

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2021.4.27>

PARTYCYPACYJNY STYL PRZYWÓDZTWA JAKO WSKAŹNIK ROZWOJU PRZYWÓDZTWA

Roman Storozhev

*kandydat nauk z administracji publicznej,
doktorant Katedry Parlamentaryzmu*

Kijowskiego Uniwersytetu Narodowego imienia Tarasa Szewczenki (Kijów, Ukraina)

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5103-7274

e-mail: ris03021976@ukr.net

Adnotacja. Styl przywództwa jako charakterystyczny sposób zachowania lidera jest prerogatywą w działaniach publicznych i zarządczych. Dzięki niej lider zachęca pracowników do osiągania celów instytucji publicznej. Autor artykułu zauważa, że styl jest przede wszystkim elementem systemu przywództwa, który charakteryzuje się indywidualnymi cechami wynikającymi bezpośrednio z osobowości lidera. W artykule przeanalizowano pierwsze badania przeprowadzone na temat skuteczności stylu przywództwa, przeprowadzone pod kierownictwem K. Levina, które przyczyniły się do podkreślenia autorytarnego, demokratycznego i liberalnego stylu zarządzania.

W swoich badaniach autor kładzie nacisk na szczególne aspekty badań nad stylami przywództwa, w szczególności „ukrytymi”, które powstały w okresie rozkwitu amerykańskiego biznesu.

Autor zwraca również uwagę na takie style przywództwa jak wykonawczy, inicjatywny i niespójny w cechach autorytarności i kolegialności. Jednak w działaniach publiczno-zarządczych taki styl przywództwa jako partycypacyjny (demokratyczny) jest mało zbadany. Zdaniem autora artykułu pozwala on osiągnąć wysoki stopień współpracy w wypracowaniu wspólnego stanowiska w rozwiązywaniu wielu problemów.

Słowa kluczowe: styl przywództwa, autorytarny, demokratyczny i liberalny styl zarządzania, styl „ukryty”, zarządzanie partycypacyjne, styl partycypacyjny (demokratyczny), działalność public-management, aktywność społeczna.

PARTICIPATIVE LEADERSHIP STYLE AS AN INDICATOR OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Roman Storozhev

Ph.D.,

Doctoral Student at the Department of Parliamentary

Taras Shevchenko National University of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5103-7274

e-mail: ris03021976@ukr.net

Abstract. Leadership style as a characteristic behavior of a leader is the prerogative in public administration activity. As follows the leader stimulates employees to achieve the goals of a public institution. The author of the article notes that style is primarily an element of the leadership system, which is characterized by individual characteristics that are directly determined by the personality of the leader. The article analyzes the first studies conducted by K. Levin on issues of the effectiveness of leadership style, which contributed to the separation of authoritarian, democratic and liberal style of management.

In his research the author focuses on special aspects of the leadership styles study, in particular, the “hidden” that formed during the heyday of American business.

The author also draws attention to such leadership styles as executive, proactive and inconsistent in terms of authoritarianism and collegiality. However, in public administration such a leadership style as participatory (democratic) is poorly explored. According to the author of the article, such a leadership style allows to achieve a high degree of cooperation in developing a common position on solving numerous tasks.

Key words: leadership style, authoritarian, democratic and liberal management styles, “hidden” style, participatory management, participatory (democratic) style, public administration activity, public activity.

ПАРТИСИПАТИВНИЙ СТИЛЬ КЕРІВНИЦТВА ЯК ІНДИКАТОР РОЗВИТКУ ЛІДЕРСТВА

Роман Сторожєв

кандидат наук з державного управління,

докторант кафедри парламентаризму

Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка (Київ, Україна)

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5103-7274

e-mail: ris03021976@ukr.net

Анотація. Стиль лідерства як характерна манера поведінки керівника є prerogativoю в публічно-управлінській діяльності. За її допомогою лідер стимулює співробітників на досягнення цілей публічної установи. Автор

статті зауважує, що стиль перш за все є елементом системи керівництва, для якого характерними є індивідуальні особливості, що зумовлюються безпосередньо особистістю лідера. У статті аналізуються перші дослідження, які проведено щодо ефективності стилю лидерства, здійснені під керівництвом К. Левіна, що сприяли виокремленню авторитарного, демократичного та ліберального стилів управління.

У дослідженні автор акцентує увагу на особливих аспектах дослідження стилів лидерства, зокрема «прихованого», що сформувався у період розквіту американського бізнесу.

