical recommendations for transforming analytical tools to enhance business resilience to external changes.

The subject of this study is the process of transforming strategic analysis in enterprises under the influence of critical uncertainty. The main methods proposed for adaptation include: scenario planning (a shift from static forecasts to the development of multiple micro-scenarios with short update cycles), the Monte Carlo method (the use of simulation modelling to obtain a probability distribution of financial results rather than deterministic indicators), and the real options method (assessment of opportunities for operational manoeuvring (expansion, postponement or withdrawal from a project) depending on market signals).

Research results. The theoretical foundation of strategic analysis under conditions of uncertainty is rooted in the intersection of several fundamental management schools. The research draws on the classical concepts of I. Ansoff regarding «weak signals» management [1] and M. Porter in the context of analysing the competitive structure of industries [8]. The evolution of strategic thought from rigid determinism to flexible models occurred thanks to the theory of dynamic capabilities, which demonstrates that a firm's viability is determined by its ability to constantly reconfigure resources and adapt to changing conditions [10].

Для ідентифікації наукової прогалини досліджень проведено компаративний аналіз основних концепцій крізь призму їхньої придатності для застосування в умовах воєнних ризиків (Table 1).

Table 1. The main advantages and limitations of key concepts in the context of military risks

Concept	Authors	Characteristics	Limitations in the context of war risks and the BANI environment
1. The theory of anti-fragility and the management of non-linear risks	Taleb (2012), «Antifragile: How to Thrive in a World of Chaos».	Focuses systems on deriving benefits from chaos and moving away from precise forecasts in favour of assessing structural vulnerability.	It involves a high degree of philosophical abstraction; there is a lack of practical, step-by-step tools for the rapid analysis of a specific enterprise.
2. The paradigm of strategic resilience and flexibility	Hamel and Velikangas (2003); Sheffi (2015), «The Resilient Enterprise».	Explores mechanisms for rapid recovery from shocks (systemic resilience) and the flexible reallocation of capital.	Models are predominantly geared towards cyclical economic crises or technological shifts, rather than the physical destruction of assets and infrastructure.
3. Classification of levels of uncertainty and scenario planning	Courtney, Kirkland and Wiggery (1997) «Strategy under Uncertainty» (HBR).	Proposes dividing uncertainty into four levels and developing adaptive strategic invariants instead of a single forecast.	Traditional scenarios rely on the assumption of rational behaviour by market participants, which is negated during wartime.
4. Dynamic and quantified SWOT/TOWS analysis	Wairich (1982); Saati (2008) «Decision-making using the Analytic Hierarchy Process».	An attempt to dynamise the SWOT matrix through the introduction of weighting coefficients and expert assessments.	This often leads to matrices being overloaded with complex mathematical calculations without their direct integration with risk maps.
5. Adapting management to conditions of martial law	Heyets (2022); Shpak et al. (2023); Reshetnyak (2023).	Empirical analysis of the resilience of Ukrainian business, relocation and diversification in the context of military aggression.	Research is largely of a descriptive nature; there is a noticeable lack of formalised analytical rapid-assessment methodologies.

Source: compiled by the author using data from [6]

Thus, an analysis of works by foreign and domestic authors suggests that Western academic thought offers powerful conceptual models, such as Antifragility, Resilience and Dynamic Capabilities, which, nevertheless, remain methodologically detached from the classic rapid analysis methods – SWOT and PESTLE – which are actually used by management in practice. On the other hand, domestic research focuses on describing tactical solutions for survival. In other words,

researchers overlook the instrumental bridge — an algorithm for modifying the classic SWOT analysis by integrating it with the quantitative parameters of risk theory and I. Ansoff's concept of weak signals. It is the development of such an integrated, dynamic analytical toolkit, adapted to the conditions of military risks, that forms the basis of this article.

As is well known, the traditional paradigm of strategic management, which for decades was based on the principles of relative stability and predictability, has proved fundamentally inadequate for explaining and managing processes in today's environment. Moreover, recent global challenges point to a shift towards an even more volatile reality – the BANI world – which makes the consequences of management decisions difficult to predict and the risks non-linear [6].

