Frontline Marketing, Management and Economics Journal
ISSN: 2752-700X

Issues Of Improving The Development Of Enterprise Development Strategies

Isayeva Nargiza Xamidovna

Associate Professor at the Department of Economics at the University of Science and Technology, Uzbekistan

A R T I C L E   I N f O

Article history:
Submission Date: 27 October 2025
Accepted Date: 18 November 2025
Published Date: 23 December 2025
VOLUME: Vol.05 Issue12
Page No. 25-30
DOI: -
https://doi.org/10.37547/marketing-fmmej-05-12-03

A B S T R A C T

Companies are more and more working in environments where demand is unpredictable, technology is changing quickly, supply chains are weak, capital is limited, and regulatory and stakeholder expectations are higher. In these circumstances, the formulation of enterprise development strategies cannot be confined to the creation of a formal plan; it must operate as a management system that integrates diagnosis, strategic selection, capability enhancement, resource distribution, and execution oversight. This article looks at problems that keep coming up that make enterprise development strategies less effective and harder to put into action. These problems include analytical bias, weak problem framing, confusion between operational effectiveness and strategy, inadequate capability-based design, insufficient integration of innovation and risk disciplines, and failure to turn strategic intent into measurable execution logic. This paper presents an integrated process logic for enhancing strategy development, utilizing a conceptual synthesis of strategic management literature and commonly employed strategy execution methodologies. The suggested viewpoint stresses disciplined trade-offs, aligning capabilities through a dynamic capabilities lens, managing uncertainty in a structured way through scenarios and risk-informed governance, and making sure that strategy and performance are linked in a clear way. The article provides a structured improvement agenda for businesses that want to close the gap between planning and execution and make their strategies more flexible without losing coherence.

Keywords: Enterprise development strategy; strategic management; competitive positioning; dynamic capabilities; strategic agility; scenario planning; innovation management; risk management; performance management.

INTRODUCTION

As competition becomes less predictable and more structurally complex, the subject of enhancing the formulation of enterprise development strategies has regained significance. Businesses face not only the usual competitive pressures, like price wars and product substitutions, but also new challenges brought on by digitalization, platform business models, data-driven competition, and quick changes in what customers want. In many fields, an organization's ability to adapt faster than its competitors, reorganize its resources, and put new ideas into action on a large scale is becoming more and more important. The quality of the strategy development process becomes a strategic resource in and of itself as a result. The company that can consistently identify change, make logical strategic decisions, and carry them out through coordinated action is better able to keep up with development paths when things are uncertain.

Nonetheless, numerous enterprise strategies falter prematurely due to inherent deficiencies in their development processes. A common pattern is that making a strategy turns into a planning exercise that happens every so often and is meant to create a document for internal approval or external signaling. In these situations, strategy is seen as an event instead of a system. In practice, this means that there is often a gap between strategic intention and execution, which shows up in delayed initiatives, broken investments, unrealistic goals, and frequent re-prioritization without clear ways to learn from them. The problem gets worse in companies where governance structures are weak, strategic planning is too centralized, or performance management focuses more on short-term financial goals than on building capabilities.

Another issue is that people don't understand the difference between operational effectiveness and strategy. Companies often focus on making processes more efficient, cutting costs, and improving quality, and then they call these changes "strategy." Operational effectiveness is necessary for long-term differentiation, but it is not enough on its own. Competitors can copy best practices, especially when technologies and processes spread quickly. Strategy, on the other hand, requires decisions that set the business apart, create coherent activity systems, and involve clear trade-offs that stop the business from pursuing conflicting goals at the same time. Without those kinds of choices, "development strategies" often turn into lists of projects instead of unified strategic commitments.

Another big problem is how to deal with uncertainty. A lot of strategy development processes still use just one baseline forecast and assume that things will stay pretty stable. But shocks, like financial crises, geopolitical disruptions, big changes in technology, and sudden changes in rules, have happened a lot in the last few decades. In these situations, the strategic value of a plan is based not only on what it is expected to achieve in one scenario, but also on how well it can handle other possible futures and how well the business can change without losing its way. To improve strategy development, you need to include structured uncertainty management and create organizational routines for strategic learning.

Lastly, relationships with stakeholders are making the enterprise development strategy more limited and more possible. Customers, employees, suppliers, investors, and regulators all have an effect on feasibility. The speed of change depends on how many talented people are available. The concentration of suppliers affects resilience. Regulators have a say in what business models are acceptable and how much it costs to follow the rules. Reputational capital is affected by how the public sees things. If stakeholder constraints are only dealt with after the strategy has been made, the business often finds that the strategy is too expensive or politically impossible to carry out. Better strategy development includes early and clear considerations of stakeholder feasibility and legitimacy.

