ISSN 2413-9610, E-ISSN 2663-2365
Journal homepage: https://devma.com.ua/en

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

UDC 658.114.5:339.37
DOI: 10.63341/devt/2.2026.21
Vol. 25, No. 2. 2026

Characteristics of organisational structure and management decision-making systems in large shopping centres

Andrii Brynzylo*
Postgraduate Student
International Humanitarian University
65009, 33 Fontanska Doroha Str., Odesa, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3287-4994

Abstract. The study aimed to identify the characteristics of the organisational structure and the management decision-making system in large shopping and entertainment centres in Ukraine under a war economy. The methodology combined a structural-functional analysis of management models, an analysis of the distribution of powers between the strategic and operational levels of decision-making, and a comparative case study of the Gulliver, Lavina Mall and Nikolsky centres in 2022-2025. The study determined that Gulliver, with a total area of 158,000 m^2 and a lettable area of 108,000 m^2, operates under a hybrid organisational structure characterised by the strategic centralisation of financial control and the delegation of operations to an external manager, which provides for a guaranteed monthly payment of UAH 17,387,779.06 and the transfer of 70% of revenue. Lavina Mall, with a total area of 170,300 m^2 and a lettable area of 127,000 m^2, operates under a centralised group structure with managerial autonomy; in 2024, revenue stood at UAH 1.8 billion, occupancy exceeded 99%, and turnover in 2025 increased by 17%. Nikolsky, with a total area of 106,000 m^2 and a lettable area of 53,000 m^2, operates under a functional organisational structure with centralised strategic management and operational authority concentrated within the internal management team; following losses of approximately USD 18 million in 2022, the centre restored footfall to 85% and turnover to 90% thanks to a redistribution of management responsibilities and enhanced coordination between departments. The study recommends the implementation of a multi-level organisational structure with a clear distinction between strategic and operational powers, the formalisation of the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the decision-making process, the breakdown of integrated performance indicators to the level of departments and positions, and the combination of management adaptability with operational resilience. Practical significance of the study is determined by the possibility for owners and management of retail and leisure centres to use the proposed model to optimise the distribution of powers and enhance the stability of management

Keywords: delegation; management; responsibility; manager; effectiveness

INTRODUCTION

Large shopping and entertainment centres in Ukraine are operating amid increased uncertainty, changing consumer behaviour patterns, alterations to logistics routes, business relocations and fluctuations in the population's purchasing power. Under these circumstances, the management of shopping and entertainment centres exceeds the scope of standard property management and takes on the character of multi-level coordination of the interests of owners, management companies, tenants, contractors and visitors. The operational efficiency of such facilities depends largely on a clear division of responsibilities, the standardisation of procedures, the transparency of approval processes, and the management system's ability to ensure timely decision-making.

The operation of shopping and entertainment centres in Ukraine in the context of armed aggression necessitates the integration of security measures with ensuring business continuity and maintaining the economic resilience of these facilities. A. Brynzylo (2025) investigated the integration of crisis management into the security strategies

Article's History: Received: 02.12.2025; Revised: 07.04.2026; Accepted: 19.05.2026; Published: 29.06.2026

Suggested Citation:
Brynzylo, A. (2026). Characteristics of organisational structure and management decision-making systems in large shopping centres. *Development Management*, 25(2), 21-33. DOI: 10.63341/devt/2.2026.21.

*Corresponding author (andriybrynzylo@gmail.com)

of shopping and entertainment centres in Ukraine by conducting a documentary analysis of response plans and evacuation protocols, as well as a case study of facilities in various regions of the country. The findings revealed that the set of measures includes the provision of shelters with autonomous power supplies, multi-level warning systems, fire safety infrastructure, staff rotation, data backup and coordination with state services. The challenges faced by the owners and management of such facilities after 2022 were analysed by K. Nesterova & A. Brynzylo (2024), who systematised the risks, examined the dynamics of macroeconomic indicators, changes in rental rates and footfall, and outlined the practice of adapting operational and budgetary policies using the example of the "Riviera Shopping City" shopping centre. The study described in detail the algorithm for restoring damaged assets, the structure of the reconstruction budget, the mechanisms of tender procedures, cost control and the implementation of a payment approval matrix, which made it possible to outline a set of management actions in conditions of high uncertainty.

Uneven distribution of retail infrastructure, changing consumer priorities and technological advances necessitate the coordination of strategic and spatial decisions in the development of retail chains. Y. Tymeichuk (2025) examined the conceptual foundations of the strategic and spatial development of retail chains, substantiating the influence of a chain's life cycle on the choice of distribution models, outlining the stages of spatial evolution from concentration in centres of demand to polycentric and virtual presence, and identifying the role of geographic information system modelling, geomarketing, the cluster approach and omnichannel strategies in enhancing the adaptability and competitiveness of retail chains. The study systematises strategic management tools according to life-cycle phases and outlines approaches to market segmentation, spatial diagnostics and the modelling of location potential, thereby enabling the formation of an integrated model for network development in the context of economic transformations. A. Kostruba (2025) examined the legal and economic aspects of foreign companies' operations in Ukraine during wartime, analysing national legislation on business registration, the employment of foreign nationals, investment regimes and tax changes, as well as assessing the impact of wartime factors on operational activities, human resource capacity, energy stability and the competitive environment. The study justifies the need to simplify registration procedures, digitise administrative services and introduce e-residency as a tool for attracting entrepreneurs remotely; it also identifies promising areas for post-war recovery (energy, construction, information technology and the agricultural sector).

Destabilisation of Ukraine's retail enterprises amid the pandemic and military hostilities has been accompanied by disruptions to supply chains, a reduction in the number of retailers, a rise in bankruptcy proceedings, and the need for urgent adaptation of management mechanisms to a high-risk environment. T. Perederii (2024) investigated existing practices in crisis management and sustainable development at Ukrainian retail enterprises, analysing the dynamics of the number of retail outlets between 2018 and 2022, bankruptcy statistics, business activity indicators and the structure of employment, as well as justifying the need to adopt a systematic approach to financial stabilisation, risk management, cost optimisation and the development of online business formats. The paper identifies areas for improving enterprises' solvency and proposes measures to enhance strategic planning, a multi-level risk management system, remote working arrangements and staff productivity. Methodological approaches to the strategic assessment of management effectiveness were systematised by A.M. Ivanov (2025), who justified the feasibility of an integrated approach, the Balanced Scorecard, SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) in a dynamic context and scenario-based forecasting, whilst also proposing an original three-component model for determining the stimulating impact of strategic management through the calculation of an integrated index. The study tested the model using five enterprises from different sectors in Odessa as case studies, thereby demonstrating the possibility of quantitatively measuring strategic impact through indicators such as profitability, operational model flexibility, the level of digitalisation, innovation initiatives and partnership programmes.

Increasing complexity of managing shopping centres in a competitive environment and in the context of changing consumer expectations has led to the need to formalise a system of performance indicators. The value of using key performance indicators as the basis for strategic planning, as noted by I.I. Koblianska & N.V. Stoyanets (2021), was confirmed by identifying core business processes and success factors and developing a system of generalised key performance indicators (KPIs), grouped by performance, costs, operations and efficiency. The study specified key financial, operational and traffic indicators and demonstrated the possibility of breaking down integrated KPIs to the level of departments and positions. The characteristics of managerial decision-making were analysed, based on the findings of N.O. Kondratenko & M.V. Volkova (2022), by defining the role of hierarchy, information provision and the balance of authority; an algorithm for assessing organisational and managerial potential was also proposed. The paper emphasised the need to combine managerial adaptability with operational resilience and incorporate the qualitative characteristics of staff alongside quantitative indicators.

