

Socio-cultural and public participation of inhabitants in the management of the single-industry city in the conditions of the new economy

P.I. Blus

Perm State National Research University
Perm, Russia
piblus1962@gmail.com

D.G. Krasilnikov

Perm State National Research University
Perm, Russia
d_krasilnikov@psu.ru

Abstract – The article presents an analysis of possible ways to enhance the socio-cultural and public participation of citizens in the management of a single-industry city through the introduction of socio-cultural design technologies, self taxation mechanisms and proactive budgeting, the further development of territorial public self-government. On the materials of a number of Russian single-industry cities, including Perm territory, the place and role of the local community in changing of the situation in such localities is revealed; the significance of public participation of citizens in achieving positive changes in them is shown.

Keywords – *single-industry city (town) management, public participation, socio-cultural design, proactive budgeting, self-taxation, project management*

I. INTRODUCTION

Today there are 319 single-industry cities in the Russian Federation, where about 14 million people live (almost 10% of the country's population).

At the turn of XX-XXI centuries, in the period of transition of a planned economy to a market economy, characterized by a radical breaking of previous production ties, a rejection of the planned distribution of orders and resources among enterprises, a change in the markets for certain types of industrial products, town-forming enterprises of single-industry cities were on the verge of survival. Since, until this time, in a planned economy the city-forming enterprise, as a rule, ensured the operation of the entire single-industry city, since almost all social infrastructure facilities of the settlement were on its balanced sheet, a sharp deterioration in the economic activities of city-forming enterprises led to aggravation of many communal problems in single-industry cities. The consequences of these problems are: the outflow of qualified personnel, the decline in the number of able-bodied population and the aging of the remaining, which in the long term threatens with the extinctions of single-industry cities, the decline in the level and quality of life of the population. That is why the support and development of single-industry cities is recognized today by the federal government as one of the significant tasks.

Despite the difficulties that have arisen related to the transition from the traditional to the new economy, today the

potential of single-industry cities still remains, and its activation depends on the possibilities of restructuring the economy and including additional resources in the turnover, among which we see, first of all, social capital. We believe that possible activation of public participation of citizens in the management of single-industry cities will help to solve such problems as:

1. Low activity of the population which has arisen due to the increase in the degree of people's distrust of local authorities because of their ineffective actions or inaction to stabilize and improve the socio-economic situation in single-industry cities.

2. The lack of a constructive dialogue between the population and the local authorities, which in principle did not arise in the former single-industry city management paradigm when the tasks were set by the federal and regional authorities exclusively "vertically" and the population was not considered an interested participant in the development of management decisions to formulate their own vision of the development prospects of single-industry cities.

3. The lack of agreement between the authorities and the public in a joint discussion of local problems and finding ways and tools to solve them.

Meanwhile, the inclusion of the public in the social management of the territory became possible in Russia as a result of administrative reform since the early 2000s, when the course was taken to increase the degree of openness of government for the population. The current regulatory framework in the country today already allows citizens to be involved in the management process, gives them the opportunity to express their point of view and identify the most significant problems, thereby ensuring that public opinion [12] is taken into account, and also to increase the degree of openness of authorities for citizens and creates real possibilities of organizing and conducting a public control procedure, including a procedure through a system of independent assessment of the quality of budget services provided by social organizations.

Among the most common and effective tools for the direct participation of the population in the management of the territory should be mentioned, first of all, territorial public self-government (TPSG). In addition, new opportunities for

increasing civic activity of the population, attracting additional funds to local budgets, including on the principles of co-financing, opens the institution of self-taxation of citizens which, after making changes to certain articles 131-FZ, will become more accessible for implementation in single-industry cities.

Another form of expanding citizen participation in solving of local issues has become the development of initiative budgeting in Russia which allows for the inclusion of specific citizens' proposals into local budgets. In single-industry cities such public initiatives in the areas of improvement, public utilities, infrastructure, culture and sports were supported as part of the implementation of the priority state program "Integrated development of single-industry cities" and the program "Five steps of improvement".

In other words, one of the resources for the preservation and revitalization of the socio-economic potential of single-industry cities is social capital, by which we understand the interconnections and interaction of socially active people allowing us to stimulate and support new directions of development of single-industry cities with civil ideas and actions. Their socio-cultural and public participation in the management of a single-industry city is already becoming a real factor in improving the situation and identifying new prospects for the development of this type of settlement in the new economy.

II. THEORY AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The scientific substantiation of the phenomenon of "socio-cultural and public participation of citizens in the management of a single-industry city" implies the interrelation of such basic concepts as "management", "society", "city" and, in particular, "single-industry city". All of them have long been the subject of many scientific fields. Thus, the general theoretical problems of management are laid down in the works of M. Weber and F. Taylor where the subject and general principles of management are defined [3].

The study of the theory and practice of managing the development of cities, their role in the territorial political, economic, socio-cultural systems, is the work of G.P. Lappo, M.N. Mezhevich [9].

Issues of social development of the city, as well as some aspects of social management of urban spaces are reflected in the works of A.Amin, T.Banejee, H.Shaftoe, W.Whyte [18].