This article contends that the fundamental challenges in enterprise strategy development are most effectively addressed as a system design issue. Strategy development ought to be regarded as a systematic process with clear criteria for diagnosis, option assessment, trade-off management, capability alignment, risk oversight, and execution translation. The article's goal is to find the main problems that lower the quality of strategy development and suggest a clear way to improve the process so that enterprise development strategies become more unique, realistic, strong, and easy to put into action.

This article employs a conceptual-analytical methodology grounded in the structured synthesis of strategic management theory and strategy execution methodologies. The analysis is structured according to three methodological principles. First, it makes a difference between the content and the process of a strategy. Strategy content is about the choices the business makes about what to do and what not to do. This includes markets, value propositions, and ways to compete. Strategy process is about how a business figures out what's going on around it, weighs its options, makes trade-offs, decides how to use its resources, and makes sure that implementation is controlled. The article is mostly about making the process better, since problems with the process can make even the best strategic ideas fail.

Second, the article brings together different points of view that cover both competitive positioning and capability development. Competitive positioning frameworks elucidate the function of strategic trade-offs and the distinction between operational effectiveness and differentiation. Capability-oriented perspectives, particularly the dynamic capabilities framework, elucidate how organizations maintain competitive advantage amidst evolving circumstances by identifying opportunities and threats, capitalizing on opportunities through resource allocation, and adapting organizational structures and asset bases as required. This integration is used to suggest changes that link strategic goals with what the organization can actually do.

Third, the analysis includes structured methods for managing uncertainty and translating strategy. Scenario planning logic is used to help robustness testing of strategic options and to make assumptions more disciplined when there is uncertainty. To translate, strategy performance management methods, such as multi-perspective performance frameworks, are used to make the causal logic between capabilities, processes, customer outcomes, and financial results clearer. The objective is not to promote a singular tool, but to delineate the functional prerequisites that any enterprise strategy development system must fulfill.

The conceptual synthesis advances by recognizing persistent failure modes, aligning them with corrective principles sourced from literature, and consolidating these principles into a cohesive process logic that can be tailored to the enterprise context. The article is conceptual, so it doesn't give any statistical estimates or experimental results. Instead, it gives a structured list of process improvements backed up by theoretical reasons and widely accepted management practices.

The synthesis pinpoints several persistent challenges that undermine the efficacy of enterprise development strategy formulation and offers a cohesive rationale for enhancement.

The first big problem is that problems are not framed well and diagnoses are not fair. In many businesses, the first step in developing a strategy is to choose a preferred solution, like expanding into new markets, going digital, or diversifying. After that, they look at the environment to see if the direction makes sense. This method creates "solution-driven strategies" that are weak because they don't come from proven strategic problems. Better strategy development needs a strict separation between diagnosis and choice. The diagnosis should focus on making the strategic problem clearer. This means figuring out what factors affect the economy of the industry, how customer value drivers are changing, what moves competitors are likely to make, what limits there are in the company's current cost structure and operational model, and where the company already has or can build unique capabilities.

The second problem is that people get operational improvements and strategic advantage mixed up. Businesses often talk about efficiency programs, cost-cutting measures, and quality initiatives as part of their strategy. These initiatives may be necessary for survival and competitiveness, but they seldom result in enduring differentiation unless integrated into a unique activity system or facilitating a distinctive value proposition. When a business clearly states its competitive logic, such as which customer segments it will focus on, what value proposition it will offer, how it will stand out, and what trade-offs it will make, it makes developing a strategy easier. The discipline of trade-offs is very important because businesses that try to serve all segments with all value propositions often end up making choices that aren't consistent, investing less, and performing worse.

A third problem is that there isn't enough capability grounding. A lot of development plans are based on financial forecasts and lists of investments, and internal analysis only looks at how much money is currently being made and how many resources are available. But strategies work or don't work based on what the business can do, like its routines, how it's set up, the skills of its employees, and how well it can change how it uses its resources. To make strategy development better, you need to do a capability audit that looks at both current strengths and capability gaps, how long it will take to close them, and what changes need to be made to the organization to keep new ways of working going. A capability-based strategy makes it clear which capabilities will be the most important, which will come from partnerships, and which will be put on the back burner.

