

# **Regional dynamics of social partnership: political, legal and value characteristics**

**Ashkhen S. Aroyan**

Faculty of Political Science Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration  
under the President of the Russian Federation  
(Moscow, Russia)  
E- mail: [niko.m\\_2002@mail.ru](mailto:niko.m_2002@mail.ru)

**Alexander V. Ponedelkov**

Political Science and Ethnopolitics Russian Academy of National Economy and Public  
Administration under the President of the Russian Federation  
(Moscow, Russia)  
E- mail: [ponedelkov@skags.ru](mailto:ponedelkov@skags.ru)

**Natalia V. Fedorova**

Don State Technical University  
E-mail: [fnavl@mail.ru](mailto:fnavl@mail.ru)

**Sergey S. Shestopal**

Department of Theory and History of Russian and Foreign Law Vladivostok State University of  
Economics and Service  
(Vladivostok, Russia)  
E-mail: [ss.shestopal@yandex.ru](mailto:ss.shestopal@yandex.ru)

## **Abstract**

The subject of this work is the study of the level of development, key problems and directions for the development of social partnership via expert surveys conducted in 13 regions of the Russian Federation. As a result, the development of regions, the provision of positive social dynamics in the development of the latter is associated with the formation and stimulation of social partnership. In conclusion, the model of joint development of the key actors of the political and socio-economic processes is the most adequate in comparison with the liberal-democratic forms and practices, to solve many regional problems, conflicts and contradictions.

**Keywords:** Power, State, Law, Politics, Survey.

*Dinámicas regionales de asociación social: características políticas,  
legales y de valor*

## **Resumen**

El tema de este trabajo es el estudio del nivel de desarrollo, problemas clave y direcciones para el desarrollo de la asociación social a través de encuestas de expertos realizadas en 13 regiones de la Federación Rusa. Como resultado, el desarrollo de las regiones, la provisión de dinámicas sociales positivas en el desarrollo de estas últimas se asocia con la formación y el estímulo de la sociedad

social. En conclusión, el modelo de desarrollo conjunto de los actores clave de los procesos políticos y socioeconómicos es el más adecuado en comparación con las formas y prácticas liberal-democráticas, para resolver muchos problemas, conflictos y contradicciones regionales.

**Palabras clave:** Poder, Estado, Derecho, Política, Encuesta.

## **1. Introduction**

Currently, the regional political process is dominated by the tendencies of social disunity, egocentricity, and utility in public-government, economic, political, and other social interactions. The latter is the result of a protracted cardinal reform of the national state-legal organization, the absence of a common vision of models and strategies for transforming Russian statehood. Today, the demand for forms of mutual social assistance, support, technologies of social integration and joint development of key actors of social and political life is obvious. On the whole, the Russian political tradition is characterized by an orientation toward solidaristic forms of interaction between public organizations, movements, business structures, political parties, institutions of public authority, etc. It seems to us that the social orientation of Russian politics, economic interaction, and legal regulation of social relations is and will be the main issue on the political agenda. It is no coincidence that the current President of the Russian Federation in his Address to Russian society noted that we are one people, with a common historical fate and a common future. And only by maintaining a sense of spiritual community, social responsibility, pride in our country, personal involvement in its fate, we will be able to succeed. It seems that the socio-political model of the joint movement united with the individual development, development of public structures and the state was voiced in this political formula (Mordovtsev et al., 2016).

## **2. Methodology**

In general, our hypothesis is that ensuring positive dynamics in the development of regional socio-economic and political spaces is associated with the formation and development of social partnership within the framework of public-government interaction between society, the regional business community and government structures. From our position, this model is not only adequate for solving many regional problems, conflicts and contradictions in the socio-economic and political development of the regions, but also has stable traditions in Russian political and economic history. The empirical base of the research is grounded on expert surveys conducted in 13 regions of the Russian Federation according to quota sampling principle. Expert assessments were given by different categories of experts. The survey included: academics, government officials, representatives of municipal authorities, the business community and various public organizations.

## **3. Results and discussion**

The main results of these sociological studies presented information and analytical materials.

1. Key orientations in the development of public interaction in the state-business-society system. Today, it can be stated that the period of market transformation of the domestic

sociocultural space did not significantly change the steady dominants of public consciousness and the overall target orientation in the interaction of society, state and business. It is noteworthy that, in general, the expert community recognizes the significance and social value of the market (Western European) model for organizing socio-economic relations in society. At the same time, in the overwhelming majority of regions of Russia, societal orientations, rather than liberal-democratic ones, serve as a target for socio-economic development (Baranov et al., 2017).

