

COMPARISON OF MANAGEMENT MODELS: PARTICIPATORY GOVERNING IN ORGANIZATIONS AS A NEW KIND OF POST-NPM MODEL

Robert NAHAPETYAN

University of Warsaw; robert.nahapetyan@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-8587-2814

Purpose: Modern researchers substantiate the need to investigate the transformation of management style in various organizations. Socium cannot successfully function and develop without its own, corresponding to its goals, style of state management interaction, ideology of social control.

Design/methodology/approach: Basing on the analysis, thinking and generalization of theoretical approaches and attitudes of various researchers, updates of approaches to the study of the participatory management style in the civil service system are presenting, the essential features of participatory management style are clarifying.

Findings: Research tries to understand how roles of management can not be fulfilling by chance, borrowing from the side and reflecting the spiritual experience of someone else's experiences.

Originality/value: It really now explains current scientific direction of study of management style, showing it's path from classic style into post-NPM style of ruling.

Keywords: New public management, government, participatory governing, management styles.

1. Introduction

Research confirms sociologists or politologists substantiate the common features of organizational management styles. Prove that the modern life of society is characterized by the explosive flow of social processes. Under these conditions, a strictly regulated professional activity, an authoritarian (command-administrative) or classic style of human resource management, a rigid construction of organizational systems, become not only ineffective, but also threaten the preservation of the integrity of the social organizational structuring.

Thus, importance of democratic transformations of management style practices is adaptability, flexibility of forms of social organization of social systems, the ability of officials to act in unexpected and extreme situations. In the new conditions, the state faces the serious

task of creating such a system of government, which, on the one hand, will be able to democratize the style of social management interaction itself, gradually reducing the role of public servants in this process. On the other hand, the state should become an integral element of the mechanism of socio-political protection of society against various social pathologies. It should be borne in mind that the problems of public service are associated with deep-seated social interests, ideological preferences and ideological orientations. The interests of the state are closely intertwined in the general socio-cultural context. As Ansell C, Torfing J. are arguing in their paper: "It is common to attack the governance literature for suggesting a totalizing and radical shift from "government" to "governance." While governance theories arose, in part, as a critique of state-centric government, new forms of governance often supplement or extend the state rather than supplant it... [If] proliferation of NGOs might be eroding... states in developing countries, NGOs may complement state capacity and even enhance democratic access to the state. [So] governance often operates in the shadow..., does create more decentered, pluri-centric modes of governing..., is best understood as a hybrid of different modes" (Ansell & Torfing, 2016, p. 552).

Researchers claim, as of management style is the most important indicator of the effectiveness of management of any social system. T. Parsons, developing this approach, notes that the concept of efficiency, the style of organizational interaction and the concept of social control complement and mutually enrich each other (Sergushko, 2002, pp. 256-258). Authors consider the transformations of management style in the context of improving managerial relations and correlate them with updating the set of permanent personal professional qualities of managers and subordinates. Researchers traditionally set the task of scientific analysis of various management styles, identifying how management style relates to the leadership behavior of managers and others. Researchers are trying not only to classify various management styles, but also try to identify the "best" management style, i.e. an ideal set of models of managerial behavior that managers must demonstrate in organizations of various types and various forms of ownership.

In the framework of our research, we find attempts to investigate the processes of transformation of the style of management of social systems. As Ansell C., Torfing J. are arguing in their paper: "Fordist logics of production were transformed, and new forms of transnational political and economic organization arose. Powerful fiscal pressures pushed states to engage in major reforms of the welfare state and pushed public agencies to explore new logics of public management" (Ansell & Torfing, 2016, p. 551).

We share the position of researchers who consider the improvement of management style in the context of improving and developing the social system of society. The development of the social system of society is associated with the general democratization and improvement of civil society. The latter objectively must be accompanied by the improvement of the management style in each social organization.

As of it, it is necessary to agree with the conclusions of D. Hampton, who convincingly proved that all modern management styles are embedded in the classical model of management styles: authoritarian, democratic, liberal (Hampton, 2001, p. 78), which in our opinion, correspond to classic, NPM, governing styles. As Klijn E.H. is mentioning: "If we look at both dominant views on management and the way they view complexity in society, we see that it is treated differently... In NPM the manager tries to keep as far as possible from the complex interaction system itself..., [which] is treated as a black box... Governance acknowledges that the processes are very dynamic..., which can be addressed by being part of the interactive system through influencing... choices of... coordinating the interactions of [others]" (Klijn, 2012, p. 211).