In addition, a special group consists of the work of Russian scientists E.G. Animitsa, V.Ya. Lyubovniy, I.S. Samboretzky, I.D. Turgel [1], in which the problems of single-industry cities, related to their characteristics, their role in the country's economy, the social well-being of citizens and management problems, are specified.

It should be especially noted here that the problems and prospects for the development of single-industry cities of the Perm Territory are substantiated in the works of A.I.Bratchikova, A.S.Zuykin, A.V.Lapin, A.D [6].

The issues of enhancing public participation in decision-making on issues of local importance have become relevant in connection with the development of democratization processes in Russian society and have become one of the attributes of the administrative reform in the country, which has expanded the possibilities of public participation in territorial

management. The manifestation of social activity of citizens in solving municipal problems is one of the key areas for solving urgent problems of local self-government and is the focus of attention of many domestic and foreign researchers [2].

III. RESEARCH RESULTS

Having studied the conditions and practices of public participation of citizens in managing single-industry cities, we consider it possible to single out the following forms among the most promising and, at the same time, giving real social and economic results: socio-cultural design, initiative budgeting and self-taxation of citizens.

Socio-cultural design is a tool for concentrating public resources in the main directions of development of a single-industry city. It contributes to the implementation of socially significant projects aimed at solving communal tasks and improving urban space, filling it with various events that improve the spiritual and moral well-being of citizens, updating common areas (parks, squares, and embankments) and their arrangement with small architectural forms.

The long-term experience of the Perm Territory, where the practice of socio-cultural design, received its beginnings in the late 1990s, is still being successfully implemented both at the municipal and regional levels, serves as an example of applying new approaches to accumulating funds from various sources, as well as capitalization intangible assets of public organizations. This approach is consistent with the principles of the new economy and allows you to attract additional funds for one ruble of budget funds in the average ratio of 1: 5.

It should also be noted the initiative to support social projects by individual business structures that send their funds to the formation of grant funds of certain competitive nominations or the financing of specific projects. This practice is consistent with both the spirit of social responsibility of business and the principles of the new economy and allows you to increase the amount of funds for the implementation of social projects. Thus, thanks to the Competition of social and cultural projects conducted by the PJSC LUKoil group of enterprises in the Perm Territory, over the past 15 years, the company supported the creation of more than 2,000 jobs organized by initiative citizens, which fully corresponds to the meaning and approaches of the new economy turnover of social capital.

The experience of single-industry cities Krasnovishersk and Ocher shows that the formation of an aggregate grant fund to support social and cultural projects involving budgetary and extrabudgetary sources is quite a feasible task. For example, in 2017, for the implementation of 20 projects - winners of the XV district competition of social and cultural projects of the Krasnovishersky municipal district, it was possible to accumulate funds of two municipal programs, as well as OJSC Solikamskumprom for a total of 691.0 thousand rubles.

The next effective form of public participation of citizens in the management of a single-industry city is *initiative budgeting*, which occupies a special place among the effective tools for involving citizens in the budget process at the municipal level. The participatory budgeting underlying was first tested in Latin America in the 1980s, and today it has been practically implemented in more than 20 countries of

Western and Eastern Europe, Latin America, the USA and, more recently, in China [20].

In Russia, such experience as one of the participatory budgeting options was called “proactive budgeting” and started in 2007 from the World Bank’s Local Initiatives Support Program, which was carried out in the eastern districts of the Stavropol Territory.

Currently, the project for the development of initiative budgeting in Russia has already embraced 47 subjects of the Federation. The analysis of the experience of single-industry cities of the Russian Federation in applying the practice of proactive budgeting suggests that this technology, which is relatively new for Russia, nevertheless already provides citizens with opportunities for constructive inclusion in the budget process, and also opens up real opportunities for the population to contribute the authorities of their proposals for the development of the territory for which quite real budget funds are allocated. The successful practice of implementing such projects has already been demonstrated by single-industry towns: Inza of the Ulyanovsk region, Uchaly of the Republic of Bashkortostan, Neftekamsk of the Republic of Bashkortostan, Cherepovets of the Vologda region, Aleksandrovsk, Gornozavodsk, Chusovoy of the Perm Region.

It should also be noted that in Russia there are positive practices of single-industry towns, where citizens *self-taxation* as a form of active participation of the population in managing a single-industry town produced positive results: Navashino, Nizhny Novgorod Region, White Kholunitsa, Kirov Region, Ocher and Pashiya of the Perm Territory.

The capitalization of public initiatives through the introduction of self-taxation of the population in the single-industry city territory meets the modern challenges of the new economy and allows, firstly, to attract additional funds from the regional budget for solving local issues of the municipality (for example, in the Perm region, participation in projects for improvement - in the ratio of 1 to 30), and, secondly, includes in the economic turnover such intangible assets as public participation and the responsibility of residents for improvement of life in the city, which is fully consistent with the principles of the new economy. It should also be noted that there is the practice of supporting projects of *territorial public self-government* (TPSG), started in the Perm region in the mid-90s of the last century. In order to further enhance the project activity of TPSG, from June 2016, grants have been provided from the regional budget for the support of projects winning the regional competition of TPSG projects from the regional budget. Thus, for example, in 2017, the single-industry town Ocher of the Perm Territory implemented 5 TPSG projects in the total amount of 942.5 thousand rubles in 2017, and in 2016 the single-industry city of Chusovoi, 1 such project was completed for 250.1 thousand rubles.

