

FEATURES OF MAKING MANAGERIAL DECISIONS IN A CRISIS AT THE MICRO AND MACRO LEVELS

O. Chernega, Uy. Yakovenko, A. Chepurnova, O. Makieieva

ABSTRACT

The analysis of the interpretation of the concept of «managerial decision» in scientific sources is carried out. A generalized classification of managerial decisions has been formed. The parameters influencing the adoption of managerial decisions at the micro (organizational structure of the enterprise, qualifications and personal characteristics of personnel; efficiency of information acquisition channels; provision of means and objects of labor) and the macro level (competence of employees of public authorities; rationality of structure and bureaucratic procedures, decision-making, technical means, information support; decision-making and implementation environment; requests from stakeholders; regulatory framework for the functioning of public authorities, political situation; financial and economic situation). The main methods and models used in making managerial decisions are generalized. The main stages of managerial decision-making are highlighted. It has been substantiated that one of the directions of managerial decisions at the macro level is migration policy. The stages of making managerial decisions in the migration policy of the European Union are considered. The main challenges for the migration policy of the European Union as a managerial decision at the macro level have been identified (numerous uncontrolled flows of illegal migrants and refugees following the countries of Africa and Asia, the need to ensure effective control over the borders of the EU member states). The analysis of the migration policy of Ukraine from the point of view of the effectiveness and efficiency of managerial decision-making at the macro level is carried out. It is determined that the main task of the migration policy of Ukraine is to reduce labor emigration. Measures and directions for the implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy have been developed.

KEYWORDS

Managerial decisions, migration, migration policy, managerial decision-making model, managerial decision-making mechanism.

1.1 PECULIARITIES OF INTERPRETATION AND ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF MANAGERIAL DECISIONS

The process of making managerial decisions is an important component of the functioning of any economic entity. At the enterprise level (micro level), the process of making managerial decisions and the procedure for their implementation depends on many factors: organizational structure;

the level of risk; information environment; human capital, etc. However, the process of making managerial decisions at the state level (macrolevel) and a number of factors influencing their adoption, especially during a crisis period, require detailed study.

Highlighting the features of managerial decisions in a crisis at the micro and macro levels will allow developing a general algorithm for their adoption at all levels, establishing the degree of their impact on the environment (business, society) and defining a general approach to making effective managerial decisions when implementing the migration policy of Ukraine in the EU.

A critical analysis of scientific sources [1–7] made it possible to establish that, despite the diversity of the interpretation of the concept of «managerial decision» depending on the level of its implementation, the resulting result is a choice. Best, E. notes that «decision making is a special type of human activity, which consists in choosing one of several decisions» [4]. Grover, J. somewhat expanded the interpretation of the concept, emphasizing that a managerial decision «is the choice of an acceptable alternative among possible, the choice of effective actions to achieve the goal of the activity» [6].

Agreeing with the opinion of Leoveanu, A. C. that «state managerial decisions are a conscious choice, a voluntary act, the end result of discussion, the activities of decision-makers whose object of activity is state business... decisions made by the mayor, president, minister, state secretary, civil servants who are part of the public sector» [1] it should be noted that managerial decisions in Ukraine at the state level are made by the President, the Verkhovna Rada and the Cabinet of Ministers.

At the same time, it is fair to note that «the concept of a solution in the context of public-state relations is a constant concept, which, however, does not have an established definition in the scientific literature... and is a process of choosing between alternative scenarios aimed at solving problems, performing functions, achieving certain results or effect» [8].

Managerial decisions, as an economic category, are one of the tools for responding to changes in the external or internal environment. At the same time, the versatility of managerial decisions allows to single out the criteria by which they can be classified (**Table 1.1**).

The mechanism for making managerial decisions at the micro and macro levels has a number of features. At the micro level, the process of making a managerial decision depends on the parameters:

1. The organizational structure of the enterprise. The organizational structure of the enterprise determines the centers for making and executing decisions. With a linear structure, managerial decisions are made solely by the head. The functional structure provides for the distribution of decision-making capabilities at the grassroots management level. Linear staff, divisional and matrix organizational structures of management provide for a clear separation of the possibilities for making managerial decisions at the highest, middle and lower levels.

2. Qualifications and personal characteristics of personnel.

3. Effectiveness of channels for obtaining information.

4. Provision with means and objects of labor.

At the same time, an important parameter that encourages entrepreneurs to make managerial decisions is also the need to ensure economic security. Agreeing with the opinion of Ivanova, N.,

Pryimak, N. it should be noted that «economic security is the core of the formation of motivational processes and sustainable development of enterprises... the importance of economic security consists of business entity profit motivation and increase of the income amount (revenue) from the product sale (goods, work, services), the need to overcome existing risks – devastation of economic activity has to be taken into consideration as well» [12].

