

SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

**HIGHER ECONOMIC - SOCIAL SCHOOL IN
OSTROLEKA**

2/2019(33)

<http://www.sj-economics.com/>

Łomża, 2019

PROGRAMME BOARD

Prof. zw. dr hab. dr H.C. Antoni Mickiewicz - Zachodniopomorski Uniwersytet Technologiczny w Szczecinie, **Prof. David Gerard Alber** - Pennsylvania State University USA, **Prof. Jonathan Tuthill** - Pennsylvania State University USA, **dr hab. Andrzej Borowicz prof. UŁ** - Uniwersytet Łódzki, **prof. James W. Dunn** - Pensylwania State University USA, **dr hab. Bogusław Kaczmarek prof. UŁ** - Uniwersytet Łódzki, **dr hab. Paweł Mickiewicz, prof. ZUT** – Zachodniopomorski Uniwersytet Technologiczny w Szczecinie, **dr hab. Wojciech Popławski prof. WSB** – Wyższa Szkoła Bankowa w Toruniu, **prof. Enrique Viaña Remis** - University of Castilla-La Mancha Hiszpania, **dr hab. Wojciech Wiszniewski prof. PW** - Politechnika Warszawska, **dr hab. Piotr Bórawski prof. UWM** - Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie, **dr hab. Agnieszka Brelik prof. ZUT** – Zachodniopomorski Uniwersytet Technologiczny w Szczecinie, **dr hab. Mariola Grzybowska-Brzezińska prof. UWM** - Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie, **dr Manfred Müller** - SiegmundsbürgerHaus Werraquelle GmbH Niemcy, **dr Radosław Szulc** - Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie, **associate professor Volodymyr Ternovsky**, – Tavriya State Agrotechnological University, Ukraina, **dr hab. Elżbieta Jadwiga Szymańska prof. SGGW** - Szkoła Główna Gospodarstwa Wiejskiego w Warszawie, **dr hab. Agnieszka Sapa, prof. UEP** – Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Poznaniu, **dr Kazimierz K. Parszewski** – Ostrołęckie Towarzystwo Naukowe im. A. Chętnika, **dr Marta Bloch** – Wyższa Szkoła Ekonomiczno-Społeczna w Ostrołęce, **dr inż. Iwona Pomianek** – Szkoła Główna Gospodarstwa Wiejskiego w Warszawie.

DRAFTING COMMITTEE

dr inż. Ireneusz Żuchowski (editor-in-chief), **mgr Kazimierz Krzysztof Bloch** (secretary), **dr Agnieszka Sompolska-Rzechula** (statistical editor), **mgr Alina Brulińska** (language editor), **Jeffrey Taylor** (language editor – English language), **dr hab. Bogusław Kaczmarek prof. UŁ** (theme editor),
dr hab. Andrzej Borowicz prof. UŁ (theme editor),
dr hab. Piotr Bórawski prof. UWM (theme editor), **dr hab. Mariola Grzybowska-Brzezińska prof. UWM** (theme editor)

PUBLISHER
HIGHER SCHOOL OF AGRIBUSINESS IN LOMZA
18-402 Łomża, ul. Studencka 19, tel./fax. +48 86 216 94 97
www.wsa.edu.pl



Punkty Informacji Europejskiej w Ostrołęce
Europe Direct



Publikacja wydana ze wsparciem
finansowym
Komisji Europejskiej w ramach projektu
Europe Direct

© Copyright by
HIGHER SCHOOL OF AGRIBUSINESS IN LOMZA
Łomża, 2019
ISSN 2391 - 9167

SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL – nr 2/2019(33)

Dr hab., MBA Walery Okulicz-Kozaryn

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6486-1369

Researcher ID:

Scopus Author ID: 57194456022

Pedagogical University of Cracow - PBN ID: 1027

Dr hab., Mykola Zhurba

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2764-0687

Lugansk Regional Institute of Postgraduate Pedagogical Education

PhD, Anastasiia Simakhova

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7553-4531

Researcher ID: T-4300-2017

Scopus Author ID: 57294637544

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University

PhD, Anatoly Zhurba

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3374-3612

International Academy of Personnel Management

DO UKRAINIAN CITIZENS PREFER THE EASTERN MANAGEMENT MODEL?

