There are analyzed basic theoretical approaches to the study of cultural styles of governance in the context of "metagovernance" concept. Classifications of metagovernance styles are overviewed, namely the division into three pure styles: hierarchical (hierarchy governance), network (network governance) and market (market governance). There are processed the investigations of scientists, where there is justified the classification of governance styles as cultures, i.e. three ideally typical styles of governance are also a reflection of a culture. The results of the research according to G. Hofshtede’s methodology are suggested.
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The implementation of public authorities’ system modernization in any country in the context of globalization involves a thorough scientific study of modern theoretical principles and practical case studies of successful reforms in foreign countries. To ensure the scientific processes of implementing practical measures to reform public administration in Ukraine, we believe, there is a need to analyze and synthesize foreign theoretical approaches to the study of "metagovernance" concept, in which there are processed and produced: modern classification of approaches / styles of governance; cultural styles / cultural dimensions of governance issues researches; the semantics of terms in which the scientific debate about theoretical and applied aspects of governance, metagovernance and public management is implemented.
The basic theoretical background studies of the aspects of cultural styles of governance in the context of the metagovernance concept are contained in the works of such scholars as: G. Bukert, A. Vidinski, B. Jessop, R. Ellis, M. Castells, J. Kelly, L. Meuleman, A. Molodtsov, K. Pollit, E. Sorensen, J. Torfing, K. Hood, M. Tomposon, H. Hofshtede and others.

The article presents the results of theoretical researches of cultural styles of governance in the context of the metagovernance concept. We have attempted to study modern theoretical approaches to the classification of cultural styles of governance and make recommendations for academic researches and practices of reforming the system of public administration.

It is believed that the term "metagovernance" was offered by the British sociologist B. Jessop as a "coordination" of different forms of governance and ensuring minimal connections between them [1]. He used the term in the context of demand management / coordination of three (pure) styles of governance (lifestyles / cultural styles): hierarchical (hierarchy governance), network (according to A. Molodtsov, 2011) [2] (network governance) and market (market governance) [3]. Using metagovernance approach allows producing the greatest degree of governance coordination, ensuring the compatibility of different governance mechanisms and regimes, combining hierarchy, market and network governance approach, as well as hybrid forms [4].

Previous studies of summarizing current researches concerning the evolution of public administration concepts have enabled us to find out that at present the most recognized are: Traditional governance (Old Public Administration); Public Management / New Public Management; Governance / New Public Governance.

It was detected that traditional public administration (Old Public Administration) – it is an implementation of the classic concept of bureaucracy: the state, based on professional standards. The result – authoritative rules of regulations and providing qualitative services aimed at ensuring justice. Public Management/New Public Management provides a strategic performance management and quasi markets: public and private. Governance / New Public Governance is based on cooperation between different levels and sectors: government, public and private.
Expected results – new tools aimed at the empowerment and involvement of private stakeholders interested in social production, solution of problems and providing services (Table. 1) [5 - 7].

**Table 1**

**The evolution of public administration concepts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Concept implementation</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Old Public Administration</td>
<td>Bureaucracy: state, based on professional standards</td>
<td>Authoritative rules of regulations and providing qualitative services aimed at ensuring justice</td>
<td>Periodic elections and constitutional responsibility</td>
<td>Understanding the State as a special, higher sphere, the share of trained professionals, bureaucrats. Citizen Services is only one of the functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
<td>Strategic performance management and quasi markets: public and private</td>
<td>Deregulation and service marketing aimed at providing effectiveness and consumers satisfaction</td>
<td>Measuring and sanctions through competitions</td>
<td>A &quot;customer-oriented&quot; model of the State, services in accordance with standards and regulations, achieving good results is the main thrust of the official’s activity. Providing services is a key function of the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Public Governance</td>
<td>Cooperation between different levels and sectors: government, public and private</td>
<td>New tools aimed at the empowerment and involvement of private stakeholders interested in social production, solution of problems and providing services</td>
<td>Several reporting forms based on different standards, focused on the continuous development of collaboration forms between public authorities and stakeholders</td>
<td>The active role of those interested. The joint work of citizens, civil society, business and public authorities including through &quot;a new wave of technologies.&quot; The emphasis on achieving partnership, equal relations with stakeholders. Qualitative administrative services are products of cooperation of the State and non-state actors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*according to J. Torfing, P. Triantafillou, 2012; supplemented by A. Lipentsev, 2013.

