

UDC: 316.354

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2019-18-3-15-27>

Amosov Oleg Yuriiyovych,

Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of Economic Theory and Finances Department, Kharkiv Regional Institute of Public Administration National Academy of Public Administration attached to the Office of the President of Ukraine, 61075, Kharkiv, Moskovsky ave. 75, tel.: +38 (050) 237 9725, e-mail: amosovoleg@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-8718-6343

Амосов Олег Юрійович,

доктор економічних наук, професор, зав. каф. економічної теорії та фінансів, Харківський регіональний інститут державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президенті України, 61000, Харків, Московський проспект, 75, тел.: +38 (050) 237 97 25, email: amosovoleg@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-8718-6343

Амосов Олег Юрьевич,

доктор экономических наук, профессор, зав. каф. экономической теории и финансов, Харьковский региональный институт государственного управления Национальной академии государственного управления при Президенте Украины, 61000, Харьков, Московский проспект, 75, тел.: +38 (050) 237 97 25, e-mail: amosovoleg@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-8718-6343

Gavkalova Nataliia Leonidivna,

Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of Public Administration and Regional Economy Department, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, 61166, Kharkiv, Nauky ave. 9-a, tel.: +38 (050) 622 61 48, e-mail: ngavl@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-1208-9607

Гавкалова Наталія Леонідівна,

доктор економічних наук, професор, зав. каф. державного управління, публічного адміністрування та регіональної економіки, Харківський національний економічний університет ім. С. Кузнеця, 61166, Харків, просп. Науки, 9а, тел.: +38(050) 622 61 48, e-mail: ngavl@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-1208-9607



Гавкалова Наталья Леонидовна,

доктор экономических наук, профессор, зав. каф. Государственного управления, публичного администрирования и региональной экономики, Харьковский национальный экономический университет им. С. Кузнеця, 61166, Харьков, просп. Науки, 9а, тел.: +38 (050) 622 61 48, e-mail: ngavl@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-1208-9607

ARCHETYPES IN THE ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED TERRITORIAL COMMUNITIES

Abstract. Economic and social development is inextricably linked with a certain territory, the characteristics of which largely depend on its orientation and dynamics. Its complex development is possible only with the purposeful development of all the elements. The territorial and managerial components of each country are its administrative and territorial units that form its administrative-territorial subdivisions when accounting for archetypes inherent in a given territory. The issues of administrative-territorial system reforming connect with the decentralization, so problems of united territorial communities in Ukraine remain relevant. The points of reforming the administrative-territorial system are related to the actual problems of decentralization, and the study of the role of archetypes in new associations is practically absent in domestic developments, therefore the stated perspective is relevant and timely.

The most current trends in the context of the decentralization of the capacity of regional governments and local authorities are the following: adoption of an effective strategic document that defines the overall objectives, trends, tools and decentralization mechanisms in all systems of public-political and socio-economic relations; a widespread use of scientific approach to the development of regional development programs, with a focus on return on investment and/or real social and economic benefits; formation of a system of vertical and horizontal to coordinate efforts of local governments and territorial communities in order to enhance their cooperation in addressing the challenges of territorial development; a creation of an effective legal framework, which removes all the sensitive issues in the context of cooperation of local governments, territorial communities, business structures and civil society institutions in the process of socio-economic development of regions. One of the factors affecting decentralization is the social archetype. Its accounting allows both at the stage of formation and at the stage of development of the united territorial communities, to accept changes and implement effective management of communities, their budgets, and land.

One of the main characteristics of the territorial communities is its viability. By sustainable community we mean a consciously formed, economically, socially and politically active human community, as self-sufficient as possible in its existence and development in terms of providing financial and economic resources when taking into account the influence of public archetypes. The con-

ducted research on functioning and development of territorial communities has proved that one of the main reasons for the adverse socio-economic situation in small communities, is the lack of compliance of communities with the requirements of viability of territorial communities: the number of community members that should be not less than the minimum possible level, financial autonomy, organizational and legal independence, state support and security, systemic integrity.

Ways to ensure the sustainability of the main territorial communities, improve the socio-economic situation and create conditions for their dynamic development is to carry out administrative-territorial reform, which is designed to solve legal, economic and organizational problems, taking into account the impact on communities of public archetypes.

Keywords: archetypes, united territorial communities administrative-territorial reform.

