

Meaning as a Coordination Mechanism: A Philosophical-Cognitive Model of Strategic Action

UDC 165:159.955:005.21:351

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15421/172691>**Ivanova Svitlana¹**Ph.D., Assoc. Prof., <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9065-8687>, isaivanova2014@gmail.com**Anpilohov Artem²**Ph.D. Student, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-8673-4285>, anpilaartem@gmail.com¹ Oles Honchar Dnipropetrovsk National University (Dnipro, Ukraine)² Dnipro University of Technology (Dnipro, Ukraine)

Abstract

In the context of information overload and the increasing complexity of social systems, the key problem is not a lack of data, but a lack of mechanisms for interpreting it and transforming it into the basis for coordinated action. Information overload exacerbates cognitive overload, reduces the quality of managerial decisions, and leads to a state of decision paralysis, in which the presence of a large volume of information does not ensure strategic choice and sustainable development.

The aim of this article is to provide a philosophical-cognitive interpretation of Meaning as a mechanism of sense-making that facilitates the transition from information to coordination and action, as well as to justify its role as a fundamental element of the Strategic Capacity model.

It is argued that Meaning should be viewed not as the semantic meaning of a message, but as a mechanism for organizing experience, reducing complexity, aligning interpretations, and initiating joint action. In the Strategic Capacity model ($SC = \text{Meaning} \times \text{Trust} \times \text{Horizon} - \text{Limits}$), Meaning serves as the primary component, since neither trust nor the formation of a strategic horizon is possible without a semantic structure.

An interpretation of the internal structure of Meaning is proposed through a meaning-formation formula, demonstrating the dependence of strategic feasibility on the level of information noise and the multiplicity of interpretations.

Prospects for further research involve deepening the philosophical and epistemological foundation of the category of Meaning and its operationalization in strategic management.

The study concludes that there is a need to transition from information management to meaning management, where the system's ability to organize collective understanding becomes the primary condition for sustainable development and strategic decision-making. The key factor in strategic development is not the volume of resources, but the ability to form a stable semantic structure that ensures coordinated action and the possibility of generating something new.

Keywords: philosophy of cognition, meaning, meaning formation, strategic management, strategic capability, public administration, coordination

Meaning як механізм координації: філософсько-когнітивна модель стратегічної діяльності

Іванова Світлана¹, Анпілогов Артем²¹Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара²Національний технічний університет «Дніпровська політехніка» (Дніпро, Україна)

Анотація.

У контексті інформаційного перевантаження та зростаючої складності соціальних систем ключовою проблемою є не брак даних, а відсутність механізмів їх інтерпретації та перетворення на основу для скоординованих дій. Інформаційне перевантаження посилює когнітивне перевантаження, знижує якість управлінських рішень і призводить до стану «паралічу прийняття рішень», коли наявність великого обсягу інформації не гарантує стратегічного вибору та сталого розвитку.

Метою цієї статті є надання філософсько-когнітивної інтерпретації Значення як механізму створення сенсу, що сприяє переходу від інформації до координації та дій, а також обґрунтування його ролі як фундаментального елементу моделі Стратегічної спроможності.

Стверджується, що Значення слід розглядати не як семантичний зміст повідомлення, а як механізм організації досвіду, зменшення складності, узгодження інтерпретацій та ініціювання спільних дій. У моделі стратегічної спроможності ($SC = \text{Сенс} \times \text{Довіра} \times \text{Горизонт} - \text{Обмеження}$) Сенс виступає як основний компонент, оскільки без семантичної структури неможливі ні довіра, ні формування стратегічного горизонту.

Пропонується інтерпретація внутрішньої структури Сенсу через формулу формування сенсу, що демонструє залежність стратегічної здійсненності від рівня інформаційного шуму та множинності інтерпретацій.

Перспективи подальших досліджень полягають у поглибленні філософських та епістемологічних засад категорії «Сенс» та її операціоналізації в стратегічному менеджменті.

У дослідженні зроблено висновок про необхідність переходу від управління інформацією до управління сенсом, де здатність системи організовувати колективне розуміння стає основною умовою сталого розвитку та прийняття стратегічних рішень. Ключовим фактором стратегічного розвитку є не обсяг ресурсів, а здатність формувати стабільну семантичну структуру, що забезпечує скоординовані дії та можливість генерування чогось нового.

