



**UDC 351(061.1ЄС)**

***Karpa Martha Ivanivna,***

*Candidate of Sciences in Public Administration, doctoral student of the Department of Regional Administration and Local Self-Government of Lviv Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, 79491, Lviv-Briukhovychi, Str. Sukhomlynsky, 16, tel.: +38 (067) 670 57 77, e-mail: marta.karpa@ukr.net*

*ORCID: 0000-0001-8141-4894*

***Карпа Марта Іванівна,***

*кандидат наук з державного управління, докторант кафедри регіонального управління та місцевого самоврядування Львівського регіонального інституту державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України, 79491, м. Львів-Брюховичі, вул. Сухомлинського, 16, тел.: +38 (067) 670 57 77, e-mail: marta.karpa@ukr.net*

*ORCID: 0000-0001-8141-4894*

***Карпа Марта Івановна,***

*кандидат наук по государственному управлению, докторант кафедры регионального управления и местного самоуправления Львовского регионального института государственного управления Национальной академии государственного управления при Президенте Украины, 79491, г. Львов-Брюховичи, ул. Сухомлинского, 16, тел.: +38 (067) 670 57 77, e-mail: marta.karpa@ukr.net*

*ORCID: 0000-0001-8141-4894*

*DOI <https://doi.org/10.31618/vadnd.v1i14.106>*

---

## **COMPETENCE APPROACH IN EUROPEAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: ESSENCE AND DEVELOPMENT TRENDS (ARCHETYPAL ASPECT)**

**Abstract.** The article reveals the main features of the competence approach in the practice of European public administration. The features of the competence approach in public administration are determined on the basis of analysis of the basic concepts of public administration. In the dynamics of the formation and development of popular theories of interaction between state and local authorities, such as the theory of a free community, community (public) and public and state (the theory of municipal dualism), we can trace a number of characteristic features of a competency approach, which manifests itself both through the general

theoretical relations and manifestations, and through the practice of coexistence of public authorities. There is a problem of definition and distribution of public functions as a prerequisite for defining and shaping the competences of public institutions. An important issue in the context of a competent approach is the institutional consolidation of functions in the context of the existence of the basic models of territorial organization of power. In each of the varieties of the Governance concept (Responsive Governance concept, Democratic Governance concept, Good Governance concept), the specifics of the use of competencies are defined.

The archetypal symbols in the European public administration are singled out using the analysis of competence in public administration in its main constituents. A brief description of the archetypal aspect of European public administration is given. The main components of competence are shown in connection with the existing archetypal symbols and the characteristic trends of their development. Their connection is shown according to the scheme “the entity component (who?) – the object component (what?) – the administrative component (how?) – the basis (in what environment?)”.

Concerning the trends of development of a competence approach in the context of practice and theory of public administration, it is determined that modern concepts of public administration are characterized by shifting the balance between state and public institutions to the sphere of common goals and tasks, and thus responsibility. The joint activity of all subjects of society requires new forms of cooperation, definition of the spheres and subjects of each entity’s activity for effective cooperation, distribution of functions and competences of the entities, formation and consolidation of their status characteristics.

**Keywords:** public administration, public service, competence, competence approach, competence of the entity of public administration, archetype.

### **КОМПЕТЕНЦІЙНИЙ ПІДХІД У ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОМУ ПУБЛІЧНОМУ УПРАВЛІННІ: СУТНІСТЬ ТА ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ РОЗВИТКУ (АРХЕТИПНИЙ ВИМІР)**

**Анотація.** Розкрито основні ознаки компетенційного підходу у практиці європейського публічного управління. Визначено ознаки компетенційного підходу у публічному управлінні на підставі аналізу основних концепцій публічного управління. У динаміці становлення й розвитку популярних теорій взаємодії державної та місцевої влади, таких як теорія вільної громади, громадівської (громадської) та громадсько-державницької (теорія муніципального дуалізму), простежується низка характерних ознак компетенційного підходу, які виявляються як через загальнотеоретичні співвідношення й прояви, так і через практику співіснування органів публічної влади. Виникає проблема визначення та розподілу публічних функцій як передумови визначення та формування компетенцій публічних інституцій. Важливим питанням у контексті компетенційного підходу є інституційне закріплення функцій у розрізі існування основних моделей територіальної організації влади. У кожному з різновидів концепції Governance (концепція Responsive Governance, концеп-

ція Democratic Governance, концепція Good Governance) визначено специфіку використання компетенційних складових.