Автор звертає увагу також на такі стилі лидерства, як виконавчий, ініціативний та непослідовний за характеристиками авторитарності й колегіальності. Однак у публічно-управлінській діяльності такий стиль лидерства, як партисипативний (демократичний), є малодослідженим. На думку автора статті, він дозволяє досягти високого ступеня співпраці у виробленні загальної позиції щодо розв'язання численних завдань.

Ключові слова: стиль лидерства, авторитарний, демократичний та ліберальний стилі управління, «прихований» стиль, партисипативне управління, партисипативний (демократичний) стиль, публічно-управлінська діяльність, громадська активність.

Introduction. At the end of the twentieth century scientists have identified the so-called “hidden” style of leadership that emerged during the heyday of American business, but its inadequate self-confidence has led to a slowdown in the growth of companies. Its essence is that the most responsible decisions are made by the top managers, and with the leaders of the middle and lower management no one is in personal contact (Orban-Lembryk, 2003: 15). As a result of the “hidden” style discrediting, an “open” leadership style was formed. Such kind of style is characterized by a special recognition of the significance of horizontal connections – free communication between representatives of different structural units, which contributed to effective interaction between them (Dancheva, Shvalb, 1999: 176). Such leadership styles as executive, proactive and inconsistent are also distinguished (Stolyarenko, 2001: 68). There is a classification of leadership styles according to the characteristics of authoritarianism and collegiality. However, such a leadership style as participatory (democratic) – partnership allows to achieve a high degree of cooperation in developing a common position on solving many tasks or problems (Kolot, 2002: 43–45).

The term “participatory management” is borrowed from foreign management theory and practice and means “participation-based management”, precisely, the involvement of employees in various forms of employee participation in management, including management decisions.

Today, a number of scientists, in particular, O. Dokuchayev (Dokuchayev, 2006: 79–82), D. Shvets (Shvets, 2015: 63: 229–256); V. Yakubenko (Yakubenko, 2004: 4–20) note that participatory management is one of the most promising directions in various areas of social activity – business, education, social relations.

O. Dokuchayev believes that participatory direction allows to more fully reveal the creative and labor potential of employees, increase motivation, increase productivity, improve product quality, labor discipline and reduce conflict (Dokuchayev, 2006: 80).

Thus, the most important feature of participatory phenomena in public administration relationships is the establishment of external and internal partnerships between employees of public institutions/organizations and their leaders.

1. Development features of participatory leadership in public administration activity

The idea of participatory leadership in public administration is the modernization tool that directs the subjects of social interaction to cooperation and team building as a responsible movement towards the set goals and concerted actions based on social values, competence growth and self-development strategy. Undoubtedly, in this context, the innate and acquired ability of the individual to adapt – adaptability to all the diversity of life under any conditions. It is also important that participation does not diminish the role and responsibility of leaders, as the relationship in the manager-employee system is based on consulting with each other using advisory rules and so on.

Yu. Simakov notes that self-realization, independence and the ability to work in a team is now a priority, which is primarily determined by the need for strong brains (Simakova, 2010). Therefore, participatory leadership in public administration activity is a leadership style in which, due to various forms of participation, a new public administration relationship is created, which allows to increase motivation, reduce conflict, and so on. Therefore, within the current legislation, for each participant of the outlined process there are opportunities to apply a creative approach for solving certain social problems, which will reveal their intellectual potential, increase self-esteem, etc.

Participatory leadership style requires not only the application of a scientific approach, which provides an opportunity to explain the nature of public administration activity, to establish causal links, identify factors and conditions under which the partnership becomes more effective, as well as to analyze, forecast, develop strategies and tactics of relations in the new public administration. However, since in times of social crisis there is a need for rapid “responses to multiple challenges”, F. Taylor’s opinion on the need to modernize management activity leads to the awareness of the need to combine science and art in this process. Only in the art of management the scientist sees the fusion of education, experience and individuality of the creative personality (Teylor, 2008).

According to the above, there is a question concerning with the awareness of the involvement and participation of citizens in the modernization processes of Ukrainian society. Thus, in January–February 2020 a nationwide public engagement survey was conducted by the Ilko Kucheriv Democratic Initiatives Foundation, within the framework of the Join the Public Activity Promotion Program! (USAID/ENGAGE), funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and implemented by the Pact in Ukraine. The survey was conducted through interviews among Ukrainians aged 18 and over, in person at their homes. Survey sample included 2011 respondents and was formed according to the distribution of the adult population of Ukraine by age, sex, region and type

of settlement (except for the Crimea, Donetsk and Luhansk regions that are not controlled by the government of Ukraine). The sampling error is 2.2%. The results of the survey allowed to draw the following conclusions.

