

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT OF TEAM INTERACTION IN AGRICULTURAL ENTERPRISES

Oriekhova Alвина

*Doctor of Sciences (Economics), Professor, Sumy National Agrarian University, Ukraine
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1016-3287*

In the current conditions of globalization and turbulence of the agricultural market, the paradigm of agricultural enterprise management is undergoing fundamental transformations, shifting the emphasis from purely technological support of production processes to the development of strategic leadership and the construction of effective command structures. The specificity of the agricultural sector, due to seasonality, territorial dispersion of resources and a high level of dependence on natural and climatic factors, places special demands on management entities, where classical administration gives way to adaptive leadership.

The effectiveness of modern agribusiness today is determined not only by the level of technical equipment or the volume of the land bank, but primarily by the ability of management to form synergistic interaction within multifunctional teams. In this context, leadership is viewed not as a hierarchical position, but as a dynamic process of social influence, ensuring the alignment of individual goals of employees with the vector of sustainable development of the enterprise. The transition from transactional to transformational leadership, which is able to initiate innovative changes and maintain high motivation of personnel in the conditions of digital transformation of the industry, is of particular relevance.

The study of the mechanisms of team interaction management in the agricultural sector allows us to identify critical points of contact between corporate culture, psychological climate and economic performance. The formation of trust, delegation of authority and the introduction of participatory management tools become the levers that transform a disparate group of specialists - from agronomists to engineers and analysts - into a holistic team organism capable of self-organization and prompt response to the challenges of the external environment. This section of the monograph is devoted to a comprehensive analysis of the theoretical and methodological foundations of leadership potential and the development of applied recommendations for optimizing team processes as a key factor in the competitiveness of modern agricultural enterprises.

Despite the significant number of scientific works devoted to leadership and team interaction, the problem of their comprehensive study and adaptation to the modern realities of Ukrainian agricultural enterprises remains relevant. Special attention is required to study the relationship between leadership styles, the dynamics of team processes and the results of the organization's activities.

In today's fast-paced world, where innovation and adaptability are key to survival and success, the role of leadership and effective team interaction becomes paramount.

The concept of leadership has come a long way from ideas about innate traits to complex models that take into account context, situation, and interactions with followers. Initially dominated by theories of great people, which postulated that leaders are born with certain unique qualities, empirical research has not been able to unequivocally confirm the existence of a universal set of leadership traits.

They were replaced by behavioral theories of leadership that focused on the actions of the leader. Two main styles were distinguished: task-oriented and people-oriented. Although these theories expanded the understanding of leadership, they also proved to be insufficient, since the effectiveness of the style depended on the specific situation.

Later, situational and contingent theories of leadership emerged, emphasizing the importance of matching leadership style to the specifics of the situation, followers' characteristics, and the specifics of the task. Models such as Hersey-Blanchard's situational theory and Fielder's contingent model demonstrated that there is no single best leadership style.

Modern approaches to leadership focus on transformational leadership, which is characterized by the leader's ability to inspire and motivate followers to achieve higher goals, going beyond their own interests. Such a leader creates a shared vision, stimulates intellectually and individually takes into account the needs of each team member. In parallel, the concept of servant leadership is developing, where the leader primarily serves the needs of his followers, helping them develop and realize their potential. These modern approaches emphasize the importance of emotional intelligence, empathy and the ability to build trust. The modern understanding of leadership in the field of personnel management encompasses a number of interdependent aspects, including psychological competence, social interaction, strategic vision, the ability to adapt to change and the ability to inspire a team. In the conditions of a dynamic labor market, growing competition and

digitalization, the role of a leader goes far beyond the classic manager. In recent years, the scientific literature has tended to view leadership as a set of competencies. This is consistent with the competency-based approach, which states that an effective leader must possess both professional and interpersonal skills.

Key competencies of a modern leader (according to D. Goleman):

- emotional awareness,
- emotion management,
- motivation of oneself and others,
- empathy,
- social interaction skills.

Modern approaches to leadership in personnel management involve considering not only managerial qualities, but also psychological characteristics, the ability to adapt, communicate, resolve conflicts, and emotional intelligence.

The most common differentiation is between transactional (focused on reward for achievement) and transformational (focused on development and change) leadership (Table 1).

Table 1. Comparative characteristics of transactional and transformational leadership

Parameter	Transactional leadership	Transformational leadership
Employee motivation	Material incentives	Inspiration, vision of the future
Communication	One-sided	Dialogue, feedback
Attitude towards change	Perceives as a threat	Initiates change
Orientation	On processes	For development
Example of a leader	Control Manager	Visionary, inspirer

A comparison of transactional and transformational leadership demonstrates that in conditions of constant change and high competition, transformational approaches are more effective.

They contribute to a deeper involvement of employees in the decision-making process, stimulate innovation and provide emotional leadership. However, in some situations it may be appropriate to combine both types of leadership. Thus, in the conditions of the modern market, transformational leadership has more advantages, as it allows you to adapt to changes and stimulate the creativity of employees. For agricultural enterprises operating in conditions of instability, this approach is especially relevant.

