



# REVISTA INCLUSIONES

HOMENAJE A JUAN R. COCA Y ANABEL PARAMA

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número 1

Enero / Marzo

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

**CUERPO DIRECTIVO**

**Directores**

**Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda**

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

**Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras**

Universidad de Los Lagos, Chile

**Subdirectores**

**Mg © Carolina Cabezas Cáceres**

Universidad de Las Américas, Chile

**Dr. Andrea Mutolo**

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

**Editor**

**Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda**

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

**Editor Científico**

**Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo**

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

**Editor Brasil**

**Drdo. Maicon Herverton Lino Ferreira da Silva**

Universidade da Pernambuco, Brasil

**Editor Ruropa del Este**

**Dr. Alekzandar Ivanov Katrandhiev**

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

**Cuerpo Asistente**

**Traductora: Inglés**

**Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero**

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

**Traductora: Portugués**

**Lic. Elaine Cristina Pereira Menegón**

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

**Portada**

**Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos**

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

**COMITÉ EDITORIAL**

**Dra. Carolina Aroca Toloza**

Universidad de Chile, Chile

**Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado**

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

**Dra. Heloísa Bellotto**

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

**Dra. Nidia Burgos**

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

**Mg. María Eugenia Campos**

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

**Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera**

Universidad de Valladolid, España

**Mg. Keri González**

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

**Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González**

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

**Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy**

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

**Mg. Cecilia Jofré Muñoz**

Universidad San Sebastián, Chile

**Mg. Mario Lagomarsino Montoya**

Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile

**Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes**

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

**Dr. Werner Mackenbach**

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

**Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín**

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

**Ph. D. Natalia Milanesio**

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

**Dra. Patricia Virginia Moggia Münchmeyer**

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

**Ph. D. Maritza Montero**

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

**Dra. Eleonora Pencheva**

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

**Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira**

Universidad de La Coruña, España

**Mg. David Ruete Zúñiga**

Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, Chile

**Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona**

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

**Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra**  
*Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia*

**Dra. Mirka Seitz**  
*Universidad del Salvador, Argentina*

**Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov**  
*South West University, Bulgaria*

**COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL**

**Comité Científico Internacional de Honor**

**Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía**  
*Universidad ICESI, Colombia*

**Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas**  
*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Martino Contu**  
*Universidad de Sassari, Italia*

**Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo**  
*Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil*

**Dra. Patricia Brogna**  
*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez**  
*Universidad de Barcelona, España*

**Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén**  
*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Lancelot Cowie**  
*Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago*

**Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar**  
*Universidad de Los Andes, Chile*

**Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo**  
*Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, México*

**Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto**  
*Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina*

**Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco**  
*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo**  
*Universidad de Chile, Chile*

**Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandia**  
*Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España*

**Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar**  
*Universidad de Sevilla, España*

**Dra. Patricia Galeana**  
*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dra. Manuela Garau**  
*Centro Studi Sea, Italia*

**Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg**  
*Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia*  
*Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos*

**Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez**  
*Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia*

**José Manuel González Freire**  
*Universidad de Colima, México*

**Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera**  
*Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España*

**Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre**  
*Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil*

**Dr. Miguel León-Portilla**  
*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura**  
*Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel", España*

**Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros**  
*Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil*

**+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández**  
*Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela*

**Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango**  
*Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México*

**Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut**  
*Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España*

**Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa**  
*Dilemas Contemporáneos, México*

**Dra. Francesca Randazzo**  
*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Honduras*

**Dra. Yolando Ricardo**

*Universidad de La Habana, Cuba*

**Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha**

*Universidade Católica de Angola Angola*

**Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza**

*Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica*

**Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix**

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades  
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

**Dr. Luis Alberto Romero**

*CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig**

*Dilemas Contemporáneos, México*

**Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Juan Antonio Seda**

*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva**

*Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil*

**Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso**

*Universidad de Salamanca, España*

**Dr. Josep Vives Rego**

*Universidad de Barcelona, España*

**Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni**

*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Comité Científico Internacional**

**Mg. Paola Aceituno**

*Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, Chile*

**Ph. D. María José Aguilar Idañez**

*Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, España*

**Dra. Elian Araujo**

*Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil*

**Mg. Rumyana Atanasova Popova**

*Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria*

**Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa**

*Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal*

*Centro de Estudos Africanos, Portugal*

**Dra. Alina Bestard Revilla**

*Universidad de Ciencias de la Cultura Física y el  
Deporte, Cuba*

**Dra. Noemí Brenta**

*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Ph. D. Juan R. Coca**

*Universidad de Valladolid, España*

**Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel**

*Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España*

**Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik**

*Universidad de Colonia, Alemania*

**Dr. Eric de Léséulec**

*INS HEA, Francia*

**Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti**

*Universidad de Barcelona, España*

**Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant**

*Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalén, Israel*

**Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro**

*Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia*

**Dra. Claudia Lorena Fonseca**

*Universidad Federal de Pelotas, Brasil*

**Dra. Ada Gallegos Ruiz Conejo**

*Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Perú*

**Dra. Carmen González y González de Mesa**

*Universidad de Oviedo, España*

**Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov**

*Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria*

**Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez**

*Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia*

**Dr. Patricio Quiroga**

*Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile*

**Dr. Gino Ríos Patio**

*Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú*

**REVISTA  
INCLUSIONES**  
REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES  
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

**Dr. Carlos Manuel Rodríguez Arrechavaleta**  
*Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México*

**Dra. Vivian Romeu**  
*Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México*

**Dra. María Laura Salinas**  
*Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina*

**Dr. Stefano Santasilia**  
*Universidad della Calabria, Italia*

**Mg. Silvia Laura Vargas López**  
*Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, México*

**CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA  
EDITORIAL**

**Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo**  
*Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina*

**Dr. Evandro Viera Ouriques**  
*Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro, Brasil*

**Dra. María Luisa Zagalaz Sánchez**  
*Universidad de Jaén, España*

**Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec**  
*Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia*

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía  
Santiago – Chile  
Representante Legal  
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

## Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF  
SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad  
de Concepción

BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN



**COMMUNICATION OF BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT:  
IN SEARCH OF AN EFFECTIVE MODEL FOR RUSSIA**

**Dr. Rashid Tazitdinovich Mukhaev**

Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Russia  
muhaev\_r@mail.ru

**Ph. D. (c) Elena Evgenievna Prokopenko**

Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Russia  
apro2009@yandex.ru

**Fecha de Recepción:** 10 de agosto de 2019 – **Fecha Revisión:** 22 de agosto de 2019

**Fecha de Aceptación:** 17 de octubre de 2019 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de enero de 2020

**Abstract**

This paper is devoted to an answer to the question: “How are business interests embedded in the mechanism of managerial decision-making in Russia?” To answer the question, the foreign experience of public-private interaction is analyzed, as well as Russian practices of GR communications between government and business. The purpose of the paper is to construct an effective model of interaction between business and government in Russia, based on positive foreign experience and taking into account the economic, political, and sociocultural characteristics of the country. It is proved that a universal model of interaction between business and government does not exist, but in each national model of communication between business and government, there are effective practices that can be adapted to Russian realities. The novelty of the study is that the forms and technologies of GR communications of business and government are considered as elements of the state administration mechanism. The paper contains some suggestions on the development of mechanisms of interaction between business and government in Russia, capable of changing the paternalistic model of business and government communication to a more effective partnership model.

**Keywords**

Public administration – Corporatism – Pluralism – Neo-corporatism – Political communication

**Para Citar este Artículo:**

Mukhaev, Rashid Tazitdinovich y Prokopenko, Elena Evgenievna. Communication of business and government: in search of an effective model for Russia. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num 1 (2020): 318-342.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported  
(CC BY-NC 3.0)  
Licencia Internacional





## Introduction

The search for an effective model of interaction between business and government that can lead Russia onto the trajectory of sustainable development has determined the theoretical and practical relevance of the stated research topic. The growing competition of world powers for resources, markets for their products has led to increased interaction between business and government. The transition of developed countries to “economy 4.0”, which is based on knowledge, intellectual resources and digital technologies, has intensified the struggle for leadership in the field of artificial intelligence, the achievement of which will ensure global dominance. In the conditions of total digitalization, the driver of an innovative and technological breakthrough in Russia, the mechanism of its sustainable development should be an effective public administration system that can provide a solution to these problems. However, the action of these factors has significantly changed the parameters of the effectiveness of the public administration system.

Globalization not only informally and mentally draws local societies into the space of universal interactions, but also radically changes the picture of the world, social practices, the pace of life, and patterns of human behavior. Under these conditions, the effectiveness of the public administration system is determined by the ability of its institutions to recognize emerging group demands and relevantly convert them into managerial decisions. This is possible if there are sustainable channels of communication between government bodies and interests in society. Due to them, interest groups (business community, employees, gender groups) convey their requests to state authorities, which, in turn, translate them into managerial decisions. This allows the public administration system to balance interests and maintain the high legitimacy of the political regime.

In addition, the informatization of the public sphere, the introduction of market mechanisms into it, radically changed the format of modern public administration, which is a network of permanent information communications between political actors, during which the interests of various functional groups are coordinated. Thus, the sphere of public administration becomes an arena of dialogue between the authorities and interest groups, including business entities. The content of the public administration process is a form of interaction between the authorities and functional groups regarding the equitable distribution of the “public good” (rights, freedoms, wealth, statuses, welfare) through managerial decisions. In this regard, the knowledge of communication mechanisms between business and government, as well as their competent use, is of particular relevance.

