

DOI 10.31558/2307-2318.2025.2.10

УДК 658.3 : 330.1

JELClassification: D 23, D 74, D 81, D 91

Oleksiienko Roman,PhD in Economics, Associate Professor of Department of the Foreign Economic Activity,
University of Customs and Finance, Ukraine,

ORCID: 0000-0003-4029-3840

roman.dniepr@gmail.com

Herman Yaroslav,

MBA, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, Ukraine,

ORCID: 0009-0009-2593-1278

herman.yarik@gmail.com

Rudyi Volodymyr,

Master's student, University of Customs and Finance, Ukraine,

ORCID: 0009-0004-4884-9983

vovanrudoy2000@gmail.com

**THEORETICAL ISSUES OF ORGANIZING THE RISK MANAGEMENT OF
CONFLICT AND CRISIS SITUATIONS**

The main purpose of the article is to consider and discuss some theoretical issues of organizing the risk management of conflict and crisis situations in order to determine the most appropriate ways to respond to conflicts. In accordance with the stated goal, the paper considers the theoretical foundations and methodology of conflict resolution and risk management. Within this framework, the features of the emergence and development of conflicts are investigated, individual stages of conflict escalation within the Glasl's conflict resolution model are analyzed, and the most dangerous types and stages of conflicts that can lead to critical negative and crisis consequences are identified. The feasibility and features of using the "ALARP" principle for risk management in order to effectively control conflict situations are separately proven and presented. The use of the most effective strategies, approaches and methods of risk management and conflict management in specific situations is justified. As a result, key "points of contact" for responding to conflict situations within the framework of joint processes of risk management and conflict resolution are identified and this interdependence is demonstrated in a correspondingly developed table.

Keywords: conflict, conflict management, life cycle of conflict, risk management, "ALARP" principle, Glasl's conflict resolution model.

Tab. – 1

Олексієнко Р.Ю.

кандидат економічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри менеджменту
зовнішньоекономічної діяльності, Університет митної справи та фінансів,

ORCID: 0000-0003-4029-3840

roman.dniepr@gmail.com

Герман Я.Є.

магістр бізнес-адміністрування, Харківський національний економічний університет
імені Семена Кузнеця,

ORCID: 0009-0009-2593-1278

herman.yarik@gmail.com

Рудий В. О.

магістрант, Університет митної справи та фінансів,

ORCID: 0009-0004-4884-9983

vovanrudoy2000@gmail.com

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ПИТАННЯ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЇ УПРАВЛІННЯ РИЗИКАМИ КОНФЛІКТНИХ ТА КРИЗОВИХ СИТУАЦІЙ

Основна мета статті полягає в розгляді та обговоренні деяких теоретичних питань організації управління ризиками конфліктних та кризових ситуацій з метою визначення найбільш доцільних способів реагування на конфлікти. У відповідності до заявленої мети, у роботі розглянуто теоретичні основи та методологію врегулювання конфліктів та управління ризиками. У межах цього досліджено особливості виникнення та розвитку конфліктів, проаналізовано окремі етапи ескалації конфліктних ситуацій у межах моделі вирішення конфлікту Гласла, а також виділено найбільш небезпечні різновиди і стадії конфліктів, які можуть призводити до критичних негативних та кризових наслідків. Окремо доведено доцільність та наведено особливості використання принципу «ALARP» для здійснення управління ризиками з метою ефективного контролю конфліктних ситуацій. Обґрунтовано використання у конкретних ситуаціях найбільш дієвих стратегій, підходів та методів управління ризиками та управління конфліктами. У результаті виявлено ключові «точки дотику» щодо реагування на конфліктні ситуації у межах спільних процесів управління ризиками та врегулювання конфліктів і продемонстровано цю взаємозалежність у відповідно розробленій таблиці.

Ключові слова: конфлікт, управління конфліктами, життєвий цикл конфлікту, управління ризиками, принцип «ALARP», модель вирішення конфлікту Гласла.

Табл. – 1

Statement of the problem. Every person in his/her life, one way or another, has encountered conflict situations, been an active participant in them, and felt the consequences of the development and resolution of conflicts. This happened and is happening at all levels and in all directions, both in the form of external demonstrations of interaction between people and within the consciousness of an individual.