For Ukraine's national economy, the uncertainty resulting from the military operations taking place on our territory has reached extreme levels. All the risks associated with the destruction of production infrastructure, the forced migration of capital and human resources, as well as the critical disruption of logistics chains, have made survival the paramount priority – one that depends not on static competitive advantages, but specifically on the speed of strategic manoeuvring. The statistics highlight the scale of this crisis: around 60% of Ukrainian businesses have been forced to radically overhaul their marketing and operational strategies, whilst a significant number of businesses have ceased trading altogether due to their inability to adapt to the new realities.

The main obstacle to the resilience of business systems was the inertia in strategic decision-making. In other words, managers continued to adhere rigidly to behavioural models that had been successful until recently, but which, under the new conditions of a full-scale invasion, had become destructive. These realities led to the devaluation of all approaches based on a linear extrapolation of past experience. They also demanded a radical shift in the objective of management: from the instrumental maximisation of corporate profit to ensuring institutional integrity and operational continuity.

The traditional approach to strategy is linear: it involves analysing the environment, then setting objectives, drawing up a plan and proceeding to implement it. However, in a high-risk environment, conditions change faster than a company can complete this cycle. This is precisely why key methods need to be adapted. The transformation of logistics and investment strategies is the tangible manifestation of this adaptation. This signals a shift from Just-in-Time efficiency to Just-in-Case reliability. And this forced transition to the Just-in-Case model, in which the foundation is not instant efficiency but reliability and continuity, requires the creation of a powerful strategic buffer comprising resource redundancy, system duplication, digitalisation, organisational agility and decentralisation. In other words, it is precisely through a profound restructuring of assets that the opportunity to capitalise on uncertainty arises. Despite rising operating costs, businesses should prioritize alternative logistics and redundant supply chains. Some are investing in private transportation fleets and border terminals.

Digital communication and cloud infrastructure further mitigate risk by decentralizing and safeguarding business systems. The modern capabilities of big data and artificial intelligence provide the foundation for real-time decision-making. Another approach, such as transforming investment logic through the introduction of the real options concept, proves invaluable in conditions of extreme turbulence and military risks. The previous operating principle – investing capital in a single large-scale project – now creates a critical point of vulnerability and carries a high risk of total capital loss. It is the concept of real options that proposes investing not in a fixed outcome, but in the creation of strategic opportunities that can be utilised depending on the market situation. In other words, a phased approach is created, with the separate option to continue and expand, or even withdraw from the project altogether.

The very nature of an option allows capital flows to be adjusted in real time, thereby ensuring investment flexibility. This results in flexible, adaptive tools. Depending on whether a company invests in leasing, mobile warehouses or digital platforms, there are various options for adjusting capital flows and responding: either by waiting, maintaining a course towards expansion, or even changing direction or liquidating at any stage to recover part of the liquid value and

minimise significant losses. In other words, real options serve as a tool for implementing the «Just-in-Case» strategy, which focuses on «just in case» scenarios and ensures reliability and strategic resilience, thereby creating an opportunity not only to survive but also to capitalise on uncertainty, transforming it into a source of added value. And this creates a platform for the «Build Back Better» principle, which enables businesses to capitalise on opportunities once the market stabilises, having built up a portfolio of options. Real options therefore offer a way to mitigate the risks of business failure in the current climate, which, unfortunately, is the reality facing Ukrainian businesses.

Another approach that helps maintain the institutional integrity of the system during military operations is organisational agility and decentralisation. Indeed, moving away from a rigid vertical hierarchy and adopting decentralised management models enables an organisation to respond swiftly in unpredictable situations.

The war in Ukraine has compelled businesses to revise their strategies and key operations, as detailed in Table 2.