The successful functioning of an organization directly depends on how the team works. A team is not just a group of people working together; it is a collection of individuals who are united by a common goal, interdependent in their activities and collectively responsible for the results. The effectiveness of a team largely depends on the quality of team interaction, which includes communication, cooperation, conflict resolution and mutual support.

The dynamics of team interaction are often described through a model of team development stages. Each stage presents its own challenges and opportunities for the leader:

- formation - team members get to know each other, define roles and expectations. It is important for the leader to create an atmosphere of trust and clarity;
- storming - conflicts and clashes of views arise when team members start to defend their positions. The role of the leader is to facilitate constructive conflict resolution and direct energy into productive channels;
- rationing - the team develops norms of behavior, rules of interaction, and procedures. The leader helps to establish clear standards and strengthen cohesion;
- execution - the team works together and effectively to achieve the set goals. The leader can delegate authority and focus on strategic leadership;
- completion - the team disbands after the task is completed. The leader evaluates and recognizes everyone's contribution.

Team interaction is a dynamic process that involves coordinating efforts, assigning roles, managing conflicts, and building trust. Models of effective interaction allow for diagnosing problems and optimizing team structures (Table 2).

Table 2. Main models of team interaction and their characteristics

Model	Main stages/elements	Application in practice
Tuckman's model	Formation, conflict, norming, productivity	Diagnostics of team development stages
Lancioni model	Trust, conflict, commitment, responsibility	Identifying dysfunctions in teams
Belbin Model	9 team roles	Optimization of role distribution

*Source: compiled by the author

One of the most famous is B. Tuckman's team formation model, which describes the stages of team development: formation, conflict, norming, performance, and termination. It is also important to consider Lancioni's model, which emphasizes the following key factors: lack of trust, fear of conflict, avoidance of responsibility, lack of commitment, and inattention to results.

Several key factors influence the quality of team interaction. The first is a clear definition of goals and roles. Each team member must understand their own role and contribution to the overall result. The second factor is open and effective communication. Thanks to such communication, information should circulate freely within the team. The third factor is mutual trust and respect. This implies that team members trust one another and respect different points of view. The fourth factor is constructive conflict resolution. Conflicts are inevitable, but it is important to resolve them in a way that promotes development rather than destroying relationships. The fifth and final factor is psychological safety. This means creating an environment where each team member feels comfortable expressing their ideas and concerns without fear of judgment.

In real-world business environments, it is important to combine different approaches. For example, agricultural enterprises often form a seasonal team that goes through all stages of the Tuckman model in a short period of time, which requires a flexible approach to management from the leader.

The research methodology in this area is based on an interdisciplinary approach, which includes methods from organizational psychology, management, sociology, and economics. The most common methods are:

- 1) Questionnaire – to identify leadership styles and team relations;
- 2) SWOT analysis – to assess internal and external factors that affect team interaction;
- 3) Case study method – for analyzing specific situations from the experience of the enterprise;
- 4) Interviews with managers and employees – to collect qualitative information;
- 5) Sociometric method – to determine the structure of informal leaders and relationships in the team.

Generalized data on the methodological tools are presented in Table 3.

A carefully selected methodology allows you to form a holistic picture of leadership and team effectiveness at the enterprise.

Forming an effective team in a modern enterprise is a complex and multi-level process, in which the leader plays a key role. Not only the effectiveness of joint work, but also the microclimate in the team, the level of motivation and cohesion of employees depend on his managerial, communicative, and personal qualities.

Table 3. Methodological tools for researching team interaction

Method	Characteristic	Strengths
Questionnaire	Collecting statistical data from respondents	Speed, quantitative analytics
Sociometry	Identifying relationships in a group	Visualization of the informal structure
SWOT analysis	Identifying team strengths/weaknesses	Strategic planning
Case studies	Analysis of real examples	Practicality, depth
In-depth interview	Research on employee motivation and attitudes	Flexibility, emotional interpretation

*Source: compiled by the author

The role of a leader in forming an effective team can be characterized by several key aspects:

1. The leader as the initiator of the team structure - it is the leader who determines the composition of the team, taking into account not only the professional qualities of the candidates, but also their psychological compatibility. An effective team is not just a collection of specialists, but a balanced system with clearly distributed roles, where everyone feels their significance.

2. The leader as a motivator - a modern leader must be able to stimulate team members not only materially, but also morally. Recognizing achievements, supporting initiatives, creating conditions for professional growth - all this is critically important for maintaining high efficiency.

3. The leader as a communication facilitator - in a team that functions effectively, feedback must be established. The leader must be able to listen and hear, create an atmosphere of trust and openness, and resolve conflicts constructively.

4. The leader as a role model - the leader's behavior, attitude towards work, ethical principles and responsibility shape the corporate culture. If the leader demonstrates honesty, determination, openness - the team adopts these qualities.

5. The leader as a strategic thinker - especially in the agricultural sector, where seasonality and market instability dictate their conditions, the leader must think several steps ahead. His task is not only operational management, but also ensuring the stability of the enterprise's development.