Виокремлено архетипові символи в європейському публічному управлінні з використанням аналізу компетенції у публічному управлінні за основними її складовими. Надано стислу характеристику архетипного виміру європейського публічного управління. Основні складові компетенції показано у зв'язку з наявними архетиповими символами та характерними тенденціями їх розвитку. Показано їх зв'язок за схемою “суб’єктна складова (хто?) – об’єктна складова (що?) – управлінська складова (як?) – основа (в якому середовищі?)”.

Щодо тенденцій розвитку компетенційного підходу у контексті практики й теорії публічного управління визначено, що сучасні концепції публічного управління характеризуються зміщенням балансу між державними та громадськими інституціями до сфери спільних цілей і завдань, а відповідно і відповідальності. Спільна діяльність усіх суб’єктів суспільства потребує нових форм співробітництва, визначення сфер і предметів діяльності кожного суб’єкта для ефективної співпраці, розподілу функцій та компетенцій суб’єктів, становлення й закріплення їх статусних характеристик.

**Ключові слова:** публічне управління, публічна служба, компетенція, компетенційний підхід, компетенція суб’єкта публічного управління, архетип.

### **КОМПЕТЕНЦИОННЫЙ ПОДХОД В ЕВРОПЕЙСКОМ ПУБЛИЧНОМ УПРАВЛЕНИИ: СУЩНОСТЬ И ТЕНДЕНЦИИ РАЗВИТИЯ (АРХЕТИПИЧНОЕ ИЗМЕРЕНИЕ)**

**Аннотация.** Раскрыты основные особенности компетенционного подхода в практике европейского публичного управления. Определены признаки компетенционного подхода в публичном управлении на основе анализа основных концепций публичного управления. В динамике становления и развития популярных теорий взаимодействия государственной и местной власти, таких как теория свободной общины, громадской (общественной) и общественно-государственного (теория муниципального дуализма), прослеживается ряд отличительных признаков компетенционного подхода, которые проявляются как через общетеоретические соотношения и проявления, так и через практику сосуществования органов публичной власти. Возникает проблема определения и распределения публичных функций как предпосылки для определения и формирования компетенций публичных учреждений. Важным вопросом в контексте компетенционного подхода является институциональное закрепление функций в разрезе существования основных моделей территориальной организации власти. В каждом из разновидностей концепции Governance (концепция Responsive Governance, концепция Democratic Governance, концепция Good Governance) определена специфика использования компетенционных составляющих.

Выделены архетипические символы в европейском публичном управлении с использованием анализа компетенции в публичном управлении по

основным ее составляющим. Предоставлено краткую характеристику архетипного измерения европейского публичного управления. Основные составляющие компетенции показано в связи с имеющимися архетипическими символами и характерными тенденциями их развития. Показано их связь по схеме “субъектная составляющая (кто?) — объектная составляющая (что?) — управленческая составляющая (как?) — основа (в среде?)”.

В связи с тенденциями развития компетенционного подхода в контексте практики и теории публичного управления определено, что современные концепции публичного управления характеризуются смещением баланса между государственными и общественными институтами в сферу общих целей и задач, а соответственно и ответственности. Совместная деятельность всех субъектов общества требует новых форм сотрудничества, определение сфер и предметов деятельности каждого субъекта для эффективного сотрудничества, распределения функций и компетенций субъектов, становления и закрепления их статусных характеристик.