◆ **Table 1.1** General classification of managerial decisions

No.	Criterion	Type
1	By the level of acceptance	General Private
2	By the level of influence	Decisions affecting the environment Decisions affecting the internal environment
3	By level of taking	Decisions at the highest (institutional) level of management Decisions at the middle (managerial) level of management Decisions at the grassroots (technical) management level
4	By the way of taking	Rational Intuitive Analytical
5	By the time interval	Short-term Long-term
6	By the organizational structure level	Centralized Decentralized Combined
7	By the degree of novelty	Innovative Standardized
8	By the area of implementation	Economic Social Technological Organizational

Source: compiled by the authors based on these sources [6, 9–11]

At the macro level, the process of making managerial decisions, especially in a crisis, has a number of features. Nedelko, I. notes that a managerial decision at the state level must meet the following requirements: the presence of a scientific justification for the feasibility of the decision and its expected results; the possibility of implementation, will provide the best solution to the problem,

taking into account the actual situation in the environment; timeliness of implementation [13]. Another feature of the process of making managerial decisions at the macro level is the need to understand the responsibility for their implementation. The state managerial decision must be clearly communicated to citizens and implemented in accordance with all legislative requirements [1].

The third feature of the process of making managerial decisions at the macro level is the specificity of the organization and distribution of powers between government bodies. So, «the distribution of the state apparatus into state power bodies (legislative and executive) and local self-government determines the scale of managerial decisions and the nature of the procedures, it is possible to apply» [8].

At the same time, the list of mechanisms for making managerial decisions that can be used at the macro level is quite diverse and significantly different from each other. The direct decision-making process is influenced by the following factors of the internal and external environment:

1. «Factors of the internal environment: the competence of employees of public authorities; structure rationality and bureaucratic procedures; the level of motivation when making decisions; technical means; information support» [8].

2. «Factors of the external environment: environment of decision-making and implementation; stakeholder inquiries; legal and regulatory framework for the functioning of public authorities; political situation; financial and economic situation» [8].

Tsui, G. Y., Hoogenboom, G., Thornton, P. K. summarized the factors influencing managerial decisions into four large groups: «rational factors: quantitative factors such as price, time, forecasts, and the like; psychological factors: the personality of the manager, his/her personality traits, experience, perceptions, values, goals and roles are important factors in decision making; social factors: the consent of performers, especially those influencing decisions, is important. Taking these issues into account reduces potential negative consequences and controversies regarding such a decision; cultural factors: cultural characteristics of the region, country and integration association, as well as the culture of the decision-making organization. These cultures influence individual/organizational decisions in the form of socially accepted values, trends and shared values» [14].

Scientific sources provide a list of principles that must be followed when making managerial decisions at the macro and micro levels. So, Leoveanu, A. C. and Miroiu, A. identified the following principles for making managerial decisions:

1. «The principle of effective means. Due to a specific objective and more alternatives (means of achieving that objective) the principle requires adopting the alternative that best meets the purpose» [3].

2. «The principle of comprehensiveness. An alternative is preferable to another if its application would result in the application of all the goals we attain the other application and other purposes, in other words it is the preferable alternative that has the required comprehensive consequences» [3].

3. «Higher probability principle. If the goals we can achieve by two alternatives are generally the same, but it's a greater chance to achieve those goals by applying one of the two alternatives, then it is rational to choose this one» [1, 3].

1.2 MODELS OF MANAGERIAL DECISION-MAKING AT THE MICRO AND MACRO LEVELS

Many different models are used to make managerial decisions at the micro and macro levels in times of crisis. The general classification of models of managerial decisions is presented in **Table 1.2**.

● **Table 1.2** General classification of managerial decision-making models

No.	Criterion	Type
1	Depending on the tasks (functions) of management	Calendar planning model Enterprise development management model Product quality control model
2	Depending on the stage (procedure) of automation control	Information Mathematical Programmatic
3	Depending on the approach to decision making	Rational Intuitive

Source: compiled by the authors based on these sources [6, 9, 10, 15–19]

1. Calendar planning model.

The model assumes the adoption of managerial decisions, taking into account the «distribution of the quarterly production program for months in the context of production units, as well as in the establishment of schedule standards for organizing the production process (the duration of the production cycle for the manufacture of products, the size of work in progress, the size of the batch of products, etc.)» [20].

2. Enterprise development management model.

The model assumes that «the development of an organization depends on... the strategic directions of development... the concept of management of the development of an enterprise implies the definition of the goal of the activity, tasks for its achievement and substantiation of the directions of effective development» [21].

3. Product quality control model.

The model presupposes making managerial decisions aimed at maintaining or improving product quality. Provides for the implementation of managerial decisions in control centers and responsibility centers.

4. Information model of managerial decision making.

The model assumes that the process of making managerial decisions consists of 6 main stages: «determination of information needs; collection of information; organization and storage of information; development of information products and services; dissemination of information; and use of information» [22].

The main goal of this model is to provide the organization with a sufficient amount of information data for the qualitative improvement of personnel, understanding the potential directions of the organization's development, finding solutions to existing current problems.

5. Mathematical model of managerial decision making.

Mathematical models that serve as the basis for making managerial decisions can be divided into five large groups.

«Extreme models include models that give the possibility of finding an extreme of a function or a functional. This includes models built using graphical methods, Newton's method and its modifications, methods of the calculus of variations, etc.» [6].

«Models of mathematical programming (planning) include models of linear programming, nonlinear programming, and dynamic programming» [22].