Yes, to the question “Have you participated in the activities of a public organization during the last year?” respondents provided the following answers: “yes, took an active part” – 5%; “rarely participated in the activities of a public organization” – 12%; “did not participate because i did not have time” – 37%; “did not participate, because I’m not interested” – 43%; “hard to say” – 3%.

As we can see, a rather small percentage of citizens (16.9%) join the activities of public organizations.

Regarding various forms of democratic participation, respondents are mainly involved in the work of public committees (8.1%), participate in public hearings (6.4%) and peaceful assemblies (4.4%), ready to file complaints on infrastructure issues (5, 2%) and initiate or sign electronic petitions (4.2%).

Regarding awareness of civic activities, approximately seven out of ten Ukrainians (67.5%) know about the opportunities of participating in peaceful assemblies on specific issues. Ukrainians are also aware of the possibility to inform local authorities about infrastructure problems in person or by telephone (64.6%) and to set up a house, street or neighborhood committee or to participate in the work of such a committee (60.0%). Citizens are least aware of those forms of activism that require certain expertise, such as participation in a formal advisory body (38.5%) and discussion of bills (38.8%).

Ukrainians are most interested in reporting infrastructure problems in person or by phone (21.2%). They also expressed interest in reporting infrastructure problems through online platforms (20.1%), participating in community committees (17.2%) and submitting official information requests to government agencies (16.8%). According to the survey, citizens are the least involved in anti-corruption activities. Only 1.5% of respondents reported corruption to the prosecutor’s office or the police. Almost the same percentage of respondents (1.1%) openly reported corruption in the media. Only 0.6% of citizens used online tools to anonymously report corruption or election irregularities (National survey on public involvement, 2020).

Thus, the involvement of citizens in the activities of public organizations remains insignificant, but the level of awareness and interest in public activities, including the actual participation in public organizations, inspires optimism.

One of the significant factors of legitimacy as the development of leadership is the presence of trust, which in public administration enhances certainty, consolidating partnerships between participants in this process. Thanks to trust, various social groups are created, including public organizations with their inherent perception of moral and value categories and personal characteristics. It is important that each social group more/less brings its own understanding of values, which to some extent transforms the category of trust. Accordingly, a leader who uses a participatory leadership style plays an important role in this process, as complementarity through participation and the availability of strong trusted leaders create the conditions for the solving urgent social problems.

Thus, trust as a socio-psychological phenomenon is the basis that determines the values that unite people – interaction, responsibility, positive reputation, moral commitment, which affects the creation of conditions for the application of participatory leadership style and its development (Konosuke Matsushita Way, 2019: 120). Accordingly, it is possible to establish a partnership in public administration activity based on the personal authenticity of the leader, his responsibility, rationality, pragmatism, ethical principles, communication skills and leadership through the expectations of employees to provide opportunities and uplift and public trust that accumulates in public thought.

The participatory leadership style, asserting the awareness of one’s own involvement in society and the state, generates social activity, which is manifested in a responsible attitude to solving multiple social problems. In this process, we recognize a significant role of the influence of personal (human) capital of the leader on the creation of social capital. It is valuable to understand and realize that in modern public administration activity it is outlined the important role of leaders who are able to create such an environment in which everybody can find common ground, coherence and as a result gain public trust.

2. Analysis of the results of the sociological survey of public opinion on the level of trust in state and public institutions in Ukraine

Below are the results of the sociological survey of public opinion on the level of trust in state and public institutions, that was conducted from 13 to 17 February 2020 by the Razumkov Center. The study interviewed 2018 respondents aged 18 and older. The survey was conducted in all regions of Ukraine, except for the Crimea, Donetsk and Luhansk regions that are not controlled by the government of Ukraine. The sample, representing the adult population of the country according to the main socio-demographic indicators, was built as a multi-stage, random with quota selection of respondents at the last stage. The theoretical sampling error (excluding the design effect) does not exceed 2.3% with a probability of 0.95.

As can be seen from the table, among the state and public institutions, trust is most often expressed in the Armed Forces of Ukraine, volunteer organizations, the Church, the State Emergency Service, volunteer battalions, the National Guard of Ukraine, the State Border Guard Service, Ukrainian media and NGOs.