Table 2. The main advantages and limitations of key concepts in the context of military risks

Strategic parameter	Pre-war strategy (focus on stability)	Military adaptive strategy (focus on resilience)
Objective function	Profit maximisation and market expansion	Maintaining viability and operational continuity
Planning horizon	Medium- and long-term (3–5 years)	Short-term (1–3 months), rolling planning
Key assets	Fixed assets, production capacity	Mobility, digital data, managerial flexibility
Logistics strategy	Just-in-Time (cost and inventory optimisation)	Just-in-Case (reliability and redundancy of chains)
Management decisions	Centralised strategic planning	Decentralised and situational decision-making
Performance criterion	Financial indicators (ROI, profit)	Resilience, speed of response, speed of recovery

Source: compiled by the author using data from [3-8]

The data in the table indicate a fundamental shift in the management paradigm from static stability to dynamic resilience in the context of systemic military risks. This adaptation has been reflected in practice by a change in the logistics system: a shift away from a linear model focused on strict stock minimisation towards a strategy that ensures the system's viability through the duplication of critical supply chains and the creation of strategic buffers.

Changes in methodological approaches involve a shift from deterministic to probabilistic planning. The traditional SWOT analysis should be transformed into a dynamic matrix analysis through the integration of quantitative risk assessment. Furthermore, the classic SWOT analysis often devolves into a mere list of factors, which is simply not enough in conditions of uncertainty. For each threat and opportunity factor, a weighted risk assessment must be calculated:

$$R=P \times I,$$

where *R*- is the level of risk/opportunity,

P -is the probability of the event occurring (0–1),

I -is the impact on the organisation (1–10 points).

This approach enables managers to filter out information ‘noise’ and direct limited resources towards critical areas.

At the same time, the classic PESSTLE analysis is supplemented by monitoring ‘weak signals’ using I. Ansoff’s methodology and the integration of scenario planning. It enables proactive management rather than simply recording figures that have already materialised.

In circumstances where it is impossible to predict the future with certainty (for example, the duration of military operations or fluctuations in exchange rates), strategic analysis must be based on scenario-based options, which are a key component of an adaptive strategy. To this end, at least three scenarios need to be developed. One of these should be an optimistic scenario, aimed at the rapid recovery of markets and access to finance; the second should be a realistic scenario, aimed at stabilising the current trend of threats; and the third should be a pessimistic scenario, in the event of

a deterioration in the security situation and the loss of assets. Each of the three scenarios has its own set of anti-crisis measures, which are immediately triggered upon reaching certain critical thresholds. This is known as a 'modular structure', i.e. a list of measures that can be rapidly activated depending on which scenario unfolds.

Strategic management principles are adapting to effectively navigate the complex BANI environment, where non-linear risks make predicting decision outcomes challenging [6]. The full-scale military invasion has exacerbated the uncertainty facing the Ukrainian economy, prompting a shift in strategic focus from competitive advantages to building the system's dynamic capacity to rapidly reallocate resources. Even traditional management approaches, developed over many years, are now failing to deliver results because they are designed to operate strictly in accordance with outdated behavioural models. The analysis conducted suggests that it is timely to shift from deterministic planning to probabilistic planning, and that traditional SWOT analysis should be transformed into dynamic matrix analysis through the introduction of quantitative risk assessment.

An important aspect of adaptation is the introduction of the concept of real options. This means that a company invests not in a large, indivisible project, but in creating opportunities that can be exploited in the future if conditions are favourable, or abandoned with minimal losses.

Discussion. The research conducted suggests that, given the high levels of uncertainty and risk characteristic of Ukraine's current economic situation, traditional deterministic models of strategic analysis lose their predictive capacity under systemic, exogenous military-economic shocks.

Consequently, the transition from linear planning to probabilistic and scenario-based modeling represents not merely a tactical tool for crisis response, but a fundamental stage in designing an entirely new form of business architecture. The additive synthesis of its four core components - digitalization for online operationality, organizational mobility for rapid asset relocation and structural changes, proactivity for anticipatory management, and depth of transformations to measure the scale of internal reconfigurations - effectively eliminates subjectivity in resilience assessment.

A specific feature of this methodology is the dynamic escalation of weights for mobility and proactivity under wartime conditions, which aligns with the dual-crisis concept established by Kaminsky and Reinhart, who proved that the velocity of environmental degradation requires an asymmetric amplification of a system's speed and anticipatory capabilities.