«Probabilistic models include models constructed using the apparatus of probability theory, random Markov type models (Markov chains), queuing theory models, and others» [6].

«Statistical models include models of sequential analysis, the method of statistical tests, Monte-Carlo, etc.» [9]. «Random search methods are used to find extreme values of complex functions that depend on a large number of arguments... at the heart of these methods is the use of the mechanism of random choice of arguments, on which the minimization is carried out. Methods of random search are used, for example, in modeling organizational management structures» [9].

6. Program model of managerial decision making.

Program models of managerial decision making can be divided into three main groups.

Rational Unified Process (RUP). This is a model that was designed by Rational Software Company... and involves large amount data and formal processes. This is the reason why software designed with this model has high level of details. This model has a bigger difference with other major software model because it does not use waterfall approach. The main phases in RUP are requirement, analysis, design, implementation, integration and testing [23].

Structured Systems Analysis and Design Methodology (SSADM). SSADM is a software project development model that is widely used. SSADM unlike RUP it is standard open software implying that it is free for use that has enabled it to stabilize because many companies have supported it. SSADM take an approach of waterfall systems development where there are sequences of steps which are to be accomplished one after another. SSADM can be used in all projects of all sizes small, medium or large [24].

EXtreme Programming (XP). Software project management can use this model in designing their software project. This model is aimed at reducing risks in the software development and management process. In project management, delays in making decisions can result into huge losses. This model pays attention to the cost and revenues of design decisions [23].

7. Rational model.

This model assumes that managerial decisions are made after the establishment of the main social values and goals. For democratic societies, the main tasks of this model are equality, development, and effective operation of state institutions.

The theory of rationalism presupposes an integrated rational approach to decision making. The main characteristic of this theory is a reasoned choice according to the desirability of taking different directions of action to solve social problems [8]. In addition, a rational decision-making model assumes that the main problems of government organizations and managers are the choice of methods for solving problems. However, «rational model, it may encounter many barriers, and that in practice we can not speak of absolute rationality but only a limited one, if we start from the premise that decision making is a process of logical type» [1].

The general algorithm for making managerial decisions in a rational model at the macro level assumes: «Decision initiation, defining objective decision and the means of achieving it, documentation in order to formulate the decision, selection and analysis of collected information, outlining and analyzing decision alternatives, decision adoption, decision application, observing the implementation of the decision, formulating the conclusions applying the decision» [1].

In order for public administration decisions to be effective, rational and consistent, it is necessary to comply with a number of requirements:

- 1) an individual or collective decision maker must identify a policy problem on which there is consensus among all relevant stakeholders;
- 2) an individual or collective decision maker must define and consistently rank all goals and objectives whose attainment would represent a resolution of the problem;
- 3) an individual or collective decision maker must identify policy alternatives that may contribute to the attainment of each goal and objective;
- 4) an individual or collective decision maker must forecast all consequences that will result from the selection of each alternative;
- 5) an individual or collective decision maker must compare each alternative in terms of its consequences for the attainment of each goal and objective;
- 6) an individual or collective decision maker must choose that alternative which maximizes the attainment of objectives [25].

8. Intuitive model.

The model assumes that managerial decisions are made through intuitive perception of the problem. Managers develop a course of action based on their previous experience. Thanks to continuous training, experience and knowledge, managers have an idea of the effectiveness and timeliness of the decision. A feature of the model is that only one choice is considered in advance [26].

The key stage in making a managerial decision at the micro and macro level is the control over its implementation. In general, monitoring «is considered as one of the most effective tools for continuous observation over managerial processes in the sphere of public administration. Continuity and regularity of monitoring makes it possible to accumulate large amounts of information on the status of the observation object» [8].

In addition, at the macro level, control is an effective tool with which it is possible to establish not only the effectiveness of the adopted managerial decision, but also «to track the real status of program implementation, achieving goals and objectives» [8].

Timely ongoing monitoring of the implementation of managerial decisions at the macro level also makes it possible to establish deviations from planned results and identify potential opportunities for their improvement.

The general system of internal control over the implementation of managerial decisions at the state level should include: «subject of control – internal divisions of the government authority, which are endowed with the appropriate powers; object of control – managerial decision-making processes, including preparation and implementation; subject matter – managerial decisions regarding the direct activities of government authorities; external environment, including the culture of managerial decision-making processes by government authorities; risks that could potentially reduce the effectiveness of adopted managerial decisions in government authorities; direct control procedure, which is usually prescribed in regulations or instructions; monitoring of the internal control system; information system» [8].

1.3 THE MECHANISM FOR MAKING MANAGERIAL DECISIONS AND EXAMPLES OF THEIR APPLICATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MIGRATION POLICY OF UKRAINE IN THE EU

The necessity of creating a general approach to making management decisions is caused by the diversity of their types and methods. In general, the process of making managerial decisions includes approaches:

- 1) use of hierarchy in decision-making process [5];
- 2) use of target interfunctional groups [7];
- 3) «using formal rules and procedures in decision-making» [7];
- 4) «the use of spikes in decision-making is aimed at coordinating the activities of the firm in the cents» [27].