The latter approach is actively developed in his studies P. Northhouse. He proves the universality of the manifestation of an classic, new public (various forms of its manifestation), governing management styles. It shows that in the conditions of the formation of a civil society, both classic and new public management styles are ineffectively manifesting themselves. In this context, governing management style has various forms of manifestation: group management, supporting style, task-oriented style, situational style, participative style. The author's conclusion is important that their governing style should be investigated both systematically and at the level of individual forms of manifestation. In practice, a gradual democratization of the management style in the conditions of the formation of a civil society is necessary.

Based on these approaches, we can conclude that governing model or corresponding management style in various forms and manifestations (a high degree of care for people and a high degree of care for production) is ideal in the conditions of the emergence of civil society. As of it, it is necessary to use the management within the framework of any large social system as the basis for the leadership development program for managers and subordinates. As Klijn E.H. is mentioning: "Thus, where NPM is mainly intraorganizational, trying to improve the internal operation of governments, governance is mainly interorganizationally oriented, trying to improve coordination of governments with the other actors who are necessary to deliver services or implement policies. One could also say that NPM is more occupied with efficiency and improving existing services and policies, while governance is more concerned with delivering new solutions for complex problems by improving coordination between the various actors" (Klijn, 2012, p. 210). Successful application of a group governing democratizing management style will lead to a high dynamics of career growth in the social system, which in turn increases the motivation of the officials' professional work activities.

2. Transformation of governing styles

Douglas McGregor uses various sociological methods to study the transformation of the management style of the social organizational system. The author argues that all social organizations (including labor organizations) are objectively forced during their development to gradually democratize and improve the management style. The gradual democratization of the management style is the most important regularity in the development of any social system (both at the macro and micro levels). The author emphasizes that within the framework of the classical social organization, managers treat employees as lazy people who need constant guidance and control (theory "x"), and not as responsible people who want to work and are able to take responsibility for their organization (theory "y") (Torrington, Hall, & Taylor, 2004, p. 386).

If a management style is built up according to the "x" theory, workers will behave in accordance with the "x" theory; on the contrary, if they are governed by delegating power management authority, assuming that they behave according to the theory of "y", they react like the workers of the theory of "y".

In particular, it is well known that the gradual democratization of management style is always a cyclical process. Therefore, the gradual democratization of management style has negative and at the same time positive consequences.

Applying this theory in practice, authors come to the important conclusion that the implementation of the social program to democratize the style of public administration objectively leads to the demonstration of behavior by officials according to the model of the governing leader. However, this leads to unexpected and undesirable consequences. In some cases, the members of the management team are frightened that their leaders unexpectedly change their management style, and in some cases the management style does not fit the situation. In the end, within the framework of these organizational systems, it may be decided to abandon the further implementation of the program of phased democratization of management style.

Classic (administrative, directive) management style: the manager's behavior is task oriented. New public (supportive) management style: managerial behavior is focused on human relations.

Further development of the concept of management styles is carried out in the framework of the theoretical developments of P. Hersey and C. Blanchard. These authors develop a paradigm of democratic leadership style. (Hersey, 1985, p. 20)

The authors emphasize that preparedness for the phased implementation of democratic principles of governance implies managerial abilities and desires. In this case, the authors focus on the managerial abilities and desires of both the managers and the governed. Abilities include managerial knowledge, skills and experience that employees have in relation to a particular

work situation. Desires include motivation and responsibility, self-reliance. Based on these approaches, it is easy to see that the manager must determine the degree of maturity of the performers, and depending on this, the management style and behavior of both the manager and the subordinate changes.

So, it should be noted that in the above concepts there is no study of management styles by the criterion of public participation in management decisions and their social control. We find partial overcoming of these shortcomings in social concepts that model social management systems.

The version is confirmed that the participative management style is a clear manifestation of the highest level of democratization of managerial relations. The characteristic of a participatory management style is given, its essential feature is the attraction to management of not only managers of middle and lower levels, but also immediate social actors who are the object of management. It is hypothesized that as the formation of a civil society, the effectiveness of a participatory management style will increase. The disadvantage of this concept, in our opinion, is its isolation from practical research, not systematic empirical research confirming it.