When comparing these findings with traditional strategic approaches, it becomes evident that conventional methods favor a deterministic, linear, and long-term planning horizon focused heavily on financial optimization, margin preservation, and a rigid vertical hierarchy. Conversely, the proposed adaptive paradigm shifts the corporate structure toward flexible, short-term scenario planning, decentralized management via autonomous teams, and a strategic view that treats uncertainty as a source of innovation rather than just a risk to minimize. This fundamental transition is best exemplified by the move away from the traditional Just-in-Time logistics philosophy, which prioritizes cost reduction and minimal inventory, toward a Just-in-Case reliability framework.

While conventional financial theories suggest that maintaining deliberate resource redundancies - such as autonomous power generation, duplicated infrastructure nodes, and strategic raw material stocks - depresses the current return on capital, retrospective analysis of Interpipe's operations proves that under severe exogenous shock, the costs of maintaining a strategic buffer act as a necessary premium for systemic survival.

Furthermore, replacing the obsolete linear planning paradigm with the recursive management cycle of "Sense-Assess-Option-Act-Learn" transitions the enterprise into a dynamic, self-organizing system.

Concurrently, the Ukrainian experience introduces unprecedented elements to classic crisis management literature. The migration of corporate IT architecture to cloud environments effectively mitigated geographical risks of physical asset destruction, allowing management continuity to remain intact even during physical relocation. However, the study identifies certain ambiguities and

potential limitations that require scientific recognition. First, a profound information asymmetry and reporting lag exist, as a significant portion of long-term financial consequences and material losses, particularly in temporarily occupied or frontline territories, remains unquantifiable and cannot be fully reflected in balance sheets until the active phase of the conflict concludes. This introduces legal and economic uncertainty when calculating the transformation depth component. Second, because the model was validated using a large industrial enterprise with substantial initial capital and export revenues, the replication of a Just-in-Case surplus strategy may prove financially impossible for small and medium-sized enterprises, which are more frequently forced to adopt reactive-defensive survival models. Third, while decentralizing authority to autonomous cross-functional teams during the Decide & Act phase demonstrates high efficiency during acute crises, prolonged decentralization without rigid corporate oversight risks distorting long-term strategic goals and increasing agency costs, thereby requiring a dynamic re-balancing of the management vertical during periods of relative stabilization.

In light of these limitations, prospective avenues for future scientific inquiry should focus on developing differentiated weighting scales within the indicator to accommodate the limited financial capacities of smaller business systems, and applying econometric counterfactual analysis, such as difference-in-differences methods on panel data, to mathematically isolate the impact of internal adaptive strategies from external macroeconomic stabilization factors. Ultimately, because modern international standards, including the ISO 31000 risk management guidelines, do not contain specific protocols for coping with high-intensity conventional warfare, synthesizing the unique experience of Ukrainian enterprises into a normative crisis model can make a significant contribution to global methodology. This framework provides a rigorous theoretical foundation for the long-term postwar reconstruction of the national economy under the international Build Back Better principle, where continuous adaptability and systemic resilience are recognized as the core prerequisites for sustainable industrial development.

The research conducted suggests that, given the high levels of uncertainty and risk characteristic of Ukraine's current economic situation, traditional methods of strategic analysis require significant modification. A key aspect of this adaptation is the shift from deterministic planning to probabilistic and scenario-based planning. Based on the findings, it is recommended that enterprises implement dynamic SWOT analysis with a quantitative assessment of risks and use scenario planning as a core decision-making tool, which will ensure strategic flexibility and enhance the resilience of the business to external shocks. Furthermore, the evidence demonstrates that the adaptation of strategic analysis tools - driven by the military-economic crisis - has ceased to be a purely technical process of adjusting plans.

Today, it acts as a catalyst for designing a fundamentally new, flexible form of business organization, which involves the creation of dynamic business systems characterized by a high degree of internal diversification and decentralisation, enabling them not merely to passively withstand, but to effectively absorb the destructive energy of exogenous challenges, thereby minimising losses and maintaining viability. Above all, this new architectural configuration enables businesses not merely to adapt, but to capitalise on uncertainty, transforming it into a source of investment and competitive advantage. In this way, a paradigm of reliability is created, underpinned by the established surplus of resources and the decentralisation of management decisions.

