

... ,

,

,

,

()

,

« »

».

:

[12].

,

.

« »

(co-opetition).

,

[1, с. 55].

:

« »,

,

:

,

, %

	2013	2016	2013	2016	2013	2016	2013	2016
	27	37	19	37	24	31	36	38
,	46	45	57	44	34	44	45	47
,	12	8	14	9	18	8	6	7
	7	4	4	3	9	7	7	4
	8	6	6	7	15	10	6	4
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

, -

,

,

, -

, 2016 . : « -

-

?». , « » 25%

« , » -57%, « » -

11 2%. 82%

. 1 -

-

,

,

,

.

-

.

, , , -
 .
 « » « , » -
 (2013 . – 73%, 2016 . – 82%). -
 , -
 2016 . -
 72% (2013 . – 66%). 86% -
 (2013 . – 83%). -
 , -
 , , . -
 [4; 6; 8]. -
 , , , -
 , , . 2 -
 , -
 , -
 (19%) (20%), -
 (17%). -
 , -
 . (.3), -
 , (18%), -
 (19%) -
 (18%).

2016 ., %

	12	10	12	14
	19	19	18	20
-	20	21	20	20
,	11	10	10	11
	17	18	20	16
,	10	11	10	8
	10	10	10	10
	1	1	-	1
	100	100	100	100

,

-

,

-

,

-

.

-

,

-

,

-

.

-

-

,

-

,

-

.

-

197

, 2016 ., %

/	18	17	20	18
-	19	24	14	18
/	14	15	14	13
-	9	8	11	10
	18	14	19	20
-	14	15	13	14
-	7	7	9	7
	1	-	-	1
	100	100	100	100

2016 . 41% -
 (4%) , 48%
 , 53%
 28% -
 , 64% -
 (53%), (11%) -

, ,
 -
 , ,
 -
 , ,
 -
 [2].
 , ,
 -
 , «
 , ,
 -
 , ,
 -
 » [9, с. 276].
 .
 -
 -
 -
 .
 -
 . 70% 2016 . , 60% 2013 .
 (.4).
 , ,
 -
 , ,
 -
 15 2016 .
 (.5):
 (12%);
 (12%);
 (10%);
 (10%).

, %

	2013	2016	2013	2016	2013	2016	2013	2016
-	10	9	10	7	10	11	10	9
	5	5	4	5	5	7	5	4
	9	10	9	10	10	11	9	10
-	9	8	8	7	8	7	11	9
-	12	12	15	16	11	11	11	10
-	10	12	11	12	12	15	9	11
	5	4	4	3	5	3	5	5
	7	6	6	5	8	7	7	5
,	4	4	5	6	4	4	2	4
-	4	4	4	4	5	3	3	4
-	6	5	6	5	5	5	7	6
-	7	6	7	6	4	5	9	6
-	3	5	2	4	4	4	4	6
-	8	10	9	10	8	7	8	11
	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

()

, 2016 ., %

(,)	27	27	26	27
	30	33	29	29
-	15	15	10	17
-	13	9	17	15
,	15	16	18	11
-	-	-	-	1
	100	100	100	100

-

-

(30%)

(27%) (. 6).

(,)

, [10].

, ()

.

-

-

.

« ».

-

- , () -
- .
- , - .
- , -
, -
, -
2016 . , 58%
« »
« » (.7).
,
,
-
,
-
. ,
.
-
».
7
,

%

	2013	2016	2013	2016	2013	2016	2013	2016
	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
	5	4	8	5	4	5	4	1
	42	35	58	45	40	33	29	27
	30	34	22	34	27	33	39	36
	12	24	4	12	14	26	17	33
	11	3	8	4	15	2	11	3
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

-
5. // : – 2014. – 2 (82). – . 7–38. -
 6. – 2014. – 4. – . 182–187. //
 7. – 2015. – 4. – . 41–61. -
 8. // : – 2012. – 34. – . 2–8. -
 9. // : – 2015. – 1 (85). – . 275–301. ,
 10. « », 2004. – 336 . : ,
 11. // – 2009. – 3. – . 18–25. ,
 12. *Moore J.F.* The Death of Competition: Leadership and Strategy in the Age of Business Ecosystems. – N.Y.: Harper Business, 1996. – 288 .

(. . . .) –
 (620014, , 29, e-mail:
 svazhenin@mail.ru).

(. . . .) – -
 (620014, , 29, e-mail:
 isvazhenina@mail.ru).