Ключові слова: філософія пізнання, сенс, формування сенсу, стратегічне управління, стратегічний потенціал, державне управління, координація

Стаття надійшла / Article arrived: 11.03.2026 // Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 23.03.2026 // Підписано до друку / Approved for printing: 13.04.2026

Introduction.

Contemporary society is characterized not by a shortage of information, but, on the contrary, by its abundance. The growth of digital data flows, the acceleration of communication processes, the expansion of data transmission channels, and the constantly increasing complexity of social systems have led to a situation in which the mere presence of information no longer guarantees the quality of understanding or the effectiveness of decision-making. Information overload creates a paradoxical situation: the more data becomes available, the more difficult it becomes to identify what is significant, maintain a coherent perception, and ensure coordinated action.

Under conditions of high uncertainty, this leads to the phenomenon of decision paralysis – a state in which an individual or system possesses a significant amount of information but is unable to transform it into a strategic decision. A crisis of understanding arises: the problem is no longer access to data, but the lack of mechanisms for interpreting, structuring, and transforming it into the basis for collective action.

In this context, the category of Meaning takes on particular relevance, understood not as some linguistic meaning or element of semantics, but as a mechanism of meaning-making that ensures the transition from information to the ability to carry out coordination and action. Meaning functions as the system's ability to identify what is significant, form stable cognitive constructs, and ensure coherence between perception, interpretation, and practice.

The theoretical basis for this approach can be found in philosophy, where thinking is viewed as a form of organizing collective experience. Furthermore, cognition is not a passive reflection of objective reality, but rather an active structuring of a complex world to enable collective action. It is precisely this logic that allows us to rethink modern management: it is not information per se that governs the system, but the ability to give meaning to information that is crucial for organizational impact.

This framework takes on particular significance in management research, where it is becoming increasingly evident that sustainable development is determined not only by resources but also by the quality of the system's semantic organization. This allowed for the integration of the category of Meaning into the Strategic Capacity model (Anpilohov, 2026): $SC = \text{Meaning} \times \text{Trust} \times \text{Horizon} - \text{Limits}$, where Meaning serves as the primary condition for strategic capacity, since without a semantic structure, neither trust in the future nor the formation of a long-term decision horizon is possible.

Thus, there is a need for a philosophical-cognitive interpretation of Meaning as a coordination mechanism that explains how systems transition from information to action and why meaning-making specifically becomes the foundation of strategic management.

The aim of this article is to study Meaning as a

coordination mechanism and the development of a philosophical-cognitive model of strategic action, as well as in refining cognitive approaches to meaning-making within the Strategic Capacity model.

Literature Review. The study of the category of Meaning requires drawing on several academic traditions: the philosophy of knowledge, cognitive psychology, organizational theory, and strategic management.

The philosophical foundations for understanding Meaning as an organizational mechanism trace back to the works of Alexander Bogdanov (1873–1928). In Empiriomonism (Bogdanov, 2019), he views thinking as a specific form of organizing collective experience, and cognition as a tool for ordering reality to ensure joint action. In contrast to the classical opposition between subject and object, Bogdanov shows that knowledge arises not as a reflection of a ready-made world, but as a means of coordinating practice. Reality is understood not as a collection of things, but as a system of relations and organizational connections. This position became an important prerequisite for the further development of systems thinking and organizational theory.

Similar ideas are found in the philosophy of Martin Heidegger, where understanding is linked to the unfolding of being and going beyond a mere description of what exists (Heidegger, 1971). In Immanuel Kant's philosophy, productive imagination functions as a mechanism for constituting experience (Kant, 2000), while in Gilles Deleuze's work, creativity is understood as the production of difference and a move beyond given structures (Deleuze, 1994). These approaches allow us to view Meaning not as a secondary interpretation, but as a primary condition for the emergence of the new.