АРХЕТИПИ В ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ ОБ'ЄДНАНИХ ТЕРИТОРІАЛЬНИХ ГРОМАД

Анотація. Економічний і соціальний розвиток нерозривно пов'язаний з певною територією. Цей комплексний розвиток можливий тільки при цілеспрямованому розвитку всіх елементів з урахуванням впливу архетипів даної території. Територіальні складові кожної країни є її адміністративно-територіальними одиницями. Питання реформування адміністративно-територіальної системи пов'язані з актуальними проблемами децентралізації, а також з тим, що дослідження архетипів в об'єднаних територіальних громадах практично відсутні, що зумовлює актуальність та своєчасність заявленої проблематики.

Сучасні тенденції в контексті децентралізації місцевих органів влади полягають у: прийнятті ефективного стратегічного документа, що визначає цілі, тенденції, інструменти та механізми децентралізації в усіх системах суспільно-політичних і соціально-економічних відносин; формуванні системи вертикальної і горизонтальної координації дій органів місцевого самоврядування та територіальних інституцій з метою розширення їх співробітництва у вирішенні задач територіального розвитку; створенні діючої правової бази, яка усуває всі спірні питання в контексті співробітництва органів місцевого самоврядування, об'єднаних територіальних громад, бізнес-структур та інститутів громадянського суспільства в процесі соціально-економічного розвитку регіонів. Одним з факторів, що впливають на децентралізацію, є національний архетип. Його урахування як на етапі формування, так і на етапі розвитку об'єднаних територіальних громад допоможе прийняти зміни і здійснити ефективне управління громадами, їх бюджетами, землею.

Однією з основних характеристик новостворених територіальних громад є їх життєздатність. Під сталою громадою ми розуміємо усвідомлено сформоване, економічно, соціально та політично активне співтовариство

людей, яке є максимально самодостатнім у своєму існуванні та розвитку з точки зору забезпечення фінансовими та економічними ресурсами з урахуванням впливу громадських архетипів. Проведені дослідження щодо функціонування та розвитку територіальних громад показали, що одна з головних причин несталої соціально-економічної ситуації в суспільстві є невідповідність громад вимогам щодо їх існування: кількість членів громади повинна бути не менше можливого рівня для забезпечення фінансової автономії, організаційної та правової незалежності, державної підтримки та безпеки, системної цілісності.

Способами забезпечення життєдіяльності об'єднаних територіальних громад, поліпшення соціально-економічної ситуації та створення умов для їх розвитку є проведення адміністративно-територіальної реформи, яка забезпечить вирішення правових, економічних і організаційних проблем з урахуванням впливів суспільних архетипів.

Ключові слова: архетипи, об'єднані територіальні громади, адміністративно-територіальна реформа.

АРХЕТИПЫ В ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ ТЕРРИТОРИАЛЬНЫХ ГРОМАД

Аннотация. Экономическое и социальное развитие неразрывно связано с определенной территорией, характеристики которой во многом зависят от ее ориентации и динамики. Его комплексное развитие возможно только при целенаправленном развитии всех элементов с учетом архетипов, присущих данной территории. Территориальные и управленческие составляющие каждой страны являются ее административно-территориальными единицами. Вопросы реформирования административно-территориальной системы связаны с актуальными проблемами децентрализации, а исследование роли архетипов в новых объединениях практически отсутствует в отечественных разработках, поэтому заявленная проблематика является актуальной и своевременной.

Современными тенденциями в контексте децентрализации потенциала местных органов власти являются: принятие эффективного стратегического документа, определяющего общие цели, тенденции, инструменты и механизмы децентрализации во всех системах общественно-политических и социально-экономических отношений; формирование системы вертикальной и горизонтальной координации действий органов местного самоуправления и территориальных сообществ с целью расширения их сотрудничества в решении задач территориального развития; создание эффективной правовой базы, которая устраняет все спорные вопросы в контексте сотрудничества органов местного самоуправления, территориальных сообществ, бизнес-структур и институтов гражданского общества в процессе социально-экономического развития регионов. Одним из факторов, влияющих на децентрализацию, является общественный архетип. Его учет позволяет как на этапе формирования, так и на этапе развития объединенных территориальных

сообществ, принимать изменения и осуществлять эффективное управление сообществами, их бюджетами, землей.