At the same time, issues relating to the organisational structure of the management of large shopping and entertainment centres, the distribution of powers and the formalisation of decision-making procedures remain insufficiently explored and require further research. The study aimed to develop a model of the management structure and a mechanism for organising the decision-making process in large shopping and entertainment centres in Ukraine under martial law. To achieve this aim, the following objectives were set: to analyse the organisational structures for the management of large shopping and entertainment centres and to characterise their structural and functional elements; to investigate the mechanism for the distribution of powers and responsibilities between the owner, the governing body and local management at the strategic and operational levels of managerial decision-making; to formulate recommendations for optimising the management structure and the delegation of powers as tools for enhancing productivity and managerial resilience under martial law.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was of a theoretical and empirical nature and covered the period from 2022 to early 2026. This period was selected due to significant transformations in the management of shopping and entertainment centres in Ukraine, driven by military risks, changes in ownership structure, crisis phenomena and the gradual recovery of business activity. The year 2022 reflected a phase of sharp destabilisation and forced adaptation; 2023-2024 represented a stage of structural review of management models and stabilisation of operational activities; whilst 2025 saw the formation of updated management structures and financial results, enabling the dynamics of change to be traced across the full "crisis–adaptation–stabilisation" cycle. The year 2026 was used to incorporate court rulings and management transformations recorded as at the start of the year. Pre-war and pandemic indicators were used as a benchmark for interpreting changes in 2022-2025 and were not included in the main empirical period of the study.

In the theoretical section, the method of systematisation and structural-functional analysis was applied to generalise approaches to the classification of organisational management models – functional, divisional and hybrid – according to criteria such as the principle underlying the structure's design, the level of centralisation, responsibility for financial performance, flexibility of response and the need for coordination mechanisms. The analysis was based on studies by A.S. Gutterman (2023) and Y.-M. Wei (2025), as well as by Ingentis (2025) generalisations regarding divisional organisational structure, which were selected for their conceptual consistency, relevance and practical focus in the field of corporate governance.

A model of multi-level managerial decision-making, divided into strategic and operational levels, was examined separately. To this end, the method of modelling managerial processes and institutional analysis was employed, the use of the Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed (RACI) matrix as a tool for interpreting the distribution of roles within multi-level management structures. The methodological framework was based on the research by R.D. Suhanda & D. Pratami (2021), J. Rosiak (2025) and a review of the application of RACI in budget management (RACI matrix for…, 2025). Within the scope of this study, the RACI matrix was not reconstructed as an empirically validated framework for each entity based on internal regulations or job descriptions, access to which is restricted. It was used as a generalised analytical model that can be used for allocation of responsibilities between the main management entities – owners, asset managers and the operational team – to be structured and interpreted. However, the specification of operational roles is subject to methodological limitations due to the lack of access to the properties' internal management documentation. The application of RACI in this format systematised interaction between management levels and explained mechanisms for allocating responsibility in large retail and leisure centres within the context of a wartime economy, without claiming to provide a complete reconstruction of internal management regulations.

The empirical section was based on the case study method and a comparative analysis of three major shopping centres in Ukraine – Gulliver, Lavina Mall, Kyiv and Nikolsky. These centres represent different models of ownership and management: Gulliver operates under a hybrid model, with operations outsourced to an external asset manager; Lavina Mall operates within the centralised corporate structure of a property development group with in-house management; and Nikolsky operates under a functional model, with decision-making powers concentrated within an in-house team. The scale of the centres (106,000-170,300 m^2) presents challenges in terms of coordination, the number of tenants and the multi-tiered nature of management. The extent of the impact of the war varied: Nikolsky suffered direct damage and a temporary suspension of operations in 2022; Gulliver operated under managerial and financial constraints; Lavina Mall continued to operate without interruption. This provided a range of organisational configurations for analysis.

For Gulliver, a method of documentary analysis of open sources was applied to examine the gross building area (GBA), gross lettable area (GLA) and the structure of the sites, as well as an institutional analysis of ownership transformation and the transfer of management (Matyash, 2025). The tenant mix and average rental rates were examined using content analysis and economic descriptive analysis of open-source data, in particular, advertisements for the letting of commercial premises in the Gulliver business centre, as well as publications in specialist media regarding the preparation of the property for opening following the period of restrictions (AIN, 2025). This made it possible to assess the tenant mix, the range of rental rates, the commercial attractiveness of the property and its market positioning based on publicly available information. The period during which the shopping centre operated under crisis conditions and the stages of resuming operations following the shutdown were analysed using chronological and situational analysis (Kostenko, 2026), which traced management decisions made under conditions of high uncertainty and determined their impact on the continuity of operational activities.

A separate institutional and legal analysis was conducted of Decision of the Commercial Court of Kyiv No. 134081967 (2026) and the financial obligations of the previous owner – "Tri O" Limited Liability Company. To this end, the methods of legal analysis, analysis of case law and elements of the regulatory framework, as well as the method of financial risk analysis, were applied. The study examined court decisions relating to asset management, the mechanism for transferring property to the Asset Recovery and Management Agency (ARMA), and the financial obligations of the previous owner. An analysis of legal disputes, debt obligations and changes in the ownership structure identified their impact on the transformation of the shopping centre's management model, the revision of the distribution of powers among stakeholders and the strengthening of strategic control by the new owners.

For Lavina Mall, a method of structural analysis was applied to assess the complex's GBA and GLA, the configuration of anchor tenants and the functional mix of retail spaces, based on the company's publicly available corporate materials regarding floor area and tenant structure. This approach made it possible to determine the property's positioning, the balance between retail, entertainment and service areas, and to assess the impact of the tenant mix on the generation of stable footfall and rental income. The complex's management structure was analysed using organisational and institutional modelling methods. This identified the level of centralisation of management functions within the development group, the role of the local Chief Executive Officer (CEO), and the mechanisms for strategic control over financial indicators.

A financial and dynamic analysis was conducted using a method of horizontal comparison of revenue, profit and occupancy rates for the years 2024-2025 (Results of 2025..., 2025). This approach made it possible to assess the stability of cash flows, the efficiency of leased space utilisation and the complex's ability to maintain a high occupancy rate given the limited scope for extensive expansion. In addition, a functional analysis of the coordination between the leasing and marketing departments was performed, which made it possible to assess the degree of integration of commercial and communication strategies in generating footfall and revenue. An analysis of the dynamics of repeat visits on social media for the period 2019-2024 was conducted using the comparative trend analysis method (Dudka, 2025), which made it possible to track changes in audience loyalty and assess the effectiveness of marketing tools in the long term.

A crisis-adaptive analysis combining structural and institutional approaches was applied to the Nikolsky shopping centre. The GBA, GLA, complex format and tenant structure were analysed based on publicly available materials, in particular a journalistic review of the Nikolsky shopping centre's operations within the commercial property market (Symonenko, 2022), which was used for an assessment of the property's scale, its functional configuration and its dependence on anchor brands. The management structure was examined through an institutional analysis of the role of the Budhouse Group as a strategic centre, which determined the level of centralisation and the mechanisms of coordination between the group and local levels. The consequences of the missile strike and the recovery process were examined using situational and chronological analysis, whilst the dynamics of occupancy rates and footfall after 2022 were analysed using comparative temporal analysis to assess the effectiveness of crisis management measures (Ukrainian Council of Shopping Centres, 2023). However, open-source data do not contain systematic information on the operational and management indicators of the Nikolsky shopping centre for 2024-2025; consequently, a detailed analysis of this period was not conducted as part of this study.

Following the collection and systematisation of empirical data, a comparative analysis was conducted to compare the organisational management models of Gulliver, Lavina Mall and Nikolsky. KPIs were used in the study to compare the organisational models. These included occupancy rates, footfall trends or their proxy indicators, revenue or turnover per square metre of lettable area (where data was available), the proportion and stability of anchor tenants within the tenant mix, as well as financial performance indicators for the property. The analysis was conducted exclusively based on publicly available indicators; internal corporate KPI systems and the properties' Business Intelligence platforms were not analysed in the study due to limited access to management reporting. This approach identified differences between centralised and hybrid management models and traced their relationship with financial and operational performance.

The rationale for the areas of improvement in the organisational structure was established using the methods of management modelling and structural design. The obtained results were logically generalised and compared with theoretical principles regarding functional, divisional and hybrid models. This formed practical recommendations for optimising the distribution of powers, institutionalising strategic control and enhancing the operational autonomy of local management within a multi-level management system. A limitation of the study stems from the use of open public data and case studies of three facilities, which restricts the possibility of generalising the results to the entire population of large shopping centres in Ukraine.