In cognitive psychology, the problem of meaning-making is linked to the processes of processing experience and reducing complexity. L. S. Vygotsky views creativity as the transformation of elements of experience into new combinations, mediated by culture and imagination (Vygotsky, 2004). J. Piaget links the formation of new meaning structures to the restructuring of cognitive schemas (Piaget, 1970). J. Guilford and E. de Bono emphasize divergent and lateral thinking as tools for going beyond standard models of interpretation (Guilford, 1967; De Bono, 1992).

In management research, the category of "Meaning" is increasingly viewed as a factor in strategic feasibility. T. Amabile emphasizes the role of intrinsic motivation and the environment in the emergence of creative solutions (Amabile, 1996). M. Csikszentmihalyi links creativity to a state of flow, in which action becomes maximally aligned with the internal structure of meaning (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996). Contemporary research in strategic management shows that the effectiveness of decisions is determined not only by resources but also by the interpretability of the strategy, the level of trust, and the length of the planning horizon.

Despite the significant contributions of these fields,

existing research remains fragmented. Philosophical approaches rarely translate into applied management models, cognitive theories are limited to the analysis of individual thinking, and strategic models often fail to account for the mechanisms of meaning-making as the basis for coordination.

This necessitates an integrative model in which Meaning is viewed as a central condition of strategic action, ensuring the transition from information to coordination and the implementation of decisions.

Theoretical Framework.

1. Meaning in the Philosophy of Organization

The philosophical foundation for understanding the category of Meaning as a mechanism of coordination is provided by A. Bogdanov's (2019) concept. Within the framework of empiriomonism, cognition is interpreted not as a reflection of reality, but as a form of organizing collective experience. According to Bogdanov, thinking structures the chaotic flow of perceptions to ensure joint action and social coordination.

Thus, knowledge becomes not a "mirror" of the world, but a tool for organizing complexity and integrating individual practices into a unified system (Bogdanov, 2019).

Thus, thinking primarily fulfills an organizational function. It is necessary not for describing reality as such, but for creating stable patterns of interaction with it. Cognition becomes a means of reducing uncertainty and maintaining collective coherence. Consequently, truth is determined not only by correspondence to facts, but also by the stability of collective coordination (Bogdanov, 2019). An important feature of this approach is the understanding of knowledge as a temporal construct. Error is not viewed as a deviation from ultimate truth, but rather as a natural part of the cognitive process. If the environment changes, previous patterns lose their effectiveness, requiring a reconfiguration of meanings, new forms of coordination, and new management models.

This gives rise to Bogdanov's key formula (Bogdanov, 2019): to understand is to organize.

It is precisely this idea that allows us to translate the philosophy of Meaning into a modern management context: Data → Meaning → Coordination → Action.

Here, Meaning is not an interpretation following the receipt of information, but rather the primary condition for the possibility of action.

2. Meaning as a cognitive mechanism

From a cognitive perspective, Meaning can be viewed as a mechanism for reducing complexity, allowing the subject to navigate an excessive and uncertain reality. Human thinking is incapable of handling the full complexity of the world; therefore, it inevitably selects, simplifies, and structures incoming information.

This is precisely the cognitive function of meaning-making: not the accumulation of data, but the identification of what is meaningful. Meaning arises as a result of the organization of perception, when a chaotic stream of

signals is transformed into stable images, schemas, and interpretive models.

L. S. Vygotsky viewed creativity as the reprocessing of elements of experience into new combinations, mediated by culture and imagination (Vygotsky, 2004). The new does not emerge in a vacuum – it is formed through the reconfiguration of existing meaning structures. Imagination serves as a tool for the transition from perception to a new organization of reality.

J. Piaget explains this process through the mechanisms of assimilation and accommodation. The subject either integrates new experience into existing cognitive schemas or is forced to restructure the schemas themselves if the previous models cease to function (Piaget, 1970). Thus, meaning becomes not a static content but a dynamic process of cognitive adaptation.

Images and schemas play a special role as forms of the primary organization of experience. The image precedes the text: first comes a holistic, intuitive grasp of the situation, followed by its rational articulation in concepts, rules, and procedures (Ivanova, 2026). In conditions of uncertainty, it is the image that allows one to navigate where a ready-made normative structure is currently lacking.