Distrust is most often expressed in the judiciary in general, the state apparatus (officials), local courts, political parties, commercial banks, the Prosecutor’s Office, the Supreme Court, the Constitutional Court of Ukraine, the Anti-Corruption Court, the Specialized Anti-Corruption Prosecutor’s Office, the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine, Prevention of Corruption, the National Bank of Ukraine and the Russian media (Otsinka hromadyanamy diyalnosti vlady, riven doviry do sotsialnykh instytutiv i politykiv, elektoralni oriyentatsiyi hromadyan, 2020).

Table 1

Citizens' assessment of the level of trust in state and public institutions

	I do not trust at all	I rather do not trust	Rather I trust	Completely I trust	It is difficult to answer	Balance of trust-distrust*
President of Ukraine	17.9	22.7	39.5	12.0	8.0	10.9
Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine	28.1	36.9	24.6	3.3	7.2	-36.5
Government of Ukraine	27.7	36.8	24.4	3.6	7.5	0.4
State apparatus (officials)	34.0	43.3	13.8	2.4	6.5	-61.1
Armed Forces of Ukraine	10.0	14.5	52.6	15.0	6.9	44.1
State Border Guard Service	12.6	18.0	47.4	12.8	9.2	29.6
National Guard of Ukraine	11.7	18.1	48.3	11.5	10.4	30.0
National Police	14.9	29.4	37.4	6.3	12.0	-0.6
Security Service of Ukraine (SBU)	17.2	25.0	36.4	6.5	14.8	0.7
State Emergency Service	11.4	14.1	49.0	16.1	9.4	39.6
Prosecutor's office	30.9	36.8	16.0	2.6	13.6	-49.1
Courts (judicial system as a whole)	40.5	35.1	11.5	1.7	11.3	-62.4
Local court in your area, city	34.8	36.4	14.5	1.8	12.5	-54.9
Supreme Court	33.6	30.7	16.7	2.1	16.9	-45.
Constitutional Court of Ukraine	31.9	28.6	18.7	2.2	18.6	-39.6
National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine (NABU)	36.6	28.6	14.1	1.9	18.8	-94.2
Specialized anti-corruption prosecutor's office	35.6	30.4	12.9	1.9	19.3	-51.2
National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption (NAPC)	36.4	28.4	12.3	1.7	21.7	-50.8
Anti-corruption court	37.0	27.1	13.2	1.4	21.2	-49.5
Patrol police	17.9	28.3	36.8	2.9	14.2	-6.5
Verkhovna Rada Commissioner for Human Rights	15.6	16.9	33.3	6.4	27.9	7.9
Mass media of Ukraine	15.4	24.8	49.2	3.3	7.4	12.3
Russian media	58.1	23.6	8.1	1.1	9.0	-72.5
National Bank of Ukraine	26.1	34.2	24.5	2.5	12.7	-33.3
Commercial banks	34.3	37.2	16.1	2.3	10.2	-53.1
Trade unions	24.4	26.6	25.2	3.1	20.8	-22.7
Political parties	31.5	38.4	14.8	2.0	13.4	-53.2
NGOs	14.9	24.6	41.3	5.2	14.1	7.0
Western media	19.3	22.9	30.9	3.5	23.3	-7.8
Church	13.5	14.5	45.8	16.7	9.4	34.5
Volunteer battalions	15.7	20.0	40.4	10.2	13.7	14.9
Volunteer organizations	11.6	16.8	48.3	11.6	11.7	31.5

Thus, in the possibility of expressing public opinion as a kind of direct democracy, public participation is clearly defined – the involvement of the community in the analysis of various social issues. We believe that the free and real expression of public opinion on various phenomena and processes of public administration activity, including trust in state and public institutions, allows the introduction of the idea of social partnership in the new public administration, that undoubtedly affects leadership development.

The basis of public relations are current legislation and moral norms. The last are not characterized by detailed regulation and concretization, as they are created over the centuries, passed down from generation to generation, turning into customs, common rules and values, that are firmly rooted in people's minds. Moral norms approve and uphold certain social values, that provides an alternative of behavior for the individual and society.

Therefore, a complex system of moral norms consists of appropriate rules, patterns of behavior, values, evaluations and motives, creating a certain moral order, that corresponds to the "golden rule" of morality, the essence of which is as follows: "I must demand from myself what I demand from others". It is also important that any moral norms have certain common essential features, in particular, imperativeness – the obligation of the command embodied in them, where the obligation is critically categorical. Would a person's moral honesty or courtesy be worth much if they were backed by a desire to please someone? It is clear why such "virtues", in contrast to the real ones, are called demonstrative (Nizhnik, 2005: 107).