Одной из основных характеристик новосозданных территориальных сообществ является их жизнеспособность. Под устойчивым сообществом мы понимаем сознательно сформированное, экономически, социально и политически активное человеческое сообщество, максимально самодостаточное в своем существовании и развитии с точки зрения предоставления финансовых и экономических ресурсов с учетом влияния общественных архетипов. Проведенные исследования по функционированию и развитию территориальных сообществ показали, что одной из основных причин нестабильной социально-экономической ситуации в малых сообществах является несоответствие их требованиям жизнеспособности территориальных сообществ: количество членов сообщества должно быть не менее возможного уровня для обеспечения финансовой автономии, организационной и правовой независимости, государственной поддержки и безопасности, системной целостности.

Способами обеспечения устойчивости объединенных территориальных сообществ, улучшения социально-экономической ситуации и создания условий для их динамичного развития является осуществление административно-территориальной реформы, которая призвана решить правовые, экономические и организационные проблемы с учетом влияния на сообщества общественных архетипов.

Ключевые слова: архетипы, объединенные территориальные сообщества, административно-территориальная реформа.

Problem statement. The development of civil society in Ukraine is possible when taking into account the influence of social archetypes and processes of decentralization of power, which have come into conflict with the recurrence of authoritarianism (authoritarian society), the tendencies caused by the existence of an “old” administrative and territorial system and corruption in power structures.

Further development of Ukraine is possible, taking into account the emphasized problems, subject to a high level of public trust in public authorities, which also envisages an archetypal social paradigm. One of the main as-

pects of functioning of state and public administration bodies is public trust in the actions of the highest and local level institutions, however, existing management mechanisms do not always provide the necessary level of public trust in authorities.

The basis of trust is the interest of parties to find the ways to problems solution. The role of trust in formation of mechanisms for the implementation of public authority is significant and implies the existence of public archetypes, since trust is considered as a social or group sentiment, social situation and social problem, and performs such functions as: administration, reduction, or-

ganization, optimization of relations and activities, reproduction, regulation and balancing of social and cultural diversity, constructing vertical social relations.

In Ukrainian society trust is associated with the creation of new units — united territorial communities, their number at the end of 2018 amounted up to 806. The united territorial community is a voluntary declaration of the will of inhabitants of several villages about the consolidation of their self-government bodies, provided by paragraph 2 Article 1 of the Law of Ukraine “On Local Self-Government in Ukraine” [1], formed in accordance with the Law of Ukraine “On Voluntary Association of Territorial Communities” [2]. The creation of the UTC is a vivid example of the results of decentralization taking place in Ukraine. UTCs are definitely different in terms of the number of people and the quality of their activities, which is expressed by the indicators of socio-economic efficiency, for example, the level of management of the combined local budgets. If we go back to trust, its level depends on a number of influential factors, such as archetypal and economic. If the nature of economic is well-known: the higher is the financial performance of UTC, the greater is the level of public trust in the authorities; the archetypes are innovations in the concept of modern national science, which makes this research relevant and timely.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Despite the fact that the problem of development of united territorial communities (UTC) is rather new, many scientists, including S. Batazhok, S. Bila, N. Kaminska, G. Monastyrsky

et alia [3–7] investigate these problems, the issue of the development of UTC, taking into account the influence of archetypes, the scientific basis of which was created in the Ukrainian science by scholars led by E. Afonin [8], as well as the authors of this article [9], is almost uninvestigated among the domestic scientific community.

The purpose of the article is to formulate the justification of scientific and theoretical foundations of the development of united territorial communities taking into account the influence of archetypes.

Statement of basic materials. At the heart of any economic system lies the archetypal basis. The bottom line is that property relations are formed on the basis of social subconscious perception of an object, as one that is the object of possession, disposal, use, management of an individual. Without this the orientation towards the conscious fixation of certain rules and norms does not work. In our opinion, the use of law enforcement in a jury trial in the United States is a confirmation of such an opinion.

The basis of democracy is subconscious as a result of transformation into the sphere of consciousness, into a consensual democracy.

In his book, “State Building: Governance and the World Order in the 21st Century” F. Fukuyama notes that the power of a young state depends on both the desire of ruling elite to build and strengthen statehood, and on their ability to establish effective governance and gain recognition of society [10].