This is particularly important for managerial decisions: text captures what has already been mastered, whereas imagery helps us work with a reality that is not yet structured (Ivanova, 2026). In this sense, Meaning represents a transitional zone between the chaos of perception and formalized knowledge.

Thus, meaning-making performs three cognitive functions:

- reduces the complexity of the environment;
- creates stable interpretive frameworks;
- enables the transition from perception to action.

Without this mechanism, information overload does not enhance manageability but instead causes cognitive overload and decision paralysis.

3. Meaning as a Condition for Coordination

If, at the philosophical level, Meaning functions as the organization of experience, and at the cognitive level as a mechanism for reducing complexity, then at the level of social practice it becomes a condition for coordination.

Coordination is impossible without a shared interpretive space. Joint action requires not only the transmission of information but also the alignment of meanings. People may possess the same data but make different decisions if their interpretive models do not coincide.

This is precisely why communication is not the transmission of information, but the alignment of conceptual frameworks. Effective interaction arises only when there is an overlap of semantic fields among participants. Otherwise, information does not translate into action but remains a set of unconnected signals.

This is particularly evident in management systems. A formally correct strategy may prove ineffective if its

participants understand the goals, risks, and rationale for action differently. The absence of a shared Meaning leads to a disconnect between planning and implementation, creating the phenomenon of the “strategy illusion” (Anpilohov, 2026) – a situation where a concept exists but is not put into practice.

Meaning facilitates the transition from individual understanding to collective action through three levels:

- interpretation of the situation;
- recognition of shared significance;
- coordination of actions.

Here, a close connection arises between Meaning and Trust. Meaning creates the foundation for trust: an individual is ready to act only when the situation becomes interpretable and predictable. In turn, trust allows Meaning to be translated from a cognitive structure into a practical decision.

Consequently, coordination arises not from formal control, but from the alignment of meanings. Management becomes not the distribution of commands, but the organization of a space of interpretation in which joint action is possible.

In modern strategic management logic, this signifies a transition: from information management → to meaning management.

This is precisely why Meaning serves as the primary element of the Strategic Capacity model (Anpilohov, 2026): $SC = \text{Meaning} \times \text{Trust} \times \text{Horizon} - \text{Limits}$

If Meaning is absent, Trust lacks a foundation, Horizon loses its direction, and the system itself shifts into a mode of reactive survival rather than strategic action.

4. Meaning in the Strategic Capacity Model

A previous study (Anpilohov, 2026) on the cognitive and institutional mechanisms of strategic capacity demonstrated that strategic development is determined not so much by the volume of resources as by the alignment of three interrelated components – Meaning, Trust, and Horizon – operating within the constraints of Limits. In this article, the focus shifts specifically to Meaning as the primary condition of the entire construct, since without a meaningful framework, neither trust nor the formation of a decision horizon is possible.

In the model

$$SC = \text{Meaning} \times \text{Trust} \times \text{Horizon} - \text{Limits},$$

the Meaning component is understood as the interpretability and structural clarity of the strategy – the system’s ability to present its future in a form that reduces perceptual uncertainty and creates stable expectations. However, for a deeper explanation, it is necessary to reveal the internal structure of Meaning itself.

In the previously proposed formula for meaning, it was shown that Meaning is formed as a result of the ratio of forces of influence to the number of interpretations (Ivanova, 2025):

$$\text{Meaning} \approx \sum \text{powers of interpretations} / n \text{ interpretations}$$

where the numerator reflects the set of factors that

distort or disperse meaning (information noise, competing interpretations, perceptual stereotypes, emotional reactions, external associative fields), and the denominator reflects the number of possible interpretations arising among communication participants.

For strategic management, this means that meaning does not exist as a given: it is constantly eroded by external noise and the multiplicity of interpretations. The higher the level of these factors, the lower the system’s controllability and the weaker the strategy’s ability to translate into action.

Given the logic of semantic purification, effective Meaning emerges when two parameters decrease:

- a reduction in the sum of influencing forces (purification from noise);
- a reduction in the number of interpretations (increased controllability of meaning).