3. The value aspect of leadership in public administration activities

In times of complexity of public life, which in all respects is currently observed in Ukraine, there should be an increase in spiritual principles in the lives of most people, based on eternal, traditional ethical values – security, freedom, justice and so on. According to this, the correlation of professional, ethical principles with the moral

virtues of the leaders of the new public administration is brought to the first step. However, the distribution of resources, benefits and influences creates competition, which can cause both sympathy and antipathy and other evaluative attitudes of some members of society to others, that leads to conflict. Therefore, the effort to overcome this problem necessitates a fair assessment, fair conflicts resolution, fair justice, because only establishment of justice and balance of interest groups has become the value that motivates Ukrainian society to participate. It is obvious that the moral and professional virtues of the new public administration leaders should be based on the principles of humanism, namely, respect for each individual, tolerance, peace, solidarity, responsibility, self-discipline, non-corruption, compassion, mercy, legal protection, transparency, flexibility, ability to make fair decisions in an ever-changing environment. All of mentioned above are the significant moral guidelines that promote the development of leadership.

Considering the above, to study the personal value orientations (personal qualities) of civil servants of category "A", in particular their analysis and, if necessary, correction, it was conducted the survey in a focus group of 97 people.

In order to achieve this goal, it was developed the questionnaire, one of its tasks was to determine the rating of professional and personal qualities of the leader (table 2), that are the priority for creating conditions for participation in the new public administration.

As can be seen from the table 2, such quality as professionalism (100%) and responsibility (97%) were marked with the highest rating.

Table 2

Personal qualities	significance indicators (%)
Professionalism	100
Goodwill	60
Responsibility	97
Rationality	90
Energy	91
Balance	89
Self-criticism	50
Flexibility	85
Sociability	70
Conscientiousness	88
Rationality	90
Modesty	14
Justice	74

As we can see, slightly lower rating got such qualities as energy (91%), reasonableness and rationality (90%), balance (89%), flexibility (85), fairness is indicated by such an indicator as (74%). Minimal support was given to such a leader personal quality as modesty (14%) – a trait of character and lifestyle, which is reflected in moderation and indifference to luxury and extravagance; lack of power gaining, it means that a person has not the desire for permanent priority representation; compliance with the framework of decency; decency and honesty in communication with other people (Otsinka hromadyanamy diyalnosti vlady, riven doviry do sotsialnykh instytutiv i politykiv, elektoralni oriyentatsiyi hromadyan, 2020). Therefore, the author assumes that there are very few modest leaders-managers now. Maybe that's why there are so few moral authorities among them?

Conclusions

Summarizing the above conclusions and the results of the represented survey including their discussion, the author of the article tends to believe that there is no ideal leader, but using a participatory leadership style, the leader refuses to centralize, focusing on the principle of decentralization. Respectively, the conditions of participation are created, under which the performance of certain tasks encourages employees to successfully complete them.

Bibliography:

1. Данчева О.В., Швалб Ю.М. Практична психологія в економіці та бізнесі. Київ : Лібра, 1999. 270 с.
2. Докучаєв О.А. Методи дослідження механізму мотивації персоналу підприємства. *Економіка та держава: міжнародний науково-практичний журнал*. 2006. № 8. С. 79–82.
3. Колот А.М. Мотивація персоналу : підручник. Київський національний економічний ун-т. Київ : КНЕУ, 2002. 337 с.
4. Коносок Мацушіта Шлях. Львів : Видавництво Старого Лева, 2019. 280 с.
5. Національне опитування щодо громадського залучення. URL: <https://dif.org.ua/article/ukrainsi-zalucheni-do-gromadskoi-diyalnosti-ale-unika-yut-aktivnoi-uchasti> (дата звернення: 07.05.2021).
6. Нижник Н. Управлінська культура: теоретичне поняття чи управлінська поведінка? *Політ. менеджмент*, 2005, № 5. С. 105–111.
7. Орбан-Лембрик Л.Е. Психологія управління : навчальний посібник для студентів вищих навчальних закладів. Київ : Академвидав, 2003. 568 с.