RESULTS

Principles for developing organisational management models for large retail and leisure centres

Formation of the organisational management structure is determined by the scale of the property, the complexity of the letting's portfolio, the multifunctional nature of the space, and the need to integrate strategic and operational decisions. The functional model involves grouping activities by function (lettings, operations, marketing, finance, security), which report to the property manager or the management company. Within this configuration, decision-making is concentrated at the top management level, whilst departments perform specialised tasks following approved regulations. This model ensures standardisation of procedures, transparency in budget control and the unification of policies regarding tenants and contractors. At the same time, a high degree of centralisation may limit the speed of response to local market changes and create additional coordination barriers (Gutterman, 2023).

The divisional model is based on the principle of relative autonomy for individual organisational units, which may be grouped by business activity, revenue stream or geographical area. In such a system, divisional managers are accountable for the financial performance of their segment, whilst support functions may be either centralised or partially delegated. This approach enhances flexibility and adaptability but requires a clear system of internal control and a clear delineation of responsibilities (Ingentis, 2025).

The hybrid model combines features of the two previous configurations and involves the centralisation of strategic functions (asset management, investment planning, tenant-mix policy) whilst delegating operational powers to the property level. This model maintains control over long-term decisions whilst ensuring operational efficiency in resolving day-to-day issues. This configuration is often used in conditions of heightened uncertainty, when it is necessary to combine corporate governance standards with local adaptation (Wei, 2025). To systematise the differences between these models, their key parameters have been summarised (Table 1).

Table 1. Comparative analysis of organisational management models for large shopping centres

Evaluation criteria	Functional model	Divisional model	Hybrid model
Principle of structure's design	By functional areas	By business segment or facility	Combination of functional and segment-based approaches

Table 1, Continued

Evaluation criteria	Functional model	Divisional model	Hybrid model
Level of centralisation	High	Average or low	Strategic centralisation, operational decentralisation
Responsibility for financial performance	Consolidated at management level	Assigned to divisions	Shared between head office and local management
Flexibility of response	Limited	High	Balanced
Need for coordination mechanisms	Regulations and vertical links	System of internal agreements and KPIs	Matrix of responsibilities and multi-level reporting

Source: compiled by the author based on A. Gutterman (2023), Ingentis (2025), Y.-M. Wei (2025)

As the classification shows, the choice of organisational model is determined not only by the size of the entity, but also by the owner's strategy, level of functional diversification, degree of risk and the presence of a network structure. Thus, the classification of management models provides a methodological framework for further analysis of the coordination of sub-units and the assessment of the performance of organisations within the scope of an empirical study. The multi-level decision-making model involves distinguishing between the strategic and operational levels of management, defining their functional scope and formalising accountability mechanisms. This approach ensures a balance between centralising key areas of development and delegating authority to ensure a rapid response to changes in the environment. The strategic level encompasses decisions that have a long-term impact on the organisation's financial stability, positioning and investment attractiveness. These include defining the development concept, shaping the revenue structure, approving investment programmes, asset management policy, and reviewing cooperation formats with partners and clients. Such decisions are characterised by a high degree of uncertainty and require analytical justification, financial modelling and risk assessment. Responsibility for strategic decisions is typically concentrated at the level of the owner or senior management, who are accountable for achieving integrated performance indicators (Slobodeniuk *et al.*, 2024).

Operational level encompasses day-to-day management activities aimed at ensuring the stable functioning of business processes. These include decisions on concluding and managing contracts, planning marketing activities, organising technical maintenance, controlling costs, managing staff and ensuring security. Operational decisions have a short-term horizon and are characterised by a higher degree of standardisation in procedures. Delegating authority at this level increases responsiveness and reduces the workload on the strategic management centre (Blackmore, 2025).

The efficiency of a multi-level model depends on a clear delineation of responsibilities and the formalisation of the roles of those involved in the decision-making process. One tool for structuring responsibilities is the RACI matrix. Using this matrix helps to avoid duplication of functions, conflicts of authority and delays in approval. Table 2 presents a generalised RACI matrix for strategic and operational decisions.

Table 2. Generalised RACI matrix for multi-level decision-making

Type of solution	Owner	Director	Head of departments
Approval of investment programme	A	R	C
Review of strategic development policy	A	R	C
Formation of annual budget	A	R	C
Conclusion of key contracts	C	A	R
Conducting a marketing campaign	I	A	R
Existing operating expenses	I	A	R
Decisions on safety and risks	C	A	R

Note: R – Responsible; A – Accountable; C – Consulted; I – Informed
Source: compiled by the author based on R.D. Suhanda & D. Pratami (2021), J. Rosiak (2025), RACI matrix for budget management (2025)

The proposed model demonstrates that strategic decisions have a defined "Accountable" party, whilst "Responsible" duties may be delegated to lower levels. At the operational level, accountability is more often assigned to the head of the organisation, whilst execution is entrusted to functional departments. This configuration helWps to maintain strategic control over key areas whilst ensuring operational efficiency. Consequently, the multi-level management decision-making model is based on a clear distinction between strategic and operational functions, the delegation of authority and the formalisation of roles through tools such as RACI. Its application enhances process transparency, reduces approval times and ensures that decisions align with the organisation's overall development strategy.

A review of approaches to the classification of organisational management models and an analysis of the multi-level decision-making system have shown that management effectiveness is determined by a combination of the structure of authority and coordination mechanisms. Functional, divisional and hybrid models differ in terms of their level of centralisation, nature of responsibility and degree of flexibility, which determines their application depending on the development strategy, scale of operations and level of risk. The distinction between the strategic and operational levels of management ensures a balance between long-term objectives and operational adaptation to changes in the environment. Use of tools for formalising accountability, in particular the RACI matrix, helps to increase the transparency of management processes, the clarity of role allocation and the consistency of decisions within the overall management model.

Organisational models and decision-making in large shopping centres

The Gulliver multi-purpose complex in Kyiv is one of the capital's largest mixed-use developments, combining retail, leisure and office spaces. Its GBA is 158,000 m^2, of which 38,180 m^2 is occupied by the shopping centre, whilst the GLA is 108,000 m^2. Facilities include a car park with 1,320 spaces, a fitness centre and a cinema. This configuration creates a complex organisational model that requires coordination between the retail and office segments. The complex opened in September 2013 following a lengthy construction period (2003-2012) (Hmarochos, 2018). Key changes took place in 2025, when ownership of the asset was transferred to a consortium of state-owned banks – Oschadbank (80%) and Ukreximbank (20%) (Gordiychuk, 2025). The transfer took place following Decision of the Commercial Court of Kyiv No. 134081967 (2026), involving the previous owner, "Tri O" LLC. In January 2025, ARMA selected the management company for the "Millennium" business centre through an open tender, offering a fee of 0.15% of revenue to manage the asset, valued at UAH 7.6 billion (Matyash, 2025). Thus, after 2025, Gulliver's organisational model became a centralised structure with elements of a hybrid configuration, where strategic control is exercised by the owners, whilst operational management is delegated to a professional manager. The tenant mix comprises over 250 brands, with anchor tenants accounting for around 37% of the floor space (AIN, 2025). By 2022, footfall stood at 14,000-15,000 people per day. In 2024, the office section was approximately 75% occupied, meaning that 9 out of 34 floors remained vacant (Ponomarenko, 2024). The average rental rate for the retail section is around 32.8 USD/m^2, and for offices it is 25 USD/m^2 plus a service charge of 8USD/m^2. However, actual rates are subject to individual agreements and may be adjusted depending on the location of the premises, the format and the tenant's status.