Indeed, the purpose of the public administration system was to achieve consensus in society regarding the distribution of priority goods between social groups. At each stage of the development of society, the public administration system is designed to provide a moving balance of interests of the castes, classes, and communities, reflecting their needs in managerial decisions. Moreover, the evolution of public administration systems follows the principle of the necessary diversity of Ashby, according to which the management system should have no less diversity than the managed one<sup>1</sup>. A higher degree of the social diversity of economic, political, and cultural relations in society created the need for a more comprehensive management system. To meet the rapidly changing mosaic of people’s requests, the public administration system must combine the high responsiveness of the

---

<sup>1</sup> W. R. Ashby, *Vvedenie v kibernetiku* (Moscow: 1959), 294.

state apparatus and clear strategic planning. Whenever the management system was unable to convert social diversity into relevant decisions, a paradigm shift took place and a request arose for a more comprehensive model of public administration.

The interaction of business and government in the public administration mechanism should be considered as a process of harmonization of private and public interests in the process of managerial decision-making. However, the roles of government and business in the process of developing and making managerial decisions are unequal. For this reason, models of their interaction can develop based on the principles of partnership, patronage, suppression, domination. Effective communication between business and government implies building working, equal relations between business entities and government authorities, within the framework of which a spectrum of social, economic, and political relations is formed, aimed at the optimal use of resources based on partnerships.

*Hypothesis:* The interaction of government and business in Russia can become more effective only if business can move from the practice of traditional individual lobbying of own interests to collective legal actions aimed at ensuring conditions for sustainable economic development in their sectors, industries and regions, which requires institutional reforms.

## Methods

The history of interaction between business and government goes back centuries and begins its countdown with the advent of private capital. However, the theoretical understanding of public-private partnership occurred not so long ago and was caused by the search for a balance of private and generally significant interests in a market economy and political democracy. The historical experience shows that both unlimited freedom of entrepreneurial activity and excessive state interference in economic life are equally dangerous.

The nature and forms of interaction between business and government have become a priority area of research in institutional economics. It considered the communication of business and government as a process of exchanging services and resources. The market paradigm used to interpret public administration interpreted it as a process of realizing many private interests through mutually beneficial exchange based on competition, consumer choice, the motivation of the decision-making officials<sup>2</sup>.

The managerial approach in the analysis of public administration uses a set of concepts created in the framework of various versions of the theory of rational choice. They were the basis of administrative reforms in Western countries in the late 1970s, seeking to introduce market mechanisms in public administration in order to increase its effectiveness.

So, according to Becker, the leader of the Chicago school, the behavior of people in politics and economy is identical: acting in the conditions of market competition, each individual tries to achieve own goals<sup>3</sup>. The main methodological principles of the theory of rational choice are: a) the rationality of individuals (the ability to arrange their preferences

---

<sup>2</sup> C. Hood, "A Public Management for All Seasons?", *Public Administration*, num 69 (1991): 3-19.

<sup>3</sup> G. Becker, *Chelovecheskoe povedenie: ekonomicheskii podkhod* (Moscow: SU-HSE, 2003).

in accordance with their maximum benefit); b) the primacy of an individual in the political process, who independently determines his/her preferences and builds a hierarchy of political interests; c) the egoism of an individual who seeks to simultaneously maximize his/her own benefit and minimize costs<sup>4</sup>.

In the framework of the theory of public choice, representatives of the Virginia school interpreted the political market by analogy with the commodity one, but with one caveat: “People exchange apples for oranges in the market, and in politics, they agree to pay taxes in exchange for the benefits everyone needs: from the local fire department to the court”<sup>5</sup>. According to the ideas of the founder of the Virginia school, Buchanan, politics is a complex system of exchange between individuals in which participants collectively strive to achieve their private goals, because they cannot realize them through ordinary market exchange. Citizens realize their individual interests through the actions of the government: deputies and officials whose purpose is also to obtain political rent – material benefits arising from the right to make decisions. Politicians (deputies) for their election are trying to get support from voters and interest groups (including business), requiring particular decisions in their interests. The bureaucracy, designed to serve the interests of various groups of legislators and executive bodies, by virtue of its position, is not directly related to the interests of voters, since it is appointed by politicians. At the same time, officials not only implement the already adopted laws, but also actively participate in their development. Therefore, to obtain political rents, they are often directly connected with groups that defend special interests in parliament. The bureaucracy, in turn, is used by pressure groups to advance their interests in the process of making universally significant public decisions.

The advantage of “market models” of behavior is that they represented politics specifically, visibly, as the sphere of distribution of public goods, the main tool of which is public administration. A common drawback of these approaches is the reassessment of the possibilities of an individual’s real participation in the distribution of benefits, since any selfish interest needs not only articulation, but also its “promotion” in the public sphere.

In Western political science, a number of authors (Bentley, Truman, and Dahl) rightly noted that in plural systems, effective “embedding” of selfish interest in public administration can occur through collective action. In this case, the adoption of managerial decisions was considered as a process of *influencing* the power not of a single individual, but of a group of persons who, in order to advance their interest, could be united in a community on a social or property basis, religious or party affiliation. The main postulate of the group theory of politics was that the effectiveness of public administration was determined by the structure of the political system, which ensured the optimal nature of the interaction of interest groups and government regarding the distribution of the public good.

For the first time, the process of public administration as the interaction of interest groups that put pressure on the government in order to induce it to submit to their will was introduced by Bentley<sup>6</sup>. People’s activities are determined by their needs and interests and are aimed at their implementation. People do not achieve their goals independently, but through a group where they are united based on a common interest. In this regard, politics

---

<sup>4</sup> G. Becker, *Chelovecheskoe povedenie: ekonomicheskii podkhod...*

<sup>5</sup> J. Buchanan, *Konstitutsiya ekonomicheskoi politiki*. In *Izbrannye Trudy* (Moscow: Taurus Alfa, 1997), 23.

<sup>6</sup> A. Bentley. *The Process of Development*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968).

appears as the interaction of interest groups that pursue their private interests. By exerting pressure on the authorities, groups encourage them to make the decisions they need. According to Bentley, managerial decisions made by the government are the result of the balance of power between interest groups<sup>7</sup>. The concept of “interest group” was introduced into the academic circulation by Truman. A distinctive feature of an “interest group” is that it has requirements for other groups that are put forward on the basis of the basic attitudes of its members to form and consolidate relevant types of behavior. Based on this, he understood public administration as a sphere of power relations, where certain interest groups interact<sup>8</sup>.

Based on the experience of the United States, Dahl proposed an institutional model of communication between interest groups and authorities in modern politics. In his opinion, an increase in the diversity of social needs leads to the formation of various interest groups (associations of individuals with common values, needs and goals) that are independent of each other. In these conditions, political decisions cease to be the privilege of official power institutions and become the result of the consensus of rival groups. Public administration is increasingly becoming the interaction of competing groups, where none of them absolutely dominates, and public politics is the result of their open political competition, equal to their political influence. Dahl called this model of power, established in the USA, not democracy, but polyarchy (multipower)<sup>9</sup>.

## Results

The Russian model of communication between business and government cannot be attributed to any of the classical systems of representing business interests in public space – pluralistic or corporatist. Firstly, it was formed by borrowing foreign institutions and practices of public-private partnerships and transferring them to the Russian ground through the efforts of the ruling elite. Secondly, the legal forms of communication between business and government, enshrined in law, were significantly different from actual practices. Thirdly, the basic strategies of business behavior – distancing from the state and/or close interaction with it – occurred due to the power or weakness of the state at different stages of post-Soviet development<sup>10</sup>. For these reasons, the algorithm and the results of this invasion are ambiguous, as well as the nature of post-Soviet pluralism, still causing discussion in academic science and among practitioners.

In its development, the Russian model of public-private interaction went through five key stages of evolution. Moreover, at each stage, specific models for reconciling the interests of business and the state dominated.

The first stage (1990-1996): “patronage model”. It is characterized by the dominant role of the state in dialogue with business. In the process of privatization, the current government itself determined the circle of “selected” business people who made up the “Kremlin” business elite, which gained advantages in implementing market reforms. Personal relations and acquaintance of entrepreneurs with senior officials were a determining factor in the development and preservation of business.

<sup>7</sup> A. Bentley, *The Process of Development*... 13.

<sup>8</sup> D. Truman, *The Governmental Process* (New York: 1951), 19.

<sup>9</sup> R. Dahl, *O demokratii* (Moscow: Aspekt-Press, 2000).

<sup>10</sup> A. A. Yakovlev, “Evolutsiya strategii vzaimodeistviya biznesa i vlasti v rossiiskoi ekonomike”, *Rossiiskii zhurnal menedzhmenta*, Vol: 3 num 1 (2005): 27-52.

The second stage (1996-1998): the “business dominance model”. The change of model was caused by the increasing role of large business in the political life of the country, which meant the growth of its economic power. On the one hand, this contributed to the growth of additional extrabudgetary resources for the state. On the other hand, it led to a coalescence of power and property in the hands of oligarchic groups. In practice, this meant “state capture” by large business<sup>11</sup>.

The third stage (1998-2000): “the distance model”. The negative consequences of the 1998 default and the election of Vladimir Putin the President of Russia led to the replacement of the model of oligarchic dominance, oligarchic groups lost their influence, some of them were removed from the political decision-making. The reformatting of the political field took place, when some business outsiders quit the game, while others abandoned excessive “political” dominance.