Introduction

The aim of the empirical analysis is the identification of the management model preferred by Ukrainian citizens. Because Ukraine is also a post-Communist country, it is very important to investigate the preferences of Ukrainian citizens.

The main idea of this study is Ukrainian citizens prefer the European management model. The European Union has an integrated economy. This economy operates on the rules of the European management model. It is a very interesting direction for research - to make a verification of the choice of management model for the Ukrainian citizens.

This paper is a part of a general study of Eastern European citizens' preferences related a management model. The first part of the study has already been published (Okulicz-Kozaryn, 2018). It was about Polish respondents only. Both of these papers are united by a common research methodology. They have very close fields of literature review. They differ in the purpose of the study, the groups of respondents and recent research results.

First of all, we studied the preferences of state and municipal employees. At the same time, the preferences of other groups of citizens were studied.

Many authors analyze the problems of the post-Soviet territories. For example, Poklonskaya (n.d.) said that the main problem is employees of local government.

Further, 'Transition' as the prevailing paradigm for governing post-soviet societies has rarely been questioned. More than 20 years, it has served as the guiding framework for thinking and practicing post-soviet transformation in the Central and Eastern European (CEE) region. By using Estonia this research employs for exploring how public administration has been constituted ([Muhhina 2017](#)). Before that, Buda (2016) gave some recommendations regarding the way in which the community and the state could improve local authorities' work.

In the paper of Bonsón (2017), data on 75 local governments in 15 countries of Western European were collected and tested for both government use and citizens' engagement. This research highlights the importance that local governments attach to clearly establishing the main purpose of their SM accounts to avoid frustration on the part of citizens that can lead to distrust and reduce the chances that citizens will invest their resources, time, and knowledge in participation.

It was showed by Balaban (2016) that there are new challenges for public communication in Romania. Based on the example of over 40 city halls, city councils, prefectures and county councils from Transylvania, the study analyzes the use of new media tools in public communication by applying content analysis and in-depth interviews with the Public Relation representatives in those institutions. The most important advantages of online communication in public administration are high speed, cost reduction, reaching young audiences, etc. There are also critical voices that express possible risks such as exclusion of audience groups that have no online media literacy.

Šenková (2016) showed a source of strength of the organization in Slovakia (European management model). Simultaneously, Guluță (2016) studied the behavior of managers in Romania (European management model).

At the same time, the study (Dan 2015) reviews reforms in Estonia, Hungary and Romania. It finds that research that assessed changes in internal processes and activities within the public sector by far outnumber research that assessed changes in outputs and outcomes. The paper shows the influence on the public sector in the future.

Before that, the paper explores the types of organizational culture and the role effectiveness of the HRM function in 71 New South Wales and Queensland local government entities (Stephen T.T., Titien A., Rodwell J.J., 2003). It was shown that market-oriented organizations have a higher level of human resource role effectiveness.

In the Eastern countries (including the USSR and post-socialist countries), public administration and business are focused on the Eastern management model (Ouchi 1981; Pascale 1981; Whitehill 1992). In the European countries, public

administration and business are focused on the European management model (Calori, Woot 1994; Okulich-Kazarin 2009; Ouchi 1981; Pascale 1981). In these situations, there is a harmony between the requirements of the management model and the expectations of employees. The person feels a satisfaction and operates with high efficiency. There are cases, when employees work in the management model that he does not like. In such cases, employees feel frustration and irritation. And their effectiveness is reduced.

Today it is interesting to explore European and Eastern models of management on the example of Ukraine.

The aim of the study is to check: do Ukrainian citizens prefer the Eastern management model?

Methodology:

The study was carried out since June 2018 till April 2019. When planning an ascertaining experiment, we have relied on the results of previous studies. The practical part of the study was focused locally, in Ukraine. From a theoretical point of view, we relied on studies carried out in different countries before that.

We use the methods of sociological research (Kravchenko 2014; Volkov 2003). For some statistical calculations we used the methods of social statistics (Vasileva, Lalin 2012; Textbook 2010; Minashkin 2008).