**Ключевые слова:** публичное управление, публичная служба, компетенция, компетенционный подход, компетенция субъекта публичного управления, архетип.

---

**Thesis statement.** The relevance of this research is determined by the development of a competent paradigm in public administration. The influence on the formation of public administration systems is, of course, carried out by archetypes, since they form the environment of the functioning of society and the state, affect the development of democracy, in particular regarding the separation of communities as entities of governance. In the context of this research, it is advisable to determine the archetypal aspect of public administration, the search and defining of archetypal symbols in European public administration from the point of view of the application of a competence approach.

**Analysis of recent publications and the definition of previously unsettled parts of the general problem.** Representatives of various foreign scientific

schools, namely G. Bréban, J. Wiedel, D. Garner, J. Grimo, C. Davis, J. Eberbach, K. Ekstine, J. Elder, N. Owen, S. Solon, R. Schaffhauser, J. Chevalier and others were involved in the study of certain components of the competences of public administration entities. A number of scholars, including V. B. Averianov, S. S. Alekseev, I. L. Bachilo, I. A. Grytsiak, V. S. Kuibida, V. K. Mamutov, O. I. Sushinskyi, Yu. O. Tikhomirov and K. F. Sheremeta, paid attention to the concept of “competence”.

The processes of forming a concept of competence in public administration both from the position of theoretical and methodological development, and on the practical implementation of it, remain earlier unsolved part of the general problem in the context of this problem.

**Objective of the article** is to identify the main features of the competence

approach in the concepts and theories of European public administration and to distinguish archetypal symbols in the public and management aspect.

**Results.** According to a number of researchers, the competence paradigm arose in the 70's of the twentieth century. The development of the competence approach as a system conception of describing human education is linked to the studies of the famous American linguist N. Chomsky, who formulated the concept of competence in relation to the theory of language [1]. As a dominant educational paradigm, the competence approach began to develop in the late 70's of the twentieth century under the influence of the formation of education models in Western Europe and the United States [2].

In the dynamics of the formation and development of popular theories of interaction between state and local authorities, such as the theory of a free community, community (public) and public and state (the theory of municipal dualism), we can trace a number of characteristic features of a competency approach, which manifests itself both through the general theoretical relations and manifestations, and through the practice of coexistence of public authorities. The theory of a free community was based on the idea of the community's natural right to resolve community issues. This is evidenced by the Belgian and French law in the XVII–XIX centuries [3; 4]. Consequently, the community institute was distinguished as the subject of the exercise of local authority, and determined the issues that it should solve, that is, the subjects of community management as part of its competence. The state au-

thority retained control functions. In this, we see an attempt to separate the competence of the state and self-government authorities.

In the context of the development of the management system of European states, institutions of power are characterised by such a feature as the absence of vertical governance structures and central regulatory influence (a kind of “governance without government” that acquires transnational horizontal networks) [5]. Such a concept is inherent to decentralized management practices and social self-regulation. A characteristic feature of this model is the interdependence of the entities, which gives rise to the idea of forming common goals and objectives of the activity with the need to define the functions of each entity. The most acute question here is the political issues of separation of powers, since the entities in such a model are participants with different status and, accordingly, with different functional and competency load. Integration of public and non-public entities generates a number of questions regarding their interaction and competence, first of all with respect to responsibility and status characteristics. Among the possible forms of innovation in the context of the action, the concept of political (social) networks indicates their ability to provide horizontal coordinating links, associative forms of organization and management, coordination and reorganization, corporatization of public administration, orientation towards social responsibility; the use of project-program-targeted management, administrative and financial, and public accountability, as well as rational allocation of resources. Despite the

mentioning of joint activities of state and public institutions on a partnership basis (“provision of social services on a partnership basis”, “optimization of (proper) correlation “centralization–decentralization”, its (the state’s) partnership with the population in decision-making”), V. Bakumenko sees a strong role of the state in the activity of network structures (“the dominance of the state in various spheres of society in partnership with public structures”) [6].