In our opinion, there is a necessity in a separate study of a classification, which was suggested by Ch. Pollitt and G. Bouckaert in their third comparative study of Public Management Reforms in 12 countries and the European Commission. These reputable scientists have included to their model of basic styles ("Big models") both neo-Weberian state and Network style (tab. 2) [8].
## Big models: main styles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Basic requirements</th>
<th>The biggest general mechanism of coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>Make government more prescriptive &quot;accountable to the consumer with the introduction of business methods&quot;</td>
<td>Marketing type mechanisms, quantity and quality indicators / results, production figures, objectives, competitive contracts, quasi markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neo-Weberian style / state</td>
<td>Modernize traditional state apparatus so as to become more professional and more accountable to citizens. Business methods can play a supporting role in this aspect, but the state remains the main actor with its rules, methods and culture</td>
<td>Public authority is implemented through the disciplinary hierarchy of impartial officials People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Make government more informed, more flexible and less exclusive, working through &quot;self-organizing&quot; networks rather than a mechanism of hierarchy or market</td>
<td>Networks of mutually connected stakeholders (interested parties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Governance (where New Public Governance – NPG – is one of the variants)</td>
<td>Make government more effective and legitimate, including into it more public representatives, both in politics and in production. Some management options have to clearly rely on &quot;network approach&quot;, and most of them to pay special attention to &quot;horizontal&quot; rather than &quot;vertical control&quot;</td>
<td>Networking and partnership among stakeholders (interested parties)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*adopted according to Ch. Pollitt and G. Bouckaert, 2011 – by A. Lipentsev.*
In 2008 the Rotterdam University professor L. Meuleman suggested the more expanded definition of metagovernance as an approach aimed at combining successful combinations of ideas from different styles of governance and govern using them. Metagovernance can be defined as an approach that produces a certain level of coordinated governance through the development and management of appropriate / reasonable combination of "pure" styles of governance: hierarchical, market and network (Fig. 1), to achieve the best results, from the point of public managers’ view, those who are responsible for management (guidance) in the public sector. Metagovernance–it is not a style of "super management", but the attitude and approach, which is expected to help overcoming some of the typical failures of each of governance styles and their combinations [10].

Fig. 1. Graphical model of the “metagovernance” concept [9]

Some scientists use the term "metagovernance" in the sense of strengthening one of the styles of governance. Following this idea, E. Sorensen and J. Torfing determine metagovernance as a way to improve the efficiency of the network governance using hierarchical governance mechanisms / instruments, such as the introduction of internal regulations in the network, or creating legal frameworks, in which there must be present network processes [10, 11]. In another work, E. Sorensen expresses the view that the concept of "metagovernance" may be used "not only by government
agencies, but also by different networks of public and private entities both at the national, regional and local levels in the formal political system." In its broadest sense there could be defined metagovernance as "an alternative form of management (government) ..., which is not based on direct and vertical ("top-down") control, but on many indirect ways to influence or coordinate the activities of self-governance entities" [12].

Such researchers as J. Kelley determine metagovernance as an attempt to restore state control over new forms of governance. He notes that hierarchical governance arises in a new form to coordinate the network and market governance styles. It provides government influence in the form of management and guidance (leadership) within the network and market styles of governance [13].

Supporters of metagovernance believe that its use as a prudent intervention in the styles of governance and the creation of "hybrids" increases the ability of public sector organizations to solve complex social problems and opportunities. The use of metagovernance involves the conscious situational approach, taking situational form (shape) that is defined by: the type of task, organizational culture and balance, the level of pressure by those interested (stakeholders) [14].