This allows us to present an enhanced formula for strategic Meaning as follows:

$$M^* \approx 1 / (\sum \text{powers of influence} \times n \text{ interpretations})$$

Thus, Meaning becomes inversely proportional to information noise and the vagueness of interpretation. The higher the cognitive clarity and the narrower the scope for arbitrary interpretations, the higher the system’s strategic capability.

This is precisely why Meaning comes first in the SC model: it precedes trust. Trust does not arise in relation to an unclear strategy; Horizon does not form without an interpretable image of the future. Consequently, strategic development begins not with resources and not even with trust, but with the organization of meaning.

In this context, it can be argued that it is not strategy that creates Meaning, but Meaning that makes strategy possible.

Consequently, management becomes not the management of information, but the management of the meaning structure of the future.

5. Typology of the system’s meaning regimes

If Meaning serves as the basic element of Strategic Capacity, then its level of development determines not only the quality of strategy interpretation but also the very mode of the system’s functioning. In a previous work (Anpilohov, 2026), a typology of strategic states was proposed based on a combination of Meaning, Trust, and Horizon, where each configuration reflects a specific type of managerial dynamics.

However, it is Meaning that sets the starting point for diagnosis, since it determines whether the system has the very possibility of coordinated movement.

At a high level of Meaning (Meaning ↑), the strategy becomes cognitively manageable: goals are interpreted unambiguously, cause-and-effect relationships are transparent, and participants are able to reconstruct the logic of the future. It is this that creates the foundation for trust and allows for the expansion of the planning horizon. Under such conditions, the system transitions into a mode of growth or sustainable development.

If high Meaning is accompanied by a lack of Trust, a “strategy illusion” mode emerges: the concept appears convincing but fails to gain support from investors, partners, or the organization itself. The vision exists but does not translate into action.

If, on the other hand, a high level of Meaning is combined with a limited Horizon, a state of turbulence emerges: the strategy is clear and supported, but the institutional environment allows only short-term implementation cycles. The system is forced to constantly adapt, without transitioning to sustainable development.

A low level of Meaning (Meaning ↓) is a more critical state. Even with resources and trust, the absence of a meaningful structure blocks development. A “locked-in potential” mode emerges: opportunities exist, but the strategy remains uninterpretable, and thus unmanageable.

With a simultaneous decline in Meaning, Trust, and Horizon, the system enters a state of stagnation, where the logic of survival dominates over development. Here, management becomes reactive, and decisions are made in response to external pressure rather than as a result of strategic planning.

Thus, the typology shows that the key problem is more often not a shortage of resources, but a shortage of Meaning. Strategic development is determined not by the absolute level of individual parameters, but by their coherence; however, it is Meaning that serves as the entry point into the system.

This leads to an important practical conclusion: transformation should begin not with tightening control or seeking external funding, but with restoring clarity of meaning – structuring goals, visualizing cause-and-effect logic, and reducing cognitive overload.

It is in this sense that Meaning becomes not merely a component of the model, but the primary mechanism for coordinating strategic action.

The proposed typology of meaning regimes allows us to return to the approaches discussed in the literature review and see that the category of Meaning unites several lines of research. In the philosophy of organization, Meaning is revealed as a way of organizing experience and overcoming the chaos of perception. In cognitive theories, it acts as a mechanism for reducing complexity and constructing interpretive frameworks. In management research, Meaning manifests as a condition for coordination, trust, and strategic action.

Thus, Meaning can be viewed as an integrative concept that connects the philosophical, cognitive, and managerial levels of analysis. While in Bogdanov’s work thinking performs an organizational function, in the Strategic Capacity model, Meaning becomes the element that translates information into coordinated action. In this sense, the Meaning ↑ / ↓ typology reveals not only the state of communication but also the depth of the system’s organization (Table 1).