In 2022, the Gulliver shopping and entertainment centre operated in conditions of a sharp decline in the city's economic activity following the start of the Russian full-scale invasion. In the first weeks of the war, the shopping and entertainment centre temporarily suspended operations, along with most commercial premises in Kyiv. Operations were partially resumed on 1 April 2022, but work continued on a limited basis in accordance with martial law: reduced opening hours, suspension of activities during air raid alerts, and the evacuation of visitors to shelters (The Gulliver shopping..., 2022). The complex's underground car park (level P-1) was used as a temporary shelter for visitors, tenants and staff. During this period, the centre's management focused on maintaining basic operational processes, ensuring visitor safety, and gradually resuming tenants' operations.

The crisis of 2025 highlighted the peculiarities of the decision-making system. On 30 October 2025, the complex was completely closed due to the previous owners having shut down the building services, which posed a safety risk. The decision to close the complex was taken immediately at the level of the banking consortium, with tenants being granted a rent holiday. As early as 12 December 2025, the emergency commission approved the partial reopening of the lower floors, and on 1 February 2026, operations were fully resumed (Kostenko, 2026). The speed with which these decisions were taken demonstrates the high degree of centralisation in strategic management and the ability of a consolidated management structure to act in conditions of uncertainty. In 2023, the revenue of "Tri O" LLC amounted to UAH 906.5 million (Sharipov, 2025). Following the transfer of the asset to ARMA's management in 2024, the financial parameters were defined not as the projected revenue from the asset, but as a guaranteed minimum payment to the state budget. In particular, the terms of the open tender on the Prozorro platform stipulated that the manager must ensure minimum monthly budget receipts of UAH 17,387,779.06 as a guaranteed payment, as well as transfer 70% of the revenue generated from managing the property (Institute of Legislative Ideas, n.d.). Given these characteristics, the Gulliver organisational model can be described as a hybrid model characterised by centralised strategic control. Strategic management is concentrated in the hands of the owners, whilst operational management is delegated to a professional manager. The crisis events of 2025 demonstrated that this model ensures a rapid response whilst maintaining control over key financial flows. At the same time, limited transparency in reporting and a high degree of dependence on the owners' decisions shape the specific nature of coordination between departments and the distribution of powers within the group.

Lavina Mall is one of the capital's largest shopping and entertainment centres, with a strong focus on combining retail and entertainment. The GBA is approximately 170,300 m^2, whilst the GLA is 127,000 m^2. The centre opened on 1 December 2016 following several delays to the launch and has developed in line with the original concept without any radical redesigns. Following the opening, entertainment areas were introduced in phases, including a family amusement park and the expansion of the entertainment offering; however, the format has remained stable and adheres to the hybrid retail + entertainment model. The complex comprises over 400 shops, a food court and a Food Hall with more than 50 restaurants, Ukraine's largest multiplex cinema (13 screens including IMAX), as well as the 20,000 m^2 Galaxy family amusement park. Anchor tenants account for a significant share – approximately 40-50% of GLA. Key operators include Auchan, Silpo and Epicentre. Fashion brands such as H&M, the Inditex Group and LPP was also substantial. Additional traffic drivers include Leroy Merlin and the Multiplex cinema. These operators generate the bulk of footfall and determine the property's commercial appeal. The high concentration of anchor tenants in key areas ensures a stable level of footfall, meaning that the projected number of visitors is maintained throughout the year without sharp seasonal or crisis-related fluctuations, which can be used for the maintenance of premium rental rates.

The property is owned by the Azerbaijani businessman Vagif Aliyev through Lavina Mall LLC. Lavina Mall is part of the Mandarin Plaza Group property development group (Mandarin Plaza Group..., 2024). The group also manages assets such as Mandarin Plaza, Blockbuster Mall (partially), Ocean Plaza and the Ocean Mall projects.

At the same time, day-to-day operational management is conducted through Lavina Shopping Centre LLC, without the involvement of an external manager or a separate asset manager (Maranchak, 2023). The CEO of Lavina Mall is Dmytro Lashin, who also serves as the Chief Operating Officer of Blockbuster Mall. Public sources indicate a high degree of autonomy for the local management: the director comments on strategic decisions, implements infrastructure initiatives (launching a 4 MW solar power station, creating family parking spaces, updating the tenant mix) and approves substantial marketing budgets (Results of 2025…, 2025). There are no indications in open sources of external control over strategic decisions or their approval at group level, which suggests a centralised yet autonomous operational model.

Financial indicators confirm the effectiveness of the chosen organisational structure. In 2024, the revenue of Lavina Shopping Centre LLC was 1.8 billion UAH, and for the first half of 2025, it stood at UAH 774 million, with a net profit of UAH 44.7 million (All Retail, 2025). The occupancy rate at the end of 2025 exceeded 99%, meaning the vacancy rate was less than 1%. After 2022, the centre recovered to its pre-war levels within two years and achieved a complete absence of vacant space. In 2025, the tenant mix was refreshed with the addition of 35 new brands, which contributed to a 17% increase in tenants' turnover and a shift towards the middle+/premium segment (Results of 2025…, 2025). Leasing and marketing functions are coordinated centrally under the leadership of the Chief Executive Officer. The official website has served as a ROPO platform since 2021, reflecting the integration of digital marketing with in-store footfall (Osiiyk, 2021). Large-scale marketing campaigns, audience research (2019-2024), infrastructure projects and active communication on social media are fostering stable guest loyalty: the repeat visit rate has risen from 57% in 2019 to 75% in 2024, and half of the guests visit the centre 2-3 times a week (Dudka, 2025).

Lavina Mall's organisational model is therefore characterised by centralised management within the development group, whilst the local CEO retains a high degree of operational autonomy. The combination of a stable ownership structure, an active marketing policy, a diversified tenant mix and a well-developed entertainment component ensures almost full occupancy and strong financial performance. Compared with other properties, the Lavina Mall model demonstrates a high degree of integration between strategic and operational decisions at the level of a single management centre, which facilitates a rapid response to market changes and helps maintain a competitive position in the capital. Nikolsky is one of the key retail and entertainment centres in Eastern Ukraine, operating in Kharkiv amidst heightened security risks. Its GBA is approximately 106,000 m^2, whilst its GLA is 53,000 m^2 (The largest dome…, 2023). The complex is defined as a mixed-use development, combining shopping arcades, entertainment facilities and food courts. The tenant mix comprises over 150 brands, of which 80 outlets were operational as of November 2022 (Symonenko, 2022).

The property is owned by "NIKOLSKY Shopping Centre" LLC, which forms part of the Budhouse Group property development group led by Anatoliy Shkriblyak. Investment in the project amounted to approximately USD 124 million. Management is performed centrally through the Budhouse Group; no separate management company or independent asset manager has been appointed. The company's CEO is Yuriy Volodymyrovych Kolbasynskyi, although strategic decisions are coordinated at the group's senior management level, in particular by the Chief Operating Officer, Maksym Gavryushin. This structure indicates a high degree of centralised management (Maksym Gavryushin, Budhouse Group…, 2021). Anchor tenants include Silpo, H&M, brands from the Inditex and LPP groups, and the Multiplex cinema. The entertainment offering comprises a cinema, a food court, restaurants and children's play areas, which generate steady footfall (Symonenko, 2022).

On 9 March 2022, the facility sustained significant damage as a result of a missile strike: the roof, dome, façade elements, ventilation equipment and part of the structural framework were destroyed. Direct losses were estimated at approximately 18 million USD, whilst indirect losses were estimated at up to USD 150 million. The centre temporarily suspended operations. Decisions regarding the closure and subsequent restoration were taken at Budhouse Group level. Repair work began just three weeks after the strike; on 17 June 2022, the basement level reopened, followed by floors 1-3 in autumn 2022, and the full restoration of the damaged areas was completed on 1 December 2023. The grand reopening in its revamped format took place in February 2026. Following the strike, security measures were increased: regular evacuation drills were introduced, consultations were held with the State Emergency Service of Ukraine, a shelter was fitted on the second basement level of the car park with the capacity to evacuate within 2-3 minutes, a secure entrance from the underground was organised, and operational procedures during air raid alerts were revised. Some of the underground areas operated on a reduced basis. Consequently, the decision-making system took on a crisis-adaptive character: strategic control remained centralised, whilst tactical decisions regarding operating modes, evacuation and partial reopening were delegated to local management (Ukrainian Council of Shopping Centres, 2023). Occupancy and footfall trends since 2022 have shown a gradual recovery. In November 2022, around 32% of retail space on the open-plan floors was occupied. By December 2023, there was no vacant space left (with the exception of temporarily closed Inditex and H&M stores); footfall had recovered to 85% of pre-war levels, and turnover to 90%. Nikolsky's organisational model is characterised by centralised management through the Budhouse Group, with limited autonomy for local directors on strategic matters. Following the outbreak of the war, the model retained its centralised structure but became more adaptive thanks to operational decisions regarding recovery, security and tenant support. Thus, the management of the Nikolsky shopping centre can be classified as crisis-adaptive: it combines a strategic concentration of authority with rapid tactical responses to external threats, hence the facility could resume operations in a wartime environment.