There is a problem of definition and distribution of public functions as a prerequisite for defining and shaping the competences of public institutions.

An important issue in the context of a competent approach is the institutional consolidation of functions in the context of the existence of the basic models of territorial organization of power. In his research, S. Hix states that relations between state and non-state institutions are non-hierarchical and characterized by interdependence. The main functions of governance are not distribution, but regulation of social and political risks [7]. The White Paper also states that “governance concerns the state’s ability to serve the citizens. Governance refers to the rules, processes, and behaviour by which interests are articulated, resources are managed and power is exercised in the society” [8].

The continental (French) model is characterised by a hierarchical system of subordination and a dominant control function in accordance with the subordinate principle. Local authorities have certain functions: municipalities – as to issues of property management, management of relevant services, allocation of local budgets, etc.; public

authorities – as to the exercise of state power at all institutional levels of the hierarchical pyramid and control over the exercise of the functions of public authorities.

The mixed model combines the features of continental and Anglo-Saxon models. The peculiarities of this system are the activities of state and self-government authorities as a single system, the fulfilment of state functions is carried out in part by self-government, the emergence of public institutions in the relations between the state and society. For example, Germany, as a bright representative of this model, recognized that the federation and the lands are not the only subjects of public administration. Communities function either as institutions of self-government, or as bodies to which the state delegates certain functions [9].

The concept of Public administration was built on the activities of state structures and institutions, the peculiarities of which are the hierarchical structure of interconnections, standardization of procedures and decision-making and subordinated relations between the entities of power. The main tasks that were typical of public administration at this stage were to ensure citizens’ security and property protection, to establish social standards and to adhere to the rule of law principle [5].

Widely spread from the 90-s of the twentieth century, the concept of Governance, which emerged after the work of J. Habermas “The Theory of Communicative Action” [10] in the 90’s of the twentieth century, is characterised by partnership principles of interaction that forms the institutional consolida-



tion of relations between government, business and citizens. Often, this interprets as an equal partnership, which should mean the same right of access to resources. At the same time, from the point of view of competence, issues of establishing norms of responsibility, allocation of powers, and, consequently, the assignment to participants of the appropriate status remain complex. The basis of the concept remains relevant, although the primary source of its creation was the exercise of power in the process of disposing of the political, economic and social resources of the countries that are transitioning from totalitarian to democratic regimes, which was considered an instrument of the World Bank since 1993 [11].

In each of the varieties of the concept of Governance, there is a specific use of competency constituents. The concept of Responsive Governance manifests most in terms of responsibility as a component of the competence of the entities of governance. The concept of Democratic Governance manifests in the context of the formation and consolidation of the status characteristics of all entities of governance

as equal members, forming authority, departmental affiliation and responsibility. The focus is on Good Governance, which involves engaging business and the public in governance processes, based on human rights, interaction between different institutional levels. All types of Governance concepts extend the involvement of its subjects in public administration, among others, citizens, non-governmental organizations, entities and business structures. Strengthening public control creates certain competency limits for government bodies or even self-government bodies.

From the point of view of the application of the competence approach, we will try to analyse the archetypal symbols, distinguishing its main components. Table shows the components of the competence approach, the connection of the component/forming question, archetypal symbols and trends in their development. Consequently, the main components of competence are shown in connection with the existing archetypal symbols and the characteristic trends of their development. Their connection is shown according to the scheme: “the entity component

**Archetypal symbols in public administration in the medium term from the point of view of application of the competence approach (author’s model)**

<b>Component of the competence approach</b>	<b>The connection of the component/forming question</b>	<b>Archetypal symbols</b>	<b>Trends of development</b>
1	2	3	4
Entity	Entity/who?	Community (Belgium, XIX century) – state; citizen – state; private sector; public institutions – government institutions;	Expansion of the role of multientity, coentity, interentity; predominance in the direction of entity-entity relations (reduction of entity-object ones)