The fourth stage (2000-2003): “a model of consolidation and dialogue” between business and government. There was a distancing of business from power, it ceased to dictate its own rules and followed the general political doctrine of government. The ruling elite offered business a scheme of institutional dialogue through meetings at the level of the President of the Russian Federation with the leadership of the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs.

The fifth stage (2003-2019): “partnership model”. During this period, the state realized the importance of equal partnerships with business and created a regulatory framework for legal channels and institutional forms of private-public communication. Meeting with representatives of the business community, President Putin said: “On the site of the Presidential Administration, we need to build a dialogue between business and law enforcement”<sup>12</sup>. In this dialogue between government and business, the special role of the largest business associations was noted: Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs, Chamber of Commerce and Industry, “Delovaya Rossiya”, “OPORA Rossii”.

The dismantling of the command economy and the introduction of the market mechanisms in the late 1980s during the period of Perestroika in the USSR demanded to practically identify the ways of interaction between the authorities and the nascent business. The ruling elite sought to transfer the principles and forms of a pluralistic model of interaction between interest groups and government to Russia. The acts “On a State Enterprise” and “On Cooperation”, adopted in 1987, became the legal basis for the transit of elements of this model. Those acts first secured the right of private ownership of production facilities and eliminated the monopoly of state property that existed in the USSR. The introduction of the principles of a pluralistic model in the USSR led to the creation of 227 concerns, 123 consortia, commercial banks and a stock exchange<sup>13</sup>. However, the specifics of the primary accumulation in the USSR, based on the merging of power and property, led to the formation of a nonclassical format of a pluralistic system of communication between business and government. It took the form of a model of limited or

---

<sup>11</sup> T. Frye, “Capture or Exchange? Business Lobbying in Russia”, *Europe Asia Studies*, Vol: 54 num 7 (2002): 1017-1036.

<sup>12</sup> P. Ermolayeva, *Ploshchadka dlya dialoga: Putin i Shokhin obsudili vzaimodeistvie biznesa i vlasti*. 2016. Available at: <https://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=2720716>

<sup>13</sup> S. P. Peregudov. *Renessans korporativizma?* In *Zaslavskaya, T.I. (ed.), Kuda idet Rossiya? Transformatsiya sotsialnoi sfery i sotsialnaya politika* (Moscow: Delo, 1998), 131.

closed pluralism, the hallmark of which was the noticeable influence of bureaucratic groups and oligarchic business entities on the process of shaping the political course, the choice of means for implementing public policy. The coalescence of power and property either in the hands of the bureaucracy or the oligarchy formed different models of public-private partnership in Russia. In the first case, it was a “patronage model”, which was characterized by the dominance of the personal interests of political actors, regardless of the effectiveness of the general economic system of property rights. In the second case, it was the model of “state capture” by the oligarchic class, which emerged through the transformation of the former party, Komsomol, bureaucratic elites into a class of entrepreneurs<sup>14</sup>.

In the early 2000s, in the Russian model of public-private partnership, elements of corporatism began to appear clearly. One of the main mechanisms of private-public interaction in Russia began to be business associations, the role of which in the socio-political and socio-economic life of the country has grown markedly. A special place in the Russian model of GR communications is given to the role of business associations, such as the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs, “OPORA Rossii”, “Delovaya Rossiya”, designed to represent the interests of large, small and medium-sized businesses at the federal level. In turn, business associations began to emerge in the areas of their activities: banking, energy, metallurgy, oil and gas: the Association of Russian Banks, the Russian Association of Automobile Dealers, the Association for the Development of Business Patriotism in Russia – Avanti, etc.

The consolidated position of business in the main areas of economic and social policy of the state is formulated by the working bodies of *the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs*. The basic priorities of the business community in the main areas of socio-economic policy are determined by the *RUIE committees*, the parameters of which are communicated to the *RUIE member companies* and become an action program. The business position on specific or related types of economic activity is developed by the *RUIE commissions*. The forms of activity of the working bodies of the *RUIE*, through which they form business positions on various issues, are diverse. They include: 1) examination of draft regulations governing the sphere of entrepreneurial activity; 2) initiation of proposals to amend the current legislation; 3) systematic analysis and monitoring of the law enforcement practice. Along with this, the *RUIE Committees and Commissions* carry out daily interaction with state authorities, expert groups and the business community.

*The Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Russia (CCI)* represents the interests of not only large, but also medium, small companies and firms. The following forms of interaction between business and government are provided for in the *CCI*: 1) organization of committees and councils of the *CCI*; 2) creation of expert and coordination councils; 3) interaction through the business councils of the *CCI*<sup>15</sup>. In order to increase the effectiveness of the system for protecting and promoting the interests of business, the Department for Working with Business Associations and the Legislative Department of the

<sup>14</sup> N. Yu. Lapina and A. E. Chirikova, *Regionalnye elity RF: modeli povedeniya i politicheskie orientatsii* (Moscow: INION RAS, 1999).

<sup>15</sup> Zakon RF ot 07.07.1993 N 5340-1 (red. ot 30.12.2015) “O torgovo-promyshlennykh palatakh v Rossiiskoi Federatsii” (s izm. i dop., vstup. v silu s 01.09.2016). 1993. Available at: [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_2269/](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_2269/)

CCI monitor the current state of business and government interaction. According to the data presented in the Report on the Results of Monitoring the Implementation of the “Strategy for the Development of the System of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation until 2020”, one of the strategic initiatives of the CCI is to increase the effectiveness of the system for protecting and promoting business interests. In the framework of this initiative, the following areas were identified: improving the system of support for legislative initiatives; expanding the participation of representatives of the system of chambers of commerce of the Russian Federation in the activities of authorities and related organizations; improvement of the work of public structures of the Russia’s CCI system.

According to surveys conducted by the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs, many companies are more satisfied with the expertise of government decisions on the part of business associations than with direct contacts with government officials. If Russian companies prefer interaction with the authorities through business associations, then foreign companies consider direct contacts with the authorities more efficient. It is paradoxical, but ideally, it was the associations of foreign business that could set an example of institutional interaction here<sup>16</sup>.

Thus, the model of communication between business and government in Russia cannot be unambiguously attributed to any classical model of interaction between business and government – pluralistic or corporatist. If at the post-Soviet stage in the 1980s-90s, private-public partnership was built on the principles of a pluralistic model, since the 2000s, there has been a process of institutionalization and the formation of features of a corporatist system. At the same time, the specificity of the hybrid model of public-private interaction in Russia is the dominance of informal latent practices based on personal connections in the system of business communications with government. This became the basis for a number of authors<sup>17</sup> to consider the legality of forms of public-private interaction between business and government in Russia as the main distinguishing feature of the Russian model. Relations between business and government in Russia were often built depending on the level of their legality. The degree of the legality of such communications is different, however, it acts as the basis for ranking models (or zones) of public-private interaction. In the literature, “three zones” of business and government communication are distinguished by the criterion of their legality:

1) The “White Zone” is the relationships of government and business, which are regulated and practiced on the basis of the current legislation.

2) The “Black Zone” is an area of informal regulation, when corruption is the main instrument of interaction, the basis of which is a bribe.

3) The “Gray Zone” includes the informal practice of levying businesses that are not directly related to corruption, as well as the practice of informal trading with the authorities

---

<sup>16</sup> A. N. Shokhin, *Biznes i vlast v Rossii: Regulyatornaya sreda i pravoprimeritel'naya praktika* (Moscow: HSE Publishing House, 2017), 7.

<sup>17</sup> A. A. Dregalo, *Strategicheskoe partnerstvo vlasti, biznesa i obshchestva* (Arkhangelsk: Lomonosov Pomeranian State University, 2010) y G. M. Shamarova, *Organy vlasti i biznes: modernizatsiya otnoshenii*. In *Materialy VI Mezhdunarodnogo nauchnogo kongressa “Rol biznesa v transformatsii rossiiskogo obshchestva – 2011”*, 18-22 aprelya 2011 (Moscow: MFPA, 2011).

regarding the conditions for the operation of a particular business<sup>18</sup>. The dominance of informal business and government communication practices is fertile ground for widespread corruption schemes that cause irreparable damage to the reputation of Russian business and the country's economic development.

The principle of “revolving doors” has become widespread in Russia – the migration of members of the power elite to business and vice versa with the actual preservation of the general elite status in society. However, the practice of “personnel exchange” has mixed consequences. On the one hand, the principle of “revolving doors” simplifies the interaction between government and business, allowing them to understand each other's interests and problems. For example: in the recent past, the head of the Department of Labor and Wages of MMC Norilsk Nickel Novak, now heads the Ministry of Energy of the Russian Federation (before that, he was Deputy Minister of Finance of the Russian Federation). Recently holding the position of Deputy General Director of MMC Norilsk Nickel, Kuznetsov headed the Krasnoyarsk Territory; and the former General Director of RAO Norilsk Nickel Khloponin until the end of 2018 was the Deputy Prime Minister of the Russian Federation and held the position of Presidential Plenipotentiary in the North Caucasus Federal District, etc.. On the other hand, companies often hire former government employees not so much because of their professional qualities and managerial skills, but based on their relations and acquaintances that can provide unique corporate preferences in the market.