The study was performed in several stages:

- information research;
- planning the ascertaining experiment;
- statistical observation;
- primary processing and grouping of results;
- verification of statistical hypotheses;
- writing the text and correcting the text according to the reviewers' comments.

First, we define of the question – what exactly we were trying to find out?

During information research more than 60 scientific sources were studied, including those published in the journals indexed in databases WoS and SCOPUS.

Secondly comes the formation of a hypothesis, which is the idea that Ukrainian citizens, as citizens of Europe, prefer the European management model.

The Null Hypothesis in the form: $\mu_0 = 0,0$.

The Null Hypothesis: Ukrainian citizens prefer the European management model. In other words, the percentage of Ukrainian citizens who chose the European management model equal to 100%, if random deviations will not to take into account.

The Alternative Hypothesis is written: $\mu_0 \neq 0,0$.

The Alternative Hypothesis: Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the European management model. In other words, the percentage of Ukrainian citizens who do not chose the European management model do not equal to 100%,

if random deviations will not to take into account.

The next stage of the method is the design of an experiment. In our experimental run data collection takes place, followed by data analysis. The methods of social statistics allow to use the obtained data to assess the two general populations:

- Ukrainian citizens who had experience in the public administration;
- Ukrainian citizens who had no experience in the public administration.

The experiment involved 110 respondents. It was selected three experimental groups for the study (table 1).

Table 1. General characteristics of respondents, 2018-2019

Tabela 1. Ogólna charakterystyka respondentów, 2018-2019

No	Group of respondents Grupa respondentów	Number Liczba	Age Wiek
1	Young workers of the Parliament of Ukraine, Kiev Młody pracownicy Rady Najwyższej Ukrainy, Kijów	36	25-35
2	Young workers of local government, Luhansk region Młody pracownicy organów samorządu terytorialnego, Obwód Ługański	34	28-35
3	Students of the International Academy of Personnel Management, Luhansk region Studenci Międzynarodowej Akademii zarządzania personelem, Obwód Ługański	40	22-35
	In total / Suma	110	-

Source: Own survey

Źródło: Badania własne

The first experimental group consisted of 36 persons. They were the young workers of the Parliament of Ukraine at the age from 25 to 35 years. They had experience in the public administration and basic theoretical knowledge in the field of a management theory.

The second experimental group included 34 persons. There were young workers of local government, Luhansk region. The age of the respondents ranged from 20 to 30 years. They had experience in the public administration and basic theoretical knowledge in the field of the management theory.

The third experimental group included 40 persons. There were students of full-time and part-time form of education of the International Academy of Personnel Management, Luhansk region. So, the age of the respondents ranged from 22 to 35 years. They had no experience in the public administration. However, they had the basic theoretical knowledge in the field of the management theory.

The experiment was carried out in three phases: statistical observation, primary processing and grouping of results, verification of statistical hypotheses.

In the first phase survey of respondents was performed. The survey was anonymous. The main question for respondents was: what management model do

I prefer – Eastern or European?

In the second phase comes the primary processing and grouping of results.

Then comes formation of statistical hypotheses, which are explanations of a situation based on what is currently known from the experiment.

And the data was interpreted and from this, we were able to draw conclusions.

Results and discussion

The first phase

Exactly we wanted to know, do Ukrainian citizens prefer the Eastern management model?

Table 2 shows the results of the survey, which covered n = 110 respondents.

Table 2. Preferences of respondents when they choose the management model

Tabela 2. Preferencje respondentów przy wyborze modelu zarządzania

№	Group of respondents Grupa respondentów	Number Liczba	Chosen of European Wybrali Europejski	Chosen of Eastern Wybrali Wschodni
1	Young workers of the Parliament of Ukraine, Kiev Młody pracownicy Rady Najwyższej Ukrainy, Kijów	36	28	8
2	Young workers of local government, Luhansk region Młody pracownicy organów samorządu terytorialnego, Obwód Ługański	34	20	14
3	Students of the International Academy of Personnel Management, Luhansk region Studenci Międzynarodowej Akademii zarządzania personalem, Obwód Ługański	40	18	22
	Amount / Suma	110	66	44
	Amount / Suma, %	100	59,50	40,50

Source: Own survey

Źródło: Badania własne

Table 2 shows, at first glance, quite a paradoxical situation. It seems to us that the first and second groups of respondents prefer the European model of management. And the students of the International Academy of Personnel Management do not prefer the European management model.