Of course, given the emotional and psychological nature of a person, for each participant in a conflict, his/her specific problem situation is always felt closest and most painfully than something relatively distant in space or time. However, from the point of view of social consequences and the scale of influence, among other things, the issue of the existence of conflict situations and the development of conflicts also arises particularly acutely in the context of business activity and the activities of organizations, companies, and enterprises.

At the same time, it is very important and desirable that the consequences of conflicts will not be destructive, demoralizing, and unpleasantly unexpected, but could be predicted and controlled, and even become a certain positive impetus to improve the situation in the future. To accomplish this difficult task, it is advisable to apply the most appropriate approaches and methods of risk management, which are designed to keep the situation within acceptable limits.

All this emphasizes the relevance of studying the issue of early warning of potential conflict situations and finding ways to effectively manage existing conflicts, both in everyday life and at the organizational level.

Analysis of the latest research. Many researchers and scientists have devoted their works to the issue of conflict management and resolving the conflict situations, for instance: L. Achkasova, O. Bilovodska, S. Garkavets, L. Gerasina, A. Hirnyk, O. Kanova, Yu. Kravchuk, J. McFadyen, N. Nazarov, V. Romadykina, T. Yakhno, and others. In this field, it is worth separate noting the thorough research of such scientists as F. Glasl, R. Kilmann, K. Thomas, whose works have become the basis for further studies.

It is also worth mentioning the research contributions of P. Koster, J. Hurst, H. Kinuhata, T. Kodama, J. McIntyre, Y. Tamauchi, V. Vicente, who deeply investigated the “ALARP” principle and other risk management issues.

Nevertheless, some aspects of the problem outlined within this scientific article require additional study, in particular, in terms of combining approaches and methods of risk management and conflict resolution in order to prevent destructive crisis consequences.

The purpose of the publication is to consider and discuss some theoretical issues of organizing the risk management of conflict and crisis situations in order to define the most appropriate ways to respond to conflicts.

Presentation of the main material. Written sources have brought us information that global, local and everyday conflict situations occurred in pre-class society, were actively reflected in the mythology of different peoples of the world and the social life of ancient civilizations, and were purposefully studied by thinkers of the Middle Ages and modern times [1, pp. 10-44]. In other words, the entire historical and evolutionary development of humanity is somehow connected with conflicts or conflict situations. Therefore, conflicts should be perceived as an integral part of human existence in society.

A similar assumption can be confidently made regarding the existence of all kinds of risks, which should be perceived as a natural and expected aspect of human life and the constant need to make a choice in a situation of uncertainty.

Today, there are many approaches to interpreting the essence and concept of conflict. Some of them are quite abstract, while others try to cover as many nuances as possible. One way or another, regardless of the individual characteristics of perception, it should be noted that the essence of conflict is closely related to the confrontation of different ideas, motives, thoughts, views or actions.

It can be considered that the very nature of social interaction between people is at the basis of the emergence and development of conflicts. Thus, all members of the group (they are also potential subjects of conflict) perform different functions or roles in the process of group actions. The point is that each participant in a social group has his/her own path, personal tasks, but at the same time he/she encounters other people who also pursue personal interests. Therefore, in conditions of group interaction it is necessary to take into account other individuals, because everyone works together to achieve a certain common goal, but this can serve as an impetus for removing them from a state of personal comfort and internal balance.

Analysis of existing research allows us to highlight the main features of the modern understanding of the general features and reasons underlying the emergence of a conflict situation, to which it is appropriate to attribute the following points [2, p. 110]:

- emergence of opposing interests;
- presence of a situation perceived by the participants as conflictual;
- indivisibility of the object of conflict between the participants in conflict interaction;
- exacerbation of social contradictions;
- activity of the parties aimed at overcoming contradictions;
- striving for victory, gradual expansion of the arsenal of various means used (for example, condemnation, intimidation, blackmail, threats, physical influence);
- desire of the participants to continue conflict interaction to achieve their goals, rather than a way out of the current situation;
- increased emotional background, exacerbation of negative emotions up to their complete uncontrollability.

It should be noted that researchers distinguish some typical stages of the entire process of conflict existence from its origin to its disappearance, which have their own specifics [3, pp. 18-19].