In the world of management science, three main paradigms of leadership have been formed: personal (leadership traits), behavioral (leadership styles), and situational (adaptation to the context). Each of them offers valuable tools for analysis, but the direct transfer of these models to the soil of Ukrainian agricultural enterprises encounters a number of limitations.

First, most classical theories were developed on the basis of research on industrial or service companies with a relatively stable external environment. The agricultural sector of Ukraine, on the contrary, operates in conditions of high uncertainty: weather and climate risks, fluctuations in prices on world markets, delays in budget VAT reimbursement, changes in customs and land legislation, and now also security threats. Situational theories of leadership (Fiedler, Hersey-Blanchard) formally take into account the context, but the matrices they propose ("maturity of subordinates", "structure of the task") are difficult to operationalize in field conditions, where the foreman and the mechanic often have the same informal authority, but different formal status.

Secondly, the Ukrainian agricultural enterprise is characterized by a peculiar combination of industrial and pre-industrial management practices. On the one hand, large agricultural companies use ERP systems, satellite monitoring of fields and precision farming. On the other hand, a significant part of operational management is based on personal agreements, oral orders and "manual" control. A leader in such an environment is forced to constantly balance between transformational inspiration (which requires time and trust) and transactional management (which ensures quick execution, but depletes motivation). This creates the problem of "double optics": a researcher or practitioner cannot unambiguously attribute the leader's style to democratic or authoritarian - more often it is necessary to record hybrid, internally contradictory configurations.

Thirdly, the issue of leadership in agricultural enterprises is closely related to the phenomenon of informal power, which is based not on position, but on professional experience, territorial proximity or family ties (especially in farms). This phenomenon is practically not taken into account by classical theories of leadership, but in the agricultural context it often determines the real ability of a manager to implement changes.

Thus, a theoretical understanding of leadership in agricultural enterprises requires not simply choosing one of the known models, but developing a context-sensitive approach that would integrate:

- taking into account seasonality of production and associated peak loads on communication;
- analysis of the distribution of formal and informal authority in teams with a long history of working together;
- assessment of staff readiness for autonomous decisions (given the long tradition of directive management).

The concept of "team" in management implies a common goal, complementary roles, shared responsibility, and a synergistic effect that cannot be achieved by the sum of individual efforts. However, the direct application of this concept to agricultural enterprises encounters a number of significant caveats.

The first problem is related to the technological division of labor. In crop production, a significant part of the work (plowing, sowing, fertilizing, harvesting) is performed by mechanized units, which often work at a considerable territorial distance from each other. Such spatial dispersion objectively complicates operational

feedback and the formation of a common "team spirit". Moreover, in many cases, teams perceive themselves not as a single farm team, but as autonomous detachments, the competition between which is maintained even at the level of the labor remuneration system (piecework uniform). In animal husbandry, on the contrary, there is a high interdependence of milking parlor operators, veterinarians, feed suppliers and zootechnicians. However, this interdependence is often not so much of a team as of a conveyor belt nature: a failure in one area stops the entire process, but this does not stimulate a joint search for solutions, but instead gives rise to mutual accusations.

The second problem concerns the motivational structure of employees of agricultural enterprises. Team interaction assumes the presence of internal motivation, readiness to take on additional responsibility for the overall result. At the same time, empirical observations show that for a significant part of agricultural workers (especially grassroots workers) external motivation dominates, focused on stable wages and minimizing efforts. This is not an anomaly - it is a rational adaptation to many years of practice, when management assessed the result by formal indicators (for example, "hectares processed"), and not by participation in improving processes.

The third problem is the uncertainty of the boundaries of the team. In classical management, a team is clearly identified: it is a group of people working on a common task under the leadership of a leader. In an agricultural enterprise, the boundaries of the "team" are blurred. Should the entire farm team be considered a team? Or only a team of 5–7 people who interact directly? Or temporary groups created for the harvesting campaign (where the composition changes daily due to the involvement of seasonal workers)? The theory does not give unambiguous answers to these questions, but without their solution it is impossible to develop methods for assessing the effectiveness of team interaction.

In addition, it is necessary to pay special attention to the problem of seasonal workers, which is unique to the agricultural sector. A significant part of the labor resources is involved for periods from several weeks to several months (sowing, harvesting). These people often do not identify with the enterprise, do not have a sufficient level of trust in permanent employees and, accordingly, are not included in team interaction at the level of shared values. Managing such a "temporary" team requires separate mechanisms that are practically absent in the scientific literature.

The complexity of the simultaneous study of leadership and team interaction in agricultural enterprises is due to the fact that these phenomena belong to different analytical levels. Leadership is traditionally studied at the level of the personality (traits, styles, behavior) or the dyad "leader - follower". Team interaction, in turn, is a group phenomenon that is not reduced to the sum of individual characteristics. Comprehensive research requires methodological integration - a combination of individual-psychological, social-psychological and organizational-management methods.

However, in practice, researchers face a number of obstacles.