Table 1

Theoretical Approaches to Meaning and Their Connection to the Strategic Capacity Model

Approach / Author	Key idea	How Meaning is understood	Connection to the typology of Meaning ↑ / ↓	Significance for management
A. Bogdanov, empiriomonism	Thinking as the organization of collective experience	Meaning as a way of organizing experience for collective action	Meaning ↑ – experience is organized; Meaning ↓ – experience is fragmented	Management begins with the organization of meaning
I. Kant	Productive imagination structures experience	Meaning as a synthesis of representations	Meaning ↑ – there is a holistic schema; Meaning ↓ – perception remains disconnected	A solution is possible if a cognitive structure is present
L. Vygotsky	Imagination processes experience into new combinations	Meaning as a culturally mediated processing of experience	Meaning ↑ – reconfiguration of experience is possible; Meaning ↓ – experience does not transform into something new	Meaning creates the basis for creative action
J. Piaget	The new emerges through the restructuring of cognitive schemas	Meaning as adaptation and modification of schemas	Meaning ↑ – the system restructures schemas; Meaning ↓ – the system gets stuck in old models	Management requires cognitive flexibility
H. Simon	Bounded rationality and information overload	Meaning as a mechanism for selecting what is significant	Meaning ↑ – complexity reduced; Meaning ↓ – decision paralysis	Management should reduce cognitive load
K. Weick	Sensemaking as the creation of meaning in an organization	Meaning as a collective interpretation of a situation	Meaning ↑ – participants align their understanding; Meaning ↓ – interpretations diverge	Coordination depends on a shared understanding
T. Amabile	Creativity depends on the environment, motivation, and competence	Meaning as a condition for internal engagement	Meaning ↑ – participants understand the significance of the action; Meaning ↓ – motivation is not sustained	Meaning supports creativity and action

Approach / Author	Key idea	How Meaning is understood	Connection to the typology of Meaning ↑ / ↓	Significance for management
M. Csikszentmihalyi	Flow as the alignment of purpose, action, and feedback	Meaning as the internal coherence of action	Meaning ↑ – action becomes purposeful; Meaning ↓ – action falls apart	Effectiveness requires a clear goal and feedback
Strategic Capacity	Development depends on the alignment of Meaning, Trust, and Horizon	Meaning as a primary component of strategic capacity	Meaning ↑ – growth, trust, and horizon are possible; Meaning ↓ – blockage, stagnation, reactivity	Meaning is the entry point to strategic transformation

Source: author's elaboration

A comparison of approaches shows that the category of Meaning goes beyond the mere content of a message. In an environment of permanent transformation, meaning becomes a critical mechanism for adaptive survival, compelling the subject to remain in a state of continuous interpretation of the new reality. In this context, cognition shifts from a static fixation on the world to a dynamic process of constructing stable connections between chaotic perception and action. Thus, knowledge can no longer serve merely as a reflection of reality; it becomes a tool for the operational organization of complexity, enabling a person to develop relevant ways of interacting with an accelerating environment and to ensure the coordination of joint practice.

This is precisely why, in the Strategic Capacity model, Meaning precedes Trust and Horizon: trust and strategic horizon can only emerge when the situation becomes understandable, structured, and interpretable.

Prospects for further research.

Prospects for further research are primarily linked to deepening the philosophical and epistemological foundation of the category of Meaning and its further operationalization in strategic management. While this paper considers Meaning as a mechanism for coordinating and structuring collective experience, the next step is to study it as an independent epistemic framework that determines not only decision-making but also the very architecture of managerial thinking.

Of particular interest is the development of the connection between the philosophy of knowledge and a creative approach to management. In classical epistemology, knowledge was often interpreted as a reflection of an already existing reality, whereas the modern logic of strategic action requires a shift toward understanding cognition as a process of constructing a possible future. In this context, creativity ceases to be exclusively a psychological characteristic of the individual and becomes a systemic mechanism for generating new managerial trajectories.

A promising area of research is the further exploration of the transition: information → meaning → imagination → coordination → action, where imagination serves as an intermediate link between cognitive interpretation and strategic planning. This approach allows us to combine the epistemology of Immanuel Kant, Martin Heidegger,

Gilles Deleuze, and Alexander Bogdanov with the cognitive psychology of Lev Vygotsky and modern models of strategic feasibility (Ivanova & Anpilohov, 2025).

The empirical development of Meaning indicators, which allow for measuring the level of semantic clarity of a system, the degree of interpretive coherence (), and the influence of cognitive noise on strategic decisions, requires special attention. This will enable the translation of the philosophical model into an applied diagnostic tool for public administration, organizational development, and investment strategy formulation.