The second phase

We assume, that the respondent, who chose the European management

model, receives the value '1' (one). The Respondent, who chose the Eastern management model, receives the value '0' (zero). On this basis, we can calculate the average of sample \bar{X}_i and statistical deviation δ_i and δ_{i-1} for each of group (table 3).

Table 3. Statistical data for 4 groups of respondents

Tabela 3. Dane statystyczne na 4 grup respondentów

Group of respondents Grupa respondentów	The sample size / Wielkość próby n_i	The average of sample Średnia próby \bar{X}_i	The statistical deviation Statystyczne odchylenie δ_i	The statistical deviation Statystyczne odchylenie δ_{i-1}
Young workers of the Parliament of Ukraine, Kiev Młody pracownicy Rady Najwyższej Ukrainy, Kijów	36	0,78	0,41	0,42
Young workers of local government, Luhansk region Młody pracownicy organów samorządu terytorialnego, Obwód Ługański	34	0,59	0,49	0,50
Students of the International Academy of Personnel Management, Luhansk region Studenci Międzynarodowej Akademii zarządzania personelem, Obwód Ługański	40	0,45	0,49	0,50

Source: Own survey

Źródło: Badania własne

Statistics (\bar{X}_i , δ_{i-1}) allows to use the obtained data to assess the three groups of respondents.

The third phase

Here we check do Ukrainian citizens prefer the European management model? Previously, we suggested that Ukrainian citizens (as residents of European country) prefer the European management model.

Since respondent, who chose the European management model, receives the value "1" (one), we write the Null Hypothesis in the form: $\mu_0 = 1,0$.

The Null Hypothesis: Ukrainian citizens prefer the European management model. In other words, the percentage of Ukrainian citizens who chose the European management model equal to 100,0%, if random deviations will not to take into account.

The Alternative Hypothesis is written: $\mu_0 \neq 1,0$.

The Alternative Hypothesis: Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the European management model. In other words, the percentage of Ukrainian

citizens who do not chose the European management model do not equal to 100%, if random deviations will not to take into account.

The method of testing of the hypothesis about the average of General population is to calculate t-statistics (BUS_9641 2010): $t_{stat} = (\bar{X} - \mu_0) / \hat{S}_{\bar{X}}$.

Table 4 shows the statistical results for groups 1-3.

Table 4: the verification of statistical hypotheses: Ukrainian citizens prefer the European management model, the checking level is 1,0 %

Tabela 4: Weryfikacja hipotez statystycznych: Obywatele Ukrainy wolą Europejski model zarządzania, sprawdzanie poziomu 1,0 %

No	Initial data Dane	The group 1 Grupa 1	The group 2 Grupa 2	The group 3 Grupa 3
1	Sample size, n	36	34	40
2	Selective average, \bar{X}	0,78	0,59	0,45
3	Standard deviation for sample, δ_x	0,41	0,49	0,49
4	Average error, $\hat{S}_{\bar{X}} = \delta_x / \sqrt{n}$	0,068	0,084	0,158
5	Value $ t_{stat} $ for $\mu_0 = 1,0$, $(\bar{X} - \mu_0) / \hat{S}_{\bar{X}}$	3,235	6,071	3,482
6	Value t_{tabl} for significance level 99,0, %, Table 9.1.1 (Textbook 2010, 42)	2,724	2,733	2,708
7	Result, $t_{stat} > t_{tabl}$	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	The accepted hypothesis Przyjęta hipoteza	Alternative alternatywna	Alternative alternatywna	Alternative alternatywna

Source: Own survey

Źródło: Badania własne

If t-statistics in absolute $|t_{stat}|$ is larger the t-value from the t-table t_{tabl} , we reject the Null Hypothesis and accept the Alternative Hypothesis: Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the European management model.

The observed difference between the statistical average \bar{X} and a specified value of $\mu_0=1,0$ can not be explain by coincidence only. Since the difference exceeds a simple coincidence, Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the European management model, if random deviations will not to take into account.