1	2	3	4
		civil society – power; local self-government – state power; network structures; intergovernmental institu- tions	
Object of competence	Object/what?	Citizen's rights; public needs; public interests – power interests – state interests	Development of social inte- gration, grouping of commu- nities, defining of goals and needs of society, citizens and groups; the formation of inter-entity components (objectives, needs, goals)
Administrative componet	Mechanism/ how?	Management – control – administration; State administration – public administration – local self-government; public governance; self-management, self-organization	The trend of self-govern- ment, self-organization
Principles and basis	Basis/in what environment?	Humanization; protection of rights; freedom; democracy; equality; socialization; communication	Development of communi- cative paradigm; socialization of society

(who?) – the object component (what?) – the administrative component (how?) – the basis (in what environment?)”.

From the standpoint of the concept of competence, the indicated symbols will form the subject of competence in a generalized form that at the initial stages forms the generalized function of public administration (for example, the protection of the rights and freedoms of citizens), its systemic definition (the development and introduction of functions to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens in a particular system of public management), the institutionalization of functions (the creation of insti-

tutions in accordance with functions, the definition of mechanisms of activity, normative and legal support, etc.) and content (providing spare organizational and functional load of institutions in the system of public administration, resource and methodological support, etc.).

The archetypal aspect of European public administration manifests in the archetypal ideas and principles that shape the environment for the implementation of public administration. According to Professor E. Afonin, the archetype is “a collective unconscious cultural stereotype that affects the behaviour and history of mankind” [12].



We can assume that today such generalized archetypal aspects, the essence of which can be characterized by their constituent and certain features, are relevant. The “Equality” aspect is the protection of the rights of a citizen, equal access rights to resources, powers and authority. The “Equality” aspect also can include the phenomenon “Civil Society” as one of the forms of application of equality to the processes of involving the subjects of management in the context of the existence of a system of public administration. Discussion issue in the aspect of the archetype “Equality” is the issue of privileges, special regimes, special statuses, etc., which offsets the concept of equality. The equal participation of citizens in political life, equality of all public institutions, equal powers in public administration, etc., remain problem issues.

The basis of the aspect of “Democracy” is clearly considered as a political regime (direct, indirect democracy). But it is also a collection of ideas and principles that have developed in the public consciousness; the existence of rights and freedoms, the subordination of the minority to majority, the power of the people, the protection of rights and freedoms, election, the possibility of social control, etc. The “Freedom” aspect is the ability to choose, non-participation, free definition, limitation by filters of the normative and legal framework and public ones.

The aspect of “Globalization” is global democracy, integration processes, cosmopolitan democracy, multi-levelness, network governance, world citizenship, etc.

**Summary and prospects of further research.** Features of the competence

approach in the concepts and theories of public administration based on the above analysis can be considered as:

- the separation of the community institution as the entity exercising local governance, and the defining of the issue to be addressed by it, that is, the subjects of community management; state authority retains control functions; in this we see an attempt to separate the competence of the state and self-government authorities;

- the existence of common goals regarding the provision of the necessary services to the population by local and central authorities on a partnership basis or on an equal participation basis and the existence of different goals, which creates the limits of competence of the subjects of management;

- the need to differentiate the functions of each entity; the most acute question here is the political issues of separation of power, since the entities often are with different statuses and, accordingly, with different functional and competence load;

- integration of state and non-state entities generates a number of questions regarding their interaction, first of all with respect to responsibility and status characteristics;

- availability and development of entity and status characteristics in public administration, which facilitates the establishment and differentiation of competences of all entities of management;

- the formation of goals defines the functions of the entities of management systems, which become the basic precondition for determining and fixing the competence of the entities of management; an important issue for the de-

velopment of public administration, in particular in the context of a competent approach, is the allocation of functions and their institutional consolidation;

- relations between the state and the developing community, based on their own and common subjects within power in the form of desires, interests and needs;

- the specificity of legal systems (families) can be considered as a prerequisite for characterizing the features of a competent approach in public administration;

- within the legal aspect, the issue of constitutional regulation of the competence of entities of public administration is most acute.