The presented ideas are actively promoted and developed by P. Drucker. He substantiates the need for a gradual democratization of the management style of any modern social system. The important conclusion is that in twenty years in a typical social organization there will be half as many management levels and three times fewer managers than today. The structure, the problems of management and other tasks facing it will not be very similar to what is typical of modern social organization. Organizations in the future will become more like a hospital, university or symphony orchestra. (Drucker, 2006, p. 208)

3. From classic to new kind of public management

In scope of our research we have chosen other 4 articles which were analyzed according 4 questions.

1. How is it describing terms of governance or management?
2. What are its research questions?
3. What data is put into analysis?
4. What is results it achieving?

First text is Sancino A., Hudson L. Leadership in, of, and for smart cities—case studies from Europe, America, and Australia. *Public Manage. Rev.*, 2020.

1. It doesn't provide scientific descriptions of this term but provides description of leadership:
2. According authors: "question posed by this lens is: Where is leadership emerging?" (Sancino & Hudson, 2020, p. 12) "Why is leadership created?" (Sancino & Hudson, 2020, p. 13) "Who are the leaders?" (Sancino & Hudson, 2020, p. 13) or so
3. It uses data of Policy documents, Websites, Reports, Academic literature or so: "We collected the case study evidence from multiple sources: academic literature, policy documents, reports, websites, the re-analysis, and interpretation of data sets from previous smart city studies and from knowledge gained by one author participating as a consultant and researcher in two of the cities" (Sancino & Hudson, 2020, p. 8).
4. According its comparative analysis it result propose some theoretical generalizations about 'modes' of smart city leadership in their matrix.

Second text is Biondi L., Demartini P., Marchegiani L., Marchiori M., Piber M. Understanding orchestrated participatory cultural initiatives: Mapping the dynamics of governance and participation. *Cities*, 2020, p. 96.

1. Article is not suggesting clear description of this term but says: "governance and participation can be adequately understood with the figure of 'bricolage'. According to the very requirements of the situation, the orchestrator acts as a bricoleur experimenting with an ephemeral mix of vision, coordination, empty canvasses and loose ends. However, we have to be aware that the orchestrators might also have their own political agendas or be instrumentalised by powerful political actors or elites" (Biondi, Demartini, Marchegiani, Marchiori, & Piber, 2020, p. 8).
2. According authors: "research question we address in this paper is: What elements provide a deeper understanding of the development and the governance of PCIs" (Biondi, Demartini, Marchegiani, Marchiori, & Piber, 2020, p. 2).
3. Data of participatory initiatives is from various primary and secondary sources: "PCIs were selected through a purposeful sampling technique. In it motivation for this study sprang from the growing importance of participation as a major theme at the European level. Therefore, we decided to select from European PCIs. To the purpose of the inquiry, we identified four cases, each of which involves different forms of orchestration and governance – public, private, hybrid. We collected data from both primary and secondary sources. In terms of primary data, each researcher conducted an in-depth investigation of one case through direct observations and semi-structured interviews with several key actors and stakeholders. The secondary sources of data included documents, official reports, press releases, publicly accessible videos, social media postings, meetings observations, and websites" (Biondi, Demartini, Marchegiani, Marchiori, & Piber, 2020, pp. 2, 3).

4. In result analysis authors say they: “found a similar pattern of development in all the PCIs: i) the starting phase (generation of ideas); ii) the opening-up phase (design/preparation/production of the cultural project); and iii) the implementation of the project (expected uses according to the goals of the PCI). So it during these phases, the complex dynamics of participation unfold.” (Biondi, Demartini, Marchegiani, Marchiori, & Piber, 2020, p. 6).

Third text is Hausberg J.P., Spaeth S. Why makers make what they make: motivations to contribute to open source hardware development. *R. D. Manage.* 2020, 50(1), pp. 75-95.