It was statistically proved that Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the European management model. The result is highly statistically significant (0,01).

Than we check do Ukrainian citizens prefer the Eastern management model?

Since respondent, who chose the Eastern management model, receives the value "0" (null), we write the Null Hypothesis in the form: $\mu_0 = 0,0$.

The Null Hypothesis: Ukrainian citizens prefer the Eastern management model. In other words, the percentage of Ukrainian citizens who chose the Eastern management model equal to 0,0%, if random deviations will not to take into account.

The Alternative Hypothesis is written: $\mu_0 \neq 0,0$.

The Alternative Hypothesis: Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the Eastern

management model. In other words, the percentage of Ukrainian citizens who do not chose the Eastern management model do not equal to 0,0%, if random deviations will not to take into account.

Table 5 shows the statistical results for groups 1-3.

Table 5: the verification of statistical hypotheses: Ukrainian citizens prefer the Eastern management model, the checking level is 1,0 %

Tabela 5: Weryfikacja hipotez statystycznych: Obywatele Ukrainy wolą Wschodni model zarządzania, sprawdzanie poziomu 1,0 %

No	Initial data Dane	The group 1 Grupa 1	The group 2 Grupa 2	The group 3 Grupa 3
1	Sample size, n	36	34	40
2	Selective average, \bar{X}	0,78	0,59	0,45
3	Standard deviation for sample, δ_x	0,41	0,49	0,49
4	Average error, $\bar{S}_x = \delta_x / \sqrt{n}$	0,068	0,084	0,158
5	Value $ t_{stat} $ for $\mu_0 = 0,0$, $(\bar{X} - \mu_0) / \bar{S}_x$	11,471	7,024	2,848
6	Value t_{tabl} for significance level 99,0, %, Table 9.1.1 (Textbook 2010, 42)	2,724	2,733	2,708
7	Result, $t_{stat} > t_{tabl}$	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	The accepted hypothesis Przyjęta hipoteza	Alternative alternatywna	Alternative alternatywna	Alternative alternatywna

Source: Own survey

Źródło: Badania własne

If t-statistics in absolute $|t_{stat}|$ is larger the t-value from the t-table t_{tabl} , we reject the Null Hypothesis and accept the Alternative Hypothesis: Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the Eastern management model.

The observed difference between the statistical average \bar{X} and a specified value of $\mu_0=0,0$ can not be explain by coincidence only. Since the difference exceeds a simple coincidence, Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the Eastern management model, if random deviations will not to take into account.

It was statistically proved that Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the Eastern management model. The result is highly statistically significant (0,01).

Discussion

In our study, we got the very interesting results - Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the Eastern management model.

Ukraine "is moving" to Europe. This means that the country should have the European social and administrative institutions. And Ukrainian citizens do not accept these institutions psychologically and professionally. Ukrainian citizens do not want to work in this social and professional system (the European management model). They have absolutely no an internal motivation to work in the European management model. At the same time, they do not want to work in the Eastern management model. They are not internally motivated to work in the European management model or in the Eastern management model.

So, Ukrainian citizens cannot operate effectively in the European management model. This situation may be a consequence of the Communist regime. It may be reasonable to suppose that part of socio-economic problems of Ukraine (European country) is tied to a desire and willingness of Ukrainian citizens to work in the European management model.

What to do in a situation when Ukrainian citizens do not want to work in the European management system? One of the solutions is to change a training process. It seems to us it is necessary to strengthen the development of personal and social competences in the training process of Ukrainian citizens.

It was a little or a lot to have 110 Respondents?

For example, in the paper (M.C. Guluță, 2016), 50 managers were questioned only. It was enough to show correlations in their companies. In the paper (Özdemir, 2018) the study was carried out only with the participation of 40 respondents. In the paper (Kayalar, 2017), the study was carried out only with the participation of 15 university students. And, in the paper (Pavlova, 2016) there were 48 respondents only. So, we are sure that 110 Respondents are quite enough to get the reliable results in the study.

Can we trust the results of our research?

Every researcher has right to try to disprove the results. To do this, s/he needs to get the result more highly statistically significant. This means that s/he needs to interview respondents several times more than in this study. And it does not guarantee that the result will be different. However, we believe that everyone can try to replicate or refute results of the study with higher precision.