Archetypal symbols in European public administration are identified using the analysis of competence in public administration in its main components. The main components of competence are shown in connection with the existing archetypal symbols and the characteristic trends of their development. Their connection is shown according to the scheme “the entity component (who?) – the object component (what?) – the administrative component (how?) – the basis (in what environment?)”.

Concerning the trends of development of a competence approach in the context of practice and theory of public administration, it is determined that modern concepts of public administration are characterized by shifting the balance between state and public institutions to the sphere of common goals and tasks, and thus responsibility. The joint activity of all subjects of society requires new forms of cooperation, definition of the spheres and subjects of each

entity’s activity for effective cooperation, distribution of functions and competences of the entities, formation and consolidation of their status characteristics.

The main trends of the development of public administration from the point of view of application of the competence approach to the implementation of public functions are as follows:

- strengthening and developing processes of interaction between authorities and the population, strengthening citizens’ participation in the governance that creates conditions for partnership approaches as to the distribution of functions of governance in society;

- hierarchical structures of power are gradually replaced by horizontal, coordinating or local, network ones; subordination is gradually replaced by coordination, which strengthens the competency component, subordination and territorial functional load on the subject of management;

- change in the distribution of influence on objects of state and public communities management; trends will be manifested both in the spheres of influence, that is, in determining the objects of management and their consolidation by the entities, and in the possibility of cooperation and partnership between state and self-governing entities of management in order to achieve influence on the objects of management;

- managerial technologies begin to occupy a significant place in management, managerial activity itself changes, new paradigms, principles and norms emerge that form complex systems of both state and municipal management; most often, the latest man-

agement technologies are applied in the area of management decision-making, leadership, communication, conflict management, responsibility and organizational culture;

- the phenomenon of management publicity will increase, which will be manifested in the ever-greater use of public accountability (financial, organizational, administrative), access to services or goods, and the ability of society to participate directly or indirectly in public administration;

- the public service will require new specialists – public servants with analytical, innovative, administrative and crisis management skills and experience;

- trends in coordination, motivation, regulation, deregulation and self-regulation intensify.

## REFERENCES

---

1. *The official site of Noam Chomsky*, available at: <https://chomsky.info>
2. *Simchenko N. O.* (2012), “Ways of realizing competence in the management of human resources”, available at: <http://nauka.kushnir.mk.ua/?p=26165>
3. *The Belgian Constitution on February 7, 1831*, edited by S. Svatikov, trans. with A. Kharitonov, V. Kharitonov), Paramonova “Don’s Rech”, 1905, p. 39.
4. *The Fund for Settlement and Development of the Territorial and Regional Self-Adoption of Ukraine (1994)*, “Local government in Ukraine. History, problems, suggestions”, p. 368, Kyiv, Ukraine.
5. *Krasivsky O. Y., Kogut P. V., Kirichuk O. S.* (2012), “Development of the EU governance system: experience for Ukraine: science-method. research”, NADU, Kyiv, Ukraine.
6. *Bakumenko V. and Popov S.* (2015), “Paradigm of innovative society deve-

lopment: modern concepts of reforming public administration”, *Efektivnist’ derzhavnoho upravlinnia*, vol. 43, p. 21–28.