It should be noted that the list of areas of mutually beneficial cooperation between Russian business and government is quite wide, and its potential can significantly improve the socio-economic condition of the country. So, for example, reduction of unemployment in Russia can be achieved by: a) creating new jobs, in particular, using the mechanism of public-private partnership; b) advanced training/retraining of personnel; c) active support of domestic commodity producers, including the import substitution program. The solution to such problems is possible due to the resources of companies, on the basis of which scientific centers have been created, for example, the research center of JSC LUKoil, the corporate university of Norilsk Nickel, etc. According to experts, in agriculture and a number of other industries, where the import substitution policy is actively pursued, there has been an increase in salaries and an increase in the number of jobs<sup>19</sup>. It should be noted that Russia's losses from sanctions in 2014 alone amounted to more than 23 billion euros, which corresponded to 1.5% of the national GDP, which directly affected foreign investment<sup>20</sup>.

Defining the most important problems of interaction between business and government, one can notice that they are in the field of state and municipal procurement, taxation, development of small and medium enterprises, anti-corruption, insolvency proceedings; in total, over 30 areas of cooperation.

So, according to the analytical report by the RUIE “The State of the Russian Economy and the Activities of Companies (April 2019)”, the most negative impact on

<sup>18</sup> M. V. Kurbatov and S. N. Levin “Deformalizatsiya pravil v sovremennoi rossiiskoi ekonomike (na primere vzaimodeistviya vlasti i biznesa)”, *Ekonomicheskii vestnik Rostovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, num 1 Vol: 8 (2011): 27-50.

<sup>19</sup> V. Lyashok, *Na zanyatost povliyali importozameshchenie i starenie naseleniya*. 2018. Available at: <http://fedpress.ru/article/1943035>

<sup>20</sup> *Megaobuchalka, Evropa vryad li okazhetsya bez rossiiskogo gaza*. Available at: <https://megaobuchalka.ru/3/3478.html>



companies was made by nonpayments by counterparties. The share of this case added 6.1% over the quarter and reached 46.1%. Among the negative impacts, respondents noted: lack of working capital (42.2%), reduced demand (31.4%), increased fiscal burden (28.4%), difficulties in obtaining borrowed funds (15.7%). According to the results of the RUIE's survey, 42.2% of organizations noted a lack of working capital as a factor having negative impact on business. In January 2019, only 28.6% of respondents noted this option. The third place among the restrictions related to the state of the Russian economy and having negative impact on the activities of companies turned out to be the “decrease in demand for products” – estimates here remained almost unchanged (30.0% in January 2019, 31.4% in April 2019). The growth of the fiscal burden is highlighted by more than a quarter of the survey participants (28.4%). In January 2019, the share of this answer was lower – 21.4%. The inaccessibility of borrowed financial resources was noted by 15.7% of respondents, the share added 1.4%. Over the quarter, the option “currency instability” has lost its significance, its share has fallen by half from 27.1% in January to 13.7% in April. However, the share of respondents who noted an increase in the administrative burden on collecting fiscal payments, on the contrary, almost doubled<sup>21</sup>.

It should be noted that with a sufficiently developed legal mechanism for regulating relations between business and government in Russia, mainly latent channels for promoting business interests are used. Although, the current legislation of the Russian Federation provides for various forms of interaction between business and government: public-private partnerships (PPPs), concessions, participation in public procurement and the regulatory impact assessment (RIA) procedure<sup>22,23</sup>. Moreover, to institutionalize the relationship between government and business in Russia, the Department of Investment Policy and the Development of Public-Private Partnerships was established, which became the institution for regulatory impact assessment. The Department has become a channel of constructive dialogue between government and business, the purpose of which is to develop agreed positions on both sides. The Regulation on RIA governs the conclusion by the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation of agreements with major associations<sup>24</sup>.

In order to modernize the domestic economy and its transition to an innovative path of development, the Government of the Russian Federation created the Agency for Strategic Initiatives (ASI), which should assist medium-sized businesses in promoting their initiatives through government bodies. In addition, legal forms of interaction between large business and government are actively used: a) participation of business jointly with government in the implementation of common projects; b) government and business act as partners in the implementation of national-state programs, including 12 national projects included in the breakthrough strategy of President Putin. Successful example: Mining and Metallurgical Company Norilsk Nickel is actively involved in the development of the North; created its own airline “Nord Star” (“Taimyr”), providing preferential rates for employees of

<sup>21</sup> Otchet o rezultatakh monitoringa realizatsii “Strategii razvitiya sistemy Torgovo-promyshlennoi palaty Rossiiskoi Federatsii do 2020 g.” Available at: <https://tpprf.ru/ru/>

<sup>22</sup> Federalnyi zakon ot 13.07.2015 N 224-FZ (red. ot 29.07.2018) “O gosudarstvenno-chastnom partnerstve, munitsipalno-chastnom partnerstve v Rossiiskoi Federatsii i vnesenii izmenenii v otdelnye zakonodatelnye akty Rossiiskoi Federatsii”. 2015. Available at: [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_182660/](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_182660/)

<sup>23</sup> Federalnyi zakon ot 21 iyulya 2005 g. N 115-FZ “O kontsessionnykh soglasheniyakh” (s izmeneniyami i dopolneniyami). 2005. Available at: <https://base.garant.ru/12141176/>

<sup>24</sup> Otchet o rezultatakh monitoringa realizatsii “Strategii razvitiya sistemy Torgovo-promyshlennoi palaty Rossiiskoi Federatsii do 2020 g.” Available at: <https://tpprf.ru/ru/>

the corporation; participates in a program to relocate former employees from the Far North to more favorable areas, etc.; business forums – the Gaidar Forum, the Davos Forum, and the St. Petersburg Economic Forum, etc.; the “personnel exchange” program: business is embedded in the structures of state power in the implementation of the “revolving door” system.

Relations between business and government in modern Russia have never been trouble-free. This is understandable, given that the state is called upon to realize universally significant interests, while business defends group demands. The search for mechanisms for reconciling group and public interests has also been delayed because of criminal privatization, which has generated mutual distrust of government and business. The group egoism of the Russian business, as well as the selfish interest of the politicians and bureaucracy, extracting rents from their power position, equally hindered finding a “middle ground”. The list of mutual claims of business to government, and vice versa, still causes problems in their relationship.

One of the main problems in the interaction between business and government is the lack of sustainable feedback, i.e. receiving information from business about their preferences, needs, problems, etc. In this situation, federal authorities are limited in choosing legitimate tools for communicating with representatives of the business environment, and those available are quite conservative and slow down the speed of decision-making. This situation causes certain risks, expressed in public distrust of the government, dissatisfaction with the quality of the information provided, and the activity of some external actors in seeking other ways to build relations with government, including through the use of corrupt practices. Although the decision-making procedure in business associations is collective, the status of the management team, and sometimes the leader, is still of primary importance. For example, the head of RUIE Shokhin, as a former Minister of Economics and Deputy Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation, has a special status, including that of a lobbyist with numerous “connections” in power and government-supervised structures.

The growth of informal practices while promoting the interests of large and medium-sized companies paves the way for new corruption schemes. Among the new corruption schemes and practices, the following stand out: receipt of funds in the budget and their management; corruption transactions with the state procurement and with the contract system; withdrawal of funds through state-owned companies abroad to offshore; a very high degree of corruption risk in road construction, housing and communal services.

An equally important problem in the interaction between business and government is the legal unsettledness of certain elements of the mechanism of PPP. Despite the developed legal framework governing relations between business and government, the data from the register of systemic problems of Russian business confirm that the most important mechanism for supporting small and medium-sized enterprises through the system of state and municipal procurements under Acts No. 44-FZ and No. 223-FZ did not work. Due to imperfect legislation, the entire quotas for purchases from small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) can be used up by intermediary trading companies, including those affiliated with companies with shareholding by the state or constituent entities of the Russian Federation or municipalities. The volume of public procurement in 2018 amounted to 24.5 trillion rubles, of which 17 trillion rubles accounted for by procurement under Federal Act No. 223-FZ. At the same time, the volume of purchases from SMEs by major customers under Federal Act No. 223-FZ amounted to only 1.8 trillion rubles. As a result,

the share of purchases from SMEs was 12%. The number of concluded contracts (or notices) of 223-FZ is only 1.3 million, of which the number of contracts concluded with the largest customers by SMEs amounted to only 367,174. The average contract value amounted to 7.6 million rubles<sup>25</sup>.

The consolidation of procurements by state and municipal customers leads to the fact that many business entities are put in unfavorable competitive conditions, when the size of the contract security does not allow them to participate in procurement procedures. At the same time, some entrepreneurs would have the opportunity to compete for procurement, if divided into smaller lots. The current legislation does not fix an exhaustive list of grounds for customers to consolidate the planned procurement (increasing the amount of the contract, combining types and lists of works/services) when forming a procurement plan and procurement schedule, if earlier the respective procurement was carried out not in one but in several lots, and also does not regulate the procedure for substantiating the consolidation of procurement.