Comparison of management systems and a justification for areas of improvement in the organisational structure

To systematise the results of the case study of three shopping and entertainment centres – Gulliver (Kyiv), Lavina Mall (Kyiv) and Nikolsky (Kharkiv) – it is advisable to compare them in terms of scale, ownership structure, management model, level of centralisation of decision-making, crisis adaptability and operational indicators. A summary of the key characteristics is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Comparative analysis of the organisational management models of Gulliver, Lavina Mall and Nikolsky

Criteria	Gulliver (Kyiv)	Lavina Mall (Kyiv)	Nikolsky (Kharkiv)
Format	Mixed-use (shopping centre + business centre)	Retail + entertainment	Mixed-use (trade halls + entertainment)
GBA	≈157,400-158,000 m²	≈170,300 m²	≈106,000 m²
GLA	≈108,000 m²	127,000 m²	53,000 m²
Year of opening/ reopening	2013; full renovation in 2026	2016	2021; renovation 2022-2023
Ownership	Consortium of state-owned banks (Oschadbank 80%, Ukreximbank 20%)	Vagif Aliyev (Mandarin Plaza Group)	Budhouse Group
Management model	Hybrid: strategic control by the owners + an operational manager	Centralised, group-based structure with a high degree of autonomy for the local CEO	Centralised, group-based, crisis-adaptive
Enrolment figures (2024-2025)	Offices ≈75%; retail data is limited	>99% (vacancy rate <1%)	-
Proportion of anchor tenants	≈37% of areas	≈40-50% GLA	≈30-40% GLA
Crisis response	Closure: October 2025; full restoration: February 2026	After 2022 – a rapid recovery and renewal of the tenant mix	Missile strike, March 2022; phased reopening and repairs
Financial targets	Minimum guaranteed payment to the budget will be UAH 17.4 million per month in 2025	Revenue of UAH 1.8 billion in 2024	Investment: USD 124 million; losses in 2022: ≈ 18 million USD (direct)

Source: compiled by the author

A comparison of organisational models during the period of martial law revealed differences in the organisational configuration of management, which correlated with the trends in operational indicators during that period. The highest results in terms of occupancy rates (over 99% in 2024-2025), stability of the tenant mix (renewal of 35 brands without an increase in vacancy rates) and a 17% increase in tenants' turnover were demonstrated by the centralised model of Lavina Mall, with a high degree of autonomy for the local CEO. This demonstrates effective coordination between the leasing, marketing and financial control functions within a single decision-making centre. Gulliver's hybrid model, with a separation of strategic control and delegated operational management, has ensured the stability of financial flows (a guaranteed payment of UAH 17.4 million per month in 2025); however, occupancy figures for the retail segment remain partially undisclosed, which limits a full assessment of revenue per square metre. Coordination in this model is institutionally formalised but less flexible due to multi-level approval processes. For Nikolsky, a centralised group model with crisis-adaptive tactical decisions ensured a recovery in footfall to 85% of pre-war levels and turnover to 90% by the end of 2023. At the same time, absolute figures for footfall and revenue per square metre are not publicly available, which has prevented a full comparative assessment of financial performance.

For Gulliver, the key issue is the excessive centralisation of strategic control and the multi-tiered decision-making process involving state-owned banks, ARMA and the external administrator. This structure hampers operational efficiency and creates a risk of delays in negotiations with tenants. It would be advisable to introduce clearly defined limits on the autonomy of the managing company's director regarding the revision of lease terms, tenant mix rotation and marketing budgets within the agreed financial framework. This would shorten the decision-making cycle without compromising the owners' strategic control. At the same time, creation of a permanent strategic committee involving representatives of banks and the asset manager is recommended; this committee would approve medium-term profitability targets and performance indicators, rather than having to approve each operational initiative individually. At Lavina Mall, the management structure is characterised by a high degree of centralisation within the development group and considerable autonomy for the local CEO. The main shortcoming lies in the potential reliance on the individual management decisions of the CEO and the absence of a publicly documented system of multi-level accountability. To mitigate management risks, it would be advisable to formalise strategic performance evaluation procedures through an internal advisory board or the group's investment committee, which would conduct regular audits of KPIs (occupancy, revenue per square metre, cost structure, and return on investment for marketing campaigns). This would maintain decision-making speed whilst institutionalising control mechanisms and long-term planning, which is particularly relevant in conditions of high occupancy rates and limited scope for extensive growth.

For Nikolsky, the main shortcoming lies in the combination of centralised group control with the need for a rapid response to security risks in the frontline region. Despite the effectiveness of the crisis management decisions taken in 2022-2023, the model remains dependent on decisions made by the Budhouse Group's senior management. It would be advisable to expand the local director's powers regarding tactical budgeting, operating procedures and short-term lease terms within the framework of the approved crisis regulations. Formalising such procedures in the form of a separate business continuity protocol would help reduce management delays in the event of recurring security threats. A common recommendation for all three sites is the implementation of an integrated digital monitoring system with standardised performance indicators. The use of BI platforms accessible to both the strategic centre and the local team will ensure transparent analytical accountability and reduce the need for manual approval of operational decisions. This is particularly relevant for Gulliver, where the multi-tiered ownership structure requires systemic transparency, and for Nikolsky, where the speed of decision-making is critically dependent on real-time analysis of footfall and costs. A further area for optimisation is the institutional separation of asset management and property management functions at each property. For Gulliver, this will reduce the burden on state-owned owners; for Lavina Mall, it will enhance the formalisation of strategic control; and for Nikolsky, it will consolidate long-term planning at group level whilst maintaining tactical autonomy at the local level. Consequently, the optimisation of the management structure should be conducted with due regard to individual management gaps: for Gulliver – reducing excessive centralisation and accelerating approvals; for Lavina Mall – institutionalising strategic control without losing flexibility; for Nikolsky – strengthening local autonomy within the framework of crisis regulations. Implementing these recommendations will help to boost productivity, reduce decision-making times and strengthen the resilience of organisational models in an environment of heightened uncertainty.

DISCUSSION

Transformation of the retail sector, driven by digitalisation, changes in consumer behaviour and institutional shifts, has led to a rethinking of both the spatial and managerial models for the development of shopping centres. R. Zhou *et al.* (2024) examined changes in consumption patterns through the lens of spatial optimisation within the "new retail" concept. Using the analytic hierarchy process – geographic information system, mobile data and a system of spatial indicators, the authors assessed the suitability of locations, considering the growth in online orders, the diminishing importance of physical distance and the increasing role of fast delivery. In this study, the rationale was different: behavioural changes did not form the basis for revising territorial policy but were viewed as a factor requiring the improvement of internal management structures, the redistribution of powers and the formalisation of decision-making procedures.

A similar difference in focus was demonstrated by a comparison with the study by R. Sánchez-Gómez & L. Vázquez-Suárez (2024). The authors analysed the adaptation of shopping centres' business models to omnichannel strategies, their reimagining as social spaces, and the development of the customer experience within a European context. In contrast, this study shifted the focus from market interactions to the internal governance structure: the relationship between the roles of the owner and the management company, the centralisation of strategic functions, and the regulation of responsibilities. Both approaches recognised the need for flexibility but interpreted it differently – as a marketing adaptation or as an institutionally structured management system.