A. Kolodiy in her work [11] notes that the US President A. Lincoln spoke of democracy as “a government of people

le; by people; for people". He combined two meanings of the word "government" [12], and the translation of his famous phrase into Ukrainian could sound like this: "a government created by people that exercises governance with the words of people and for people". The phrase "e-government" ("e-governance"), "school of government" can serve as an example, when the term "governance" is understood not as a governing body but the process. Therefore, the term "government", which has got a widespread use in the West since the 1980s, requires filling it with a new content, which is not reflected by the word "government", even when they it is referred to as the process of political power implementation and conducting public policy [11].

Public policy, in turn, is connected with the types of democracy: constitutional, conservative, anarchist, polyarchical, consensual, and convectional. The "exclusion" or blocking of an archetypal imperative in public life dampens democracy as a power of people. Democracy loses its meaning as a necessary combination of people's efforts to solve problems of joint existence.

It is known from political economy that economic relations are formed at the level of society. Lowering the level of formation of economic relations to the levels of interpersonal relations leads to the fact that they become the social interconnections of convectional or consortial type.

Thus, we are approaching an important problem, namely, the alienation of a person from power, territory of residence and his/her community. A man is the pride's being. Remaining outside the pride (community), he/she begins

to feel unprotected, remains alone with his/her needs. The population of a territory with many unsatisfied needs cannot be happy. Thus, the alienation of society from happiness arises.

At first glance, it seems that the processes of decentralization and development of self-government have nothing to do with it. However, they precisely refute alienation.

Man lives in a certain territory, in a specific space. Economic and social development is a resource and is spatially and inextricably linked with a certain territory, the characteristics of which largely depend on its orientation and dynamics.

Accordingly, archotyping to the organization, its complex development is possible in case of the purposeful development of all its elements, which are the full carriers of system properties. The territorial and managerial components of any country are its administrative and territorial units that form its administrative and territorial unit. Issues of reforming of administrative and territorial system are investigated by domestic scientists, but the problems of formation of united territorial communities in Ukraine remain relevant, including the fact that the territorial features of archetypes are not taken into account.

In a number of countries, including Ukraine, the problem of formation of institutionally defined viable administrative and territorial units that met the criteria of legal certainty, organizational completeness and financial and economic sufficiency, approaching and elimination of alienation of people from the needs appeared in transformation period, arises. Regionalizations, territo-

rial decentralization of power and division of powers between different levels have been and remain the subject of discussions.

One of the ways to ensure the sustainability of basic territorial communities, to improve socio-economic situation and create preconditions for the dynamic development of municipal entities is to carry out an administrative-territorial reform, which is designed to solve the problem of formation of legal, economic and organizational conditions for effective implementation of functions of local self-governmental bodies [7].

The issue of reforming the systems of the administrative and territorial units and local self-governments on the basis of archetypes is closely connected. The effectiveness of solving one will definitely affect the solution of another. According to the experience of European states, the reform of administrative and territorial system and local self-government systems cannot be resolved in time.

The implementation of reform of local self-government and administrative and territorial structure of Ukraine on the basis of strengthening of local self-government, deepening the decentralization of power, and the use of a liberal-democratic model of interaction of central and local authorities is necessary for the development of the country. However, such reformation cannot be formal, unreasonable, indefinite, masking the inappropriateness and archaism of existing model of territorial administration. To implement it, a common, agreed political will of the country's top leadership is required, taking into account the archetypes and social

interests of territorial entities of different hierarchical levels, overcoming the alienation of a person from living conditions.

G. Monastyrsky believes [6] that a new territorial model of local economic development should meet the following requirements: ensuring optimization of the territory of municipal services provision, taking into account the connection of services, needs, their satisfaction, that is, not only social but also minimum economic expediency; taking into account not the subject, but the result of service provision; understanding that territorial association is necessary, but not the only factor of strengthening of territories; clear delimitation of powers of state authorities and local self-governmental bodies; the approximation of power to people; deepening of decentralization on the principle of subsidiarity with the simultaneous formation of a state monitoring system of local self-government activities within the legal framework of the state; taking into account the experience of administrative and territorial reforms of foreign countries, especially post-socialist countries; the need for the formation of a state municipal policy and practical implementation of state regional policy; taking into account the system of criteria for integrating various settlements into a single territorial community; ensuring the formation of a full-fledged local government at the secondary level, based on a combination of powers, mechanism for their implementation and responsibility; realization of the mechanism of functional integration of territorial communities; carrying out of administrative-territorial reform on the basis of state-volitional decision;

integrated approach to the reform of management model of development of territories. Their consideration will allow creating conditions for modernization of management of local economic development.