The general mechanism for making managerial decisions at the micro-level in a crisis requires compliance with the following requirements:

- 1) «the overall leadership of decision-making assumes is in the hands of one linear (general) leader» [5];
- 2) «rules of decision-making or standards usually developed and published by the firms themselves» [28];
- 3) «plans are a means of coordinating the activities of various divisions in making managerial decisions» [5];
- 4) «adoption of bilateral decisions by leaders of the same level on the basis of individual interaction is carried out without agreement with their general managers» [4];
- 5) «the target groups act on the basis of group interaction and make decisions concerning specific issues of joint activities in order to achieve the set goals» [5];
- 6) «in matrix structures the project manager is granted linear rights similar to those given

to the heads of functional units... network structure is emerging that makes it possible to make decisions in ever more complicated conditions, concerning increasingly complex problems» [6, 29].

The mechanism for making managerial decisions consists of nine main stages [1]:

1. Initiation of the need to make a decision in response to changes in the environment.
2. Determination of an objective managerial decision and means of achieving it.
3. Documenting the managerial decision.
4. Implementation of selection and analysis of information, which is the basis for decision-making.
5. Determination of alternative options for managerial decisions.
6. Adoption of a single managerial decision.
7. Preparation for the implementation of a managerial decisions.
8. Supervision (control) over the implementation of managerial decisions.
9. Formation of conclusions and determination of the consequences of the implementation of managerial decisions.

At the macro level, the result of managerial decisions is the adopted state strategies, which are legislatively enshrined. One example of a managerial decision taken at the macro level in a crisis is the EU migration policy.

Formation of the main provisions of the EU migration policy, determination of strategic directions of development, consolidation of all EU member states for its effective implementation is entrusted to the European Council. In addition, as the main decision-making body for EU migration policy, the European Council «provides the mandates for negotiations with third countries and adopts legislation and defines specific programs» [30].

The migration policy of the EU, as a kind of managerial decision at the macro and mega levels, has changed quite intensively. At the initial stage of formation (1951–1959), the EU was a customs union, the main task of which was to remove barriers to the circulation of production resources and ensure sufficient mobility of human capital between the member states of the EU. However, no special emphasis was placed on the development of a common migration policy within the framework of the integration association. Each member state of the EU has implemented a migration policy separately. Since the 60s of the twentieth century, to ensure economic growth, the EU countries «started to increasingly recruit workers from Turkey, Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia as well as from particular former colonies» [31].

After the 80s of the twentieth century, structural economic shifts took place in the member states of the EU, which led to an increase in the demand for highly skilled labor. This led to the adoption of managerial decisions in many EU states to reorient the migration policy to maximize the stimulation of immigration of highly qualified personnel from other countries of the world.

The first joint managerial decisions within the EU in terms of migration policy were the conclusion of an agreement «On the abolition of passport control between the countries of the European Union» or the «Schengen Agreement» in 1985. According to the agreement, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Germany and France abolished border controls at their common borders and introduced joint control rules on the crossing of citizens of other non-European Community coun-

tries. It was the Schengen Agreement, and later the Schengen Convention, that made it possible to formulate uniform rules for crossing the borders of the countries of the European Community, including for the purpose of labor migration.

In particular, Article 7 of the Schengen Agreement determines that «the Parties shall endeavor to approximate their visa policies as soon as possible in order to avoid the adverse consequences in the field of immigration and security that may result from easing checks at the common borders. They shall take, if possible by January 1, 1986, the necessary steps in order to apply their procedures for the issue of visas and admission to their territories, taking into account the need to ensure the protection of the entire territory of the five States against illegal immigration and activities which could jeopardize security» [32].

Article 17 of the Schengen Agreement established a mechanism for harmonizing the movement of persons. The outlined joint managerial decision provides that «the Parties shall endeavor to abolish checks at common borders and transfer them to their external borders. To that end they shall endeavor first to harmonize, where necessary, the laws, regulations and administrative provisions concerning the prohibitions and restrictions on which the checks are based and to take complementary measures to safeguard internal security and prevent illegal immigration by nationals of States that are not members of the European Communities» [32].

The next stage of making a managerial decision on the EU migration policy was the issue of granting political asylum and integration of third-country nationals legally residing in the EU countries in 2003. According to the decision of many summits, it was accepted the need to develop an Integration Plan and improve the directive on standard requirements for obtaining refugee status.

In 2003, in Thessaloniki, at the July summit of the EU member states, the proposal of the European Commission on the adoption of the next managerial decision was supported – the development of a common policy to combat illegal immigration, protect external borders, repatriate illegal immigrants and cooperate with third countries. The policy of combating illegal migration should provide for the following areas of implementation: to develop a regulation on Visa Information Systems (VIS) to form a biometric data base.

In 2004 in Madrid at the next Summit of the EU member states the «Hague Program» for 2005–2010 was adopted. This program aimed to ensure: the preservation of the basic rights and freedoms of citizens of the EU member states, persons in need of shelter and migrants; joint protection of the EU borders.

The Hague Agenda set a number of objectives: «to develop a common European asylum system for political refugees, including a common asylum procedure; determine the possibilities of foreigners to work in the European Union in accordance with the established demand in the labor market; establish common European standards for the integration of migrants in host countries; strengthen partnerships with «third countries» to counter illegal immigration; develop a policy for the return of illegal immigrants to their country of origin; more efficient use of biometric and information systems» [33].