P. Huang (2024) also emphasised the importance of structural changes, albeit in the context of the digital modernisation of traditional retail in China. The author focused on the challenges of integrating online and offline channels, data management and technological barriers. In this study, issues of digitalisation were not central; instead, the analysis covered the distinction between strategic and operational levels, delegation mechanisms and tools such as RACI as a means of ensuring transparency in management processes. Another dimension of transformation was demonstrated by the study by C.H. Tse *et al*. (2024), in which institutional changes in state-oriented capitalism in China were examined as a factor shaping the strategies of multinational companies. Legitimacy, the protection of property rights and industrial policy determined decisions regarding investments and partnerships. In this study, the institutional context was also significant, but at the micro-level – through the division of responsibilities between the owner and management of large shopping centres in Ukraine and the coordination of strategic and operational functions. A similar contrast was evident when compared with H. Guo & J. Kim (2023), who analysed the innovation of the "New Retail" business model and channel integration using the example of the Chinese "Super Species" format. Whilst their study examined the transformation of the value creation model, this paper focuses on the organisational management structure within the context of Ukraine's wartime economy. M. Zeng & Y. Kim (2025) examined the centralisation of regulatory powers in China's digital platform sector, in particular the mechanism of "domain-specific centralisation" and the increase in state control. In this study, the concept of centralisation took on a different meaning: it referred to the intra-corporate distribution of strategic and operational functions within specific properties. Thus, despite a shared focus on transformational processes and the role of institutional factors, the difference lay in the scale and analytical perspective – ranging from the state and sectoral levels to that of an individual organisation and its management structure.

An examination of the interaction between business and governance systems across different research traditions has demonstrated just how differently the very nature of governability can be interpreted. For instance, L. Zhang (2025) analysed the governance regime of large digital platforms in China, elaborating on the "market in the fragmented state" model using Alibaba as an example. The conclusions concerned the balance between stimulating growth and regulatory restraint on the part of the state; in other words, they had a distinct macroeconomic and political-economic dimension. In this study, the concept of centralisation was also central, though not in the context of state policy, but within the corporate structure of large shopping centres in Ukraine, where the focus was on the distribution of powers between the owner and management and the formalisation of multi-level decision-making. Another aspect of the problem of managerial decision-making was explored in a study by R. Salehzadeh & M. Ziaeian (2024), where a systematic review found that the application of multi-criteria methods in the field of HR decision-making (Analytic Hierarchy Process, Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process, Analytic Network Process) improved the soundness of staff selection, performance appraisal and strategic planning of HR policy. The study concluded that formalising criteria and weights helped to reduce subjectivity and improve the quality of management outcomes. This study also confirmed that a clear structuring of the decision-making process contributed to greater manageability and transparency; however, this result was achieved in a different way – by distinguishing between the strategic and operational levels and defining responsibilities among management participants. The RACI concept was applied as an analytical tool for structuring management functions to interpret the distribution of roles. Thus, both studies demonstrated the positive effect of formalising management procedures; however, whilst in the study by R. Salehzadeh & M. Ziaeian (2024) the result manifested in improved accuracy of HR decisions, in this study it was reflected in increased consistency and speed of decision-making within the organisational structure of the shopping centre.

The study by A. Aquilino-Navarro *et al*. (2022), which focused on management control systems in shopping centres, was more closely related to the topic at hand. The authors analysed budgetary control, the role of the managing director and the impact of leadership style on the centre's performance. In this study, management control was also viewed as a tool for ensuring manageability; however, the focus shifted from the individual leadership style to the configuration of the organisational structure – functional, divisional or hybrid – and the mechanisms of coordination between the strategic and operational levels. A similar difference in perspective was demonstrated by a comparison with M. García-Nieto *et al*. (2025), who analysed the effectiveness of cooperation between shopping centre management and tenants within the framework of customer relationship management strategies. Whilst their focus was on coordinating actions to increase footfall and customer loyalty, this study considered coordination more broadly – as an element of corporate governance that ensures a balance between the centralisation of strategic decisions and the delegation of operational functions.

The behavioural dimension of the transformation of shopping centres was most evident in the study by A. Zamfirache *et al*. (2024), which analysed the motivations for visiting shopping centres, the differences between online and offline shopping, and the impact of the pandemic on the consumer experience. In this study, these changes were recognised as contextual factors; however, the focus of the analysis remained on the managerial architecture designed to ensure adaptation to such shifts. A theoretical framework for analysis of management was proposed by A. Spicer & M. Alvesson (2025), who critically examined the tradition of Critical Management Studies and problematised managerialism as a form of power. The work did not aim to deconstruct management but, on the contrary, sought its structural optimisation; nevertheless, both approaches converged in their interpretation of management as a system of power distribution and control. The findings of L.A. Escudero-Gómez (2024) showed that shopping and entertainment centres maintained their competitiveness primarily through a change in format – the development of lifestyle concepts, the strengthening of the entertainment element and the creation of a unique customer experience. The author demonstrated that it was precisely this reorientation towards leisure and emotional consumption that counteracted the downturn. In this study, the results pointed to a different pattern: resilience and adaptability were determined not so much by a change in format as by the clarity of the management structure, the separation of strategic and operational functions, and the centralisation of key decisions. A similar discrepancy in findings was observed when compared with the conclusions of D. Stankovic *et al*. (2025). The authors argued that multifunctionality, the integration of open spaces and architectural flexibility, contributed to enhancing the centres' appeal and their long-term viability. In contrast, this study found that operational efficiency was ensured primarily by management mechanisms – balanced centralisation, delegation of authority and formalisation of responsibility – which ensured a rapid response to crisis challenges.

A study by M.A. Zaheer *et al*. (2024) demonstrated that e-trust had a direct impact on the intention to make online purchases, acting as a key mediator between the digital characteristics of the platform and consumer behaviour. Meanwhile, M. Kgakatsi *et al*. (2024) concluded that the use of Big Data was positively correlated with the financial and innovation performance of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, enhancing the strategic effectiveness of the business. In this study, information technology was not the central focus of the analysis; however, the results showed that the systematic, transparent and structured nature of management processes also acted as factors in improving efficiency. An analysis of the results showed that, despite the various research perspectives – ranging from spatial optimisation and business model innovations to digital trust, Big Data and institutional reforms – the key performance factor remained the management system's ability to ensure coordination and control. Whilst some studies linked effectiveness to technological or market drivers, in this study it was attributed to organisational configuration, the centralisation of strategic functions and the formalisation of responsibilities. Thus, a structured model of multi-level decision-making served as the institutional foundation for the shopping centres' adaptation to the transformational environment.

CONCLUSIONS

The study found that the effectiveness of the organisational structure of large shopping and entertainment centres in Ukraine is directly linked to the nature of the distribution of powers, the degree of centralisation of strategic functions, and the capacity for crisis adaptation in a wartime economy. A comparative analysis of Gulliver, Lavina Mall and Nikolsky demonstrated that the scale of a facility (GBA ranging from 106,000 m^2 at Nikolsky to 170,300 m^2 at Lavina Mall) does not in itself determine management effectiveness; the decisive factor is a combination of strategic control and operational flexibility. At Gulliver, with a GLA of 108,000 m^2, following the transfer of the asset to a consortium of state-owned banks, a model was introduced characterised by centralised strategic control and the delegation of operational management to an external manager. The financial parameters of this arrangement are reflected in the establishment of a guaranteed monthly payment to the budget of UAH 17,387,779.06 and the transfer of 70% of management revenues, which demonstrates the priority to fiscal stability and the controllability of cash flows.