The results are highly statistically significant (0,01). That is why, our results suggest that, the decision will be correct in approximately 99% of the cases and incorrect in 1% of cases only. In this sense, we have the decision-making process with accurate, controlled probability.

What are the results of the study?

In the study, we obtained the next results:

1. three general populations of Ukrainian citizens have the same preferences when choosing a management model;
2. three general populations of Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the European management model;
3. three general populations of Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the Eastern management model.

All results are highly statistically significant (0,01).

Conclusions:

The goal was achieved in the study – we have known that Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the European management model.

At the same time, Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the Eastern management model, if random deviations will not to take into account.

Statistics (\bar{X}_i, δ_{i-1}) allows to use the obtained data to assess the two general populations:

- Ukrainian citizens who had experience in the public administration;
- Ukrainian citizens who had no experience in the public administration.

It was received very strong results, because results are highly statistically significant (0,01). It may not be correct to compare the obtained results with what has been before. It is widely recognized that previous results would have been obtained in the previous social environment and so the results had to be different.

1. We had to reject a hypothesis, that Ukrainian citizens prefer the European model of management. It's been statistically proven, that Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the European management model.

2. We learned that two general populations of Ukrainian citizens have the same preferences when choosing a management model.

3. One of the solutions is to change a training process. It seems to us it is necessary to strengthen the development of personal and social competences in the training process of Ukrainian citizens.

4. It is the first task for future research – to study how to manage the training process that Ukrainian citizens will want to work in the European management model.

The second task for future research is a study of the choice of management models for citizens of other post-Soviet countries (Belarus, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Serbia, Romania, etc.).

Acknowledgement:

The study was carried out in Ukraine with the support of the Eastern European Research Group (Azerbaijan, Belarus, Poland, Serbia, Ukraine).

The authors thank the respondents who took part in the survey for their understanding, time and honesty.

Also, we would like to thank reviewers for their insightful comments on draft of this manuscript.

Bibliography

1. Balaban D.C., Abrudan M.C., Iancu I., Irimieş C., *Online Communication and PR in Romanian Public Administration. The Case Study of Public Institutions from Transylvania*. Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences, 2016, 47 E, 20-34.
2. Bonsón E., Royo S., Ratkai M., *Facebook Practices in Western European Municipalities: An Empirical Analysis of Activity and Citizens' Engagement*. Administration & Society, 2017, 49, 3, 320–347.
3. Buda D., *Local Authorities' Involvement in Fulfilling the Minor Children Maintenance Obligation, in Protecting and Promoting Children's Rights*. Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences, 2016, 47 E, 35-48.
4. Textbook BUS_9641_5M. Business_Statistics. *Textbook for the Program 'Masters of Business Administration'*. NY: Kingston University, 2010.
5. Calori R., Woot Ph., *A European Management Model: Beyond Diversity*. London and New