Thus, the pre-conflict situation immediately precedes the conflict itself and contains prerequisites, latent conflicts, misunderstandings - everything that accumulates over time. Then a certain incident occurs, which is the actual reason for the conflict, and plays the role of "the first clash". As a result, there is an escalation of the conflict, that is, aggravation of relations, confrontation. At the highest emotional point, a culmination awaits, which marks the maximum of the opposition and is accompanied by a kind of "explosion".

After that, sooner or later, the conflict must come to its logical conclusion, which is understood as its fading, ending or cessation. At this time, there is a loss of interest in the confrontation. It is expected that this phase can be the result of both mutual reconciliation of the parties, reaching a certain agreement and understanding between them, and the gradual fading of the confrontation or its development into another conflict. And it is clear that the main prerequisite for ending the conflict should be the elimination of objective and weakening of subjective causes that gave rise to the conflict situation. However, as a result of the "disappearance" of the conflict, post-conflict consequences for the individual, society and organization remain.

It is obvious that the most important from the point of view of effective risk management can be considered the stages of the life cycle of the conflict that precede the culmination of the conflict situation. Therefore, given the importance of timely and correct response to relevant events in the process of conflict development, this issue has been studied quite extensively.

In particular, there is a conflict resolution model proposed by a Dutch psychologist Friedrich Glasl [4]. It has nine levels of the conflicts escalation, as follows:

1. Hardening or Tension (the beginning of a difference of opinion and views, when the parties to a potential conflict are still quite optimistic about its favorable resolution);
2. Debates and Polemics (the situation of hope and an attempt to convince the opposite side of their rightness, using available arguments);
3. Actions, not Words (the stage of replacing constructive evidence and arguments with appropriate active behavior);
4. Images and Coalitions (the level of difficulty in understanding each other, creating a negative image of the opponent, and seeking support for one's rightness from other people who were not previously involved in the conflict);

5. Loss of Face (the time of transition “to the personal”, when the parties to the conflict try to discredit each other by all means, significantly losing their own face and reputation);

6. Strategies for Threat (the stage of a sharp escalation of the conflict, when the main “arguments” become ultimatums and threats, which can lead to the irreversible destruction of relations);

7. Limited Destruction (the level of conscious effort to cause at least some harm and difficulty to the opponent in a conflict, even experiencing accompanying problems and side negative consequences);

8. Fragments of Annihilation (the situation of critical escalation of the conflict, when the parties intensively try to destroy the authority, reputation and capabilities of each other);

9. Together into the Abyss (the final peak stage of the development of the conflict, when opponents by all means try to destroy each other, even if this leads to the destruction of themselves).

It's worth mentioning that the last stages should be considered the most threatening points due to their negative consequences. Accordingly, they can lead to the most undesirable crisis situations that would require much efforts, time and cost to manage them.

In general, from the point of view of the impact of the situation on the final result, three main approaches to defining conflict can be distinguished [5, p. 24]. First, conflict can be considered as a phenomenon dominated by a negative impact on the subjects of the conflict; second, conflict is considered as a phenomenon that has both positive and negative consequences; third, conflict is considered as a normal and predictable phenomenon that maintains a dynamic equilibrium in socio-economic systems.

Herewith, it is important to remember that the impact of the conflict on its participants and the social environment has a dual, contradictory nature. The complexity of conflicts as a social phenomenon determines the performance of dual functions by them, some of which can be attributed to positive or constructive, others to negative or destructive.

The constructive functions of conflicts in relation to the main participants include, for example, the complete or partial elimination of a contradiction that arises due to the imperfection of the organization of activities, management errors, shortcomings in the work of individual employees [6, pp. 25-26]. In such a case, the conflict illuminates unresolved issues, facts of insufficient professionalism and decency, and also allows for a deep assessment of the individual and psychological characteristics of the people participating in it, tests a person's value orientations, the relative strength of his motives aimed at activities, at himself, etc. At the same time, in relation to society, the constructive functions of conflicts are that the conflict, in particular, acts as a means of activating the social life of a group or society, supports the social activity of people, helps prevent stagnation, and serves as a source of development; indicates unresolved problems in the group's activities, can act as a tool for preventively stopping dishonest behavior; probes public opinion, collective moods, social attitudes, actualizes humanistic values; is able to perform the function of uniting the group in the face of external difficulties, etc.