Fourth, there isn't enough integration of new ideas into the process of making strategies. People often think of innovation as a separate thing to do instead of a way to plan for growth. Because of this, business strategies become cautious and slow, focusing on efficiency instead of change. When innovation is treated as a portfolio with clear rules for choosing, funding, and scaling, strategy development gets better. The development strategy should say how the business will find a balance between using its current products and processes and looking for new ones, technologies, and business models. Without this balance, businesses will see short-term improvements in performance followed by long-term vulnerability to disruption.

The fifth problem is that uncertainty and risk are not handled well. A lot of strategies are made with unspoken ideas about how demand will grow, how exchange rates will change, how input prices will change, or how stable regulations will be. When these assumptions are wrong, strategies fall apart, and companies react in an unplanned way instead of adapting in a planned way. When a business clearly lists its most important assumptions, finds the uncertainties that matter most, and tests strategic options across likely scenarios, it can come up with better strategies. Strong strategies have contingency triggers and pre-planned response options. This cuts down on reaction time during shocks and stops reallocations that are based on panic.

The sixth problem is that there isn't a clear way to go from strategy to action. Even when the strategic direction is good, businesses often don't turn it into coordinated projects, measurable goals, and governance routines. This leads to projects that are not well-organized, priorities that are not clear, and performance measurement that does not follow strategic movement. When a business turns its strategic goals into an execution logic that shows how investments in capabilities, process improvements, customer outcomes, and financial performance are all related, it makes strategy development better. A governance model should go along with the strategy. This model should spell out who has the right to make decisions, how resources will be allocated, how different departments will work together, and how often progress will be reviewed and assumptions will be changed.

These issues suggest that enhancing strategy development is not merely about augmenting analysis but rather about fostering analytical rigor, elucidating trade-offs, anchoring decisions in capabilities, and establishing governance frameworks that guarantee implementation consistency.

The issues discussed in the results section can be seen as signs of a bigger problem: a lot of businesses see strategy development as a way to document things instead of as a skill that the whole company should have. This perspective elucidates the reason strategies are frequently ambitious yet inadequately executable. The company's strategic capacity depends on how well it can sense changes in markets and technologies, weigh its options, make trade-offs, move resources around, and stick to its plans. To make strategy development better, the strategy process needs to be redesigned on purpose as an enterprise management system.

One of the main ways to make things better is to make trade-offs clear. Companies often feel pressure from within to meet the needs of many stakeholders at once, which leads to strategies that don't make clear choices. But strategy needs to be prioritized. A strategy for enterprise development should clearly state what will not be prioritized, as well as the domain of competition, the value proposition, and the main sources of advantage. This doesn't mean ignoring secondary opportunities; it just means making sure that resources are used wisely and that the organization doesn't have to go after goals that don't work together. Trade-off clarity also makes it less likely that "strategy drift" will happen, which is when a company slowly adds initiatives that make sense on their own but don't fit together.

Capability-based design is another principle of improvement. Development strategies often presume that the organization can implement new business models, penetrate new segments, or embrace new technologies without substantial alterations to organizational routines and talent profiles. In practice, execution needs more than just spending money; it also needs learning processes, leadership alignment, and sometimes even changes to the structure of the organization. A capability-based approach makes a clear link between strategic goals and the skills needed to reach them. The business can then better judge how possible, how to order, and how much money it needs to invest. This method is especially important for digital transformation projects where success depends on data governance, analytics, cybersecurity, and collaboration between different departments, not just getting new software.

A third principle for improvement is strategic agility based on governance, not making things up as you go along. Companies often change their priorities a lot when things get tough. This is called "agility," but it is often a sign of weak strategic discipline. Real strategic agility means having a clear direction, being able to quickly learn new things, and being able to move resources around as needed. To do this, you need governance routines that let you make quick decisions and move resources around, as well as a clear idea of what a strategic trigger is. Scenario-based thinking helps with this by showing how different futures could play out and making it clear what early signs would mean that a certain scenario is becoming more likely. The strategy then becomes a set of conditional promises instead of a single, strict path.

A fourth principle for improvement is to include new ideas and risk thinking in the strategy cycle. Innovation shouldn't be a separate topic for a research unit to talk about. It should be connected to strategic goals and how to create value. Risk management should not only be about compliance reporting; it should also help with strategic choices, the order in which investments are made, and decisions about how to be resilient. By making sure that opportunity and downside exposure are looked at together, adding these functions to strategy development makes decisions better. In practice, this means that strategic options should be judged not only by how much money they are likely to make, but also by how sensitive they are to key assumptions and how well the business can reduce risks.