For example, depending on the regions of the country, such target orientations as creating favorable conditions for the development of entrepreneurship or transferring a part of state functions to civil society fixing the focus on the Western European model of socio-economic organization of public relations and strengthening the importance of civil society institutions, and their responsibility for their own well-being (the individualistic model) are estimated by the expert community as having very low level of social importance (Nizhny Novgorod Region: creation of favorable conditions... - 0%, transfer of part of functions - 5%; Primorsky Territory: 4% and 11%; Krasnodarsky Territory: 4% and 10%; Astrakhan region: 7% and 6%; Arkhangelsk region: 5% and 10%; Saratov Region: 10% and 19%, similar estimates were obtained for other regions of the Russian Federation) (Gorshkov, 2016).

At the same time, the expert survey noted as dominant in the interaction between civil society, the state and business community, such targets as an effective solution of problems of citizens, improvement of life of the population (Primorsky Territory - 38%, Nizhny Novgorod region - 80%; Krasnodarsky Territory - 53%; Astrakhan Region - 52%; Arkhangelsk Region - 62%; Saratov Region - 58%, similar estimates were obtained for other regions of the Russian Federation) and improving the quality of public services for the population and the mechanism of their provision (Primorsky Territory - 26%, Nizhny Novgorod Region - 10%; Krasnodar Territory - 19%; Astrakhan region - 14%; Arkhangelsk region - 14%; Saratov region - 10%, similar estimates were obtained in other regions of the Russian Federation).

It should be noted that the social target orientation forms the model of joint development and is aimed at updating the social partnership practices of all key actors - the state, business, public institutions and structures in the formation of decent conditions for society. We note that the above focus on social partnership is between 60% and 90% of the total target values. The difference in percentage ratio in a number of regions seems to be connected with the sensitivity of certain regions to the problems of the quality of rendering public services in certain regions of the Russian Federation, for example, 26% in Primorsky Territory, and 19% in Krasnodarsky Territory. Similar assessments can be seen in the Results for monitoring the quality of electronic services provision by the regions for 2017 summarized by the Ministry of Economic Development of Russia. Thus, the Krasnodar Territory received an estimate of 23.8% for compliance with the requirements, the Saratov Region - 28.4%, the Nizhny Novgorod Region - 30%, and the Primorsky Territory - 30.4% (Mamychev, 2017).

2. Status and evaluation of the social partnership effectiveness. At the present stage, the expert community characterizes the public interaction in the state-society-business system in different ways depending on the regional specifics and features of the political process in the constituent entities of the Russian Federation. In general, it should be noted that experts stated: the model of social partnership in modern Russia is rather weakly developed, and the interaction between society, government and business community is extremely episodic, not systemic in nature, and is not effective. Although, as noted above, most experts recognize the need to develop social partnership to solve many sociopolitical problems, as well as the adequacy of this model of public

interaction both to the sociocultural tradition of Russian society and to modern tasks and challenges of regional and federal development.

At the same time, the expert community also notes positive trends, namely the formation of sustainable prerequisites for the development of social partnership in the regional socio-political space. At the same time, many forms and mechanisms of the social partnership are just beginning to be tested and applied. There is a search for the most optimal and effective forms and directions of interaction between society and business structures, joint social development programs supported by the state and the business community, and so on. It should be noted that at present, the development of partnerships in the state-society-business system is mainly stimulated by the state through various government programs, targeted competitions, grants, and so on. Most experts (the total in regions makes up more than 70%) recognize the leading role of the state in shaping the conditions and in consolidating multi-vector social forces. It should be emphasized that today, both at the doctrinal and legal level, which consolidates the strategic prospects for the development of social relations, and at the level of current legislation there are no effective legal and regulatory frameworks for encouraging the development of the social partnership. For example, neither in the National Security Strategy, nor in the doctrines of economic, information, food and other areas of ensuring national security, neither of which practically speaks about the forms and directions of development of social partnership and joint interaction when implementing national and regional development priorities of the Russian Federation.