In other words, constructive conflicts are aimed at identifying and resolving certain contradictions between participants in social relations; at activating social life; at stimulating innovations and social changes; at promoting the formation of necessary behavior, and other crucial aspects.

At the same time, the destructive function of the conflict in relation to its main participants is manifested, among other things, in the following: a pronounced negative effect on the mental state; mental and physical violence; it is accompanied by stress, the likelihood of diseases, especially cardiovascular diseases, increases sharply; depletion of material,

spiritual and vital forces; destruction of the system of interpersonal relations, hostility and hostility towards the other party; negative reflection on the efficiency and quality of the opponents' activities; consolidation of violent patterns of problem solving in the social experience [6, p. 26]. Regarding society, the destructive function of the conflict is characterized, for example, by the following points: it is accompanied by the destruction of traditions of communication, relationships in the team, organization; can negatively affect relationships in the team and its socio-psychological climate; weakening of group unity; "de-individualization" of mutual perception of the parties to the conflict; deterioration of the quality of joint work of the team; forms an attitude towards the use of violence in defending the interests of the group, etc.

It is also important to note that a destructive conflict can arise in two cases [7, p. 200]: either when one of the parties stubbornly and rigidly insists on its position and does not want to take into account the interests of the other party; or when one of the opponents resorts to morally condemned methods of struggle, seeks to psychologically suppress the partner, discrediting and humiliating him.

In general, the possible outcome of conflict management is believed to be represented by three main types of models: "Win – Win"; "Win – Loss"; "Loss – Loss" [8, p.180].

Herewith, the "Win – Win" model assumes that all aspects of the consequences of the conflict are taken into account. In the event of the end of the conflict according to this model, the parties manage to make a mutually beneficial or mutually acceptable decision on the substantive side of the conflict. The result of such a decision should also be the absence of hostility between the parties and satisfaction with the procedures for resolving this conflict.

The "Win – Loss" model, in turn, assumes the satisfaction of only one of the parties (and even then, as a rule, not completely). The losing party remains negatively disposed towards its opponent. Failure to recognize the legitimacy of procedures that are a win for the other party gives rise to the beginning of a new conflict.

Finally, the "Loss – Loss" model assumes only a certain stop in the development of the conflict process, since in this situation neither party is satisfied, which will provoke the further development of the conflict.

Thus, from the point of view of orientation towards risk management, an intermediate conclusion should be made regarding the need to pay attention to possible conflicts with destructive consequences. First of all, this should concern the "Loss – Loss" situation, when neither party to the conflict achieves the desired result, and also partially the "Win – Loss" model, when there is a risk of a new conflict.

Taking into account the fact that the conflict, in its essence, is an opposition of interests, therefore, risk management of conflict and crisis situations should be a control over the process and forms of conflict escalation. Moreover, it is important that the costs of research, assessment and conflict management would be minimal, but positive results would be as maximum as possible.

Hence, in risk management practice, the ALARP approach, which stands for "As Low As Reasonably Practicable", is actively used [9]. It involves efforts to minimize the level of risk to such a point where its further reduction is not appropriate, in terms of the excess of the costs of managing it over the potential losses from it.

At the same time, the ALARP model assumes the existence of three areas that are significantly different from each other, taking into account the reaction to the occurrence and existence of the corresponding risk:

- Unacceptable Region (intolerable level of risk that must be overcome and reduced, even regardless of the resources, cost or efforts required);

- ALARP Region (tolerable level of risk that, nevertheless, should be reduced to more suitable scale that could be “As Low As Reasonably Practicable”);
- Broadly Acceptable Region (adequately controlled and low level of risk that doesn't require any special further actions to react).

It is obvious that depending on specific situations and the correctness of risk management, these areas can transform, shifting from maximum to minimum risk levels, and vice versa.

Herewith, the key ALARP thinking, in general, can include three possible situations, taking into consideration the weighting of the relevant risk reduction consequences versus the cost, time, and efforts required to manage it [10, p. 242]:

1. If the benefits of risk reduction are considered to be proportional to the cost and effort of risk reduction, then such measures can be successfully implemented because there is no large disproportion.
2. If the costs, time, and efforts of risk reduction are too great compared to the benefits of further risk minimization, then the planned measures could be unjustifiable.
3. If the benefits of further risk reduction are much greater than the cost, time, and effort required to reduce it, then more action could be needed to ensure the risk is at the ALARP level.