According to the research made by Professor L. Meuleman, it was historically established that in the post-war Western European countries there have dominated various styles of governance. From the 50-ies to 70-ies of the XX century there dominated a hierarchy, a based style of powers (authorities), a clear division of tasks, rules, rationality and objectivity. In 80-ies of the XX century the market approach in public administration had become a new fashion, with an emphasis on price, efficiency and decentralization [15]. The market approach to governance at the same time with new forms of hierarchical control had transformed into a "New Public Management" (further on - NPM), later, in the early 2000ies, one of the classics of NPM - Professor K. Hood –began to use the term "public management" [16 - 20]. In 90-ies of the XX century there appeared the network approach to governance based on interdependence, trust and empathy. For quite a long period of time, network governance had been considered as a hybrid form of hierarchy and market. At present it is recognized that network governance should be highlighted in the third style [21 -
Other forms of governance can be viewed as hybrids from the three "ideal" types. In the scientific literature of the past three decades there have been examined thirty five differences between the three styles. These differences can be grouped into five topics: vision and strategy, orientations, structures, people and results [27] (Table 3). It is revealed that three styles of governance usually form combinations where one style dominates, and two others are working on the "background." The problem is that the hierarchical, network and market governance styles are often in conflict with each other and reduce the overall efficiency [28]. Thus, the concept of hierarchical, network and market governance styles can serve as a basic analytical basis to explain the causes of conflicts and processes of enhancement / reduction of interactions within and between the styles of government [29].

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Basic features of differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vision and strategy</td>
<td>Theoretical bases, general motive, virtues, strategy of a style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Orientations</td>
<td>How other actors are considered, how are they chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>Organizational structures, mechanisms of control and coordination, type of operation, communication roles, the role of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Leadership styles, relationships, competencies and values of public servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The similarity of types of problems, typical failures of governance style, typical kinds of products and outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table was elaborated by A. Lipentsev [30, 31].

The growing recognition of "governance" as a concept of an organizational reform of public administration reflects the widespread belief that the focus of administrative practice shifts from the hierarchical governance towards greater use of horizontal, hybrid and associative forms of governance. There is a popular idea among many scientists (those who work with the theory) that the hierarchy has disappeared / disappear, while other scientists, grounding on the analysis of more than eight hundred empirical studies, argue that this type of governance is still "alive and feels well" [32]. The verification of this thesis is also confirmed by the research of European scientists who argue that there are no conclusive evidences that there is formed a "definitely post-bureaucratic" public (state) sector. We agree with the researchers who believe that there is only a complex mixture of old and new forms of
governance, and there are no objective reasons to talk about a style of governance as a panacea [33, 34].

We have summarized the key aspects that characterize the styles of governance and provide a theoretical basis for their study as the cultural styles (tab. 4).

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>The period of dominance / fashion</th>
<th>Style of governance / country</th>
<th>The essence of a style</th>
<th>Theoretical foundations</th>
<th>The type of administrative culture / country</th>
<th>Three socially active “ways of life”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1950-ies – 1970-ies</td>
<td>Hierarchical governance</td>
<td>Style, based on powers (authorities), a clear division of tasks, rules, rationality and objectivity</td>
<td>“Rationalism” “Positivism” “The concept of rational bureaucracy”</td>
<td>“Rechtsstaat” (legal state) Germany</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1980-ies</td>
<td>Market governance</td>
<td>Focus on: the financial results of providing services, citizens as consumers, the efficiency of decentralization</td>
<td>“Rational choice theory” “Public choice theory” “Principal agent theory”</td>
<td>“Public interest” The United Kingdom</td>
<td>Individualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1990-ies</td>
<td>Network governance</td>
<td>It appears on the basis of interdependence, trust and empathy</td>
<td>“Social constructivism” “Social configuration theory” “Contingency theory”</td>
<td>“Consensual approach” Netherlands</td>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table was elaborated by A. Lipentsev [35 – 39]

According to Australian researchers of reforms in public service, the future will depend not on the approaches to public governance based on a market, hierarchy or network, but on the usage of all three styles, and the focus will be not on contract management or network management, but on the efficient mixing of all three styles, taking into account the fact that they can compete and come into conflict with each other [40].