Another example is the law on arts patronage which is a quite frame in character. The effective application of the latter largely depends on the development and adoption of relevant regional regulatory acts, detailing and adapting the general legal language of the federal law to the social, economic and ethno-political specifics of the regions. In this regard, we consider it expedient to develop and adopt the Doctrine of Regional Development of the Russian Federation (there is a relevant experience in developing a doctrine in modern Russia) that would take the latter into account, clearly establish the priorities, forms and directions of interaction between society, business structures and the state regional problems, and also formed the legal framework for the development of social partnership in the regions of the country. Thus, at the present stage of regional and federal development of modern Russian statehood, the system of social partnership is at the point of its formation. In this regard, it is important to analyze the state and the level of interaction between state bodies and the regional community, as well as the latter with local business structures (Fedotov, 2005).

The issues of interaction between society and public authorities from the point of view of expert assessments also demonstrate different dynamics depending on the regional specifics and the particularities of the political relations developing in them (see Table 1). Thus, in a number of subjects of the Russian Federation (their share is rather small in general regional indicators), more than half of the experts assess public-government relations between various political actors as a partnership (Rostov region and Ulyanovsk region). In other regions, on the contrary, the picture is just the opposite; most experts simultaneously record the absence of such interaction, the existence of conflicts between the regional authorities and public structures, as well as the presence of competition between the regional community and public authorities. For example, the total share of the latter in Primorsky Territory is 51%, in the Saratov region. - 60%, in the Republic of Karelia - 62%, in the Belgorod region. - 74%, in the Krasnodar Territory - 78% (similar figures were obtained for other regions, where these figures in the aggregate range from 30 to 45%). In addition, a large proportion of experts, in general, could not precisely specify the situation in their region, noting that public-government relations between society and the authorities are present, but they are

situational, and not strategic and systemic. For example, in the Arkhangelsk region, the share of experts who could not distinguish the stable nature of partnerships, and also unwilling to believe that in their region government authorities and society function in parallel, independently from each other, was more than 25%, and more than 15% in the Rostov region and Primorsky Territory.

Table 1. In which words can you characterize the interaction between the government and public organizations in your region? (%)

The subject of the RF Criterion	Rostov region	Arkhangelsk region	Primorsky Territory	Saratov region	Republic of Karelia	Ulyanovsk region	Krasnodar Territory	Belgorod region
Partnership	56,15	40.87	31.00	30.00	26.96	69.23	22.00	21.73
Conflict	1.99	3.48	12.00	15.80	10.43	3.85	8.00	17.31
Competitive	2.49	2.61	8.00	12.50	0.87	0.00	21.00	26.08
Parallel existence (no interaction)	21.93	26.09	31.00	31.70	50.43	3.85	49.00	30.42
Other	0.50	1.74	3.00	9.20	0.87	11.54	0.00	0.00
No answer	15.78	25.22	15.00	0.80	10.43	11.54	0.00	4.34

In turn, the expert community is also quite unenthusiastic (and in some cases very negatively set against) in assessments concerning the level of development of a partnership between public authorities and the business community in their region. The overall indicator of expert assessments in favor of formed partnership relations between the state and business is less than 30%, and the absence of such relations or their deformations (patronage relations, corrupt interaction, and formation of an oligarchic regime in the region) is just over 60%. Moreover, according to expert estimates, the acutely conflicting interaction of government and business is just over 10%.

At the same time, the regional specificity of expert opinions demonstrates both a number of similar tendencies in the interaction between government and business, and a fundamental difference in others (Table 2). For example, experts almost stably estimate the patronage nature of interaction between the authorities and society in the regions; it makes 20% in total. In turn, the development of partnerships differ significantly in expert estimates: from 50% (for example, Tambov Region - 55%, Rostov Region - 44%, Stavropol Territory - 50%, Ulyanovsk Region - 54) to 5% (for example, Chelyabinsk Region and Saratov Region - 6%, Republic of Karelia - 8%. On average, in regions, partnerships account for only 20%.