An equally urgent problem in the mechanism of interaction between business and government is the low financial discipline of the parties. So, in practice, bidders are faced with nonfulfillment by customers of their obligations under state and municipal contracts, because of which entrepreneurs cannot timely perform work on other obligations, they face debt on loans and delays in the payment of wages to their employees. The main reasons for nonpayment by customers of delivered goods and performed works/services are the misuse of funds and exceeding budget limits when signing contracts. The low priority of financing obligations under state and municipal contracts initially puts business entities in a difficult position while receiving budget funding according to the “residual principle”. In the absence of real funding, state authorities and local governments continue to conclude contracts with entrepreneurs, as they are required to comply with the federal legislation on the resolution of issues of state and local significance. There are cases when state or municipal customers refuse to accept goods (works/services), referring to their unsatisfactory quality, but without relevant evidence. Even when obtaining court decisions, engaging the bailiff service and the Treasury, entrepreneurs cannot receive the contractual price in full and on time for completed contracts. The barrier to effective interaction between business and government is the administrative regulation of the business sector. Entrepreneurs are required to submit an excessively large amount of tax and other fiscal reporting. At the same time, there is a pronounced trend towards an increase in the number of reports, which is associated with inefficient activities of the state in the field of data accounting. On the one hand, the Federal Tax Service of Russia, the Federal Customs Service of Russia, off-budget funds, the Federal Alcohol Regulation go along the path of consolidating data accounting databases in order to identify tax and fiscal violations by taxpayers, which is fully consistent with the interests of the state and specifically budget tasks. On the other hand, such consolidation, instead of leading to a decrease in tax fiscal reporting by business, leads to an increase in the number of reports and an increase in administrative costs. At the same time, the reporting forms are not harmonized with each other (for example, the alcoholic beverages sphere), they are contradictory, and the entrepreneur is forced to repeatedly indicate the data that state bodies already have.

---

<sup>25</sup> Otchet o rezultatakh monitoringa realizatsii “Strategii razvitiya sistemy Torgovo-promyshlennoi palaty Rossiiskoi Federatsii do 2020 g.” Available at: <https://tpprf.ru/ru/>

## Discussion

In the Western science, the search for an effective model of interaction between business and government was concentrated around the main problem areas: a) diagnosis of the *nature* of the relationship (administrative or market); b) identification of the *areas* of mutually beneficial partnership between business and government; c) identification of the *forms* of communication (institutional or latent); d) verification of the effective *technologies* of PPP (manipulative or persuasive).

In modern science, there are two global classical models for reconciling the interests of government and business that dominated in different historical periods – pluralism and corporatism.

The merit of developing the first model of communication between business and government – *pluralistic one* – belongs to Schumpeter and Dahl. They proceeded from the recognition of the multiplicity of private interests and the principle of free relations between business and government, and public administration was seen as the interaction of competing groups, where none of them absolutely dominated<sup>26,27</sup>. At the same time, the public authority acts in the interests of all functional groups, which, when interacting with it, are formally equal, regardless of the size of the business. Equal distance from the authorities for leading financial and industrial groups allows the state, relying on power resources, to ensure the coordination of private interests, maintain stability and balance of the system, while acting in the common interests. In the event of a violation of the balance of interests, or the appearance of signs of a crisis, government corrects the imbalance that has arisen and returns the economy to an area of relative stability, contrary to the interests of elite groups<sup>28</sup>. A pluralistic model of business and government communication is characteristic of countries with the Anglo-Saxon legal system: the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia and others. In those countries, the relationship between government and business is seen as a kind of deal concluded, on the one hand – by business (represented by a particular company), and on the other hand – by government (represented by the state machinery). The authors note that in this model of reconciling the interests, the business community (associations, unions, etc.) has little power to take actions that restrict the rights of members, who hire GR managers or lobbyists to advance their interests in government.

At the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the second model for reconciling the interests of business and government – *corporatism* – emerged. An American political scientist Schmitter interpreted corporatism as a system of representing interests with the participation of government and interest groups, in which stakeholders jointly made agreed decisions and recommendations, and participated in their implementation and control. The key mediators of interest groups here are corporations with structural representations at the government and parliament levels (expert groups, advisory councils) through which they influence the authorities<sup>29</sup>. Interest groups agree to support all political initiatives of government, except those that will affect the scope of their activities. The main instruments for realizing interests here are institutions and procedures of social partnership, compromise and consensus, with the help of which a relative harmony of interests in the

<sup>26</sup> J. Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (New York: 1947).

<sup>27</sup> R. A. Dahl, *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971).

<sup>28</sup> Ph. Schmitter, "Still the Century of Corporatism", *Review of Politics*, num 36 (1974): 118.

<sup>29</sup> Ph. Schmitter, "Neokorporativizm", *Polis*, num 2 (1997): 15.

system of general welfare is achieved: a balance of economic efficiency and social justice is ensured<sup>30</sup>. The corporatist model is typical for Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Sweden, the Netherlands and Japan<sup>31</sup>. In these countries, business associations play a special role in the interaction of business and government. The autonomous position of business associations allows them to act as the main intermediaries in the interaction of business with government. The literature conditionally distinguishes between “conservative” and “liberal” corporatism. Conservative (or state) corporatism is a model of representing the interests of functional groups (corporations, bankers, officials), where government becomes a mechanism for protecting their interests. Schmitter highlights the characteristic features of this system of representation of interests: 1) the growing influence of professional representatives of specialized interests to the detriment of the common interests of citizens; 2) providing individual associations with the privileged right of access to decision-making processes; 3) adoption and ascension of monopolistic corporations over intermediaries competing among themselves in partially overlapping spheres of coverage; 4) emergence of centralized hierarchical organizations, including associations of a nationwide nature, which undermine the autonomy of more specialized local organizations.

“Liberal” corporatism (or neo-corporatism) opposes the egoism of interest groups with the help of group pressure tools: the party-parliamentary system, the media, and the public opinion. Functional groups themselves retain autonomy, not integrating fully into the public administration system. In modern political science, different aspects of neo-corporatism stand out. Some authors consider it as a democratic model for coordinating the interests of large social institutions, the main parties (participants in the “negotiation” process) being the state, associations of entrepreneurs and unions of employees<sup>32</sup>. Other scholars understand neo-corporatism as a decision-making system in which the most influential sets of interests are incorporated, with the help of the state and its leaders, into the management process<sup>33</sup>. Moreover, interest groups are organized on a professional basis. In accordance with the same principle, they participate in decision-making processes at different levels of government. However, they do not declare their candidates in the elections and are not directly responsible for the formation of the government<sup>34</sup>. Schmitter regarded neo-corporatism as “a special type of participation of large organized groups in the development of public policy, primarily in the field of economy, characterized by a high level of intergroup cooperation”<sup>35</sup>. He has highlighted the characteristic features of this form of representation of interests: 1) interest groups are firmly integrated into the decision-making process (the degree of integration is determined by their representation in advisory committees, legislatures, etc.); 2) interest groups that have a hierarchical organization with mandatory membership, are tightly connected with political parties and actively participate in the process of developing policies based on the functional division of labor; 3) there is no competition between professional interest groups, however, in certain areas of activity, such interests are monopolistic; 4) the relationship between government and business associations is based on the principles of harmonization of interests<sup>36</sup>.

<sup>30</sup> Ph. Schmitter, Neokorporativizm...

<sup>31</sup> Ph. Schmitter, Neokorporativizm...

<sup>32</sup> G. Lembruch, Introduction: Neo-Corporatism in Comparative Perspective. In *Patterns of Corporatist Policy-Making* (London: 1982).

<sup>33</sup> D.R. Kelley. (ed.). *Soviet Politics in the Brezhnev Era* (New York: 1980), 23.

<sup>34</sup> Ph. Schmitter, Neokorporativizm...

<sup>35</sup> Ph. Schmitter and G. Lembruch (Eds.), *Trends toward Corporatist Intermediation* (Beverly Hills: 1997), 53.

<sup>36</sup> G. Lembruch, Introduction: Neo-Corporatism... 5-6.

In this model, the state is not an outside observer; it actively selects and engages the groups of interests with which it interacts and through which it controls its citizens, includes interest groups in the political and administrative system<sup>37</sup>. Here, the state acts as an arbiter, which sets the rules and monitors their compliance. Moreover, it acts as the dominant subject of interaction, forming the final results on the implementation of the political course. Thus, the interaction of private capital with the state occurs through the institutionalization of the process of developing policies and managerial decisions through compromises and consensus between a limited number of partners entering into relations with the state. The dominant mechanism of interaction between participants in the process of developing the political course is the concertation mechanism.

The most developed part of the topic of private-public partnership in Western science is the technology of articulation, positioning and promotion of business interests in public space. This was made possible due to the achievements of Western communication science and, first of all, the works of Winner, Deutsch, Lasswell, Neustadt and others<sup>38,39,40,41</sup>. There, public administration is considered as a network of information flows through which interaction occurs between interest groups and the state according to the formula “request – response”. Thus, the communication of interest groups and public authorities is understood as a form of public administration, within which managerial decisions are made. The effectiveness of the interaction between business and government depends on the availability of communication channels and the technologies used. Within the framework of the pluralistic and corporatist models of reconciliation of interests, a new set of technologies for promoting the interests of the business community has arisen due to various factors. In world practice, GR technologies are recognized as a generally accepted tool for the interaction of business and government. Government Relations is a set of communication technologies and practices of the state and interest groups, the purpose of which is to implement corporate requests in the process of making managerial decisions.

Despite the wide distribution and popularity of GR practices, there is no agreement on understanding this phenomenon. This situation is partly a consequence of the incorrect translation of the term from English, as well as the specific nature of the subject interpretation of this phenomenon in various disciplines. A literal translation of the term “Government Relations” (GR) suggests that this is a relationship with executive authorities. However, in the Anglo-Saxon version, the term “government” refers to the entire system of government, and not just the bodies of the executive branch of government<sup>42</sup>.

In Western science, GR are often identified with PR. In one authoritative publication, Government Relations are defined as “the activity of building relationships between various public groups (business entities, trade unions, volunteer organizations, etc.) and government, which includes the collection and processing of information on

<sup>37</sup> Wiarda, H. *Corporatism and Comparative Politics: The Other Great “Ism”* (New York: 1997), 8.