The problem of measuring "informal leadership". Most existing leadership questionnaires (MLQ, LPI, etc.) are focused on formal managers. In agricultural enterprises, informal leaders (for example, the most experienced tractor driver, whose opinion everyone listens to) can have a decisive influence on decision-making, but they cannot be "measured" by standard methods, since they do not hold management positions. Attempts to apply sociometric methods (who turns to whom for advice) encounter the reluctance of respondents to answer honestly in conditions where management can access the results.

The problem of seasonal dynamics. Team interaction is not static - it changes depending on the phase of the production cycle. During preparation for sowing, planning and resource allocation dominate, in the midst of field work - operational response and interchangeability, after the cycle is completed - analysis of results. Most studies record the state of interaction at one point in time (cross-sectional design), which gives a distorted picture. For agricultural enterprises, longitudinal studies are needed that would cover at least one full production cycle (year), but such studies are expensive, time-consuming and sensitive to staff turnover.

The problem of contextual dependence of tools. Questionnaires developed in Western academia often contain statements that lose their meaning or take on a different meaning in the Ukrainian agrarian context. For example, the statement "my supervisor encourages me to express my own opinion, even if it contradicts his position" may receive socially desirable responses, but in real interaction such encouragement is absent. Adaptation of instruments requires not just translation, but cultural and contextual validation, which is a separate scientific task.

The problem of integrating qualitative and quantitative data. Leadership and team interaction have both measurable (number of conflicts, decision-making time, group productivity) and deeply meaningful aspects (trust, identification with the team, perception of justice). Quantitative methods allow for statistically generalized results, but often lose context. Qualitative methods (interviews, observations) provide rich material, but their results are difficult to extend to the general population. A comprehensive study requires a mixed design, but in Ukrainian agricultural science this approach is still used extremely rarely due to the lack of an appropriate methodological culture and time resources.

The main contradiction that determines the need for adaptation is the gap between formal management structures (job descriptions, orders, staffing) and real interaction practices (personal agreements, paternalistic expectations, informal adjustment of tasks).

Let us highlight several key problems that require scientific understanding and practical solutions.

1. The legacy of the administrative-command system. Despite decades of market transformations, significant inertia of managerial thinking remains in Ukrainian agricultural enterprises. Older generation managers often tend to identify leadership with tight control and single-handed decision-making. Team interaction is perceived by them as a threat to their own authority ("if they start discussing, I will lose respect"). At the same time, younger managers (under 35–40 years old), who have received modern business education, face misunderstanding from subordinates who expect clear directives, not questions "what do you think?" This intergenerational gap in the understanding of leadership creates communication barriers that none of the existing models fully describes.

2. The impact of war and security factors. The full-scale invasion has radically changed the conditions for the functioning of agricultural enterprises. Field mining, logistical blockades, mobilization of workers, risks of rocket attacks - these factors have created an unprecedented level of stress and uncertainty. In such conditions, classic recommendations for delegation of authority and participatory leadership need to be corrected: excessive democratization of decision-making can lead to loss of time that does not exist, and excessive centralization - to burnout of the leader. Adaptation must take into account the emergence of new functions of the leader: psychological support of the team, coordination with military administrations, management of security risks.

3. Low level of horizontal mobility. Effective team interaction requires the possibility of role rotation, interchangeability, and redistribution of tasks between group members. However, in agricultural enterprises, such mobility is limited by objective reasons: narrow specialization (a tractor driver cannot replace an agronomist, and a milking parlor operator cannot replace a veterinarian) and territorial binding (a team working in one field cannot quickly move to another due to distances and the state of equipment). This creates the problem of a "rigid structure", where team interaction is possible only within narrow functional groups, and intergroup coordination remains weak.

4. Institutional weakness of trade unions and other forms of collective representation. In classical management, team interaction is supported by institutions that represent the interests of employees (trade unions, work councils). In Ukrainian agricultural enterprises, these institutions are either absent or perform purely declarative functions. As a result, employees do not have legitimate channels of influence on management decisions, which reduces their involvement in teamwork. Leadership is reduced to "top-down" influence, and "bottom-up" feedback is unsystematic.

The described limitations lead to the conclusion that improving the leadership system in an agricultural enterprise does not consist in switching to any one "correct" style, but in developing the situational flexibility of the leader. In other words, an effective leader must be able to apply different styles depending on the situation:

- in crisis situations (equipment breakdown during cleaning, threat of contract termination, security incident) - authoritarian (quick one-man decision, strict control);
- during planning periods (preparation for the season, allocation of budgets, setting priorities) - democratic (collecting proposals from foremen, agronomists, mechanics);
- in learning situations (transferring experience to young employees) - mentoring (combination of support and control);
- in routine operations (execution of technological maps) - instrumental (clear instructions, monitoring of deviations).

Such style flexibility is not an innate trait; it is formed through conscious reflection, feedback from the team, and targeted learning. This means that the leadership development system in an agricultural enterprise

should include not only theoretical seminars, but also practical cases, analysis of specific situations, and individual development plans for managers at different levels.