Table 2. How would you assess the style of relations between the political and administrative elite and its leaders with representatives of business in your region? (%)

The subject of the RF Criterion	Rostov region	Arkhangelsk region	Primorsky Territory	Saratov region	Republic of Karelia	Ulyanovsk region	Krasnodar Territory	Belgorod region
Patronage (patronizes, dominates, controls)	21.76	26.09	26.00	28.40	20.00	19.23	24.00	13.01
Partnership (enters into dialogue, interests, promotes business development)	44.19	26.96	28.00	5.80	7.83	53.85	19.00	17.35

Conflict (pursuing, arranging litigations, forcing to seek justice in higher instances, etc.)	3.16	6.09	14.00	5.80	26.09	3.85	22.00	18.23
Corrupt	5.65	11.30	11.00	29.20	16,52	7,69	29.00	27.83
Monopoly-oligarchic, who took over the entire big business	8.97	5.22	15.00	29.20	13.04	15.38	8.00	21.71
Other	0.83	5.22	5.00	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No answer	16.94	19.13	1.00	0.00	16,52	0.00	0.00	1.64

In general, we can note a certain regional stability in the interaction between government and business, the established rules of the game in the coordination of interests between the regional political and economic elite. The expert community notes that the regional political agenda in general does not contradict and does not conflict with the expectations and interests of business. Of course, these established forms and practices of interaction may change significantly due to the recent massive resignations of the governors in several regions. Perhaps, the latter was caused by the need to break up the stable forms and practices of public-government interaction that have developed in the regions which have generally formed negative dynamics in socio-political and economic development.

3. The basic mechanisms for the development of social partnership are mainly reduced in expert assessments to the formation of sustainable forms, directions and programs of interaction between societies - business – the state. Experts believe that it is the co-development model of the key actors of the political, social and economic processes that can form positive trends in regional development, and generally ensure the positive dynamics of the development of the Russian state in conditions of global instability and civilizational risks. The principle of social partnership confirms our hypothesis about the formation of a socio-economic model of co-development (this principle is leading in almost all regions of the country, although there are variations in the dominance percentage of the latter in various regions of the Russian Federation: Rostov region - 59%; Arkhangelsk region - 61%, Astrakhan region - 45%, Nizhny Novgorod region - 55%; Krasnodar Territory - 62%; Saratov region - 69%, Stavropol region - 68; Ulyanovsk region - 73%; Chelyabinsk region - 64%, similar estimates were also obtained in other subjects of the Russian Federation. In turn, only an insignificant share of the expert community believes that representatives of civil society should establish the interaction vector in the society-state-business system (Rostov region - 8%, Arkhangelsk region - 0%, Astrakhan region - 10%, Belgorod region - 10%, Nizhny Novgorod region - 0%, Krasnodar Territory - 9%; Primorsky Territory - 6%, Saratov region - 1%, Stavropol region - 9%; Ulyanovsk region - 8%, Chelyabinsk region - 6%, similar estimates were obtained in other regions of the Russian Federation) (Vorontsov et al., 2017).

At the same time, with the dominance of the social partnership principle in most regions of Russia, the expert community singles out the business elite and the state as the dominant actors determining the specifics of the development of a regional public space. In the Belgorod region, social partnership as a key principle for the development of relations between representatives of civil society, government and business received 31%, the leading role of the state - 38%, and the position according to which the availability of financial resources at business allowing its representatives to establish their own rules received 19%. In Primorsky Territory, social partnership

was noted only by 8% of experts, and the main role of the state was highlighted by 42%, the influence of business on the formation of rules and principles of public-government interaction took 35% (Shestak et al., 2015).

In many ways, such assessments of the expert community, especially in the Primorsky Territory, are associated with poor development, on the one hand, of real practices of social partnership in the region, and on the other, forms and mechanisms of interaction between public institutions and business structures, as well as government representatives. For example, political experts of the Primorsky Territory indicate that the latter was the leading factor in the resignation of the head of the region. Another factor influencing the nature of expert assessments in Primorsky Territory is associated with the special significance of state programs for the development of the region, which are key one on the political agenda. At the same time, socially significant programs presented by individual politicians and/or political parties are largely related to the attraction and implementation of such programs, and the political capital of the latter is largely based on the possibility of attracting financial assistance from federal structures and the business community.

The expert community identifies, in a number of cases, overlapping guidelines, and in others quite opposite ones as the main directions for the development of regional space, to which joint efforts of public authorities, business structures and society should be directed. However, if we take the average figure for the regions, we can distinguish three main groups of such areas: primary, important and non-key (secondary). The first group includes socio-economic areas, mainly related to the modernization of the regional economy and the introduction of innovative technologies, e.g. such areas as the improvement of the financial-banking and tax systems and technical and technological innovations aimed at re-equipment (Malchinov, 2009).