Ultimately, the investigation identifies the key pillars of a business system's resilience to include operational and logistical resilience, achieved through the creation of autonomous power sources, redundant nodes, and strategic raw material stocks, financial resilience, maintained through ultra-short budget cycles with weekly or ten-day planning, as well as the preservation of human capital and digital resilience to mitigate geographic risks.

Conclusions. The study conducted allows us to draw the following conclusions. Firstly, Ukrainian businesses have demonstrated considerable institutional resilience and a high capacity for adaptation in the context of armed conflict, maintaining operational continuity, retaining their positions in key markets and continuing to invest even amidst unprecedented external shocks.

Secondly, the introduction of an integrated adaptability index enables objective monitoring of transformational processes in real time.

Thirdly, the transition from a linear planning paradigm to a recursive management mechanism based on the 'Sense-Assess-Option-Act-Learn' cycle has been a key factor in maintaining business viability. The formation of a dynamic portfolio of flexible real options instead of a single rigid plan, and the deliberate decentralisation of decision-making, enable a radical reduction in response times to security and logistical threats, transforming environmental uncertainty into a source of innovation.

Fourthly, the successful transformation of a company's logistics and production philosophy – from the concept of cost minimisation (Just-in-Time) to the paradigm of reliability (Just-in-Case) – is the most significant indicator of the development of long-term resilience. The creation of a 'strategic buffer' through the maintenance of a justified surplus of resources, such as autonomous power generation, redundant nodes, raw material reserves, and the transition to ultra-short financial cycles, enables enterprises to mitigate critical geographical and infrastructural risks.

References

1. Ansoff, I. (1975). Managing strategic surprise by next of weak signals. *California Management Review*, 18(2), 21-33. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/41164635>
2. Chykurkova, A. D., Fedirets, O. V., Pokotytska, N. V., & Tiutiunnyk, V. V. (2025). Applying scenario planning to improve the effectiveness of strategic management under uncertainty. *Actual Problems of Economics*, 5(287), 390–402. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32752/1993-6788-2025-1-287-390-402> [in Ukrainian]
3. Courtney, H., Kirkland, J., & Viguerie, P. (1997). Strategy under uncertainty. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(6), 67–79. URL: <https://hbr.org/1997/11/strategy-under-uncertainty>
4. Hamel, G., & Välikangas, L. (2003). The quest for resilience. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(9), 52–63. URL: <https://hbr.org/2003/09/the-quest-for-resilience>
5. Kotvytskyi, A. Yu. (2026). Strategic adaptation of enterprise marketing to conditions of economic uncertainty. *Academic Visions*, (51). URL: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19057654> [in Ukrainian]
6. Kozenkov, D. Ye., Kaut, O. V., & Shportko, G. Yu. (2026). Adaptive management strategies in modern business systems. *Economic Space*, (211), 164–171. URL: <https://doi.org/10.30838/EP.211.164-171> [in Ukrainian]
7. Olshanskyi, O. V., Maslosh, O. V., & Kasatkina, M. V. (2025). Methodology for adapting management decisions for agro-industrial enterprises in times of crisis. *Bulletin of the Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University*, 3(289), 110–119. URL: <https://doi.org/10.33216/1998-7927-2025-289-3-110-119> [in Ukrainian]
8. Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. Free Press.
9. Saaty, T. L. (2008). Decision making with the analytic hierarchy process. *International Journal of Services Sciences*, 1(1), 83–98. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSSCI.2008.017590>
10. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z)
11. Geets, V. M. (2022). Ukraine's economy under conditions of war and post-war recovery. *Economy of Ukraine*, (5), 3–15. [in Ukrainian]
12. Heets, V. M. (2020). *The phenomenon of instability – a challenge to economic development*. National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, SO "Institute for Economics and Forecasting of NAS of Ukraine". Kyiv. Retrieved from: <https://akademperiodyka.org.ua/uk/books/heyets/> [in Ukrainian]
13. Kutsyk, P., Medynska, T., Koriahin, M., & Bodnariuk, I. (2025). Activities of state enterprises: Financial and strategic aspects. *Economy and Society*, (78). URL: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2025-78-51> [in Ukrainian]
14. Nosan, N., Borysenko, O., & Nazarenko, T. (2024). Crisis management and strategic development of enterprises during the war period. *Economy and Society*, (68). URL: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2024-68-18> [in Ukrainian]
15. Ovodov, D. A., & Bondarenko, V. M. (2024). Strategic development of entrepreneurship under martial law: Challenges and prospects. *Scientific Bulletin of Uzhhorod National University. Series: International Economic Relations and the World Economy*, 1(63), 194–200. URL: <https://doi.org/10.24144/2409-6857> [in Ukrainian]
16. Datsiuk, A., Protsak, K., & Horodnia, T. (2024). Business adaptation in war conditions: Levels and tools. *Economy and Society*, (67). URL: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2024-67-8> [in Ukrainian]
17. Mun, J. (2002). *Real options analysis: Tools and techniques for valuing strategic investments and decisions*. John Wiley & Sons.
18. Myers, C. (1977). Determinants of corporate borrowing. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 5(2), 147-175.
19. Schoemaker, P. J. H. (1995). Scenario planning: A tool for strategic thinking. *Sloan Management Review*, 36(2), 25-40.