7. *Hix S.* (1998), “The study of the European Union II: The “New governance” agenda and its rival”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 5, p. 38–65.
8. *European governance: A White Paper*, European Commission, vol. COM (2001) 428, Brussels, p. 27.
9. *Yevtushenko O. N.* (2009), “State power and local government: the theory and methodology of interaction”, *Visnyk Natsional’noi iurydychnoi akademii imeni Yaroslava Mudroho*, available at: [http://www.nbu.gov.ua/old\\_jrn/Soc\\_Gum/Vnyua/2009\\_1/163-174.pdf](http://www.nbu.gov.ua/old_jrn/Soc_Gum/Vnyua/2009_1/163-174.pdf)
10. *Habermas J.* (1981), *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*, Jurgens Habermas, p. 524.
11. *Traité de Lisbonne modifiant le traité sur l’Union européenne et le traité instituant la Communauté européenne*, signé. – Lisbonne le 13 décembre 2007, *Journal officiel de l’Union européenne*, vol. 17.12.2007, p. 306.
12. *Afonin E. A., Martynov, A.* (2013), “Archetype and societal: interaction and mutual influence”, *Publichne upravlinnia: teoriia ta praktyka*, pp.193-200, available at: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pubupr\\_2013\\_spets.vip.\\_27](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pubupr_2013_spets.vip._27)

## СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

---

1. *Офіційний сайт Noam Chomsky [Електронний ресурс]*. – Режим доступу: <https://chomsky.info>
2. *Сімченко Н. О.* Напрями реалізації компетенційного підходу в управлінні людськими ресурсами організації [Електронний ресурс] / Н. О. Сімченко. – 2012. – Режим доступу: <http://nauka.kushnir.mk.ua/?p=26165>

3. *Бельгийская конституция 7 февраля 1831 года* / (под ред. и прим. С. Сватикова ; пер. с фр. А. Харитонов, В. Харитонов). — Ростов-на-Дону : Изд-во Н. Парамонова “Донская Речь”, 1905. — 39 с.
4. *Місцеве самоврядування в Україні. Історія, проблеми, пропозиції.* — Київ, 1994. — 368 с.
5. *Розвиток системи управління в ЄС: досвід для України : наук.-метод. розробка* / авт. кол.: О. Я. Красівський, П. В. Когут, О. С. Киричук та ін. — Київ : НАДУ, 2012. — 52 с.
6. *Бакуменко В.* Парадигма інноваційного розвитку суспільства: сучасні концепції реформування публічного управління / В. Бакуменко, С. Попов // *Ефективність державного управління : зб. наук. пр.* — 2015. — Вип. 43. — С. 21–28.
7. *Hix S.* The study of the European Union II: The “New governance” agenda and its rival / S. Hix // *Journal of European Public Policy.* — 1998. — № 5. — P. 38–65.
8. *European governance: A White Paper* // European Commission. COM (2001) 428. — Brussels, 2001. — P. 27.
9. Євтушенко О. Н. Державна влада і місцеве самоврядування: теорія й методологія взаємодії [Електронний ресурс] / О. Н. Євтушенко // *Вісн. Нац. юрид. акад. ім. Ярослава Мудрого.* — 2009. — Режим доступу: [http://www.nbu.gov.ua/old\\_jrn/Soc\\_Gum/Vnyua/2009\\_1/163-174.pdf](http://www.nbu.gov.ua/old_jrn/Soc_Gum/Vnyua/2009_1/163-174.pdf)
10. *Habermas J.* Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns / Jurgen Habermas. — В. I. Frankfurt, 1981. — 524 с.
11. *Traité de Lisbonne modifiant le traité sur l'Union européenne et le traité instituant la Communauté européenne, signé.* — Lisbonne le 13 décembre 2007 [Електронний ресурс] // *Journal officiel de l'Union européenne.* — 17.12.2007. — 306 с. — Режим доступу: [http://europa.eu/lisbon\\_treaty/full\\_text/index\\_fr.htm](http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/full_text/index_fr.htm)
12. *Афонін Е. А.* Архетип і соціетальне: взаємодія і взаємовпливи [Електронний ресурс] / Е. Афонін, А. Мартинов // *Публічне управління: теорія та практика.* — 2013. — Спец. вип. — С. 193–200. — Режим доступу: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pubupr\\_2013\\_spets.vip.\\_27](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pubupr_2013_spets.vip._27)