Thus, further research should focus not only on the analysis of information but also on the study of the mechanisms of meaning-making as a central resource for strategic action.

Conclusion.

The article argues that the category of Meaning should be viewed not as an element of semantics or a characteristic of a communicative message, but as a fundamental mechanism for organizing experience, coordinating actions, and forming a system's strategic capacity. In conditions of information overload and growing uncertainty, it is precisely the ability to assign meaning to information that becomes a key condition for effective management.

Based on Alexander Bogdanov's philosophy of organization, cognitive approaches to meaning formation, and the Strategic Capacity model, it is shown that Meaning performs a primary function in relation to Trust and Horizon. Without a semantic structure, neither trust in the future nor the formation of a long-term decision horizon is possible. This is precisely why strategic development begins not with resources, but with the organization of the interpretive space.

The proposed formula for Strategic Capacity: $SC = \text{Meaning} \times \text{Trust} \times \text{Horizon} - \text{Limits}$ allows us to view management as a process of transition from the potential to the actual through the alignment of semantic, behavioral, and temporal parameters. Further exploration of the internal structure of Meaning through the meaning-formation formula shows that strategic feasibility depends on reducing information noise and minimizing the uncontrolled multiplicity of interpretations.

The developed typology of the system's meaning regimes demonstrates that the key problem is more often

not a deficit of resources, but a deficit of Meaning. A high level of clarity of meaning ensures growth, trust, and strategic sustainability, whereas fragmentation of meaning leads to reactivity, stagnation, and the illusion of strategy.

Thus, the main conclusion of the study is that modern management requires a shift from the logic of information

management to the logic of meaning management. It is not information in and of itself that determines the development of a system, but the ability to organize it into a stable structure of collective understanding and joint action.

It is in this sense that Meaning emerges as the central category of the philosophy of strategic action.

REFERENCES

- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Westview Press.
- Anpilohov, A. (2026). Cognitive and institutional mechanisms of strategic business feasibility in the context of digitalization and investment constraints. *Public Administration Aspects*, 14(1), 116–125. <https://doi.org/10.15421/152562>
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- Bogdanov, A. (2019). *Empiriomonism: Essays in philosophy*. Brill.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. HarperCollins.
- De Bono, E. (1992). *Serious creativity: Using the power of lateral thinking to create new ideas*. HarperBusiness.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and Repetition* (Trans. P. Patton). Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1968)
- Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The Nature of Human Intelligence*. McGraw-Hill.
- Heidegger, M. (1971). *Poetry, Language, Thought* (A. Hofstadter, Trans.). Harper & Row.
- Ivanova, S., & Anpilohov, A. (2025). Visual Turn, Attention Economy, Investment Attractiveness: Aspects of Interaction. *Scientific and Theoretical Almanac Grani*, 28(5), 270–277. <https://doi.org/10.15421/172629>
- Ivanova, S. (2025). The visual turn as a cultural and epistemological phenomenon: Artistic practices, reception, and visual thinking. *Scientific and Theoretical Almanac Grani*, 28(6), 63–69. <https://doi.org/10.15421/172638>
- Ivanova, S. (2026). Applied dramaturgy as an instrument of public governance: Values, understanding, and scenarios. *Public Administration Aspects*, 14(1), 5–17. <https://doi.org/10.15421/152551>
- Ivanova, S. A. (2025). *The information evolution of thinking: From data to understanding. Information methodologies, perceptual paradigms*. Primedia eLaunch. <https://doi.org/10.46299/979-8-89940-603-4>
- Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of Judgment* (P. Guyer, Ed.; P. Guyer & E. Matthews, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1790)
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change, and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Osborn, A. F. (1953). *Applied imagination: Principles and procedures of creative problem-solving*. Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Psychology and epistemology: Toward a theory of knowledge*. Penguin Books.
- Rhodes, M. (1961). An analysis of creativity. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 42(7), 305–310.
- Runco, M. A. (2007). *Creativity: Theories and themes: Research, development, and practice*. Elsevier Academic Press.
- Sawyer, R. K. (2012). *Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Ed. & Trans.). MIT Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage Publications.