Lavina Mall, with a rental area of 127,000 m^2 and over 400 shops, has demonstrated a different management approach: a centralised model within the property development group, with a high degree of autonomy for the local CEO. The effectiveness of this structure is confirmed by revenue of UAH 1.8 billion in 2024, a net profit of UAH 44.7 million for the first half of 2025, and an occupancy rate of over 99% (vacancy rate <1%). In addition, there has been a 17% increase in tenants' turnover following the renewal of the tenant mix and a rise in the repeat visit rate from 57% in 2019 to 75% in 2024, indicating the effective integration of strategic and marketing decisions. Nikolsky, with a GBA of around 106,000 m^2 and investments of USD 124 million, operated under more challenging security conditions. Following the missile strike in 2022 (direct losses ≈USD 18 million, indirect losses – up to USD 150 million), a phased recovery ensured 85% of pre-war traffic and 90% of turnover by the end of 2023, demonstrating the effectiveness of a crisis-adaptive centralised model with tactical decisions delegated to local management.

The results of the study therefore showed that a hybrid or centralised model, with a clear distinction between the strategic and operational levels, formalised responsibilities and the institutionalisation of KPI-oriented control, provides the best balance between financial stability, occupancy rates (up to 99%) and the speed of response to crisis events. The operational effectiveness of large shopping centres in conditions of uncertainty is determined not only by market parameters, but above all by the configuration of the management system and the ability to combine the centralisation of strategic functions with operational flexibility. The proposed recommendations provide for the formalisation of the distribution of roles according to the RACI principle, whereby strategic decisions remain "Accountable" at the level of the owners or the group, operational initiatives are defined as "Responsible" by local management, key issues are agreed upon in a "Consulted" capacity through strategic committees, whilst other stakeholders are designated as "Informed" via digital reporting systems. Areas for further research include deepening the analysis through inter-regional comparisons, examining the impact of organisational configuration on long-term financial stability, and integrating digital management tools into the multi-level decision-making system.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
None.

FUNDING
None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST
None.

REFERENCES

[1] AIN. (2025). *Gulliver in Kyiv is preparing for opening. How much did it cost to build a complex in the city center?* Retrieved from https://ain.ua/2025/12/11/gulliver-u-kijevi-gotuiut-do-vidkrittia/.
[2] All Retail. (2025). *Revenues and profits of the 5 largest Kyiv shopping centers for the first half of 2025*. Retrieved from https://surl.li/imauat.
[3] Aquilino-Navarro, A., Ramón-Jerónimo, J.M., & Flórez-López, R. (2022). Management control systems in shopping centres: Analysis of the managing director. *Logistics*, 6(1), article number 16. doi: 10.3390/logistics6010016.
[4] Blackmore, L. (2024). *The 4 levels of strategy: The difference & how to apply them*. Retrieved from https://www.cascade.app/blog/strategy-levels.
[5] Brynzylo, A. (2025). Integration of crisis management into the security strategy of shopping and entertainment centres in Ukraine in conditions of armed aggression. *Scientific Bulletin of Mukachevo State University. Series "Economics"*, 12(3), 9-20. doi: 10.52566/msu-econ3.2025.09.
[6] Decision of the Commercial Court of Kyiv No. 134081967. (2026). Retrieved from https://youcontrol.com.ua/catalog/court-document/134081967/.
[7] Dudka, O. (2025). *Research: How consumer perception of the Lavina Mall has changed in recent years*. Retrieved from https://rau.ua/news/doslidzhennja-trc-lavina-mall/.
[8] Escudero-Gómez, L.A. (2024). Shopping centers challenging decline: Competitive strategies in three case studies from Madrid's urban area. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 79, article number 103826. doi: 10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.103826.
[9] García-Nieto, M., Ramón-Jerónimo, J.M., & Flórez-López, R. (2025). Effectiveness of customer relationship management in shopping malls: Mall-retailer collaboration empirics. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(1), article number 31. doi: 10.3390/admsci15010031.
[10] Gordiychuk, I. (2025). *The capital's Gulliver shopping mall has become the property of two banks*. Retrieved from https://glavcom.ua/kyiv/news/trts-huliver-perejshov-u-vlasnist-dvokh-bankiv-1070281.html#google_vignette.
[11] Guo, H., & Kim, J. (2023). China's new retail business model: The case of Super Species. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 11(10), article number e1449. doi: 10.55908/sdgs.v11i10.1449.
[12] Gutterman, A.S. (2023). *Basic models of organizational structure*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373217565_Basic_Models_of_Organizational_Structure.
[13] Hmarochos. (2018). *Gulliver is the tallest building in Kyiv, shopping malls were invented by an American. We destroy 10 myths about shopping malls*. Retrieved from https://surl.li/famghg.
[14] Huang, P. (2024). Research on the transformation issues and optimization strategies of traditional Chinese retail enterprises under the background of digital transformation. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 208, article number 01012. doi: 10.1051/shsconf/202420801012.

[15] Ingentis. (2025). *Divisional Organizational Structure*. Retrieved from https://www.ingentis.com/en/knowledge/divisional-organizational-structure.

[16] Institute of Legislative Ideas. (n.d.). *Analytical note on the asset of the Gulliver multifunctional shopping and entertainment complex*. Retrieved from https://izi.institute/analysts/Analytical_note_on_the_Gulliver_shopping_center_asset/.

[17] Ivanov, A.M. (2025). Methods for evaluating the stimulating impact of strategic management on the development of TRC enterprises in Ukraine. *Scientific Notes of Lviv University of Business and Law*, 45, 365-374.

[18] Kgakatsi, M., Galeboe, O.P., Molelekwa, K.K., & Thango, B.A. (2024). The impact of big data on SME performance: A systematic review. *Businesses*, 4(4), 632-695. doi: 10.3390/businesses4040038.

[19] Koblianska, I.I., & Stoyanets, N.V. (2021). Strategic planning of shopping centre activities based on KPI. *National Economy: Intellect*, 21(4), 9-13. doi: 10.32782/2415-8801/2021-4.2.

[20] Kondratenko, N.O., & Volkova, M.V. (2021). Peculiarities and conditions of making managerial decisions at the enterprise. *Scientific Notes of the National University "Ostroh Academy". Series "Economics"*, 23(51), 47-53. doi: 10.25264/2311-5149-2021-23(51)-47-53.

[21] Kostenko, I. (2026). *Gulliver shopping mall in Kyiv opens fully: date announced*. Retrieved from https://www.rbc.ua/rus/news/trts-guliver-kievi-vidkrivayut-povnotsinno-1768825160.html.

[22] Kostruba, A. (2025). Managing foreign business operations in Ukraine in the context of war. *Business Horizons*, 68(1), 67-81. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2024.01.003.

[23] Maksym Gavryushin, Budhouse Group: We built the Nikolsky shopping center in one year and opened it in a very short time, despite the pandemic. (2021). Retrieved from https://rau.ua/news/budhouse-group-nikolsky/.

[24] Mandarin Plaza Group of Companies became a partner of the Ukrainian Retailers Association. (2024). Retrieved from https://rau.ua/news/mandarin-plaza-group-partner-asociacii-ritejleriv-ukraini/.

[25] Maranchak, N. (2023). *Developer Vagif Aliyev plans to buy state share of capital's Ocean Plaza shopping mall*. Retrieved from https://forbes.ua/news/developer-vagif-aliev-planue-kupiti-derzhavnu-chastku-trts-ocean-plaza-09112023-17147.

[26] Matyash, T. (2025). *ARMA elected the manager of the Gulliver shopping mall in Kyiv*. Retrieved from https://lb.ua/economics/2025/01/10/654677_arma_obralo_upravitelya_trts_gulliver.html.

[27] Nesterova, K., & Brynzylo, A. (2024). Challenges of strategic management of large shopping and entertainment centers in the conditions of martial law. *Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 32, 206-210. doi: 10.32782/2415-3583/32.31.

[28] Osiiyk, D. (2021). *Between online and offline: How shopping centers build omnichannel communication with consumers*. Retrieved from https://rau.ua/news/trts-omnikanalna-komunikatsiya/.

[29] Perederii, T. (2024). Features of the current practice of anti-crisis management of sustainable development in trade enterprises of Ukraine. *Entrepreneurship, Trade and Exchange Activities*, 278(8), 146-158. doi: 10.32752/1993-6788-2024-1-278-146-158.