Table 4. Areas of innovative development of the regions that require the priority attention of the authorities, civil society and business

The subject of the RF Options	Rostov region	Arkhangelsk region	Saratov region	Primorsky Territory	Republic of Karelia	Ulyanovsk region	Krasnodar Territory
Improving the financial, banking and tax system	32.89	28.70	34.30	13.00	8.70	9.30	26.00
Technical and technological innovations aimed at re-equipping the real economy	31.89	29.57	34.30	8.00	28.70	6.98	16.00
Innovations aimed at accelerating the information society	6.48	4.35	8.30	5.00	5.22	27.91	10.00
Innovations in education and graduate education	13.79	14.78	5.80	25.00	6.96	18.60	18.00
Innovations in the field of training, retraining and advanced training of university teachers	8.14	0.00	0.00	13.00	5.22	6.98	8.00
Health innovation	21.76	5.22	3.20	16.00	14.78	18.60	21.00
Defense innovations for national security	5.15	1.74	5.00	4.00	1.74	2.33	2.00
Innovations in state and municipal government	12.13	6.96	7.50	13.00	26.09	6.98	2.00
Other	1.33	0.87	0.80	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.00
No answer	6.64	7.83	0.80	3.00	1.74	2.33	0.00

#### 4. Conclusions

1. In general, it can be argued that the key orientations in the development of public-government relations in the system of state - society - business involves the formation of a joint development model, i.e., joint development and interaction in achieving generally significant political, economic, ethnocultural and other goals and objectives. As noted above, the latter, according to the expert community, are associated primarily with an effective solution of acute social problems, ensuring regional stability and sustainable development of specific living spaces.

2. Expert assessments of representatives of the regions of the Russian Federation confirmed our hypothesis about the need to form a socio-economic model of co-development, and a targeted focus on social partnership is leading in almost all regions of the country. In turn, the absence of a regulatory framework for the development of the social partnership, forms and programs for stimulating the joint development model at the doctrinal and legislative levels significantly reduces the potential of key actors of political, social and economic interaction, and reduces the conditions for positive dynamics of regional space development. Moreover, ignoring the latter can ultimately unleash the pendulum of political regionalization, lead to the aggravation of regional conflicts and contradictions in the state-society-business system.

3. It is necessary to develop and adopt a special Doctrine of regional development of the Russian Federation, which would take into account in its content the key forms, directions and mechanisms of the social partnership of society, the business community and regional state structures, as well as the institutions of municipal public authority. This will help create a legal framework for the development of social partnership in the country's regions and intensify the process of regional lawmaking, the adoption of specialized regulatory legal acts detailing and adapting federal legal provisions to the social, economic and ethno-political specifics of the region.

#### References

BARANOV, P., OVCHINNIKOV, P., MAMYCHEV, A., PLOTNIKOV, A. 2017. **Elites and the Socio-Cultural Vector of Development** // *Man in India*. Vol. 97 N° 23: 561-575. India

FEDOTOV, V. 2005. **Good society**. p. 544. Canada.

GORSHKOV, M. 2016. **Russian society as it is: (the experience of sociological diagnosis)**. In 2 volumes. 2nd edition, revised and enlarged. Vol. 1. p. 416. UK.

MALCHINOV, A. 2009. **The Doctrine of Regional Development of the Russian Federation**. Center for Problem Analysis and State Project Management. M.: Scientific expert. p. 256. Russia.

MAMYCHEV, A. 2017. **State power in the socio-cultural organization of modern society: theoretical and methodological aspects of political and legal transformation**. M. p. 290. Canada.

MORDOVTSEV, A., MAMYCHEV, A., MORDOVTSEVA, T., MIRZORIN, M. 2016. **Democratic transit in the South Caucasian countries // central Asia and the Caucasus**. *Journal of Social and Political Studies*. Vol. 17 N° 3: 7-14. Canada.



SHESTAK, O., PETRUK, G., VLASENKO, A. 2015. **Contemporary state and strategic directions of developing the information environment of the north-eastern regions in Russia (with the Kamchatka region as an example)**. Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce. N° 1. p. 4. UK.

VORONTSOV, S., MAMYCHEV, A., PONEDELKOV A., YANGUZIN A., VILDANOV H. 2017. **Elitogenesis in the Political Processes of Modern Russia, Based on Sociological (Field) Research** // Man in India. Vol. 97 N° 23: 273-284. India.