Respectively, it is desirable to get everything prepared and applied well enough to achieve a balance between the costs of responding to conflict risks and the favorable outcomes from this process.

In general, risk management has a wide range of approaches and effective tools in its arsenal. At the same time, four typical reactions [11] are distinguished to be successfully applied in response to the occurrence of a risk situation: avoiding, accepting, mitigating risks, or transferring the risks.

Avoiding Risks, being one of the simplest cardinal ways of reacting to potential risk, involves a complete refusal to make relevant decisions or carry out activities that are accompanied by an unacceptably high level of risk.

Accepting Risks is associated with the conscious taking of the corresponding risk under one's own responsibility and the willingness not to take any measures to protect oneself from it and its consequences. As a rule, this method is used in situations where the degree of risk is within acceptable limits. In this case, the impact on the corresponding risk is either impossible or economically unprofitable, since if the risk actually occurs, it still leads to losses.

Mitigating Risks involves taking preliminary protective measures aimed at appropriately reducing the amount of potential losses. Such steps may include, in particular, training personnel to work in emergency situations, socio-psychological measures to raise risk sensitivity, effective management in the process of implementing risky decisions, etc.

Risk Transferring means the "blurring" of responsibility for the risk and its consequences between different organizations while actually preserving its initial existing level. This method is usually advisable to apply in practice in situations where the impact on the risk by one organization is impossible or economically inefficient and unjustified, but the level of risk in this case is not acceptable for the relevant entity.

In practice the choice of a specific method of responding to risk will depend on various factors, in particular, the characteristics of the risk itself, the parameters of the operating environment, the goals set and the chosen strategy, the manager's propensity for risky decisions. All this must be taken into account in the process of developing and adopting effective risk-oriented management decisions.

Taking into account all the above mentioned information, it is possible to deduce a certain logical objective dependence of the use of the specified common risk responses and

specific levels of escalation of the conflict situation, the culmination of which can lead to significant negative crisis consequences (see table 1).

It should be noted that in practical situations, when the aforementioned methods of responding to the risks of conflict and crisis situations have failed to keep the conflict within the controlled limits of the ALARP Region, it will be necessary to resort to specific approaches and conflict management strategies.

Table 1 – Interdependence between typical risk responses and levels of conflict escalation

Escalation						
<i>Level in Glasl's model</i>	<i>Conflict function</i>	<i>Conflict consequences</i>	<i>Level of costs required to manage</i>	<i>Level in ALARP model</i>	<i>Risk management method</i>	
Hardening or Tension	Constructive	Win-Win	Low	Broadly Acceptable Region	Accepting Risks	
Debates and Polemics				ALARP Region	Mitigating Risks	
Actions, not Words		Win-Loss	Average			
Images and Coalitions						
Loss of Face	Destructive	Loss-Loss	High	Unacceptable Region	Risk Transferring	
Strategies for Threat					Avoiding Risks	
Limited Destruction						
Fragments of Annihilation		Loss-Loss	High	Unacceptable Region		
Together into the Abyss						

Source: completed by the authors

One of the most applied is the classification of approaches to conflict management, consisting of six relevant strategies [8, p. 180]:

- containment strategy (focused on the fact that the parties themselves can manage the conflict);
- process support strategy (focused on working with already established perceptions, relationships, and ways of interaction between the conflicting parties);
- socio-therapeutic support (focused on working at the individual level);

- mediation strategy (useful when the parties can no longer work together to resolve the conflict);
- arbitration (“the arbitrator” offers the parties a pre-prepared solution);
- forceful intervention (here, the will of the participants is no longer taken into account, but the use of power is usually limited to the sphere of disagreements).