<sup>38</sup> N. Winner, *Cybernetics* (Cambridge: 1971).

<sup>39</sup> M. L. De Fleur and E. E. Dennis, *Understanding Mass Communication: A Liberal Arts Perspective* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002).

<sup>40</sup> K.W. Deutsch. *The Nerves of Government: Models of Political Communication and Control* (London: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963).

<sup>41</sup> H. Lasswell. *Yazyk vlasti [The Language of Power]*. Trans. By Tolmachyov, M.V. 2006. Available at: <https://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/expertize/2006/880>

<sup>42</sup> P.A. Tolstykh, *Lobbizm, Government Relations (GR) i Public Affairs (PA): k istokam ponyatii*. Available at: <http://www.raso.ru/?Action=show&id=16626>

government activities, the preparation and dissemination of information about the positions of the represented groups, the impact on the processes of political and administrative decision-making (lobbyism)<sup>43</sup>. This definition contains features that qualify the activities of PR managers, the main tools of which are the collection of information, its dissemination, that is, putting pressure on decision-makers (DM) through the use of publicly resonant information materials.

In addition, the scope of GR technologies is often limited to the interests of the business community<sup>44</sup>. In this regard, it is hardly possible to agree with the definition given in the Russian lobbyist's dictionary: "Government Relations (GR, literally: interaction with public authorities) is the activity of specially authorized employees of large commercial structures (GR specialists) to support the activities of the company in the political environment"<sup>45</sup>. It should be noted that the use of GR tools is typical not only for the business environment, but also for the activities of nonprofit public organizations.

In general, a narrow and broad understanding of GR in science can be distinguished. In a narrow sense, GR is understood as "the interaction of business and government with the aim of ensuring, upholding and promoting the interests of business in the system of public authorities"<sup>46</sup>. In a broad sense, GR is understood as a political activity that is initiated by commercial as well as nonprofit organizations and other parties of political relations, which are aimed at the making by authorities of certain decisions<sup>47</sup>.

The literature considers various types of technologies for influencing both public opinion and public authorities. The authors of the monograph "Business and Power in Russia: Theory and Practice of Interaction", based on the American classification of "principles of 9 goals", distinguish the following types of GR technologies: 1) increasing the use of public services; 2) use of public support; 3) distribution of reports on state activities; 4) timely response to public inquiries; 5) participation in the state-related activities of the company; 6) enforcement of the law; 7) relationship with the media; 8) definition of goals and objectives of GR; 9) public education, for example, social advertising<sup>48</sup>.

Other researchers among the effective methods of GR influence indicate the following: 1) formation of written appeals; 2) involvement of the public in the problem and the formation of the public opinion, through speeches in the media; 3) financing of political, business and public organizations; 4) promotion of loyal persons to government posts; 5) conducting opinion polls; 6) creation and promotion of draft regulations; 7) joining committees of authorities and public commissions<sup>49</sup>. An expert in lobbying Feldman offers another arsenal of methods of influence: 1) responses to inquiries from government

---

<sup>43</sup> W. Agee; G. Cameron; F. Ault and D. Wilcox, *Samoe glavnoe v PR* (Saint Petersburg: Piter, 2004).

<sup>44</sup> F. Seitel, *Sovremennye publik rileyshnz* (Moscow: Inidzh-Kontakt: INFRA-M, 2002).

<sup>45</sup> P. A. Tolstykh (comp.) *Professionalnyi slovar lobbistskoi deyatel'nosti* (Moscow: Center for the Study of the Problems of Interaction between Business and Government, 2009).

<sup>46</sup> V. Senin, "GR i "lobbizm" v bankovskom sektore", *Bankovskoe obozrenie*, num 5 (2011): 44-53.

<sup>47</sup> R. T. Mukhaev, *Government Relation: teoriya, strategii i natsionalnye praktiki. Polnoe rukovodstvo* (Moscow: INFRA-M, 2019).

<sup>48</sup> A. N. Shokhin. (ed.), *Biznes i vlast v Rossii: teoriya i praktika vzaimodeystviya: monografiya* (Moscow: HSE Publishing House, 2011).

<sup>49</sup> Ya. Ya. Kail and V. S. Epinina, "Aktualnye problemy sistemy gosudarstvennogo upravleniya i napravleniya ikh resheniya", *Gosudarstvennoe i munitsipalnoe upravlenie. Uchenye zapiski SKAGS*, num 1 (2014): 35.

bodies; 2) preparation of analytical and statistical materials for government bodies; 3) organizational and methodological support of the activities of authorities; 4) a set of legislatively permitted measures that contribute to the maintenance of informal communications (congratulations of the authorities on holidays, organization of celebrations, tours and other events for officials)<sup>50</sup>.

An analysis of the practices of positioning and promoting the requests of interest groups in foreign countries in recent years allows confirming an active synthesis of traditional and new types of GR technologies using the Internet. The essence of all technologies is to attract public attention to the urgent problems, to mobilize the general public in its support and, thereby, to encourage government to recognize it and take measures to solve it. For this purpose, an arsenal of GR technologies is used, among them:

1) *Grassroots* – a technology for positioning and promoting the requests of interest groups, widely used, for example, by trade unions and environmental associations. The main methods of this technology are to organize and conduct various kinds of mass actions and other collective actions in order to attract the attention of the public and government to the urgent problems<sup>51</sup>.

2) *Crowdsourcing* (crowd + outsourcing, “the wisdom of the crowd”, “collective mind”). This technology puts pressure on the authorities by organizing protests, exposing corruption crimes, expressing a negative attitude to the adopted acts of the government, and providing support to victims of crisis situations.

3) *Hashtag politics* – a new type of GR technology used by Internet activists in social networks to discuss and promote their draft regulations. Moreover, the activities of such individuals are often inspected and directed by external curators<sup>52</sup>.

It should be noted that GR technologies are not always used to promote and actualize socially significant problems. Quite often, they act as an instrument in the hands of functional groups pursuing their own selfish interests. In order to pass off group interests as socially significant, GR managers resort to using openly manipulative methods of influence, also called “unethical”<sup>53</sup>. Among them are the following:

1) *Astroturfing* is a technology for mobilizing the public, outwardly practically no different from grassroots. Under the guise of popular discontent, in practice, there is a promotion of a political order with carefully hidden information about the source of funding.

2) *Greenwashing* is intentional statements by producers of goods, food products, etc. about their environmental cleanliness, without good reason. This technology is used by various companies to maintain the image of an environmentally-oriented company and receive political support. In this case, often, the essential characteristics of the product are omitted and the facts are falsified<sup>54</sup>.

<sup>50</sup> P. Ya. Feldman, *Lobbizm: teoriya i praktika* (Moscow. Goryachaya Liniya – Telekom, 2017), 44.

<sup>51</sup> P. Ya. Feldman, *Lobbizm: teoriya i praktika...* 47-48.

<sup>52</sup> D. Meisel, *Hashtag Politics*. Available at: <https://beautifultrouble.org/theory/hashtag-politics>

<sup>53</sup> V. A. Achkasova; I. E. Mintusova and O. G. Filatova (eds), *GR i lobbizm: teoriya i tekhnologii: uchebnik i praktikum dlya bakalavriata i magistratury* (Moscow: Yurait, 2015), 87.

<sup>54</sup> A. Artemiev, *Obama malym dollarom krepok*. 2012. Available at: [https://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2012/05/16\\_a\\_4585613.shtml](https://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2012/05/16_a_4585613.shtml)



3) *Sockpuppeting* is a technology of generating artificial excitement around an event or artificially popularizing an activist, his/her program on the Internet using “Internet bots” or “clones” (*Op. cit.*).

#### Conclusions and prospects for further research.

1. The problem of interaction between business and government has been in the focus of attention of different areas of modern science. At the same time, each of them considers public-private interaction from the angle of its subject specialization, which creates a certain one-sided perception of systems for reconciling private and generally significant interests. The growing social diversity of modern societies requires interdisciplinary research into the process of embedding group interests in the mechanism of managerial decision-making.

2. An undoubted achievement of Western science is the theoretical elaboration of the main problem complexes: public-private interaction (nature, forms, technologies), as well as the applied focus of research results, consisting in the search for relevant models of business and government communication for each country. However, their drawback is the model range of communications limited to two universal ways of coordinating the interests of business and government – pluralistic and corporatist. Practice shows that there are models for representing the interests of functional groups that are developing beyond the boundaries of this model continuum, such as Russia, China, and Japan. Moreover, local (national) communication models often turn out to be more effective than universal ones, since they are adapted to the real conditions of their functioning.

3. A comparative analysis of foreign experience in the forms of interaction between government and business allows drawing a number of conclusions. First, there is no universal model of PPP that could be relevant and applicable to other countries, including Russia, without major adaptation changes. Second, private-public interaction brings the greatest effect in the investment complex. The inflow of investments acts as a driver of economic activity, the consequence of which is the economic recovery. In turn, economic growth is launching a new round of investment activity.