Received: 28.12.2025

Accepted: 05.05.2026

Received after review: 12.04.2026

Published: 30.06.2026

Authors Contribution: All authors have contributed equally to this work

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest

Петрикiва Ольга

кандидат економічних наук, доцент,
ННІ «Каразінський банківський інститут»
Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна
майдан Свободи, 4, м. Харків, 61022, Україна
e-mail: o.petrykiva@karazin.ua
ORCID ID: [0000-0002-7169-8667](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7169-8667)

Долгов Денис

студент (другий рівень вищої освіти),
ННІ «Каразінський банківський інститут»
Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна
майдан Свободи, 4, м. Харків, 61022, Україна
e-mail: denys.dolhov@student.karazin.ua

Адаптація інструментарію стратегічного аналізу для забезпечення корпоративної стійкості в умовах високих ризиків та невизначеності

Анотація. Стаття присвячена дослідженню проблем застосування класичних інструментів стратегічного аналізу в умовах високого рівня невизначеності та воєнних ризиків.

Постановка проблеми. Сучасні умови ведення бізнесу в Україні характеризуються екстремальним рівнем невизначеності, спричиненим воєнними діями, фізичним руйнуванням інфраструктури та критичними розривами логістичних ланцюгів. Традиційні підходи стратегічного управління, що десятиліттями базувалися на принципах стабільності та лінійної екстраполяції досвіду, виявилися неспроможними забезпечити життєздатність підприємств у поточному середовищі. Таким чином, виникає гостра потреба в адаптації класичного інструментарію стратегічного аналізу шляхом інтеграції кількісної оцінки ризиків та механізмів сценарного планування для забезпечення стійкості бізнесу в умовах системних воєнних викликів

Невирішені аспекти проблеми. Недостатньо вивченим залишається питання розробки інтегрованих моделей адаптивного управління, які б поєднували стратегічне бачення з механізмами оперативної корекції рішень у режимі реального часу.

Мета статті. Обґрунтування теоретико-методологічних засад адаптивного стратегічного управління та визначення практичних інструментів для забезпечення стійкості підприємств в умовах воєнного конфлікту.

Виклад основного матеріалу. Доведено необхідність переходу від традиційного лінійного планування до гнучких проактивних стратегій. Обґрунтовано зміну парадигми з концепції ефективності «Just-in-Time» (якраз вчасно) на концепцію надійності «Just-in-Case» (на всякий випадок), що передбачає створення стратегічних буферів та дублювання критичних вузлів. Запропоновано трансформацію SWOT-аналізу у динамічну матрицю з кількісною оцінкою ризиків.

Висновки. В умовах війни традиційні моделі втрачають прогностичну цінність. Вживання та подальше відновлення бізнесу залежить від здатності впроваджувати рекурсивні цикли управління та децентралізувати прийняття рішень для швидкого реагування на «слабкі сигнали» середовища.

Ключові слова: стратегічний аналіз, невизначеність, ризик-менеджмент, SWOT-аналіз, сценарійне планування, стратегічна гнучкість, антикризове управління, воєнний стан.

Формули: 1; рис.: 0; табл.: 2; бібл.: 16.