A fifth principle for improvement is turning strategy into execution architecture. The gap between formulation and execution often happens because strategies are stated as broad goals instead of specific commitments that can be acted on. Companies get better at making strategies when they make a clear link between strategic goals and initiatives, milestones, and measurable results in many areas. Financial results are important, but they usually come after other signs. Companies also need leading indicators to see if they are building their capabilities, changing their processes, and improving their customer outcomes. A multi-perspective logic mitigates the risk of "financial myopia," wherein short-term outcomes are prioritized over long-term advancement.

Institutionalized learning is the sixth principle of improvement. Strategies that are made once a year and only checked by how well they work with the budget tend to become outdated quickly and don't show what was learned from putting them into action. Companies make it easier to come up with strategies by setting up a review schedule that keeps operational performance reviews separate from strategic reviews. Operational reviews keep track of how things are going and how problems are solved. Strategic reviews look at assumptions again, look at how the competition is changing, look at how well the portfolio is doing, and decide if resources should be moved around. This difference in governance keeps operational noise from drowning out strategy and makes sure that strategy is always based on evidence.

These principles indicate that enhancing enterprise development strategies necessitates a transformation in managerial practice, transitioning from “planning as a product” to “strategy development as a capability.” An enterprise that commits to rigorous diagnosis, clear decision-making, capability enhancement, and governance practices elevates the likelihood that its development strategy will be both resilient and executable.

Fundamentally, enhancing the development of enterprise strategies is more about process and governance than just analysis. Enterprises frequently encounter persistent challenges, including biased diagnosis, conflation of operational effectiveness with strategy, insufficient capability grounding, inadequate integration of innovation and risk disciplines, and ineffective translation of strategy into execution logic. To solve these problems, strategy development needs to be seen as an enterprise management system that connects sensing the environment, making strategic choices, setting capability goals, managing uncertainty, and translating performance. When businesses change the way they make strategies in this way, they close the gap between making and carrying out plans, make themselves more resilient in the face of uncertainty, and improve their ability to keep development paths going over time. Future research can enhance this conceptual model by investigating the impact of strategy process maturity on development outcomes across various industries, organizational sizes, and levels of turbulence.

REFERENCES

1. Porter M. E. Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors. New York: Free Press, 1980. 396 p.
2. Porter M. E. What Is Strategy? // Harvard Business Review. 1996. Vol. 74, No. 6. P. 61–78.

3. Barney J. B. Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage // Journal of Management. 1991. Vol. 17, No. 1. P. 99–120.
4. Teece D. J., Pisano G., Shuen A. Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management // Strategic Management Journal. 1997. Vol. 18, No. 7. P. 509–533.
5. Eisenhardt K. M., Martin J. A. Dynamic Capabilities: What Are They? // Strategic Management Journal. 2000. Vol. 21, No. 10–11. P. 1105–1121.
6. Teece D. J. Business Models and Dynamic Capabilities // Long Range Planning. 2018. Vol. 51, No. 1. P. 40–49.
7. Kaplan R. S., Norton D. P. The Balanced Scorecard: Measures That Drive Performance // Harvard Business Review. 1992. Vol. 70, No. 1. P. 71–79.
8. Kaplan R. S., Norton D. P. Using the Balanced Scorecard as a Strategic Management System // Harvard Business Review. 1996. No. 1. P. 75–85.
9. Ansoff H. I. Corporate Strategy: An Analytic Approach to Business Policy for Growth and Expansion. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965. 241 p.
10. Freeman R. E. Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Boston: Pitman, 1984. 276 p.
11. Schoemaker P. J. H. Scenario Planning: A Tool for Strategic Thinking // Sloan Management Review. 1995. Vol. 36, No. 2. P. 25–40.
12. Kotter J. P. Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail // Harvard Business Review. 1995. No. 3. P. 59–67.
13. Doz Y. L., Kosonen M. The Dynamics of Strategic Agility // California Management Review. 2008. Vol. 50, No. 3. P. 95–118.
14. Bharadwaj A., El Sawy O. A., Pavlou P. A., Venkatraman N. Digital Business Strategy: Toward a Next Generation of Insights // MIS Quarterly. 2013. Vol. 37, No. 2. P. 471–482.
15. Kim W. C., Mauborgne R. Blue Ocean Strategy: How to Create Uncontested Market Space and Make the Competition Irrelevant. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2005. 240 p.
16. ISO 56002:2019. Innovation Management — Innovation Management System — Guidance. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization, 2019.
17. ISO 31000:2018. Risk Management — Guidelines. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization, 2018.
18. Виханский О. С. Стратегическое управление: учебник для вузов. 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. М.: Гардарики, 2003. 296 с.