[30] Ponomarenko, B. (2024). *Every fourth office in the Kyiv BC Gulliver is empty: Realtors say that the others are even worse*. Retrieved from https://kiev.informator.ua/uk/u-kijivskomu-bc-gulliver-porozhniy-kozhen-chetvertiy-ofis-rieltori-kazhut-shcho-v-inshih-shche-girshe.

[31] RACI matrix for budget management. (2025). Retrieved from https://www.meegle.com/en_us/topics/raci-matrix/raci-matrix-for-budget-management.

[32] Results of 2025 of the Lavina shopping center – comprehensive development and formation of market standards. (2025). Retrieved from https://www.mallsclub.com/tpost/6y0nfp1mb1-pdsumki-2025-roku-trts-lavina-kompleksni.

[33] Rosiak, J. (2025). *Using RACI charts to strengthen risk management and InfoSec programs*. Retrieved from https://www.bedelsecurity.com/blog/using-raci-charts-to-strengthen-risk-management-and-infosec-programs.

[34] Salehzadeh, R., & Ziaeian, M. (2024). Decision making in human resource management: A systematic review of the applications of analytic hierarchy process. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, article number 1400772. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1400772.

[35] Sánchez-Gómez, R., & Vázquez-Suárez, L. (2024). Organizational structure and store performance in the grocery retail industry: The moderating role of narcissistic leadership. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 79, article number 103796. doi: 10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.103796.

[36] Sharipov, O. (2024). *Polishchuk's Gulliver shopping center is planned to be transferred to the management of the ARMA: The decision was initiated by the Prosecutor General's Office*. Retrieved from https://forbes.ua/news/tts-guliver-polishchuka-planuyut-peredati-v-upravlinnya-arma-rishennya-initsiyuvav-ofis-genprokurora-24042024-20766.

[37] Slobodeniuk, A., Heidor, A., Velychko, O., & Sylkina, Y. (2024). Strategic management as a catalyst for the development and financial stability of modern enterprises. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 7, article number 2024spe078. doi: 10.31893/multirev.2024spe078.

[38] Spicer, A., & Alvesson, M. (2025). Critical management studies: A critical review. *Journal of Management Studies*, 62(1), 446-483. doi: 10.1111/joms.13047.

[39] Stankovic, D., Camiz, A., Tamburić, J., & Cvetanovic, A. (2025). Multipurpose character of shopping centers – possibilities and directions of further development. *Journal of the Faculty of Civil Engineering and Architecture*, 40(1), 107-119. doi: 10.62683/ZRGAF40.9.

[40] Suhanda, R.D., & Pratami, D. (2021). RACI matrix design for managing stakeholders in project: Case study of PT. XYZ. *International Journal of Innovation in Enterprise System*, 5(2), 122-133. doi: 10.25124/ijies.v5i02.134.

[41] Symonenko, K. (2022). *How Nikolsky Shopping Center in Kharkiv works after renovation*. Retrieved from https://rau.ua/news/jak-pracjuie-trc-nikolsky-harkovi/.

[42] The Gulliver shopping and entertainment center has opened in Kyiv. (2022). Retrieved from https://kiev.vgorode.ua/ukr/news/transport_y_ynfrastruktura/a1202091-u-kijevi-zapratsjuvav-torhovelno-rozvazhalnij-tsentr-gulliver.
[43] The largest dome in Ukraine was restored in the Nikolsky shopping mall in Kharkiv. (2023). Retrieved from https://interfax.com.ua/news/general/944329.html.
[44] Tse, C.H., Meyer, K.E., Pan, Y., & Chi, T. (2024). Evolution of MNE strategies amid China's changing institutions: A thematic review. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 55, 657-675. doi: 10.1057/s41267-024-00715-5.
[45] Tymeichuk, Y. (2025). Conceptual principles of retail chains strategic and spatial development. *Economy and Society*, 77. doi: 10.32782/2524-0072/2025-77-46.
[46] Ukrainian Council of Shopping Centers. (2023). *Unique restoration: How the Nikolsky shopping mall in Kharkiv lives and works*. Retrieved from https://www.ucsc.org.ua/unikalne-vidnovlennya-yak-zhyve-ta-praczyuye-trcz-nikolsky-v-harkovi/.
[47] Wei, Y.-M. (2025). A hybrid multi-criteria decision-making framework for the strategic evaluation of business development models. *Information*, 16(6), article number 454. doi: 10.3390/info16060454.
[48] Zaheer, M.A., Anwar, T.M., Iantovics, L.B., Manzoor, M., Raza, M.A., & Khan, Z. (2024). Decision-making model in digital commerce: Electronic trust-based purchasing intention through online food delivery applications (OFDAs). *Journal of Trade Science*, 12(3), 220-242. doi: 10.1108/JTS-12-2023-0037.
[49] Zamfirache, A., Neacşu, N.A., Madar, A., Bălăşescu, S., Bălăşescu, M., & Purcaru, I.-M. (2025). Behavioural differences and purchasing experiences through online commerce or offline within mall-based retail structures. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 25, 4159-4191. doi: 10.1007/s10660-024-09879-6.
[50] Zeng, M., & Kim, Y. (2025). Institutional reforms and regulatory shifts in China's digital platform sector: How domain-specific centralization shaped the 2020-2022 transition. *Business and Politics*. doi: 10.1017/bap.2025.10015.
[51] Zhang, L. (2025). Market in the fragmented state: Alibaba and the Chinese governance regime of Big Tech. *Social Media + Society*, 11(2). doi: 10.1177/20563051251340147.
[52] Zhou, R., Wang, C., Bao, D., & Xu, X. (2024). Shopping mall site selection based on consumer behavior changes in the new retail era. *Land*, 13(6), article number 855. doi: 10.3390/land13060855.

Особливості організаційної структури та системи прийняття управлінських рішень у великих торгово-розважальних центрах

Андрій Бринзило
Аспірант
Міжнародний гуманітарний університет
65009, вул. Фонтанська дорога, 33, м. Одеса, Україна
https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3287-4994

Анотація. Метою дослідження було з'ясувати особливості формування організаційної структури та системи прийняття управлінських рішень у великих торговельно-розважальних центрах України в умовах воєнної економіки. Методологія поєднувала структурно-функціональний аналіз моделей управління, аналіз розподілу повноважень між стратегічним і операційним рівнями прийняття рішень та порівняльний кейс-аналіз центрів Gulliver, Lavina Mall і Nikolsky у 2022-2025 роках. Встановлено, що Gulliver із загальною площею 158 000 м^2 та орендною площею 108 000 м^2 функціонує за гібридною організаційною структурою зі стратегічною централізацією фінансового контролю та делегуванням операцій зовнішньому управителю, що передбачає гарантований щомісячний платіж 17 387 779,06 грн і перерахування 70 % доходів. Lavina Mall із загальною площею 170 300 м^2 та орендною площею 127 000 м^2 демонструє централізовану групову структуру з автономією керівника; у 2024 році дохід становив 1,8 млрд грн, заповнюваність перевищувала 99 %, а товарообіг у 2025 році зріс на 17 %. Nikolsky із загальною площею 106 000 м^2 та орендною площею 53 000 м^2 функціонує за функціональною організаційною структурою з централізованим стратегічним управлінням і концентрацією операційних повноважень у межах внутрішньої управлінської команди; після збитків близько 18 млн доларів США у 2022 році центр відновив трафік до 85 % і товарообіг до 90 % завдяки перерозподілу управлінських повноважень та посиленню координації між підрозділами. У дослідженні рекомендовано впровадження багаторівневої організаційної структури з чітким розмежуванням стратегічних і операційних повноважень, формалізацією ролей і відповідальності учасників процесу прийняття рішень, трансформацією інтегральних показників ефективності на рівень підрозділів і посад та поєднанням адаптивності управління зі стійкістю функціонування. Практичне значення дослідження полягає у можливості використання запропонованої моделі власниками та менеджментом торговельно-розважальних центрів для оптимізації розподілу повноважень і підвищення стійкості управління

Ключові слова: делегування; менеджмент; відповідальність; керівник; ефективність