European integration is the adoption of modern governance models.

Modern Europe is:

- the Europe of self-governing territories;
- the Europe of public administration, built on the principles of decentralization;
- the Europe of regulated regional markets.

The former model of the state system in Ukraine was built, on the contrary, on the principles of centralization. Now we often encounter its rudiments and recurrences. Such remnants should include the territorial and administrative division; especially “at the local level”. Such a division is hopelessly outdated and impedes European integration processes. Relapses are usually associated with the symbiosis of oligarchs, public sector employees, and criminal prosecutors on the basis of corruption consensus.

We consider the decentralization and development of new forms of self-organization of people as rapprochement and interpenetration of the European way of organizing the life of a society with the preservation of social archetypes. In the context of constructing a new model, we will present some considerations regarding the necessity and feasibility of functioning of the united territorial communities (UTC) and district state administrations (DSA). To substantiate our vision, research, study and generalization of the

experience gained on the territory of Ukraine were conducted. The results of the study allowed us to identify a number of problems, the consequences of which will periodically slow down the progress towards the reforms. Namely:

a) The state budget of Ukraine is burdened with the implementation of reforms. The whole thing is that decentralization is still costly or, at least, low effective. According to our forecasts, the UTCs will be able to reach the real financial “capacity” in 3–4 years, and today their functioning is ensured by the principle of subsidiarity.

b) Low wages of employees of public administration bodies. Thus, the UTC will be fraught with the staff shortage. One of the ways to save money on managing the UTCs should be the number of staffing standards for individual units. And individual functions, such as organizational work or HR, should be performed on contract terms (outsourcing, which is an effective public management tool) to similar services created for several UTCs. The minimum annual budget of the UTC should ensure its functioning and, according to our calculations, should be at least UAH 30–40 million.

Definitely the district administrations should remain as a suggestion in light of this, but they should be transformed into public institutions (for example, the prefectures). They should provide solutions to common problems of 4–6 UTCs (not less, possibly more). That is, in our opinion, districts should combine 4–6 UTCs. The district in which there are at least 20 thousand people can be capable.

The district state administrations (prefectures) may include:

- General department;
- Legal department;
- Department for conducting the state registers of voters;
- Centers for the provision of administrative services (CPAS);
- Organization of vital activity in emergency situations;
- Department of culture and others.

The criteria for the creation of UTC, in other words, should include:

- Number of people in the UTC area;
- The right of executive bodies to join small-scale UTCs;
- Guarantee of reproduction of the population and natural resources of the territory;
- Provision of social sphere;
- Managerial: an opportunity to plan development;
- The possibility of financial support;
- Project capability (opportunity to implement local projects);
- The number of the employed population directly on the territory of UTC;
- At least 1,000 people (those who have a permanent income) are required for the normal functioning of the UTC;
- An opportunity to provide special facilities;
- The optimal population for the UTC is from 5,000 to 10,000–12,000;
- Self-sufficiency;
- Providing conditions for safe living.

The UTC is created to maintain decent living conditions, thus, they should provide conditions for public healthcare and rest;

- Provision of child care and upbringing conditions;
- Education of children.

The minimum structure of the executive bodies of the UTC can be represented as:

- The head;
- 2–3 assistants;
- The secretary;
- Finance department;
- Communal property department;
- Legal sector;
- Department of housing and communal services;
- Department of economic development and investment;
- Department of architecture and construction.

The UTC cannot be a source of corruption or provision for people unable to do useful work. For example, according to the research results, the average annual wage bill for the UTC employees should be at least UAH 1,5–2 million.

Thus, the DSA should be transformed into a prefecture, or a body that would guarantee the observance of the constitutional provisions (DSAs are the representatives of the guarantor of the constitution and the provision of human rights) at the local level. The DSA needs to convey new functions that result from the reforms, such as coordination and regulation functions (coordination of local reforms) and, possibly, in part, strategic planning.

But the existence of the UTC and the DSA may conflict with the existing administrative and territorial division of Ukraine. We should be ready to this and make appropriate changes and remember that some of the problems of the UTC cannot be solved without the DSA, namely, the regulation of land

relations: the land should be nationally owned and leased; raiding and racket issues, etc.