1. While new public management is not described as a process, it is shown in forms of motivation of Open source software (OSS) and hardware (OSH) developers to contribute their private resources to public open innovation goods.
2. Research question is: “Can we really assume the motivations behind the development of the OSH to be the same as those behind OSS?”
3. According authors, research collected data from the most common and active 3D printing communities, which are the main loci of OSH development: “survey included mainly FabLabs and RepRap maker- and hackerspaces, but as well a few university-based 3D printing groups/spaces and online communities or forums, like those of sites like thingiverse, ultimaker, and youmagine. Since our contacts distributed the invitation to participate within their respective communities, we have no possibility to estimate the response rate. However, 279 clicked the link, and 169 of these responded to at least some questions and 119 (42.6%) sufficiently completed the questionnaire to include the responses in it” (Hausberg & Spaeth, 2020, p. 81).
4. As research states: “analysis reveals several important findings: firstly, the motivations are in some aspects very similar to those in open source software notwithstanding different possibilities, hurdles, and incentives regarding the OSS and OSH. Above all, enjoyment-based intrinsic motivation is a major factor affecting contribution levels. Secondly, among internalized extrinsic motivations, expected private benefits through improving own skills stands out. Thirdly, different factors of internalized extrinsic motivations can have different moderating effects on the effect of enjoyment-based intrinsic motivation. Investigating the motives behind the contributions to OSH communities based on the selfdetermination theory, it showed that some of the classical motivations behind OSS development contribution are the major factors also in the case of OSH development, but we also show some interesting interaction effects and thus contribute to theory development of the selfdetermination theory as well as to a better understanding of the OSH development” (Hausberg & Spaeth, 2020, p. 87).

Fourth text is Li J., Krishnamurthy S., Pereira Roders A., van Wesemael P. *State-of-the-practice: Assessing community participation within Chinese cultural World Heritage properties*. Habitat Int., 2020, p. 96.

1. As of describing new public management, no strict description is in research, but it says if management needs to not only include governmental agencies, experts and businesses but also NGOs and representatives of residents, with the aim of achieving community goals or so.
2. Research question is: how community participation is positioned within World Heritage management in PRC properties in World Heritage List?
3. According authors, research: “developed a targeted assessment framework through which to assess community participation within the management practice of the 36 Chinese cultural heritage inscribed on the WHL from 1987 to 2018” (Li, Krishnamurthy, Pereira Roders, & van Wesemael, 2020, p. 9), showing data of participation, initiatives from government or population.
4. Research says: “Through the application of the assessment framework to UNESCO documents, the results provide an overview of Chinese practices in facilitating community participation in World Heritage management. Generally, Chinese World Heritage management is a government-led process wherein community participation is happening to a minimal degree of it” (Li, Krishnamurthy, Pereira Roders, & van Wesemael, 2020, p. 9).

For analysis of public participation in contexts of NPM or governing developments we chose 4 recent texts, which show this trajectories. The first text looks to Participative Planning with Management. This research aims showing differences within organisations that are using participation in planning and realization, and come in conclusions, that its more resulting aims and effective now comparing to organizations that do not include its beneficiaries (Garcia-Zamor, 2019).

Next text which looks to this phenomenon, believes private-public partnership is modern way to reach aims and efficiency in management, being a recent part of NPM. Research shows participation of stakeholders in solving issues in management being in realization in different countries in different modes, but can not show which is exactly right for practicing NPM, it really connects to specifics of sociums. (Norton & Blanco, 2009).

Our next text researching this issue focuses on development of post-NPM, which is seen in it as of newest form of development in management. As author shows, in its developments to improve organization management, public administration has been introducing in its scientific research NPM and now post-NPM, limits of which are shown usual in socium it is introducing in. (Jong, p. 161)

In our next text we can find author’s explanations on how innovation in public sector can bring to development of management way or practices, shows recent trends of innovation, from NPM to governing institutions, creating competition in stakeholders, up to participation.

It is important to understand this process in order to understand way of making such sort in collaboration work, as it slowly changes into co-issuing of policies with stakeholders, its construction, organizers (Sørensen, 2012, p. 215).

Summarizing the above presented theoretical approaches, it is easy to see that in modern conditions a new democratic model of managing an organization is being formed with a corresponding transformation of the stylistic models of managing actors. In accordance with the established practice, the management model is developed on the basis of the style and cultural preferences of the formal leaders of the organization. At the same time, the system of managerial interaction should correspond to a model that, under certain conditions of labor emancipation, has maximum socio-economic results.

Based on these theoretical assumptions, it can be concluded that the design of a new democratic model of social organization management involves a gradual process of democratization of management relations, ensuring the transition from a predominantly administrative to a predominantly participative management style of the organization.