Класифікація JEL: H25; H61; F23.

Для цитування: Petrykiva Olha, Dolhov Denys. Adapting strategic analysis frameworks for corporate resilience in high-risk and uncertain environments. *Фінансово-кредитні системи: перспективи розвитку*. №2(21) 2026. С. 63-72. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2786-4995-2026-2-05>

Список літератури

1. Ansoff I. Managing strategic surprise by next of weak signals. *California Management Review*. 1975. Vol. 18(2). P. 21–33. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/41164635>
2. Застосування сценарійного планування для підвищення ефективності стратегічного управління в умовах невизначеності / А. Д. Чикуркова та ін. *Актуальні проблеми економіки*. 2025. № 5(287). С. 390–402. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32752/1993-6788-2025-1-287-390-402>
3. Courtney H., Kirkland J., Viguerie P. Strategy under uncertainty. *Harvard Business Review*. 1997. Vol. 75(6). P. 67–79.
4. Hamel G., Välikangas L. The quest for resilience. *Harvard Business Review*. 2003. Vol. 81(9). P. 52–63.
5. Котвицький А. Ю. Стратегічна адаптація маркетингу підприємств до умов економічної невизначеності. *Академічні візії*. 2026. № 51. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19057654>.
6. Козенков Д. Є., Каут О. В., Шпортко Г. Ю. Адаптивні стратегії управління в сучасних бізнес-системах. *Економічний простір*. 2026. № 211. С. 164–171. URL: <https://doi.org/10.30838/EP.211.164-171>
7. Ольшанський О. В., Маслош О. В., Касаткіна М. В. Методологія адаптації управлінських рішень для агропромислових підприємств в умовах криз. *Вісник Східноукраїнського національного університету імені Володимира Даля*. 2025. № 3(289). С. 110–119. URL: <https://doi.org/10.33216/1998-7927-2025-289-3-110-119>

8. Porter M. E. Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors. Free Press, 1980. 396 p.
 9. Saaty T. L. Decision making with the analytic hierarchy process. *International Journal of Services Sciences*. 2008. Vol. 1(1). P. 83–98. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSSCI.2008.017590>
 10. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7)
 11. Геєць В. М. Економіка України в умовах війни та повоєнного відновлення. *Економіка України*. 2022. № 5. С. 3–15.
 12. Геєць В. М. Феномен нестабільності – виклик економічному розвитку. Київ : НАН України, ДУ «Ін-т економіки та прогнозування НАН України», 2020. 456 с.
 13. Діяльність державних підприємств: фінансовий та стратегічний аспекти / П. Куцик та ін. *Економіка та Суспільство*. 2025. № 78. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2025-78-51>
 14. Носань Н., Борисенко О., Назаренко Т. Антикризове управління та стратегічний розвиток підприємств у період війни. *Економіка та Суспільство*. 2024. № 68. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2024-68-18>
 15. Оводов Д. А., Бондаренко В. М. Стратегічний розвиток підприємництва в умовах воєнного стану: виклики та перспективи. *Науковий Вісник Ужгородського Національного Університету. Серія: Міжнародні Економічні Відносини та Світове Господарство*. 2024. Вип. 1(63). С. 194–200. URL: <https://doi.org/10.24144/2409-6857>
 16. Дацюк А., Процак К., Городня Т. Адаптація бізнесу в умовах війни: рівні та інструменти. *Економіка та Суспільство*. 2024. № 67. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2024-67-8>
 17. Mun J. Real options analysis: Tools and techniques for valuing strategic investments and decisions. John Wiley & Sons, 2002.
 18. Myers, C. (1977). Determinants of corporate borrowing. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 5(2), 147-175.
 19. Schoemaker, P. J. H. (1995). Scenario planning: A tool for strategic thinking. *Sloan Management Review*, 36(2), 25-40.
- Стаття надійшла до редакції 28.12.2025
Стаття надійшла після рецензування 12.04.2026
- Статтю рекомендовано до друку 05.05.2026
Статтю опубліковано 30.06.2026

Внесок авторів: всі автори зробили рівний внесок у цю роботу

Конфлікт інтересів: автори повідомляють про відсутність конфлікту інтересів