- York: Prentice Hall, 1994.
6. Dan S., *The New Public Management is Not That Bad After All: Evidence from Estonia, Hungary and Romania*. Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences, 2015, 44 E, p. 57-73.
 7. Guluță M.C., Rusu C., *Leadership styles and managerial behavior in Romanian companies*. Polish Journal of Management Studies, 2016, 13, 2, 69-80.
 8. Kayalar, Fil., Kayalar, Fet., *The effects of Auditory Learning Strategy on Learning Skills of Language Learners (Students' Views)*. IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS), 2017, Volume 22, Issue 10, Ver. VII, 04-10.
 9. Kravchenko A.I. (2014) *Sociologia (uczebnik dla akademicheskogo bakalavriata)*. Moscow: Yurajt.
 10. Minashkin V.G. (2008) *Teoria (Textbook)*. Moscow: EAOI.
 11. Muhhina K., *Governing 'Transition', The Discursive Construction of Public Administration in Post-Cold War Estonia*. Administration & Society, 2017, 49, 4, 575-611.
 12. Okulich-Kazarin V., Kalinina D., Shtriker A., *Three 'hot' methods to economic security of Poland*. Osiągnięcia naukowe, rozwój, propozycje na rok 2014. Proceedings of the International scientific-practical Conference, Warszawa, Poland, 2014, 9-10.
 13. Okulich-Kazarin V., Kazarinov Yu. (2009) *Fundamentals of management (Textbook)*. Moscow: Prometey.
 14. Okulicz-Kozaryn W., 2018, *What a management model do employees of Polish Local Self-Government prefer: Eastern or European?* Zeszyty Naukowe WSES w Ostrołęce, 4/2018 (31), 136-145.
 15. Ouchi W. *Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1981.
 16. Özdemir, C., Özdemir, E.D. *Suggestions for Problems Faced in Basic Language Skills by University Students Learning Turkish in Kazakhstan*. European Journal of Contemporary Education, 2018, 7(2), 344 – 359.
 17. Pascale R.T., Athos A.G. *The Art of Japanese Management: Applications for American Executives*. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1981.
 18. Pavlova, A. *Gendernaya asimmetria v oboznacheniih socialnykh roley v russkom yazike v aspekte vospriyatiya*. Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski, 2016, VII/2, 211-221.
 19. Poklonskaya N., *Poklonskaya called officials the main problem of the Crimea*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://ren.tv/novosti/2017-02-25/poklonskaya-nazvala-chinovnikov-glavnoy-problemy-kryma>.
 20. Stephen T.T., Titien A., John J.R., *HR Role Effectiveness and Organizational Culture in Australian Local Government*. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 2003, 41, 3, 298-315.
 21. Šenková A., Šambronská K., Mitříková J., Matušíková D., Mat'ková S., *Corporate culture as a tool for increasing employee motivation*. Polish Journal of Management Studies, 2016, 13, 2, 131-141.
 22. Vasileva E.K., Lalin V.S. (2012) *Statistics: (Textbook)*. Moscow: Yuniti-Dana.
 23. Volkov U.G. (2003) *Sociologia (Textbook)*. Moscow: Gardariki.
 24. Whitehill A.M., *Japanese Management: Tradition and Transition*. Routledge, London, 1992.

CZY OBYWATELE UKRAINY WOLĄ WSCHODNI MODEL ZARZĄDZANIA?

Streszczenie

Celem badania jest sprawdzenie, czy wolą obywateli Ukrainy europejski model zarządzania? Podstawowymi metodami badań były metody badań socjologicznych i metody statystyki społecznej. Przeprowadzono wywiady dwie główne grupy obywateli Ukrainy (110 respondentów). Badanie przeprowadzono na podstawie statystycznej analizy preferencji obywateli Ukrainy. Przeprowadzona

kontrola dwóch par hipotez statystycznych. Musieliśmy odrzucić hipotezę, że ukraiński obywatele wolą europejski model zarządzania. Statystycznie udowodniono, że obywatele Ukrainy nie wolą europejski model zarządzania. Dowiedzieliśmy się, że dwie główne grupy obywateli Ukrainy mają takie same preferencje przy wyborze modelu zarządzania.

Cel badania został osiągnięty, jak bardzo silny wynik, ponieważ empiryczne wyniki są wysoko istotne statystycznie (0,01).

Uzyskane wyniki mogą być przydatne dla krajów Wschodniej Europy.

Słowa kluczowe: Obywatele Ukrainy, samorząd terytorialny, administracja publiczna, europejski model zarządzania, wschodnia model zarządzania, Ukraina.

Summary

The aim of the study is to check do Ukrainian citizens prefer the European management model?

The main research methods were methods of sociological research and methods of social statistics. It was asked two general populations of Ukrainian citizens (110 respondents). The study was based on the statistical analysis of preferences of Ukrainian citizens. The verification of two pairs of statistical hypotheses was performed. We had to reject a hypothesis, that Ukrainian citizens prefer the European model of management. It's been statistically proven, that Ukrainian citizens do not prefer the European management model. We learned that two general populations of Ukrainian citizens have the same preferences when choosing a management model.

The purpose of the study was achieved as a very strong result, because empirical results are highly statistically significant (0,01).

The results can be useful for other post-Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

Keywords: Ukrainian citizens, local government, public administration, European management model, Eastern management model, Ukraine.

JEL Classification: D23, H70, P10