The improvement of public administration as any other form of government can be conditionally considered in the context of the transformation of the style of managerial interaction that manifests itself in relations between managers, subordinates and the public. Improvement of any form of management (including state) is, above all, progressive transformations in the system of management style management, updating the collective characteristics (manners) of the professional management behavior of managers, changing the attitudes emerging in the implementation process of management processes. With a certain degree of abstraction, it can be stated that the improvement of public administration involves a gradual transition from the authoritarian style (manner) of managerial professional behavior of public servants to a democratic one, and then to a participatory one. In this context, it is important to clarify the essence of the various management styles in the context of sociological paradigms.

Classic management style is characterized by the use of a centralized management model, rigid administrative methods of management, suppression of the initiative and discussion of decisions made by both subordinates and representatives of the population.

The classic style is characterized by rigid authoritarian methods of management, centralization of decisions and their lack of alternatives. So it is inherent in the omnipotence of the highest governing center (represented by one ruler or a group of public servants) and powerlessness of lower-level governing bodies excludes the latter in the selection of goals, ways and means of their implementation, social control. In the framework of classic style practices, top management of the civil service is always right. He never makes a mistake; only the head of the state hierarchy has the right to make the right decisions. These principles manifest the authoritarian management stereotype. Subordinate subjects heading their subordinate organizations are also trying to translate the basic principles of authoritarianism.

The conviction reigns here that the only vertical of management authority from top to bottom minimizes the self-organization of the governed and subordinates.

Basin on it can be stated that a distinctive feature of the classic management style is the authoritarian style (manner) of managerial professional behavior of public servants. Here management is characterized by a high degree of sole power. Civil servants determine all the strategies of the social management subsystem and its individual groups; no authority is delegated to social groups; the population is not involved in management. Management activities are implemented through a single state vertical of power. System methods of administrative coercion of a social control object are of mainkyness uses.

This style, in the short term, can be effective. At the same time, it is characterized by low motivation of managers, lack of group thinking and creativity, less friendliness and a desire to cooperate with the population. Within the framework of this management style, it is easy to notice the active emergence of social contradictions, social conflicts and social aggressiveness.

In essence, the classic (administrative – rigid) type of management is directed solely at a specific result; it provides for unquestioning obedience, strict accountability, insistence on mindlessly following instructions, of it within the framework of this style there is no effective stimulation of professional growth, conditions of stagnation are created and the current stagnation is provoked.

Researchers of organizations of various types and ownership prove that the new public style (in various models of its manifestation) is opposite to the classic one. So D. Hampton stresses that within the framework of governing management changes there is an alternative choice of goals, carried out by the board, collective discussion of projects and decision-making under the leadership of a senior official and under his personal responsibility is the most important feature of a new public style.

Participatory governing style characterizes the way a manager makes decisions. The participatory governing style is characterized by the development of principles of consensus, collegial decision-making, development and encouragement of the transfer of managerial authority, stimulation of initiative and discussion of decisions.

Participatory governing style is a developed governing style with specific forms of public participation as a social object of management in the management process. Like the new public style, the participative governing style is characterized by the development of principles of consensus, collegial decision-making, development and encouragement of the transfer of administrative authority, stimulation of initiative and discussion of decisions taken by higher-ranking employees by lower-ranking employees of the civil service. In addition to this participative governing style, the participation of the population (workers) in the management process is inherent. At the same time, responsibility is not concentrated, but distributed. Therefore, the participatory governing model provides for expanding the powers of individual departments of the management structure, involving the population, public organizations, and the media not only in the process of social control, but also in the implementation of other

functions of government. The subject of management here is represented by the hierarchical structure of management institutions and officials, as a rule, elected by the population (workers) and replaced by them. In its extreme manifestation, the participatory style of government assumes the relative autonomy of involving the population in the implementation of government functions (as a subject and object of management at the same time) and the possibility of its activity in extended kinds.

The essentialness of the participatory management style lies in its orientation towards the realization of the necessary diversity of public interests, at blocking the forced unification of the needs and motives of the social action of the population, unnatural for civil society. The most important principle of a participatory management style is the combination of state administration with the self-organization of social groups of organizations and the population.

We share the scientific position of Balandina in the fact that the participative style of government is the highest manifestation of the democratic management style. Here, the democratization of management is associated with the transfer (delegation) of the most important management functions not only to individual divisions of the civil service system, but also to the population of the region, and in some cases, individual processes are completely transferred to the system of activities of public organizations, the media, and informal associations of citizens.