If leadership describes mainly the position of the leader, then team dynamics covers the processes that occur within the group: communication, role distribution, conflicts, decision-making, formation of norms and trust. The most famous model of team dynamics is the model of B. Tuckman, which distinguishes the stages of forming, storming, norming, performing and adjourning. Analysis of agricultural enterprises through the prism of this model allows us to identify specific features.

In many agricultural enterprises, especially those that involve a significant number of seasonal workers, teams are actually re-formed every season. Permanent workers form a core, and temporary groups are formed around it for the sowing or harvesting period. This means that the formation and storming stages (getting to know each other, distributing roles, conflicts due to uncertainty) occur anew each time, and the team often does not have time to reach the performing stage before the end of the peak period. The result is a chronic decrease in productivity at the beginning of each season. This decrease is often perceived as an "unavoidable expense". However, it can be partially overcome through several measures. These measures include: creating a database of seasonal workers (recording who worked where, what results they showed, and with whom they interacted effectively). They also include providing preliminary information about the rules, norms, and communication channels before the season starts. Finally, they include assigning a mentor from among the permanent workers to each new employee.

An effective team requires both a clear division of roles (who is responsible for what) and a certain interchangeability (who can replace whom in case of absence). In agricultural enterprises, there is a bias towards hyperspecialization, which makes the team vulnerable to the departure of individual members. For example, if only one mechanic has the skills to diagnose the electronic systems of a modern tractor, his illness or mobilization stops the work of several units.

Improving team interaction in this aspect involves systematic work on the formation of so-called "T-shaped" competencies (deep knowledge in one area + basic knowledge in related ones). This is achieved through in-house training (knowledge exchange between employees of different specialties); creation of "skills matrix", where it is visualized who knows what; planning rotations and "double training", when an experienced employee prepares a replacement.

However, it is important to recognize that in agricultural production, complete interchangeability is not possible due to the specifics of equipment, licensing requirements (for example, for working with pesticides), and physical limitations. Therefore, the challenge is not to achieve universality, but to reduce the criticality of individual points of failure.

Conflicts are an integral part of team dynamics. In agricultural enterprises, the most common sources of conflict are:

- resource (distribution of equipment, fuel, fertilizers, working hours between teams);
- communication (untransmitted or distorted information about the condition of the fields, weather, tasks);
- role-playing (misalignment of areas of responsibility, especially at the joints - for example, between an agronomist and a mechanizer regarding cultivation depth);
- status (confrontation between "old-timers" and new employees, between employees of different age groups).

An important observation is that in many agricultural enterprises, conflicts are either silenced or escalated to the level of the manager for an authoritarian solution. Both strategies are ineffective: silence leads to the accumulation of tension and explosive forms of discharge; authoritarian solutions do not eliminate the causes, but only transfer the conflict to a latent phase.

Improving the team interaction management system involves developing a constructive attitude towards conflict as a signal of a problem that needs to be solved, rather than as a reason for punishment. Practical steps can include: introducing regular "post-mortems" after the completion of key stages, where processes rather than individuals are discussed; training middle managers in mediation skills in industrial conflicts; creating anonymous feedback channels where employees can report problems without fear of punishment.

Trust in a team is the expectation that other members of the group will act predictably, honestly, and with common interests in mind. In agricultural enterprises, the level of trust is often low for several reasons: high staff turnover (no time to build a reputation), episodic breaches of obligations (due to objective force majeure), information asymmetry (management knows more about the financial situation than employees).

However, trust is the intangible asset that allows a team to work effectively without excessive control. Mechanisms for strengthening trust in the agricultural context are the predictability of management actions (the same rules for everyone, fulfillment of promises); transparency of evaluation criteria (the employee understands what he is receiving a bonus or reprimand for); recognition of mistakes (when a manager publicly admits his mistake, it increases, not decreases, trust, since it demonstrates honesty); delegation of real responsibility (not just “responsible”, but “responsible and have the right to decide”).

The central question is to study how leadership styles and team dynamics affect the results of an agricultural enterprise. Based on available scientific sources and observations, several typical relationships can be described.

The impact of leadership on outcomes is rarely direct. Most often, it is mediated through the state of team processes (communication, trust, conflict resolution) and individual employee states (engagement, satisfaction, motivation). Schematically, this relationship can be depicted as follows:

Leadership style → Team climate (norms, trust, openness) → Quality of team processes (speed of decisions, coordination) → Operational indicators (productivity, quality of work, downtime) → Financial results (profit, profitability)

Each link in this chain can be weakened or strengthened depending on the context. For example, an authoritarian style can provide good operational performance in the short term (high productivity during the harvest), but at the same time worsen the climate in the team, which in the long term will lead to staff turnover and increased absenteeism.

Generalizing the practice of agricultural enterprises allows us to identify several patterns that do not claim to be universal, but are typical.

Pattern 1: "hard hand". The manager uses a predominantly authoritarian style. Results in stable conditions (typical weather, standard set of operations) are above average. Results in unstable conditions (sudden weather changes, new technologies, crisis situations) are below average, as the team is not used to thinking independently. Staff turnover is high, especially among young employees with higher education. Loyalty is low, based on fear or habit.