As for the definition of archetypes in the context of formation of the UTC, it should be noted that the formation of modern communities occurs through the prism of public authority. The article [13] states that public authority is an ability of a person, a social group, an institution, an organization to exercise their will through certain means. The nature of public power is often determined also by the category of will, that is, through action of the subjects, the bearers of political will, who seek to capture reality, subjugate themselves to objective existence, actively form the vital functions of society.

An important role is played by a public leader – an authoritative member of society, whose particular influence enables him/her to play a significant role in social processes. A public leader is a person who is able to influence others in order to integrate common activities aimed at satisfying the interests of community and is guided by the archetypes [13]. We believe that the head of the UTC can influence the effectiveness of the community through means of public leadership, which results in awareness of social archetypes that can provide an understanding of social processes that affect development of the UTC. Understanding and awareness create conditions for community activity in implementing all initiatives to ensure its functioning. All this takes place within the framework of decentralization, illustrated by administrative and territorial reforms. The success of the latter is determined by effectiveness of the UTC, which should be headed by

public leaders, capable to use public archetypes in their activities.

Conclusions and directions for future research. In general, ensuring the effectiveness of administrative and territorial reform as one of the areas of decentralization in society may be the way of creating the prerequisites for the effective functioning of the UTCs, led by public leaders – carriers and disseminators of public archetypes and the DSAs. Further research will address the personality of public leaders of the UTC and an archetypal component of making optimal managerial decisions.

REFERENCES

1. Zakon Ukrainy “Pro mistseve samovri- aduvannia v Ukraini” : vid 27.03.1997, № 280/97 [The Law of Ukraine “On Local Self-Government in Ukraine” from 27.03.1997, № 280/97]. (1997). Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy – Bulletin of Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 24. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/280/97> [in Ukrainian].
2. Zakon Ukrainy “Pro dobrovilne obiednannia terytorialnykh hromad” : vid 05.02.2015, № 157-VIII [Law of Ukraine “On Voluntary Association of Territorial Communities” from 05.02.2015, № 157-VIII]. (2015). Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy – Bulletin of Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 13. Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/157-19> [in Ukrainian].
3. *Batazhok S. H.* (2016). Dokhody mistsevykh biudzhetyv yak osnova finansovoi nezalezhnosti orhaniv mistsevoho samovriaduvannia [Revenues of local budgets as the basis of financial independence of local self-government bodies]. Formuvannia rynkovykh vidnosyn v Ukraini – Formation of

- market relations in Ukraine, 2(177), 86–91 [in Ukrainian].
4. *Bila S. O.* (2014). Vplyv detsentralizatsii na stymuliuвання ekonomichnoho zrostannia terytorialnykh hromad v Ukraini [The Impact of Decentralization on Stimulating the Economic Growth of Territorial Communities in Ukraine]. *Nauk. chasop. NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova. Ser. № 18. Ekonomika i pravo — Scientific Bulletin of NPU named after M.P. Drahomanov. Series № 18. Economics and Law*, 27, 60–68 [in Ukrainian].
 5. *Kaminska N. V.* (2015). Mistseve samovriaduvannia: teoretyko-istorychnyi i porivnialno-pravovyi analiz [Local Self-Governance: Theoretical-Historical and Comparative-Legal Analysis]. Kyiv: KNT. Retrieved from http://pidruchniki.com/1584072021785/pravo/mistseve_samovryaduvannya [in Ukrainian].
 6. *Monastyrskiyi H. L.* (2018). Ryzyky paralelnoho funktsionuvannia novoi ta staroi modelei upravlinnia rozvytkom terytorii [The risks of parallel functioning of the new and old models of management of the development of territories]. *Publichne upravlinnia: problemy ta perspektyvy — Public Administration: Problems and Prospects: Proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference* (p. 30–34). Kharkiv, TOV “Konstanta” [in Ukrainian].
 7. *Monastyrskiyi H. L., Savchuk D. M.* (2018). Modernizatsiinyi pidkhid do upravlinnia ekonomichnym rozvytkom hromad [Modernization approach to management of economic development of communities]. *Problemy innovatsiino-investytsiynoho rozvytku. Seriya ekonomika ta menedzhment — Problems of innovation and investment development. Series Economics and Management*, 15, 38–46 [in Ukrainian].
 8. *Afonin E. A., Martynov A. Yu.* (2016). Arkhetypni zasady modeliuвання sotsialnykh protsesiv [Archetypal principles of modeling of social processes]. *Publichne uriaduvannia — Public administration*, 2, 34–47. Retrieved from http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/pubm_2016_2_5 [in Ukrainian].
 9. *Amosov O. Yu., Havkalova N. L.* (2018). Vplyv arkhetypiv na suspilni transformatsii [The Influence of Archetypes on Social Transformations]. *Publichne uriaduvannia — Public Administration*, 3(13), 56–74 [in Ukrainian].
 10. *Fukuyama F.* (2004). *The State Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press [in English].
 11. *Kolodii A.* (2012). Kontseptsia publichnoho (novoho) vriaduvannia v yii zastosuvanni do demokratychnykh i perekhidnykh system [Concept of Public (New) Governance in its Application to Democratic and Transitional Systems]. *Demokratyчне vriaduvannia. Naukovyi visnyk — Democratic Governance. Scientific Herald*, 10. Retrieved from http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/DeVr_2012_10_3 [in Ukrainian].
 12. *Faragher J. M.* (Eds.). (1998). *Gettysburg Address*, delivered by President A. Lincoln. *Encyclopedia of American History: The American Heritage*. New York: Henry Holt and Co [in English].
 13. *Amosov O. Yu., Havkalova N. L.* (2016). Symbioz instytutsiinykh zasad ta arkhetypiky publichnoho upravlinnia [Symbiosis of Institutional Foundations and Archetype of Public Administration]. *Publichne uriaduvannia — Public Administration*, 2(3), 15–22 [in Ukrainian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Закон України “Про місцеве самоврядування в Україні” // ВВР