A distinctive feature of the new public management style is the democratic style (manner) of the managerial professional behavior of public servants. In the context of a democratic model of social management, individual units are vested with a wide range of managerial powers, and the separation of managerial power is intensified. New public (progressive group – innovative) management style assumes that not only results are important, but also ways to achieve as of.

Governing style has a number of forms of maturity. The most mature form of the governing style defines its manifestations as a participative styles. Bilateral information flows are developing here, moreover, full, and not dosed at the behest of the manager, as the main condition for decentralization of decisions, as well as involving the population in making and implementing management decisions, stepping up bidirectional social control over the implementation of management decisions. Controlling formal and informal activities are focused mainly on social management outcomes.

Ludwig von Mises emphasizes that the bureaucracy “is not in itself either bad or good. This is a management method that can be applied in various spheres of human activity” (Mises, 1993, p. 40). He noted that bureaucratic government is a government that must follow the detailed rules and regulations established by the authority of a higher authority. The most unfavorable consequence is that the main concern of the employee becomes compliance with these and other formalities. This contributes to the preservation of the management style of civil servants.

The participatory management style reflects the maturity of the development of democratic principles of governance. It is inherent in the participation of the population in the management process. Within the framework of this style, the powers of individual departments of the management structure are maximally expanded, the population, public organizations, and the media are optimally involved in management processes. The subject of management here is represented by the hierarchical structure of management institutions and officials, as a rule, elected by the population (workers) and replaced by them. In its extreme manifestation, the participatory style of government assumes a relative, independent involvement in the implementation of government functions of the population (as a subject and object of management at the same time) and the possibility of its activity in expanded forms. The most important principle of a participatory management style is the combination of state administration with the self-organization of social groups of organizations and the population.

In practice, the processes of improving the management style are actively carried out within the framework of organizations of various types and forms of ownership. Just 10 years ago, American managers didn't want to use the concept of participatory management style. Under the new conditions, thanks to the support of the Association of Automotive Workers, the managers of leading enterprises such as Ford, General Motor, Chrysler, large state and public organizations, have changed their attitude to this concept, and in recent years organizations successfully implement management model optimization programs, involving workers in the management process. For organizations of the new type, the use of autonomous work teams has become characteristic. Building a new democratic management model involves the use of autonomous, self-governing labor collectives, determines the need for a radical rejection of the old management methods, the elimination of many labor restrictions that have linked the initiative not only of managers, but also engineering and technical workers, ordinary employees of the organization.

It is easy to see that any modern organizational system involves a constant transformation of the interaction of the head with the team, improving the style of managerial interaction of workers. The transformation of management style contributes to the elimination of deviant (socially deviant) behavior in social groups and society as a whole (Giddens, 2005). There is a need to abandon authoritarian regulators of management activities. The leader in the new conditions cannot concentrate all the power in his hands, take all the responsibility for the results of labor activity, and exercise ultimate control over management and labor activity. It is necessary to abandon the authoritarian management style, from the predominance of the sole management methods, the preferential use of administrative administrative influence on subordinates. The activities of managers cannot be carried out without partner interaction with subordinates, decisions must be made more collectively, a constant search for consensus with subordinates is necessary. Categorical, orderly form, frequent reference to the sanctions of the head in the new conditions can not be effective.

4. Conclusion

Social organizations of various forms and types of ownership reduce the direction of their activities, become less large and less stable, they dynamically develop on the basis of a qualitative transformation of social, material, and technological factors. There are tendencies in staff cuts, improving the quality of human capital, updating the structure of the organization, and dividing the staff in terms of the accumulated intellectual and educational human capital into main and secondary labor. The number of independent managers, part-time workers under contract (part-time employment) is growing. Subcontracting and temporary contracts are gradually spreading, the composition of permanent work is reduced, flexibility, innovative mobility of managers, their ability to participate independently in the labor innovation process becomes a major factor of competitive advantages.

We share the findings of theorists of social government that, in the face of increasing environmental variability, effective state organizational systems should function as open social systems, which implies, on the one hand, the introduction of new participatory principles of general management theory. On the other hand, the creation of objective conditions for attracting the population to self-development and self-improvement of public administration processes. It creates the need for the constant democratization of the managerial interaction of public servants (as a subject of government) and the population (as an object of government). The effectiveness of public administration increasingly depends not on the applied management technologies, labor discipline and the severity of the planned strategy, but on the presence of part-time interaction of civil servants with the population, coherence, creativity and innovative accumulation of new administrative ideas of residents of various regions.