Understanding the need to consolidate efforts to exercise control over the EU borders has become the reason for the formation of new executive bodies to ensure the safety of citizens

of the EU member states. That is why in 2004 the European Agency for the Protection of the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union (Frontex) was established, which is entrusted with the function of ensuring control over the borders of the EU against threats, including illegal migration.

However, despite progress in the formation of a common EU migration policy, many key areas, including immigration policy, remained in the competence of the national governments of the EU member states. Another problem also remained the issue of lifting restrictions on migration movements of the population from the countries that joined the EU in 2004.

In 2005, the European Commission prepared two key migration policy documents: «Priority Actions in Responding to the Challenges of Migration» and an appendix «Global Approach to Migration: Priority Actions for Africa and the Mediterranean». In total, these documents indicated the directions of managerial decisions in the field of migration policy: «deepening cooperation between the African and the European Union regarding migration movements; development of joint initiatives and strengthening of cooperation between countries of origin of migration flows, transit and final destination, including with the aim of countering illegal migration and human trafficking; conducting a dialogue with ACP countries in the areas of facilitating the implementation of remittances from migrants to their countries of origin, making national legislation more effective to prevent and combat illegal immigration, and to strengthen the fight against criminal activities, organized crime and corruption, institution building and technical assistance to strengthen developing countries' capacities to combat the trafficking and smuggling of human beings» [34].

In 2007–2010, the EU migration policy was aimed at consolidating the efforts of all EU member states to combat illegal migration. At the same time, at the EU summits, the need to develop a common policy on legal migration was identified.

An important managerial decision to attract legal migrants to the EU was the introduction in 2009 of the Council Directive 2009/50/EU «on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment» and the start of the EU Blue Card. The main purpose of the EU Blue Card implementation is «addressing labor shortages by fostering the admission and mobility – for the purposes of highly qualified employment – of third-country nationals for stays of more than three months, in order to make the Community more attractive to such workers from around the world and sustain its competitiveness and economic growth» [35].

The EU migration policy has undergone significant changes after 2015, it was caused by the need to make a managerial decision: the need for a managerial decision was established (a qualitative change in the EU migration policy) as a result of an intensive change in the external environment (aggravation of hostilities in Syria and an increase in the number of refugees heading to countries EU) documenting a managerial decision (A European Agenda On Migration COM (2015) 240 from 13.05.2015; Roadmap of The European Agenda on Migration from 23.04.2015) making and implementing a managerial decision (improving the EU migration policy in relation to illegal migrants and refugees, which should be implemented in the following areas: the creation of the European Border and Coast Guard, the allocation of additional funds to finance the Frontex Triton and

Poseidon programs; readmission agreements (EU – Turkey Readmission Agreement), deepening relations between EU countries and countries of intermediate deployment).

At the EU summits during 2015, a number of progressive decisions were made, in particular, the deployment of additional points of initial reception of immigrants, which are entrusted with the role of identification, registration and distribution of migrants to refugees and illegal migrants; granting expanded powers to Frontex to carry out the deportation of illegal migrants; continued cooperation with Turkey; introduction of a mechanism for distributing refugees between EU cranes.

To counteract illegal migration through the Western Balkan route, a General Action Plan was adopted in 2015. This plan includes 17 main points, among which the key ones are: «Nominating contact points within 24 hours to allow daily exchanges and coordination to achieve the gradual, controlled and orderly movement of persons along the Western Balkans route; Submitting joint needs assessments for EU support within 24 hours; Increasing the capacity to provide temporary shelter, food, health, water and sanitation to all in need; triggering the EU Civil Protection Mechanism where necessary; Greece to increase reception capacity to 30,000 places by the end of the year; Financial support for Greece and UNHCR is expected; Working with the UNHCR who will support the increase of reception capacities by 50,000 places along the Western Balkans route» [36].

In the period from 2015 to 2020, the governing bodies of the EU adopted a number of key documents that consolidated managerial decisions on migration policy (**Table 1.3**).

In 2020, the European Commission developed a New Pact on Migration and Asylum. This document is of great strategic importance, since it summarizes the directions for the implementation of the EU's common migration policy, including in the event of migration crises. The New Pact on Migration and Asylum assumes the achievement of the following results: «robust and fair management of external borders, including identity, health and security checks; fair and efficient asylum rules, streamlining procedures on asylum and return; a new solidarity mechanism for situations of search and rescue, pressure and crisis; stronger foresight, crisis preparedness and response; an effective return policy and an EU-coordinated approach to returns; comprehensive governance at EU level for better management and implementation of asylum and migration policies; mutually beneficial partnerships with key third countries of origin and transit; developing sustainable legal pathways for those in need of protection and to attract talent to the EU; and providing effective integration policies» [37].