- України. — 1997. — № 24. — Ст. 170 [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/280/97>
2. Закон України “Про добровільне об’єднання територіальних громад” // ВВР України. — 2015. — № 13. — Ст. 91 [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/157-19>
 3. *Батажок С. Г.* Доходи місцевих бюджетів як основа фінансової незалежності органів місцевого самоврядування // Формування ринкових відносин в Україні. — 2016. — № 2 (177). — С. 86–91.
 4. *Біла С. О.* Вплив децентралізації на стимулювання економічного зростання територіальних громад в Україні // Наук. часоп. НПУ ім. М. П. Драгоманова. — Серія № 18. — Економіка і право : зб. наук. пр. — Вип. 27. — Київ : Вид-во НПУ ім. М. П. Драгоманова, 2014. — С. 60–68.
 5. *Камінська Н. В.* Місцеве самоврядування: теоретико-історичний і порівняльно-правовий аналіз: навч. посіб. — К. : КНТ, 2015. — 232 с. [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу: http://pidruchniki.com/1584072021785/pravo/mistseve_samovryaduvannya
 6. *Монастирський Г. Л.* Ризики паралельного функціонування нової та старої моделей управління розвитком територій // Публічне управління: проблеми та перспективи: матеріали Міжнародної наук.-практ. конф., м. Харків, 7 грудня 2018 р. — Х., ТОВ “Константа”, 2018. — С. 30–34.
 7. *Монастирський Г. Л., Савчук Д. М.* Модернізаційний підхід до управління економічним розвитком громад // Проблеми інноваційно-інвестиційного розвитку. — Серія економіка та менеджмент. — 2018. — № 15. — С. 38–46.
 8. *Афонін Е. А.* Архетипні засади моделювання соціальних процесів / Е. А. Афонін, А. Ю. Мартинов // Публічне урядування. — 2016. — № 2. — С. 34–47 [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/pubm_2016_2_5
 9. *Амосов О. Ю., Гавкалова Н. Л.* Вплив архетипів на суспільні трансформації // Публічне урядування. — К., 2018. — № 3 (13). — С. 56–74.
 10. *Fukuyama F.* The State Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century [Text] / Francis Fukuyama. — Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 2004. — 132 p.
 11. *Колодій А.* Концепція публічного (нового) врядування в її застосуванні до демократичних і перехідних систем // Демократичне урядування. Наук. вісн. — 2012. — Вип. 10. [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/DeVr_2012_10_3
 12. Gettysburg Address, delivered by President A. Lincoln // Encyclopedia of American History: The American Heritage [Text] / John Mack Faragher, gen. editor. — N.-Y. : Henry Holt and Co, 1998. — P. 355.
 13. *Амосов О. Ю., Гавкалова Н. Л.* Симбіоз інституційних засад та архетипіки публічного управління // Публічне урядування. — К., 2016. — № 2 (3). — С. 15–22.