In turn, within the framework of the above approaches and strategies, there are some specific methods of management and resolution of conflicts, among which the following can be considered the most widespread and universal [12, pp. 33-34] since they come from relevant modes for responding to conflict situations covered by Thomas-Kilmann Instrument [13]:

- method of adaptation (can be considered as a forced or voluntary step of one of the parties to the confrontation from the struggle through submitting their positions; by refusing to fight, the conflict participant concedes to his/her opponent, completely or partially abandons his/her interests and agrees to his/her dominant role);
- method of avoidance (applied when one of the parties, or both parties, have lost interest in continuing the confrontation when there is doubt about its positive outcome, while the subject of the conflict does not disappear; in its content, this strategy is not aimed at solving the problem, rather we can see here the desire to get out of the conflict with minimal losses);
- method of collaboration (considered the most complex style of behavior, but at the same time the most productive; the essence of cooperation is the search for the most constructive forms of solving problems; the opposing subject of the conflict is no longer considered an opponent, but a partner in finding ways to solve the problem);
- method of compromise (consists in the understanding of the participants in the conflict that the resolution of the disputed issue is possible only through mutual concessions; a necessary factor in using this style of behavior is not only the possibility, but the desire of each party; here it is necessary not only to abandon part of their previously stated demands, but also to recognize, at least partially, the claims of the other party);
- method of competition (recognizes, first of all, the activity of conflicting subjects, independence in choosing the path to achieve their goals, does not set the goal of finding cooperation, participants must have strong-willed qualities; the goal of such a subject is to satisfy, first of all, their own interests at the expense of the interests of others; the method of competition is, in essence, an attempt at rivalry, imposing on the other side solutions that are beneficial to themselves).

In addition, there is a method of stimulating conflict in order to obtain a corresponding positive effect. This approach is interpreted as a type of activity of the management subject aimed at healthy provocation of conflict [14, p. 132], which is advisable to apply to constructive conflicts. Herewith, there may be various means of stimulating conflicts: implementing higher goals (shared, overarching goals); bringing up a problematic issue for public discussion (at a meeting, conference, seminar); criticizing the conflict situation; encouraging competition, and using liaison groups or integrators (individuals who bridge communication gaps between teams); speaking with critical material in the media, etc. However, in the case of stimulating a conflict, the manager must be ready to constructively manage it. This is considered a necessary condition in conflict management, the violation of which, as a rule, leads to sad consequences.

As we can see, some of the above methods are inherent in both the conflict management process and the risk management process. Therefore, it is logical that they can become the basis of a risk management system for conflict and crisis situations.

One way or another, the main requirements for any of the risk management methods for preventing or resolving conflicts should be [15, p. 144]:

- objectivity (when studying and resolving conflicts, it is necessary to rely not on personal ideas, but on specific facts);
- completeness of the study (an analysis of all parties to the conflict should be conducted);
- reliability of the results (all results of the conflict study should be checked repeatedly);
- relevance (the methodology chosen during conflict resolution should be applied only to a specific process or problem);
- cost-effectiveness (the problem should be solved in the shortest possible time and with the least cost).

The defined approaches to the study and resolution of conflict and crisis situations allow to create an appropriate and effective conflict management system within the framework of risk management in the organization. And it is obvious that each organization must determine its own conflict management technology, which should include, among other things, technologies for teaching conflict resolution methods, forming an anti-conflict orientation among employees, developing rules of conduct and procedures for managing conflicts in the team, implementing work stress prevention programs, etc.

Conclusions. Thus, conflict as a social phenomenon constantly exists in all spheres of human life and social relations, manifesting itself in the form of confrontation and contradiction of various elements, when the actual state of affairs does not meet people's expectations. At the same time, there are a number of typical dynamic stages that each conflict goes through in the process of its existence and development.

It is important to understand that despite the external hostility and negative perception of conflict situations, the nature of conflicts lays in them not only destructive, but also constructive functions, which as a result of their application can serve as an impetus for further positive changes.

In turn, the greatest threat is posed by destructive conflicts, which result in significant negative and crisis consequences. Therefore, such conflicts should be the main object of risk management in terms of preventing and regulating conflict and crisis situations in order to keep them within acceptable controlled area.