Pattern 2: "democrat on schedule". The leader consciously switches between styles: during planning periods, he involves the team, during execution periods, he switches to authoritarian control. The results are consistently high, since the team understands the logic of decisions (thanks to participation in planning) and does not relax during execution. Fluidity is moderate, higher among those who are not ready for the "dual reality" (where today you are asked for your opinion, and tomorrow you are ordered without discussion). This pattern requires a high communicative culture of the leader and maturity of the team.

Pattern 3: "good uncle". The leader tries to be democratic and supportive, avoiding tough decisions. Results are average or below average, especially in periods that require quick and unpopular decisions. The team may perceive such softness as weakness, leading to a decrease in discipline. Turnover can be either low (employees are comfortable) or high (ambitious employees go where "something is really done"). This pattern often occurs when the leader tries to imitate Western models of leadership without taking into account the context.

Pattern 4: "chaotic". The leader does not have a conscious style, reacts impulsively, his requirements contradict each other. Results are unstable, depend on random factors. Team dynamics are characterized by a high level of stress, political games and shifting of responsibility. This is the most problematic pattern, which requires either an urgent change of the leader or his systematic training.

The described patterns show that the best results are achieved not by those leaders who adhere to one "correct" style, but by those who consciously adapt their style to the situation and invest time in developing team processes (trust, communication, conflict resolution).

Not all indicators of an agricultural enterprise's performance depend equally on leadership and team interaction. There are three groups of indicators.

The first group is weakly dependent: gross harvest, yield (determined more by weather, soils, genetics, technologies than by the quality of teamwork).

The second group is moderately dependent: operational efficiency (fuel consumption, downtime, speed of work), quality of operations, number of technological violations. Here the influence of team interaction is already noticeable.

The third group is highly dependent: the ability to implement changes (for example, switching to a new precision farming system), the level of innovative activity (who suggests ideas), adaptability to crises (how

quickly the team is restructured in response to changing conditions), staff turnover, especially among qualified employees.

It is the indicators of the third group that become critical in the long term, determining the sustainability and competitiveness of the enterprise. Therefore, improving leadership and team interaction makes sense primarily for those agricultural enterprises that are focused on long-term development, rather than on obtaining quick profits at any cost.

Based on the above analysis, several areas of improvement can be outlined, which are not recipes, but rather guidelines for managers of agricultural enterprises and their teams.

An effective leader is not born, but is formed in the process of learning, self-development and gaining experience. Improving leadership in an enterprise should be a continuous process and include the following key areas (Table 4).

The implementation of the above management measures in the organization is not only expedient, but also a strategically necessary step to ensure the effective functioning of enterprises in modern conditions. All recommended changes are of a comprehensive nature, covering both intra-organizational processes and the system of interpersonal interaction, which is key to forming a strong, cohesive and effective team.

Table 4. Key areas for improving leadership in the enterprise

Direction	Content
Leadership development training and education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Emotional intelligence development programs (a participative leader must be able to recognize and manage their own emotions, as well as understand the emotions of others. Training in empathy, self-regulation, and social skills is critical. – Developing situational leadership skills (managers must be able to adapt their management style to the specific situation, the maturity level of subordinates, and the complexity of the task. This includes learning to be flexible between directive, coaching, supportive, and delegating styles. – Transformational and servant leadership trainings (learning how to inspire employees, build a shared vision, stimulate intellectually, and serve the needs of the team is key to creating a high-performance environment. – Development of strategic thinking and visionary thinking (the leader must see the big picture, formulate clear goals, and communicate them to the team.)
Mentoring and coaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mentoring programs (experienced managers can act as mentors for young leaders, sharing their experience, knowledge and helping them in their professional growth). – Individual coaching (engaging external or internal coaches to work individually with managers allows them to realize their strengths and weaknesses, develop individual development plans, and increase their effectiveness).
360-degree feedback systems	Implementing regular leadership competency assessments, where feedback is provided not only from management but also from colleagues and subordinates, allows leaders to gain a comprehensive view of their effectiveness and identify areas for development.
Creating a culture of leadership at all levels	Encouraging leadership not only at the top level, but also among ordinary employees, creating opportunities for initiative and responsibility. This forms a personnel reserve and increases the overall adaptability of the enterprise.

*Source: compiled by the author

Modern management is impossible without the constant development of managers. That is why the emphasis on the development of leadership competencies, the expansion of managerial thinking, the stimulation of initiative and the increase in staff involvement is justified and justified. In conditions when the external environment is characterized by instability, and the agricultural sector is characterized by a high level of seasonal risks, staff becomes the main driver of organizational flexibility. The formation of a strong management culture allows the enterprise not only to effectively respond to external challenges, but also to prevent internal problems at the early stages of their occurrence.

In addition, special attention deserves the introduction of modern communication tools, such as corporate portals, feedback systems, electronic platforms for internal interaction. Combined with a systematic approach to assessing the effectiveness of teamwork and building a psychologically comfortable environment,

this will allow organizations to form a stable management core on which all decision-making processes will be based.