The formation of a participatory management style is an objective process, since this style is characterized by a number of major competitive advantages. The most significant of the benefits are as follows. This type is based on the innovative type of organizational culture, which creates conditions for attracting people not only to social management control, but also to the implementation of a dynamic accumulation of research and management innovations. This creates prerequisites for the destruction of barriers to the use of social initiative of officials, employees of various ranks, social organizations, and the public. Creative innovative activity of the population is incompatible with the activities of authoritarian leaders of management, it requires emancipation, involvement in the adoption and implementation of management decisions.

The formation of a participatory management style reflects the principle of civic integration, which is the most important indicator of building a civil society.

The first phase of the formation of a participatory style is associated with the emergence of simple methods of democratic managerial interaction. Management is carried out taking into account the views of the population in solving its main problems. Within this phase there is no

rectilinear administrative imposition of the will. Here the forms of managerial activity of civil servants are developing, the managerial actions of employees are motivated through the development of social needs of a higher order. So second phase of formation is associated with the development of complex methods of democratic management interaction, the emergence and improvement of the involvement of performers in the implementation of management functions themselves. Within the framework of the second phase, the population is complicit in solving basic management tasks related to the development of strategic and tactical goals, the development of social plans, projects, programs, the development and implementation of specific management actions, the implementation of management control and self-control by civil servants.

The third phase of formation is associated with the development of complex methods of democratic public management interaction, the formation and improvement of public involvement in the implementation of public administration management. Within the framework of the third phase, the participation of the population in solving basic management tasks and in the development and implementation of social development projects is activating.

References

1. Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (2016). The current status and future development of governance theories. In: C. Ansell, & J. Torfing. *Handbook on Theories of Governance* (pp. 551-560). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
2. Biondi, L., Demartini, P., Marchegiani, L., Marchiori, M., & Piber, M. (2020). Understanding orchestrated participatory cultural initiatives: Mapping the dynamics of governance and participation. *Cities*, 96.
3. Drucker, P. (2006). *Birth of a new organization, Knowledge management*. Alpina Business Books.
4. Garcia-Zamor, J.-C. (2019). *Public Participation In Development Planning And Management: Cases From Africa and Asia*. Taylor & Francis.
5. Giddens, E. (2005). *The Disposition of Society*. Academic Project.
6. Hampton, D. (2001). *Organization of the future*. M.
7. Hausberg, J., & Spaeth, S. (2020). Why makers make what they make: motivations to contribute to open source hardware development. *R. D. Manage.*, 75-95.
8. Hersey, P. (1985). *Situational Selling*. Escondido, Calif: Centre for Leadership Studies.
9. Jong, S.J. (n.d.). The Limits of Post: New Public Management and Beyond. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 69, No. 1, 161-165.

10. Klijn, E.H. (2012). Public Management and Governance: a comparison of two paradigms to deal with modern complex problems. In: D.L. Faur, *The handbook of governance* (pp. 201-214). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
11. Li, J., Krishnamurthy, S., Pereira Roders, A., & van Wesemael, P. (2020). State-of-the-practice: Assessing community participation within Chinese cultural World Heritage properties. *Habitat Int.*
12. Mises, L. v. (1993). *Bureaucracy. Planned chaos. Anti-capitalist mentality*. Progress.
13. Norton, S.D., & Blanco, L. (2009). Public-private partnerships: a comparative study of new public management and stakeholder participation in the UK and Spain. *International Journal of Public Policy, Vol. 4, Iss. 3-4*.
14. Sancino, A., & Hudson, L. (2020). Leadership in, of, and for smart cities—case studies from Europe, America, and Australia. *Public Manage. Rev.*
15. Sergushko, S.V. (2002). *Organizational culture as a factor in the strategic development of an organization, Management of public institutions and processes in Russia: theory and practice*. Saratov: Povolzh. Acad. state Service.
16. Sørensen, E. (2012). Governance And Innovation in the Public Sector. In: D. Levi-Faur, *The Oxford Handbook of Governance*.
17. Torrington, D., Hall, L., & Taylor, S. (2004). *Human Resource Management*. Publishing house "Business and Service".