After the stabilization of the migration situation, the governing bodies of the EU continued to consolidate efforts to integrate a common migration policy in all EU member states. Among the main priorities of the migration policy, it is possible to single out the following areas: ensuring the implementation of the provisions of the New Pact on Migration and Asylum in all EU member states; expanding the list of categories of persons who can receive the Blue Card; increasing multilevel dialogues with countries of origin of migration and countries of intermediate deployment; determination of the threshold value of the migration inflow, upon reaching which the resettlement of refugees should take place; the launch of the Talent Partnership program, which provides for the active attraction of talented youth from third countries; diverse, including financial support from

third world countries (donor countries) in order to reduce migration flows to the EU; monitoring the number of illegal labor migrants in the EU; expansion of channels for legal immigration to the EU; integration of migrants into the social environment of the EU countries.

● **Table 1.3** The main regulatory legal acts of the EU bodies on the regulation of migration processes in 2015–2020

No.	Name	Basic provisions
1	A European Agenda On Migration 2015–2020, COM (2015) 240 (13.05.2015)	Specifies the areas of management of migration processes (improving the asylum system, issuing visas, helping migrants to integrate into the societies of the EU countries, strengthening cooperation with global partners, identifying the reasons for migration, promoting forms of legal migration)
2	Regulation (EU) 2019/1240 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on the creation of a European network of immigration liaison officers	The program provides for joint mechanisms for countering illegal migration for all EU member states (identifying the main reasons for illegal and forced movement in third countries, combating smugglers and traffickers; unifying the return procedure)
3	New Pact on Migration and Asylum, COM (2020) 609 (23.09.2020)	Regulates the mechanism for better coordination and optimization of the use of the network of liaison officers deployed in third countries by the competent authorities of the member states in order to more effectively combat illegal immigration, cross-border crime (smuggling of migrants, human trafficking)
4	Action plan on Integration and Inclusion 2021–2027, SWD (2020) 290 (24.11.2020)	Provides for the establishment of a link between the key processes of regulating migration flows, in particular, asylum (integration) and return. Includes the following activities: relocation (return) of newly arrived persons; creation of the Eurodac system for migrants; development of a strategy for the return and reintegration of migrants in countries of origin of migration; creation of the EU Asylum Monitoring Agency

Source: compiled by the authors based on these sources [37–40]

Another example of a managerial decision at the macro level is the implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy. After the conclusion of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU, as well as the EU liberalization of the visa regime for citizens of Ukraine in 2017, the adoption of the Law of Ukraine «On Amendments to the Constitution of Ukraine (regarding the strategic course of the state to acquire full membership of Ukraine in the European Union and the North Atlantic Agreement)» in 2019, the issue of the implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy has become strategically important.

In 2017, the Strategy of the State Migration Policy of Ukraine for the period up to 2025 (Strategy) was adopted as a managerial decision on migration policy in Ukraine. Despite the huge number of innovations, the Strategy contains a number of disadvantages. Its implementation is planned in 2 large stages, but there is no clear distinction between primary, intermediate and secondary tasks.

Let's consider the process of implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy in accordance with the general mechanism for making managerial decisions.

Stage 1. Initiation of the need to make a decision in response to changes in the environment.

The initiation of the need to make a managerial decision on the implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy was caused by such factors as: the proclamation of a nationwide course towards the integration of Ukraine into the EU; an increase in the number of Ukrainian labor migrants to the EU countries (in 2017 – 580.1 thousand people; in 2018 – 535 thousand people; in 2019 – 659.6 thousand people) [41].

Stage 2. Determination of an objective managerial decision and means of achieving it.

The implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy should be implemented at several levels. At the legislative level, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine should initiate the adoption of a set of normative legal acts that have harmonized the current legislation of Ukraine in accordance with the requirements of the EU. The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and the State Migration Service of Ukraine should develop programs for the implementation of the adopted regulatory legal acts on migration policy.

Stage 3. Documenting the managerial decision.

The adoption of a managerial decision on the implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy should be reflected in a set of normative legal acts called «Migration Policy of Ukraine» and in the normative legal act «Action Plan for the Implementation of the Migration Policy of Ukraine with EU Requirements». In addition, the foundations for the implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy are laid down in Article 16 «Cooperation in the field of migration, asylum and border management» of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU. In particular, this article states that «the parties confirm the importance of joint management of migration flows between their territories and further develop a comprehensive dialogue on all issues in the field of migration, in particular illegal migration, legal migration, illegal transfer of persons across the state border and human trafficking, as well as the inclusion of problematic issues in the field of migration... the joint introduction of effective and preventive policies to combat illegal migration, illegal smuggling of illegal migrants across the state border and human trafficking» [42].

Stage 4. Implementation of selection and analysis of information, which is the basis for decision-making.

The information basis for making a managerial decision on the implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy is the official statistics of the European Statistical Office, the State Statistics Service of Ukraine, the State Border Service of Ukraine, as well as analytical centers on migration, integration and reintegration of immigrants, refugees and migrants.

Stage 5. Determination of alternative options for managerial decisions.

The formation of the migration policy of Ukraine can be implemented in several ways:

1. Implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy with the subsequent formation of Ukraine as an EU member state.

2. Implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy with the subsequent formation of Ukraine as a partner country of the EU.