The application of the proposed approaches does not require a radical reform of the organizational structure of the enterprise. Instead, they provide for a gradual but consistent transformation of management approaches towards greater openness, transparency, trust and team interaction. The expected effects include increased employee satisfaction, reduced staff turnover, increased productivity and, as a result, improved financial and economic results of the enterprise.

For effective implementation of leadership functions and improvement of personnel management and team interaction in organizations, it is necessary not only to formulate appropriate measures, but also to competently choose a strategy for their implementation. Since organizations operate in a dynamic environment, increased seasonality and the need for quick decision-making, it is important to rely on specific methods of evaluating and comparing strategic alternatives.

Choosing a management strategy is always a multifactorial process that must take into account the internal capabilities of the enterprise, its organizational structure, human resources, financial resources, as well as external conditions, such as the market situation, economic risks, and the level of competition. Therefore, in this context, the application of clearly defined methods of analysis and comparison of options makes it possible to reasonably determine the most effective approaches to managing leadership processes. It also significantly reduces the risks of erroneous management decisions. Furthermore, it ensures the necessary transparency and objectivity in the process of making these decisions. Finally, it provides a clear vision of the potential results from each of the considered alternatives.

That is why the following is a list of methods that can be used in practice specifically in agricultural enterprises. These methods take into account the specifics of the agricultural enterprise, as well as the peculiarities of the management culture of the organization, which is at the stage of active development and modernization.

1. Personnel and role map method. This method involves creating an interactive role map of all key managers of the enterprise, identifying their leadership functions, areas of influence, level of responsibility, and communication links. Analysis of such maps allows:

- identify duplication of functions;
- assess the degree of influence of the leader on specific groups of personnel;
- visualize weaknesses in the management structure.

The method helps to make decisions about the need for retraining, delegation, or a change in management style.

2. Agro-focused SWOT analysis. The uniqueness of this approach is the adaptation of SWOT to agricultural specifics. To the standard four blocks (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) are added:

- seasonal risks (weather factors, sowing/harvesting rhythm);
- dependence on government regulation;
- the influence of the human factor in production processes. This allows for a more accurate assessment of the potential impact of changes in management styles on the effectiveness of the enterprise.

3. Leadership Potential Index (LPI) method. It is proposed to use a simplified LPI form for internal evaluation of management employees in five areas:

- the ability to inspire;
- ability to listen;
- ability to adapt;
- decision-making;
- building trust. Each manager is rated on a scale of 1–5 points. This makes it possible to compare potential and form individual development plans.

4. Method of comparative diagnostics of communication channels. It consists of recording all internal communication channels (meetings, telephone, messengers, verbal instructions, etc.), their frequency and effectiveness. Then, the following is assessed:

- speed of information transfer;
- number of errors in completing tasks;
- feedback. This allows decisions to be made on the implementation of new digital solutions (for example, a corporate portal or CRM for communications).

5. Matrix analysis of management scenarios. For each strategic alternative, a table is created with possible scenarios: optimistic, realistic, pessimistic. Each scenario is accompanied by a description:

- expected changes in the team structure;
- training/restructuring costs;
- impact on labor productivity. Such a matrix allows you to make informed decisions taking into account risks.

6. Method of practical testing of changes in a pilot unit. Before large-scale implementation of changes (new management style, motivation tools, etc.), the selected strategic alternative is tested in one unit (for example, in technical or logistics). Within 1–3 months, the following are recorded:

- changes in production indicators;
- level of conflict;
- employee feedback. The method allows you to objectively assess the effectiveness of the proposed changes.

The success of a modern agricultural enterprise largely depends on the effectiveness of its leaders and the coherence of team interaction.

Effective team interaction is a synergistic effect that results from the coordinated work of individuals. To optimize it, it is necessary to use an integrated approach (Table 5).

Improving leadership and team interaction are inextricably linked and should be considered as a single system. In this system, the leader plays a key role in shaping and maintaining effective work by creating an appropriate culture and environment. The leader acts primarily as a facilitator of team processes. This means that he not only sets tasks, but also helps the team to complete them by removing obstacles, providing the necessary resources, and in every way facilitating internal communication. At the same time, he ensures the creation of a culture of cooperation. Through his own example and system of incentives, he forms an environment in which mutual assistance, collective responsibility, and the desire for synergy become the norm. This approach is complemented by the strategic use of team diversity. An effective leader is deeply aware of the value of differences in the thoughts, experience, and skills of his subordinates and is able to skillfully use this intellectual potential to generate better management decisions and implement innovations.

Ways to improve leadership and team management in an enterprise are a long-term investment in human capital. A systematic and consistent approach to these issues allows not only to increase current efficiency, but also to lay a solid foundation for the sustainable development of the organization, its ability to innovate and adapt in conditions of constant change.

Summing up the results of the study of the role of leadership and mechanisms for managing team interaction in the agricultural sector, it should be noted that in the conditions of global instability and digitalization of agricultural production, the classical hierarchical management model is finally giving way to the paradigm of distributed leadership. The analysis has proven that the effectiveness of a modern agricultural enterprise is directly correlated with the ability of management to transform individual competencies of employees into a synergistic team resource.