For a long time the cultural aspect of political and public governance had been neglected by scientists who were working in these areas [41]. One of the reasons was that it did not fit into the dominant in a post-war paradigm of rational choice. Governance is a form of social coordination, and three "pure" styles of governance
reflect certain specific complex values and beliefs and certain patterns of interpersonal relations. Authors of "Grid-group cultural theory" M.Thompson, R.Ellis and A.Vildavski believe: "what we now define as a free society with the ability to manage their lives, the election of authorities and the right to criticism, is the product of interpenetration of hierarchism, individualism and egalitarianism" [42].

Three socially active lifestyles demonstrate the values and preferences that are quite similar to the three ideal typical styles of governance. Styles of governance are not just political and administrative concepts, but also include a cultural dimension. Governance is one of the forms of social coordination and governance styles show certain specific values and beliefs, and certain patterns of interpersonal relations. The regulations "grid-group" of the theory of culture help to make a classification of governance styles as cultures, i.e. three typical styles of governance are the reflection of culture [43, 44] (Table. 5).

| Table 5 |
| Cultural styles of governance in the context of the research according to Hofstede methodology (by L. Meuleman, 2010; supplemented by A. Lipentsev, 2015) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted distance of public authorities</th>
<th>Hierarchical administration</th>
<th>Network administration</th>
<th>Market administration</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (good public authorities, privileges, dependence)</td>
<td>Low (equal rights, pluralism, interdependence)</td>
<td>Individual (liberty, autonomy, task-oriented, independent)</td>
<td>Average (good public authorities, privileges, dependence / equal rights, pluralism, interdependence) Hierarchy - 44.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual/Collective</th>
<th>Hierarchical administration</th>
<th>Network administration</th>
<th>Market administration</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective (equality, oriented towards relations, interdependence)</td>
<td>Low (trust, high participation of residents)</td>
<td>Collective (equality, oriented towards relations, interdependence)</td>
<td>Collective (equality, oriented towards relations, interdependence) Network – 20.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertainty avoidance</th>
<th>Hierarchical administration</th>
<th>Network administration</th>
<th>Market administration</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (many laws, low participation of residents)</td>
<td>Low (trust, high participation of residents)</td>
<td>Masculinity (performance, competition, fairness, recognition)</td>
<td>Masculinity (performance, competition, fairness, recognition) Market - 79.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Long-term / short-term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term (the study of long-term personal network connections)</th>
<th>Short-term (achievement, freedom, dignity)</th>
<th>Short-term (achievement, freedom, dignity)</th>
<th>Market - 60.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Germany, France</td>
<td>Netherlands, Scandinavia</td>
<td>The UK, the USA, and other Anglo-Saxon countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine (the expert LRIPA questionary of 210 respondents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table with the results of L. Meuleman’s research according to Hofstede’s methodology was supplemented by our own researches, which have been held in LRIPA NAPA within the scientific research work: "Diagnosis of organizational culture of public authorities: methodological aspect" – state number 0215U009130. There were involved students (Masters of Public Administration) of both full-time and extramural forms of study as respondents. There were interviewed 210 respondents. Calculation of the survey results were done on the "IBM SPSS Statistics 19" software. The general distribution of respondents was analyzed as belonging to a certain level of organization, by age, gender and office.

According to our survey, in the context of the metagovernance concept, by L. Meuleman, there can be determined 2 cultural styles, which dominate in Ukraine: Hierarchical style (the distance of public authorities – 44.5 – the average index and the desire to avoid uncertainty – 75.7 – rather high index) and also Market style (short-term orientation – the highest rate – 60.9 and a high rate in terms of masculinity – 79.1. And only in one dimension of Individualism / collectivism – Network style – the index is 20.7 – that is the 3rd style according to its application in administrative practices [45].

Taking into account the pilot type of our study according to G. Hofstede’s methodology, the specificity of the objectives of the study – one of the tasks is the adaptation of the method; specific sample of respondents - students of the training program “Masters of Public Administration” (civil servants, officials of local governments, public sector employees, and entrepreneurs in a much less extent), we believe that the results should be viewed as a special case study.