4. The studies of many authors rightly point out the increased role of public opinion as a tool for shaping the political agenda and pressure on the authorities. This was a consequence of the information and communication revolution, which radically changed the role of the public in shaping the political course. Moreover, public politics arise as a sphere of life where public opinion is formed and public discourse is being constructed on the socially significant problems of the state and society<sup>55</sup>. Internet technologies and social networks are becoming effective channels of communication between interest groups and authorities. All this opens up new business opportunities to integrate their requests into the public agenda<sup>56</sup>. At the same time, there is a noticeable tendency to overestimate the effects of the media’s information impact on the values and attitudes of the population in order to formulate an actual (required by the customer) attitude towards the problem. In this case, the fact that the individual better assimilates information that matches his/her values, beliefs and cultural code is not taken into account. Individuals begin to experience

<sup>55</sup> J. Habermas, Politicheskie funktsii publichnoi sfery. In Strukturnoe izmenenie publichnoi sfery: issledovanie otnositelno kategorii burzhuaznogo obshchestva (Moscow: Ves Mir, 2016).

<sup>56</sup> E. Noel-Neumann, Obshchestvennoe mnenie. Otkrytie spirali molchaniya (Moscow: Ves Mir, 1996).

psychological discomfort when ideas, judgments, and value points of view are imposed on them. According to Klapper's "minimal effects model", mass communication strengthens, reinforces people's attitudes rather than changes them. He rightly remarked: "Mass communication does not serve as a necessary and sufficient reason for changes in the audience, rather mass communication functions among and through intermediate factors and phenomena. These accompanying factors are such that, as a rule, mass communication is a complementary factor, and not the only reason in the process of consolidating the existing conditions"<sup>57</sup>. Consequently, the content and forms of presentation of information material in order to attract support from the population should take into account its dominant values, stereotypes, beliefs.

5. The practical value of many Western studies of the interaction of business and government seemed to be the most relevant for countries with developing economies, which seek to build partnership, transparent business relations with the state, and create equal opportunities for business groups to participate in the coordination of private and generally significant interests. However, as practice shows, the automatic borrowing of Western classical models of representation of interests in countries with a different cultural and civilizational paradigm gives negative results. One system of representing business interests in the public space is legally declared; in fact, latent, corrupt practices of promoting business interests prevail.

## Conclusion

The formulated problems arising from the current state of interaction between business and government are extremely relevant for modern Russia. In the context of the identified trends, the Russian experience of informal lobbying practices of business interests of PPP requires a theoretical rethinking and constructive transformation. Improving the mechanisms of interaction between business and government in Russia largely depends on the desire of the parties to PPPs to implement mutually beneficial cooperation. In the authors' opinion, the search for an effective model of communication between business and government in Russia should go along the path of institutionalizing all forms of communication of PPPs, which will exclude informal practices.

1. To increase the transparency of the interaction of the business community with government, it is necessary to legalize the market of intermediary and representative services in Russia to make it accessible to citizens and groups that do not have large resources. The adoption of the Act "On the Legalization of Intermediary Services" means the institutionalization of GR as a set of technologies aimed at articulating and promoting the requests of interest groups (companies, business associations, public organizations), their coordination with the interests of government at various levels. The Act will establish the legal framework within which interest groups can operate. The coming out of the activities of interest groups "from the shade" is a multilevel process. Its main stages are: adoption of a regulation governing the procedure for interaction with authorities; creation of open, transparent and generally accessible registries of persons engaged in the promotion of interests; publication of reporting databases on the results of their activities; introduction of ethical standards of professional activity for GR organizations and specialists. In order for corporations to use this tool, it is necessary to train GR managers in higher education institutions, and to create GR departments in companies.

---

<sup>57</sup> J. T. Klapper, *The Effects of Mass Communication* (New York: Free Press, 1960), 8.

2. In order to increase the effectiveness of the anti-corruption policy in the field of communication between business and government, it is necessary to: conduct comprehensive statistics of corruption crimes, as well as public lists of officials at all levels who have been found to be corrupt and disqualified. A significant drawback of modern statistics is that, for the most part, information related to particular corruption cases is published on the official websites of the Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation, the Investigative Committee of the Russian Federation, the Audit Chamber of the Russian Federation, the Federal Security Service and other government agencies, which significantly complicates the perception of the situation as a whole. Information obtained on the basis of exact statistics on corruption cases is more reliable knowledge than data based on subjective opinions obtained from the media.

Personal responsibility should be introduced – from federal executive bodies to municipal bodies and state corporations for the implementation by ministers, heads of regions, municipalities of “The National Anti-Corruption Plan for 2018-2020” approved on June 30, 2018 by President Putin. The preparation and implementation of state, national, regional and sectoral plans should be included in the performance assessment system of any leader. The specifics of “The National Anti-Corruption Plan for 2018-2020” is that it focuses on the fight against corruption practices in public procurement and the contract system. A separate novelty is devoted to anti-corruption practices in the field of activity of the State Duma, the Federation Council and the deputy corps as a whole.

3. Improving the legal mechanism for the interaction of business and government and strengthening financial discipline. Regarding the modernization of the legal mechanism, it is advisable to propose: 1) RIA of the current legislation; 2) improvement of the system of support for legislative initiatives by business associations (RUIE, CCI). At the same time, the modernization of legal forms of PPP, taking into account foreign practices in this area and their thoughtful implementation in Russian realities. First of all, the regulatory framework of PPPs needs to be modernized, which lags behind the demands of the times. For this purpose, it is necessary: 1) to monitor the changes introduced into regulations at the federal level; 2) to create an expert group engaged in the development of promising legislation related to PPP (advanced developments, modular laws).

A significant drawback of PPPs in Russia is the extremely low level of implementation of PPP projects, which can be overcome through the introduction of alternative concessions of PPP forms: a) PPP agreement, lease with investment obligations, b) life cycle contracts. To implement alternative forms of PPP, it is necessary: 1) to form an incentive system (for example, using tax preferences) to use alternative concessions of PPP forms; 2) to create a planning system for infrastructure projects taking into account various forms of PPP implementation; 3) to stimulate state-owned companies and enterprises and involve private companies in the provision of services on the basis of PPP (for example, the application of life cycle contracts).

Another important drawback in PPP is the lack of a governance system in PPPs. For this purpose, foreign experience can be used, the implementation of which involves: 1) creation of a specialized institution for the development and management of the PPP sphere at the federal, regional and local levels; 2) implementation of training programs for management and methodological support in the field of PPP; 3) timely publication of information on PPPs on the portal of the National Center for PPPs, including the register of PPP projects and information on tenders. Despite the lack of a universal model for the

development of PPPs, the most effective foreign practices can be adapted to Russian realities. One of them is to ensure the openness and transparency of PPP projects through the publication of financial statements. The relevant adaptation of foreign PPP practices in Russia should take into account the goals of using the PPP mechanism in specific areas and the specifics of state and territorial management.

To solve the problem of nonfulfillment of financial obligations by state structures, the following measures can be proposed: 1) toughening the administrative responsibility of officials and bodies; 2) improvement of monitoring and control mechanisms for the use of budget funds. To increase the efficiency of government activities in the field of data records, it is advisable to propose the following areas: a) RIA, b) improvement of control and supervisory activities; c) information support on issues of accounting, tax, legal support.

4. Improving the efficiency of using the platforms of business associations to build partnerships between business and government. Business associations are not only business entities that influence the government, but are also intermediaries for the government in their relations with business, providing “feedback”. For the convenience of entrepreneurs determining their common position on business development, the Coordination Council of Entrepreneurial Unions of Russia was created, which today allows mitigating the existing contradictions between entrepreneurs, acting, in some way, as a negotiation platform. Economic forums play a similar role.

In the professional environment, there are some critical views on the role of business communities. Among the most famous critics is Olson, who believes that business associations, as a rule, serve the interests of only some of their members, which means their inability to create public goods. This ultimately leads to the so-called institutional sclerosis, that is, a slowdown in development and subsequent stagnation in the country's economy<sup>58</sup>. Despite the presence of a negative aspect in the activities of business associations, to a greater extent, such associations play a positive role. For government institutions, business communities are a source of information and analytics, both on the state of market processes and on illegal actions that limit the development of business.

In addition, enterprises that are members of associations are more often invited to consulting councils and working groups. The enterprises that are members of business associations themselves, to be protected from unlawful actions on the part of the control and supervisory bodies, often turn to representatives of government agencies and to the arbitration court. Since the 2000s, the institutionalization of the basics of the interaction between business and government has led to an increase in the role of the collective influence of entrepreneurs on public authorities. The results of surveys conducted by the HSE Institute for Analysis of Enterprises and Markets with the support of the HSE Fundamental Research Program and a grant by the Moscow Public Science Foundation showed a different share of participation in business associations. Thus, the number of enterprises in the industrial sector that are members of business communities is about 40%, while this percentage is growing. Other sectors of industries show a smaller share of such participation: about 10% in trade, from 25 to 30% in transport and construction. Most manufacturing companies found it useful to participate in business associations. More than

---

<sup>58</sup> M. Olson. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Group* (Cambridge: Mass, 1965).

50 % of the participants (members) of business associations were in industry communities, 37 % were in regional associations, 20 % were members of the CCI and only 14.5% were members of three other leading business associations (RUIE, “OPORA Rosii” and “Delovaya Rossiya”). About one in four organizations was part of two or more business associations<sup>59</sup>.

## References

### Journal articles

Frye, T. “Capture or Exchange? Business Lobbying in Russia”. *Europe Asia Studies*, Vol: 54 num 7 (2002): 1017-1036.

Hood, C. “A Public Management for All Seasons?” *Public Administration*, num 69 (1991): 3-19.