Herewith, there are many specific methods of risk management and conflict responses, regulation technologies and forms of conflict resolution that meet certain requirements, which ensure the clear implementation and achievement of the main task of conflict and crisis risk management in terms of minimizing negative consequences and contributing to the transformation of conflicts into a positive stimulating factor for the development of the organization.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Гірник А. М. Основи конфліктології. Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2010. 222 с. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Girnyk-Andrij/publication/340983523_A_M_Girnik_Osnovi_konfliktologii/links/5ea8829fa6fdcc705094f9ac/A-M-Girnik-Osnovi-konfliktologii.pdf
2. Ромадикіна В. С. Конфлікт як соціально-психологічний феномен: спроба філософського осмислення його сутності. Філософія та політологія в контексті сучасної культури. 2014. Випуск 8. С. 107-111. URL: <https://fip.dp.ua/index.php/FIP/article/view/382>
3. Гарькавець С.О., Волченко Л.П. Конфлікти в освітньому середовищі: діагностика та практика вирішення: навчально-методичний посібник. Харків: Друкарня Мадрид, 2020. 92с. URL: https://deps.snu.edu.ua/media/filer_public/45/90/45908e00-9bcd-4b8f-979e-5cf36404e337/garkavets_volchenko_konflikti_v_osvitnomu_seredovishchi.pdf

4. McFadyen J. Exploring Glasl's model of conflict resolution. Growing Scrum Masters. URL: <https://www.growingscrummasters.com/blog/exploring-glasls-model-of-conflict-resolution/>
5. Ачкасова Л. М., Водолажська Т. О., Бекетов Ю. О. Управління конфліктами на підприємстві. Економіка транспортного комплексу, вип. 40, 2022. С. 22-34. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366227095_CONFLICT_MANAGEMENT_AT_THE_ENTERPRISE
6. Конфліктологія : навч. посіб. / Л. М. Герасіна, М. П. Требін, В. Д. Воднік та ін. Х.: Право, 2012. 128с. URL: https://library.nlu.edu.ua/POLN_TEXT/POSIBNIKI_2012/Konfliktologiy_2012.pdf
7. Назаров Н. К. Конфлікти на підприємстві: визначення, причини, типи. Науковий вісник Херсонського державного університету. Серія: Економічні науки. 2014. Вип. 5 (2). С. 198-201. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvkhdu_en_2014_5%282%29_54.
8. Біловодська О.А., Кириченко Т.В. Управління конфліктами в системі управління людським потенціалом підприємств. Економіка і суспільство. Випуск # 10 / 2017. С. 177-182. URL: https://economyandsociety.in.ua/journals/10_ukr/33.pdf
9. Coster P. (2024). What does ALARP mean? Worksafe UK. URL: <https://www.worksafe.uk.com/risk-assessment/what-does-alarp-mean/>
10. Hurst J., McIntyre J., Tamauchi Y., Kinuhata H., and Kodama T. (2019). A summary of the 'ALARP' principle and associated thinking. Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology. Vol. 56, No. 2, pp. 241-253. URL: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/00223131.2018.1551814?src=getfr&utm_source=sciedirect_contenthosting&getft_integrator=sciedirect_contenthosting
11. Vicente V. (2024). 10 types of risk management strategies to follow. AuditBoard. URL: <https://auditboard.com/blog/10-risk-management-strategies>
12. Кравчук Ю. О., Шутяк І.А. Конфлікти в організації та методи їх врегулювання. SWorldJournal. Issue 7 / Part 5. 2021. Pp. 32–35. <https://doi.org/10.30888/2663-5712.2021-07-05-027>
13. Thomas K., Kilmann R. Take the Thomas-Kilman conflict mode instrument (TKI). URL: <https://kilmanndiagnostics.com/overview-thomas-kilman-conflict-mode-instrument-tki/>
14. Kanova O., Kryvobok K., Omarov E. Conflict management in entrepreneurship: strategies, communication, and leadership. Ukrainian Journal of Applied Economics and Technology. 2024. Volume 9. № 2, pp. 128 – 133. URL: ujae.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/ujae_2024_r02_a21.pdf
15. Яхно Т. П., Куревіна І. О. Конфліктологія та теорія переговорів. Навч. посіб. К.: Центр учбової літератури, 2012. 168 с. URL: <https://resource.odmu.edu.ua/chair/download/111775/dEYMgVyF2oQMwrEwf0OHCw/Конфліктологія%20та%20теорія%20переговорів.pdf>