Key aspects of strategic team management in the agricultural sector primarily include the adaptability of leadership styles. The specifics of agricultural business, due to seasonality and dependence on natural and climatic factors, require the manager to possess high cognitive flexibility. This includes the ability to quickly switch from a directive style during peak sowing or harvesting periods to coaching and democratic styles during strategic planning. This adaptability is closely intertwined with the integration of "green" human capital. Leaders who adhere to the values of sustainable development (ESG) form proactive environmental thinking in their subordinates. This not only minimizes reputational risks but also stimulates internal innovations and kaizen proposals for resource conservation. Furthermore, the digital transformation of interaction through the implementation of precision farming systems and ERP solutions is completely changing the architecture of team communication. These changes require leaders to have skills in managing virtual and hybrid teams. In such teams, trust is based not on physical control, but on data transparency and KPI performance.

Table 5. A comprehensive approach to improving team interaction

Direction of work	Stage	Content
Clear definition of roles and responsibilities	Development of functional responsibilities and areas of responsibility	Each team member should clearly understand their role, expectations, and contribution to the overall outcome. Using responsibility matrices (e.g., RACI matrix) can be helpful.
	Setting team goals (SMART goals)	Shared, specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound goals help the team stay focused and working in the same direction.
Developing effective communication	Implementing regular and structured meetings	A clear agenda, facilitation of discussions, and recording of decisions are key.
	Using modern communication platforms	Corporate messengers, collaboration platforms (e.g. Microsoft Teams, Slack) can improve the exchange of information and documents.
	Open feedback culture	Encouraging regular and constructive feedback between team members and between the manager and subordinates.
Building trust and psychological safety	Teambuilding activities	Regular events aimed at strengthening team spirit, informal communication, and overcoming internal barriers.
	Transparency in decision-making	Leaders must explain the reasons for decisions made, even if they were not popular.
	Encouraging openness and risk-taking	Creating an environment where employees are not afraid to express unconventional ideas or admit mistakes.
Conflict management	Training in conflict resolution skills	Conducting training for managers and team members on constructive conflict resolution, compromise-finding, and mediation.
	Implementing clear dispute resolution procedures	The presence of clear rules and mechanisms for resolving conflict situations.
Recognizing and encouraging team achievements	Collective bonus systems	Introducing bonuses or other incentives that depend on the overall success of the team, not just individual performance.
	Public recognition of successes	Regularly celebrating team achievements, which increases motivation and maintains a positive attitude.

*Source: compiled by the author

Effective team interaction in agricultural holdings and farms today is based on three founders: psychological safety, which allows personnel to initiate changes; technological equipment, which ensures the accuracy of decisions; and value orientation, where the leader acts not as a controller, but as an architect of the organizational environment.

A promising direction for further exploration is to study the impact of neuroleadership on labor productivity in conditions of high intensity of field work and to develop a methodology for assessing the intellectual capital of agricultural enterprises as a key component of their market value.

REFERENCES

1. Dashutina L.O., Joshua Linus Baka. (2024). The theoretical contemporary trends in the management motivation system of personnel in an enterprises. *Market infrastructure*. Vol. 77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/infrastructure77-12>
2. Hrynko T. V. (2025). The role of local leadership in anti-crisis management of small and medium-sized enterprises: adaptability, motivation, resilience. *Investments: practice and experience*. No. 16. P. 142-147. (in Ukrainian)
3. Ilashchuk S. A. (2025). Modern cases of leadership in personnel management strategy. *Scientific innovations and advanced technologies*. No. 12. P. 3104-3112. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/siat_2025_12_258 (in Ukrainian)
4. Kharchenko T., Rong M. (2023). Talent motivation as a method of socio-economic development of personnel management. *Economy and Society*. № 52. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2023-52-95>
5. Kraynik O. M. (2025). Leadership in the era of digital transformation through the integration of modern management technologies and time management in the production sphere. *Management and entrepreneurship: development trends*. Issue. 4. P. 110-120. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/mnnt_2025_4_11 (in Ukrainian)
6. Oriekhova A. (2025). Conceptual approaches to improving the motivational mechanism in the enterprise personnel management system. *Sustainable development in the era of digital transformation: challenges and opportunities for management*. / scientific ed. Nataliya Stoyanets. – Warsaw: RS Global Sp. z O.O. P. 398-411.
7. Oriekhova A.I., Goma O.O. (2024). Modern challenges and innovative approaches in human capital management: global and Ukrainian contexts. *Economy and Society*. No. 68. URL:<https://economyandsociety.in.ua/index.php/journal/article/view/4987> (in Ukrainian)
8. Stoyanets, N., & Baoer, F. (2023). Theoretical aspects of strategic personnel management research. *Economy and society*, (54). <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2023-54-29>
9. Zos-Kior M.V., Skydan S.V. (2020). Peculiarities of personnel motivation in an unstable business environment. *Economic Forum*. 2020. No. 1(3). P. 143–148. (in Ukrainian)