Kail, Ya. Ya. and Epinina, V. S. “Aktualnye problemy sistemy gosudarstvennogo upravleniya i napravleniya ikh resheniya”. *Gosudarstvennoe i munitsipalnoe upravlenie. Uchenye zapiski SKAGS*, num 1 (2014): 33-38.

Kurbatov, M. V. and Levin, S. N. “Deformalizatsiya pravil v sovremennoi rossiiskoi ekonomike (na primere vzaimodeistviya vlasti i biznesa)”. *Ekonomicheskii vestnik Rostovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, num 1 Vol: 8 (2011): 27-50.

Schmitter, Ph. “Neokorporativizm”. *Polis*, num 2 (1997): 14-22.

Schmitter, Ph. “Still the Century of Corporatism”. *Review of Politics*, num 36 (1974): 85-131.

Senin, V. “GR i “lobbizm” v bankovskom sektore”. *Bankovskoe obozrenie*, num 5 (2011): 44-53.

Yakovlev, A. A. “Evolyutsiya strategii vzaimodeistviya biznesa i vlasti v rossiiskoi ekonomike”. *Rossiiskii zhurnal menedzhmenta*, Vol: 3 num 1 (2005): 27-52.

Yakovlev, A. A.; Zudin, A. Yu. and Golikova, V. V. “Biznes-assotsiatsii i ikh rol v protsessakh modernizatsii v Rossi”. *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost*, num 3 (2011): 31-32. Available at: <http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/2013/02/01/1251414422/Yakovlev.indd.pdf>

### Books

Achkasova, V.A., Mintusova, I.E., Filatova, O.G. (eds). *GR i lobbizm: teoriya i tekhnologii: uchebnik i praktikum dlya bakalavriata*. Moscow: Yurait. 2015.

Agee, W.; Cameron, G.; Ault, F. and Wilcox, D. *Samoe glavnoe v PR*. Saint Petersburg: Piter. 2004.

---

<sup>59</sup> A. A. Yakovlev; A. Yu. Zudin and V. V. Golikova, *Biznes-assotsiatsii i ikh rol v protsessakh modernizatsii v Rossi*. *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost*, num 3 (2011): 31-32. Available at: <http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/2013/02/01/1251414422/Yakovlev.indd.pdf>

- Ashby, W. R. Vvedenie v kibernetiku. Moscow: 1959.
- Becker, G. Chelovecheskoe povedenie: ekonomicheskii podkhod. Moscow: SU-HSE, 2003.
- Bentley, A. The Process of Development. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1968.
- Buchanan, J. Konstitutsiya ekonomicheskoi politiki. In Izbrannye Trudy. Moscow: Taurus Alfa. 1997.
- Dahl, R. O demokratii [On Democracy]. Moscow: Aspekt-Press. 2000.
- Dahl, R.A. Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1971.
- De Fleur, M. L. and Dennis, E. E. Understanding Mass Communication: A Liberal Arts Perspective. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 2002.
- Deutsch, K. W. The Nerves of Government: Models of Political Communication and Control. London: Free Press of Glencoe. 1963.
- Dregalo, A. A. Strategicheskoe partnerstvo vlasti, biznesa i obshchestva. Arkhangelsk: Lomonosov Pomeranian State University. 2010.
- Feldman, P. Ya. Lobbizm: teoriya i praktika. Moscow. Goryachaya Liniya – Telekom. 2017.
- Habermas, J. Politicheskie funktsii publichnoi sfery. In Strukturnoe izmenenie publichnoi sfery: issledovanie otnositelno kategorii burzhuaznogo obshchestva. Moscow: Ves Mir. 2016.
- Kelley, D. R. (ed.). Soviet Politics in the Brezhnev Era. New York. 1980.
- Klapper, J. T. The Effects of Mass Communication. New York: Free Press. 1960.
- Lapina, N. Yu., Chirikova, A.E. Regionalnye elity RF: modeli povedeniya i politicheskie orientatsii. Moscow: INION RAS. 1999.
- Lembruch, G. Introduction: Neo-Corporatism in Comparative Perspective. In Patterns of Corporatist Policy-Making. London. 1982.
- Mukhaev, R.T. Government Relation: teoriya, strategii i natsionalnye praktiki. Polnoe rukovodstvo [Government Relations: Theory, Strategies, and National Practices. Complete Guide]. Moscow: INFRA-M. 2019.
- Noel-Neumann, E. Obshchestvennoe mnenie. Otkrytie spirali molchaniya. Moscow: Ves Mir. 1996.
- Olson, M. The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups. Cambridge, Mass. 1965.

Peregudov, S.P. *Renessans korporativizma?* In Zaslavskaya, T.I. (ed.), *Kuda idet Rossiya? Transformatsiya sotsialnoi sfery i sotsialnaya politika*. Moscow: Delo. 1998.

Schmitter, Ph., Lembruch, G. (Eds.). *Trends toward Corporatist Intermediation*. Beverly Hills. 1997.

Seitel, F. *Sovremennye publik rileyshnz*. Moscow: Inidzh-Kontakt: INFRA-M. 2002.

Shokhin, A. N. (ed.). *Biznes i vlast v Rossii: teoriya i praktika vzaimodeistviya*. Moscow: HSE Publishing House. 2011.

Shokhin, A.N. *Biznes i vlast v Rossii: Regulyatornaya sreda i pravoprimeritel'naya praktika*. Moscow: HSE Publishing House. 2017.

Shumpeter, J. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: 1947.

Tolstykh, P. A. (comp.). *Professionalnyi slovar lobbistskoi deyatel'nosti*. Moscow: Center for the Study of the Problems of Interaction between Business and Government. 2009.

Truman, D. *The Governmental Process*. New York: 1951.

Wiarda, H. *Corporatism and Comparative Politics: The Other Great "Ism"*. New York: 1997.

Winner, N. *Cybernetics*. Cambridge: 1971.

#### Legal Acts

Federalnyi zakon ot 21 iyulya 2005 g. N 115-FZ "O kontsessionnykh soglasheniyakh" (s izmeneniyami i dopolneniyami). 2005. Available at: <https://base.garant.ru/12141176/>

Zakon RF ot 07.07.1993 N 5340-1 (red. ot 30.12.2015) "O trgovo-promyshlennykh palatakh v Rossiiskoi Federatsii" (s izm. i dop., vstup. v silu s 01.09.2016). 1993. Available at: [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_2269/](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_2269/)

Federalnyi zakon ot 13.07.2015 N 224-FZ (red. ot 29.07.2018) "O gosudarstvenno-chastnom partnerstve, munitsipalno-chastnom partnerstve v Rossiiskoi Federatsii i vnesenii izmenenii v otdelnye zakonodatelnye akty Rossiiskoi Federatsii". 2015. Available at: [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_182660/](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_182660/)

#### Proceedings

Kurshiev, N. M. *Vzaimodeistvie vlasti i biznesa kak faktor innovatsionnogo razvitiya ekonomiki regiona*. In *Materialy VI Mezhdunarodnogo nauchnogo kongressa "Rol biznesa v transformatsii rossiiskogo obshchestva – 2011"*, 18-22 aprelya 2011. Moscow: MFPA. 2011.

Shamarova, G.M. *Organy vlasti i biznes: modernizatsiya otnoshenii*. In *Materialy VI Mezhdunarodnogo nauchnogo kongressa "Rol biznesa v transformatsii rossiiskogo obshchestva – 2011"*, 18-22 aprelya 2011. Moscow: MFPA. 2011.

Tpp-inform.ru. Strategiya razvitiya sistemy TPP RF do 2020 goda. 2012. Available at: <http://tpp-inform.ru/strategiya-razvitija-sistemy-tpp-rf-do-2020-goda-10503.html>

#### Internet publications

Artemiev, A. Obama malym dollarom krepok [Obama Is Strong on the Small Dollar]. 2012. Available at: [https://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2012/05/16\\_a\\_4585613.shtml](https://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2012/05/16_a_4585613.shtml)

Ermolayeva, P. Ploshchadka dlya dialoga: Putin i Shokhin obsudili vzaimodeistvie biznesa i vlasti. 2016. Available at: <https://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=2720716>

Lasswell, H. Yazyk vlasti. Trans. By Tolmachyov, M.V. 2006. Available at: <https://gtmarket.ru/laboratory/expertize/2006/880>

Lyashok, V. Na zanyatost povliyali importozameshchenie i starenie naseleniya. 2018. Available at: <http://fedpress.ru/article/1943035>

Megaobuchalka. Evropa vryad li okazhetsya bez rossiiskogo gaza. Available at: <https://megaobuchalka.ru/3/3478.html>

Meisel, D. Hashtag Politics. Available at: <https://beautifultrouble.org/theory/hashtag-politics>  
Metodicheskie rekomendatsii po organizatsii i provedeniyu protsedury otsenki reguliruyushchego vozdeistviya proektov normativnykh pravovykh aktov subektov Rossiiskoi Federatsii i ekspertizy normativnykh pravovykh aktov subektov Rossiiskoi Federatsii. 2016. Available at: <http://orv.gov.ru/Content/Item?n=6377>

Otchet o rezultatakh monitoringa realizatsii "Strategii razvitiya sistemy Torgovopromyshlennoi palaty Rossiiskoi Federatsii do 2020 g." Available at: <https://tpprf.ru/ru/>

Tolstykh, P. Lobbizm, Government Relations (GR) i Public Affairs (PA): k istokam ponyatii. Available at: <http://www.raso.ru/?Action=show&id=16626>

## CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de la **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo debe hacerse con permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**.