REFERENCES

1. Hirnyk, A. M. (2010). Fundamentals of Conflictology. Publishing House "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy". 222 p. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Girnyk-Andriy/publication/340983523_A_M_Girnik_Osnovi_konfliktologii/links/5ea8829fa6fdcc705094f9ac/A-M-Girnik-Osnovi-konfliktologii.pdf
2. Romadykina, V. S. (2014). Conflict as a socio-psychological phenomenon: an attempt of a philosophical understanding of its essence. *Philosophy and political science in the context of modern culture*. Issue 8. Pp. 107-111. URL: <https://fip.dp.ua/index.php/FIP/article/view/382>

3. Garkavets, S.O., Volchenko, L.P. (2020). Conflicts in the educational environment: diagnostics and practice of resolution: teaching and methodological manual. Kharkiv: Madrid Printing House. 92 p. URL: https://deps.snu.edu.ua/media/filer_public/45/90/45908e00-9bcd-4b8f-979e-5cf36404e337/garkavets_volchenko_konflikti_v_osvitnomu_seredovishchi.pdf
4. McFadyen, J. Exploring Glasl's model of conflict resolution. *Growing Scrum Masters*. URL: <https://www.growingscrummasters.com/blog/exploring-glasls-model-of-conflict-resolution/>
5. Achkasova, L. M., Vodolazhskaya, T. O., Beketov, Yu. O. (2022). Conflict management at the enterprise. *Economics of the transport complex*, Issue 40. Pp. 22-34. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366227095_CONFLICT_MANAGEMENT_AT_THE_ENTERPRISE
6. Gerasina, L. M., Trebin, M. P., Vodnik, V. D., and others (2012). Conflictology: a textbook. Kh.: Pravo. 128 p. URL: https://library.nlu.edu.ua/POLN_TEXT/POSIBNIKI_2012/Konfliktologiy_2012.pdf
7. Nazarov, N. K. (2014). Conflicts at the enterprise: definition, causes, types. *Scientific Bulletin of Kherson State University. Series: Economic Sciences*. Issue 5 (2). Pp. 198-201. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvkhd_u_en_2014_5%282%29_54
8. Bilovodska, O. A., Kyrychenko, T. V. (2017). Conflict management in the human potential management system of enterprises. *Economy and Society*. Issue # 10. Pp. 177-182. URL: https://economyandsociety.in.ua/journals/10_ukr/33.pdf
9. Coster, P. (2024). What does ALARP mean? Worksafe UK. URL: <https://www.worksafe.uk.com/risk-assessment/what-does-alarp-mean/>
10. Hurst, J., McIntyre, J., Tamauchi, Y., Kinuhata, H., and Kodama, T. (2019). A summary of the 'ALARP' principle and associated thinking. *Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology*. Vol. 56, No. 2, pp. 241-253. URL: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/00223131.2018.1551814?src=getfr&utm_source=sciencedirect_contenthosting&getft_integrator=sciencedirect_contenthosting
11. Vicente, V. (2024). 10 types of risk management strategies to follow. AuditBoard. URL: <https://auditboard.com/blog/10-risk-management-strategies>
12. Kravchuk, Yu. O., Shutyak, I. A. (2021). Conflicts in organizations and methods of their resolution. *SWorldJournal*. Issue 7 / Part 5. Pp. 32-35. URL: <https://doi.org/10.30888/2663-5712.2021-07-05-027>
13. Thomas, K., Kilmann, R. Take the Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument (TKI). URL: <https://kilmanndiagnostics.com/overview-thomas-kilmann-conflict-mode-instrument-tki/>
14. Kanova, O., Kryvobok, K., Omarov, E. (2024). Conflict management in entrepreneurship: strategies, communication, and leadership. *Ukrainian Journal of Applied Economics and Technology*. Volume 9. № 2, pp. 128 – 133. URL: ujae.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/ujae_2024_r02_a21.pdf
15. Yakhno, T. P., Kurevina, I. O. (2012). Conflictology and the theory of negotiations. Textbook. Kyiv: Center for Educational Literature. 168 p. URL: <https://resource.odmu.edu.ua/chair/download/111775/dEYMgVyF2oQMwrEwf0OHCw/Конфліктологія%20та%20теорія%20переговорів.pdf>