Some other results of the study of national culture in Ukraine were received by a team of researchers led by G. Hofstede [46]; taking into account that a team leader
is the developer of methods and has been working by this method for 25 years in most countries around the world, they should be considered more reliable and Ukraine can be attributed to the countries with a distinct culture of Hierarchy through nearly maximum indexes according to the dimensions "Distance of public authorities" – 92 and "Uncertainty avoidance" – 95 (tab. 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distance of public authorities</th>
<th>92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Long-term orientation</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Indulgence</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table was elaborated by A. Lipentsev according to G. Hofshtede [47]

It should be noted that to the G. Hofshtede’s methodology there was entered another dimension "Indulgence", which has the index for Ukraine – 18, but given that L.Meuleman had used the 5-dimensioned model of the research, we won’t take into account this dimension in the context of this study.

There is important the empirically proved pattern [48], that the style of governance which is close to the national culture, will be the first style to be applied as the dominant style. Only when this variant fails, then there are considered other styles and emerge situational mixtures. The above mentioned research results by G. Hofshtede [49] for Ukraine indicates that the dominant style here is Hierarchical, which is the closest one to the national culture of administration. It is proved that the transference of successful governance approach from one country to another by means of a dogmatic way, without adapting to national administrative / socio-political culture and other factors almost certainly fail. It is important to understand that approach to governance styles as cultures explains why hierarchical, network and market governance are often regarded as the doctrines, as unconditional truth, and that’s why so often also as a panacea [50].

Summarizing the study of theoretical and applied aspects of the "metagovernance" concept, main ideas should be summarized:
1. There are different approaches to determining the nature and content of the "metagovernance" concept. We agree with researchers, who believe that metagovernance can be defined as an approach that produces a certain level of coordinated governance through the development and governance of appropriate / reasonable combination of "pure governance styles": hierarchical, market and network, to achieve the best results in terms of public managers responsible for leadership in the public sector. Metagovernance is not a style of "super administration", but it’s the attitude and the approach, which is expected to help to overcome some of the typical failures of each of governance styles and their combinations [51]. According to current researches, the usage of metagovernance provides the conscious situational form, i.e. hybrids / composition of styles often have a situational form, determined by the type of a task, organizational culture and balance, the level of stakeholders’ pressure [52].

2. In our point of view, it is topical to consider metagovernance as the approach to coordinate / join 3 styles: hierarchical, network and market, when metagovernance provides the possibility to "switch" from one style of governance to another [53], for instance, network style – to a hierarchical style when problems (suddenly) were reformulated from complex and unstructured to urgent and clearly defined.

3. Understanding and usage of the "metagovernance" concept will allow researchers and practitioners in the field of public administration in Ukraine to expand the arsenal of research approaches and variation of management practices and improve the quality of decision-making, especially at the strategic level (eg. in solving problems of administrative-territorial reform, the implementation of decentralization processes, mergers of institutional / organizational structures, etc.).

4. In the works of modern foreign researchers [54 - 56] it was proved that styles of governance are not only political and administrative concepts, but also have the cultural dimension. The regulation "grid-group" of the cultural theory helps to make the classification of governance styles as cultures, i.e. three ideally typical styles of governance are also the reflection of the culture.

5. It was found that the dominant and the closest to the national culture is the hierarchical style of governance.
6. The analysis of theoretical studies of foreign scientists allowed to find out that the consideration of the "metagovernance" concept through the prism of cultural dimensions made it possible to identify a number of trends, namely: governance style, which is close to the national culture, and will be the first one to be applied as the dominant style. Only when this fails, then there are considered other styles and emerge situational mixtures: the transference of successful governance approach from one country to another by means of a dogmatic way, without adapting to national administrative / socio-political culture and other factors almost certainly fail; the approach to governance styles as cultures explains why hierarchical, network and market governance are often regarded as the doctrines, as unconditional truth, and that’s why so often also as a panacea [57]. Understanding of the "metagovernance" concept can help to develop more effective approaches to the management in specific situations [58].

7. We need to continue the study and clarification of theoretical, terminological and applied aspects of: cultural styles of governance and the "metagovernance" concept. There is a necessity to conduct a comparative research of cultural styles all over the regions of Ukraine, which will give a better understanding and will objectify the picture of dominant styles of governance in the context of axiological system of regions coordinate.
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