3. Development of Ukrainian migration policy only in accordance with the current problems of Ukraine.

Despite the proclaimed and legislatively enshrined the European integration direction of Ukraine, the Ukrainian migration policy should be implemented to the European migration policy with the subsequent formation of Ukraine as an EU member state.

Stage 6. Adoption of a single managerial decision.

The adoption of a managerial decision on the implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy must be legislatively adopted and enshrined by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine.

Stage 7. Preparation for the implementation of a managerial decision.

General preparation for the implementation of a managerial decision on the implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy should be provided by the executive authorities (profile committees of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine; State Migration Service of Ukraine; State Border Guard Service of Ukraine).

The implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy should be carried out in the following areas:

1. Strengthening cooperation between the State Migration Service of Ukraine, the Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine; State Labor Service of Ukraine; The State Border Guard Service of Ukraine and the European Agency for the Protection of the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union; The Asylum Agency; The European Labor Office with the aim of implementing multi-level management of migration flows, developing a common mechanism for the exchange of information.

2. Implementation of joint patrols of the land and sea borders of Ukraine by the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine and the European Agency for the Protection of the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union. The implementation of this direction will reduce the number of cases of illegal crossing of the borders of Ukraine and the EU; prevent the formation of a new migration corridor in the EU.

3. High-quality renovation and deployment of temporary accommodation centers for refugees in Ukraine. As of the beginning of 2021, three points of temporary accommodation of refugees in Ukraine were officially operating in Ukraine: in the Zakarpattia region (designed for 120 people); in the Odesa region (designed for 200 people) and Kyiv region (designed for 101 people). However, the integration of Ukraine into the EU, the large length of Ukraine's borders with non-EU states, as well as the presence of uncontrolled sections of the state border in the east of Ukraine create a number of prerequisites for an increase in the number of refugees and illegal migrants. At the same time, the number of temporary accommodation centers for refugees in Ukraine is insufficient and requires a qualitative expansion in all border regions.

Stage 9. Formation of conclusions and determination of the consequences of the implementation of a managerial decision.

The implementation of the migration policy of Ukraine in the European migration policy will contribute to:

- 1) implementation of an effective policy to combat illegal migration and flows of illegal migrants;
- 2) strengthening cooperation in the field of border management and the implementation of joint security;
- 3) counteraction to illegal employment of migrants;
- 4) gaining experience in consolidated cooperation between executive bodies in the field of migration;
- 5) unification of Ukrainian normative legal acts of EU normative legal acts;
- 6) reducing the «migration burden» on the EU borders.

Thus, the main directions of the EU migration policy as a managerial decision at the macro and mega levels are the fight against illegal migration, the regulation of the procedure for the legalization of refugees who have entered the territory of the EU member states, ensuring effective control over the borders of the EU member states, strengthening cooperation with the countries of origin of migration flows and countries of intermediate deployment. The main threat to Ukraine is the growth in the number of labor emigrants. The migration policy of Ukraine in the context of the implementation of the European migration policy should combine not only a set of measures to reduce labor emigration from Ukraine, but also measures of the EU migration policy.

REFERENCES

1. Leoveanu, A. C. (2013). Rationalist Model In Public Decision Making. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*, 4, 43–54.
2. Mercier, J. (2008). *L'administration publique – De l'École classique au nouveau management public*. Quebec, Les presses de l'Université Laval.
3. Miroiu, A. (2006). *Fundamentele politicii*. Vol. I. Editura Polirom.
4. Best, E. (2016). Economic Governance. Understanding EU Decision-Making, 93–110. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22374-2_7
5. Felder, S., Mayrhofer, T. (2017). Medical decision making. A health economic primer. Springer, 253. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53432-8>
6. Grover, J. (2016). 2-Node BBN. *The Manual of Strategic Economic Decision Making*, 115–117. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48414-3_7
7. Locatelli, G., Mancini, M. (2012). A framework for the selection of the right nuclear power plant. *International Journal of Production Research*, 50 (17), 4753–4766. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2012.657965>
8. Zoska, Y. V., Martysheyn, D. S., Zaiats, N. V., Arabadzhiev, D. Yu., Kapitanets, S. V. (2020). Monitoring and Control Over Managerial Decision-Making in Government Authorities. *International Journal of Management*, 11 (06), 369–384.