DOI: 10.15372/REG20170209

Region: Economics & Sociology, 2017, No. 2 (94), p. 191–209

S.G. Vazhenin, I.S. Vazhenina

**COMPETITIVE COOPERATION OF TERRITORIES
 AS AN ECONOMIC REALITY**

The article discusses the relevance of studying competitive cooperation of territories, reveals its essence, prerequisites, and major ways of formation, as well as emerging difficulties and contradictions. Competitive cooperation

of territories is supported by business representatives, public authorities, and the academic community, as illustrated by the results of sociological research. We define and rank the factors that initiate and intensify territorial cooperation in a competitive economy; at the same time, we name the ones that hinder its development. Based on the study findings, territories are ready for some self-restrictions during cooperation in the prospect of reaching a consensus. The article describes possible positive and negative effects of competitive cooperation, determines the most preferred and most promising actions for its establishment. We identify the fundamental characteristic properties of competitive cooperation and give recommendations on how to include them in its development. The article proposes examples depicting real promising projects of competitive cooperation in the Ural Federal District and particularly in Sverdlovsk Oblast.

Keywords: territory; territorial competition; cooperation; competitive cooperation of territories; the confidence in the economy; integration maturity

The publication is prepared within the framework of the project No. 16-02-00016 supported by funding from the Russian Foundation for Humanities

References

1. *Brandenburger, A. & B. Nalebuff.* (2012). Co-opetition. Konkurentnoe sotrudnichestvo v biznese: Per. s angl. [Co-opetition: A Revolution Mindset That Combines Competition and Cooperation. Transl. from English]. Moscow, Case Publ., Omega-L Publ., 352.
2. *Busygina, I.M. & M.G. Filippov.* (2013). Konkurentosposobnost rossiyskikh regionov: khoroshie instituty ili khoroshaya geografiya? [The competitiveness of Russian regions: good institutions or good geography?]. *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost* [Social Sciences and Contemporaneity], 6, 5–14.
3. *Volkov, S.K.* (2014). Kooperatsiya regionov kak faktor povysheniya konkurentosposobnosti blizlezhashchikh territoriy [Regional cooperation as a factor for the increase in competitiveness of neighboring territories]. *Marketing v Rossii i zarubezhom* [Marketing in Russia and Abroad], 3, 103–107.
4. *Zhikharevich, B.S.* (2011). Strategicheskoe planirovanie kak faktor stimulirovaniya regionalnoy sotruentsii [Strategic planning as a factor of cooperative competitiveness]. *Region: ekonomika i sotsiologiya* [Region: Economics and Sociology], 1, 3–14.

5. *Leksin, V.N.* (2014). Regionalnaya deystvitelnost i regionalnye issledovaniya [Reality of Regions and Regional Research]. Region: ekonomika i sotsiologiya [Region: Economics and Sociology], 2 (82), 7–38.

6. *Pichurin, I.I.* (2014). Konkurenciya i sotrudnichestvo v sovremennoy ekonomike [Competition and cooperation in the modern economy]. Zhurnal ekonomicheskoy teorii [Russian Journal of Economic Theory], 4, 182–187.

7. *Polterovich, V.M.* (2015). Ot sotsialnogo liberalizma k filosofii sotrudnichestva [From social liberalism towards the philosophy of collaboration]. Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost [Social Sciences and Contemporaneity], 4, 41–61.

8. *Sachuk, T.V.* (2012). Osnovnye napravleniya razvitiya mezhterritorialnogo sotrudnichestva v sovremennoy Rossii [Main directions of development of interterritorial cooperation in modern Russia]. Regionalnaya ekonomika: teoriya i praktika [Regional Economics: Theory and Practice], 34, 2–8.

9. *Untura, G.A.* (2015). Innovatsionnoe razvitie regionov Rossii: neravnomernost, kooperatsiya i konkurenciya [Innovative development of Russian regions: unevenness, cooperation and competition]. Region: ekonomika i sotsiologiya [Region: Economics and Sociology], 1 (85), 275–301.

10. *Wellborn, R. & V. Casten.* (2004). Delovye partnerstva: Kak preuspet v sovremennom biznese [Business partnerships: How to succeed in joint business]. Moscow, Vershina Publ., 336.

11. *Hayek, F.* (2009). Smysl konkurencii [The meaning of competition]. Sovremennaya konkurenciya [Modern Competition], 3, 18–25.

12. *Moore, J.F.* (1996). The Death of Competition: Leadership and Strategy in the Age of Business Ecosystems. New York, Harper Business, 288.

Information about the authors

Vazhenin, Sergey Grigorievich (Yekaterinburg, Russia) – Candidate of Sciences (Economics), Head of Sector at the Institute of Economics, Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (29, Moskovskaya st., Yekaterinburg, 620014, Russia, e-mail: svazhenin@mail.ru).

Vazhenina, Irina Svyatoslavovna (Yekaterinburg, Russia) – Doctor of Sciences (Economics), Leading Researcher at the Institute of Economics, Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (29, Moskovskaya st., Yekaterinburg, 620014, Russia, e-mail: isvazhenina@mail.ru).

31.01.2017 .

© 2017