8. Оцінка громадянами діяльності влади, рівень довіри до соціальних інститутів та політиків, електоральні орієнтації громадян. Лютий 2021 р. URL: <http://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/otsinka-gromadianamy-diialnosti-vlady-riven-doviry-do-sotsialnykh-institutiv-ta-politykiv-elektoralni-oriientsatsii-gromadian-liutyi-2020r> (дата звернення: 09.06.2021).
9. Сімакова Ю.С. Партиципативне управління як один із найперспективніших напрямів у теорії та практиці управління. URL: <http://www.drohobych.net/2010/pdf> (дата звернення: 01.05.2021).
10. Столяренко Л.Д. Психология делового общения и управления. Ростов-на-Дону : Феникс, 2001. 512 с.
11. Тейлор Ф. Принципы научного менеджмента. URL: <https://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/basis/3631> (дата звернення: 01.05.2021).
12. Швець Д.Є. Партиципативна модель управління в системі вищої освіти. *Гуманітарний вісник ЗДІА*. 2015. № 63. С. 229–256.
13. Якубенко В.Д. Партиципативне управління в соціалізації корпоративних відносин. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького торговельно-економічного інституту КНТЕУ*. 2003. Вип. IV. С. 19–24.

References:

1. Dancheva, O.V., Shvalb Yu.M. (1999). *Prakticheskaya psikhologiya v ekonomike i biznese* [Practical psychology in economics and business]. Kyiv: Libra. 270 s. [in Ukrainian].
2. Dokuchayev, O.A. (2006). *Metody doslidzhennya mekhanizmu motyvatsiyi personalu pidpryemstva* [Methods of research of the mechanism of motivation of the personnel of the enterprise]. *Ekonomika ta derzhava: Mizhnarodnyy naukovopraktychnyy zhurnal*. No. 8. S. 79–82 [in Ukrainian].
3. Kolot, A.M. (2002). *Motyvatsiya personalu* [Staff motivation]: pidruchnyk. Kyiv: KNEU. 337 s. [in Ukrainian].
4. Konosuke Matsushita Shlyakh (2019). [Konosuke Matsushita Way]. L'viv: Vydavnytstvo Staroho Leva. 280 s. [in Ukrainian].
5. *Natsional'ne opytuvannya shchodo hromads'koho zaluchennya* (2020). [National survey on public involvement]. Retrieved from: <https://dif.org.ua/article/ukraintsi-zalucheni-do-gromads'koi-diyalnosti-ale-unikayut-aktivnoi-uchasti> [in Ukrainian].
6. Nizhnik, N. (2005). *Upravlins'ka kul'tura: teoretichne ponyattya chy upravlins'ka povedinka?* [Managerial culture: a theoretical concept or managerial behavior?]. *Polit. menedzhment*, No. 5. S. 105–111 [in Ukrainian].
7. Orban-Lembryk, L.E. (2003). *Psykhohohiya upravlinnya* [Psychology of management]: navch. posibnyk. dlya stud. vyshch. navch. zakl. Kyiv: Akademydav [in Ukrainian].
8. *Otsinka hromadyanamy diyal'nosti vlady, riven' doviry do sotsial'nykh institutiv i politykiv, elektoral'ni oriyentatsiyi hromadyan* (2020). Retrieved from: <http://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/otsinka-gromadianamy-diialnosti-vlady-riven-doviry-do-sotsialnykh-institutiv-ta-politykiv-elektoralni-oriientsatsii-gromadian-liutyi-2020r> [in Ukrainian].
9. Shvets', D.Ye. (2015). *Partysypatyvna model' upravlinnya v systemi vyshchoyi osvity* [Participatory management model in the system of higher education]. *Humanitarnyy visnyk ZDIA*. No. 63. S. 229–256 [in Ukrainian].
10. Simakova, Yu.S. (2010). *Partysypatyvne upravlinnya yak odyn iz nayspektyvnishykh napryamiv u teorii ta praktytsi upravlinnya* [Participatory management as one of the most promising areas in the theory and practice of management]. Retrieved from: <http://www.drohobych.net/2010/pdf> [in Ukrainian].
11. Stolyarenko, L.D. (2001). *Psikhologiya delovogo obshcheniya i upravleniya* [Psychology of business communication and management]. Rostov-na-Donu: Feniks, 2001. 512 s. [in Russian].
12. Teylor, F. (2008). *Printsipy nauchnogo menedzhmenta* [Principles of Scientific Management]. Retrieved from: <https://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/basis/3631>. [in Ukrainian].
13. Yakubenko, V.D. (2003). *Partysypatyvne upravlinnya v sotsializatsiyi korporatyvnykh vidnosyn* [Participatory management in the socialization of corporate relations]. *Naukovyy visnyk Chernivets'koho torhovel'no-ekonomichnoho institutu KNTU*. Vyp. IV. S. 19–24 [in Ukrainian].