9. Grau-Moya, J., Ortega, P. A., Braun, D. A. (2016). Decision-Making under Ambiguity Is Modulated by Visual Framing, but Not by Motor vs. Non-Motor Context. Experiments and an Information-Theoretic Ambiguity Model. *PLOS ONE*, 11 (4), e0153179. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0153179>
 10. Virine, L., Trumper, M. (2017). Project Decision Analysis Process. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 99 (1), 1–25.
 11. Biley, M. (2016). The administrative decision as form of realization of organizational function of public administration. *Investytsiyi: praktyka ta dosvid*, 10, 71–74.
 12. Hryukivska, O., Kotvytska, N., Ivanova, N., Pryimak, N., Salkova, I. (2021). Economic Security Formation of Enterprise Under the Conditions of Steady Development. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 10 (1), 561. doi: <https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2021.v10n1p561>
 13. Nedelcu, I. M. (2009) Drept administrativ și elemente de știința administrației. *Universul Juridic*, 588.
 14. Tsuji, G. Y., Hoogenboom, G., Thornton, P. K. (Eds.) (1998). Understanding options for Agricultural production. *Systems Approaches for Sustainable Agricultural Development*. Springer, 400. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-3624-4>
 15. Stewart, A., Cao, M., Nedic, A., Tomlin, D., Leonard, N. (2012). Towards Human–Robot Teams: Model-Based Analysis of Human Decision Making in Two-Alternative Choice Tasks With Social Feedback. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 100 (3), 751–775. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/jproc.2011.2173815>
 16. Bayne, N., Woolcock, S. (Eds.) (2016). *The New Economic Diplomacy*. Routledge, 360. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315555188>
 17. Tatić, K., Činjarević, M. (2016). «When Going Gets Tough, The Tough Go Shopping»: A Case Of Young Female Consumers. *Transylvanian Journal Of Psychology*, 2, 137–149.
 18. Blokhuis, E. G. J., Snijders, C. C. P., Han, Q., Schaefer, W. F. (2012). Conflicts and Cooperation in Brownfield Redevelopment Projects: Application of Conjoint Analysis and Game Theory to Model Strategic Decision Making. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development*, 138 (3), 195–205. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)Up.1943-5444.0000122](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)Up.1943-5444.0000122)
 19. Fung, H.-P. (2015). Moderating Effects of Project Management Experience, Project Team Size, Project Duration and Project Value Size on the Relationship between Project Manager's Leadership Roles and Project Team Effectiveness in Malaysia. *Journal of Empirical Studies*, 2 (1), 17–33. doi: <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.66/2015.2.1/66.1.17.33>
 20. Heorhiadi, N. H. Svirskia, O. B. (2012). Kontseptualnyi bazys operatyvno-kalendarneho planuvannia vyrobnytstva produktsiyi. *Efektyvna ekonomika*, 12. Available at: <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=1641>
 21. Shenderivska, L., Guk, O. (2018). Enterprises Development: Management Model. *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies*, 4 (1), 334–344. doi: <https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2018-4-1-334-344>
-

22. Choo, C. W. (1998). Information Management for the Intelligent Organization. Chapter 2 A Process Model of Information Management. Available at: <http://choo.fis.utoronto.ca/fis/imio/IMIO2.html>
23. Rauf, A., Alshahrani, M. (2014). Software Project Management Models. International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 5 (1), 207–209. Available at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.429.2127&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
24. Cuéllar, M.-F., Mashaw, J. L. (2017). Regulatory Decision-Making and Economic Analysis. Oxford Handbooks Online. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199684250.013.016>
25. Ijeoma, Chikata, E. O. (2005). Policy and governance issues impacting on Nigeria's globalization initiatives. University of Pretoria. Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/2263/28605>
26. Principles of Management. Understanding Decision Making. Available at: <https://open.lib.umn.edu/principlesmanagement/chapter/11-3-understanding-decision-making/>
27. Steimer, A., Douglas, R. (2013). Spike-Based Probabilistic Inference in Analog Graphical Models Using Interspike-Interval Coding. Neural Computation, 25 (9), 2303–2354. doi: https://doi.org/10.1162/neco_a_00477
28. Project Management Methodologies: 1.0 versus 2.0 (2015). Project Management 2.0, 105–140. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119020042.ch6>
29. Galli, B. J. (2018). What Risks Does Lean Six Sigma Introduce? IEEE Engineering Management Review, 46 (1), 80–90. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/emr.2018.2810082>
30. EU migration policy. Available at: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/eu-migration-policy/>
31. European Migrations. Dynamics, drivers, and the role of policies (2018). EUR 29060 EN. European Union. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2760/168653>
32. The Schengen acquis - Agreement between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A42000A0922%2801%29>
33. The Hague Programme: Strengthening Freedom, Security And Justice In The European Union. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A52005XG0303%2801%29>
34. Priority actions for responding to the challenges of migration: First follow-up to Hampton Court (2005). Brussels: Commission of the European Communities. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0621:FIN:EN:PDF>
35. Council Directive 2009/50/EC «on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment» (2009). Official Journal of the European Union. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:155:0017:0029:EN:PDF>
36. Meeting on the Western Balkans Migration Route: Leaders Agree on 17-point plan of action. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_15_5904

37. New Pact on Migration and Asylum (2020). European Commission. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52020DC0609>
38. A European Agenda On Migration. Brussels. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf
39. Regulation (EU) 2019/1240 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on the creation of a European network of immigration liaison officers. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32019R1240>
40. Action plan on Integration and Inclusion 2021-2027 (2020). Brussels. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/system/files_en?file=2020-11/action_plan_on_integration_and_inclusion_2021-2027.pdf
41. Eurostat (2021). EC data browser. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/MIGR_RESFIRST__custom_928233/default/table?lang=en
42. Uhoda pro asotsiatsiu mizh Ukrainoiu, z odniei storony, ta Yevropeiskym Soiuzom, Yevropeiskym spivtovarystvom z atomnoi enerhiyi i yikhnimy derzhavamy-chlenamy, z inshoi storony. Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/984_011?lang=en#Text