IV. CONCLUSION

The presented examples of the practical use of various social technologies for enhancing the participation of citizens in the management and solution of local problems in single-industry towns indicate a significant social potential that allows achieving quite tangible results of public participation in single-industry towns. Subject to an open dialogue of all stakeholders, this potential of the local community gets new

prospects for further use, which will contribute to the manifestation of new qualities of single-industry cities in the new economy.

Another conclusion concerns the need for training in content and organizational aspects of the introduction and promotion of these social technologies, as well as the formation of relevant competencies both among active citizens wishing to participate in the practical creation and use of new social technologies, and among municipal employees who create conditions for ordering and practical application of these technologies.

In the perspective of the development of these social technologies of public participation in the management of single-industry towns in the new economy, the following positive changes in the local community can be achieved.

Socio-cultural design, through interested participation of business, government and the public embodying non-standard ideas and contributing to the creation of a unique result, will determine the transformation of the socio-cultural environment and the main areas of urban space, promote the establishment of new connections and communications of people in the implementation of social and cultural projects in this modified environment.

Further expansion of socio-cultural design in single-industry towns depends on: the participation of public organizations and TPSG in determining the priority directions of their development; developing the necessary for the organization and conduct of competitions of social and cultural projects of regulatory documents; identify sources of budgetary and extra-budgetary financial support for social and cultural projects; the organization of wide public education technology socio-cultural design.

In order to further implement *the initiative budgeting technology* in single-industry towns, it is necessary to upgrade the skills of local government specialists and community activists to improve the quality and increase the financial soundness of the proposed projects, for which the principles of proactive budgeting principles and mechanisms should be continued, digital design technologies and tender documentation should be introduced, to form citizens' motivation for practical actions. In addition, in the local budget for these purpose it is mandatory to plan an item of costs for co-financing of projects of initiative budgeting.

The expansion of the practice of *self-taxation of citizens* in single-industry towns will be influenced by the development at the regional level of appropriate regulatory documents, allowing allocating intergovernmental transfers to local issues in particular single-industry towns. To do this, it is advisable to establish the possibility of making decisions by the population at the micro district level, thereby focusing the interest of the local community on the choice of a relevant and priority decision for a given territory. In this case, it is appropriate to set the proportions of spending the funds raised, for example, in the ratio: 70% - remain in the micro district for local projects that meet the needs of the local community, and 30% are used for citywide projects.

In addition, it makes sense to continue to hold seminars, trainings, conferences, at which to acquaint citizens with the regulatory framework that allows increasing financial and legal literacy of the population as an active partner in

managing the development of a single-industry city. For these purposes, you should create Internet sites, thematic pages in social networks, where information will be presented on the directions of spending funds, the rationale for the expediency and volume of costs, and the discussion of alternative options for financial expenditures. This will allow an open policy of consultation with citizens on topical issues of the local community. As a result, the population will be more informed, and the degree of trust in local authorities in single-industry towns will increase.

References

- [1] Animitsa E.G., Bochkov V.S., Peshina E.V. etc. *City-factory*, Ekaterinburg: Publishing house of USUE, 2010, 81 p.
- [2] Bondarenko Yu.P. *Formation and development of social activity of the population in local government of a typical middle city*: author. Dis. Cand. soc. Sciences, Ekaterinburg, 2008.
- [3] Weber M. *Selected Works*. - M.: Progress, 1990. - 808 p.
- [4] Annual Report for 2015 "Non-profit organization "Development Company of single-industry towns": official website. Received from http://www.fmrus.ru/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/otchet_spreads_obl1.pdf
- [5] Demyanov EA. *Social conditions for the formation of self-administrative activity of territorial communities*: Dis. Cand. soc. Sciences, Saransk, 2003.
- [6] Zuykina A.S., Bratchikova A.I. Directions of state support for the development of single-industry cities in Russia in the context of economic crises (on the example of the Perm Territory), *Ars administrandi (The Art of Management)*, 2016, No. 2, pp.32-46.
- [7] Kiselev A.M. *The behavior of local communities in the system of social management of the municipality*: author. Dis. dr. soc. Sciences, Ekaterinburg, 2011.
- [8] Lapin A.V. Depressive territories of the Perm region: identification and improvement of management, *Vestn.Perm. un-that. Ser. Economy*, 2016, No 4 (31), pp. 150–163.
- [9] Lappo G.P. Cities - the centers of the units of administrative-territorial division of Russia, *Russia and its regions in the XX century: territory - settlement – migration*, M.: OGI, 2005, pp. 96-110
- [10] Lyubovny V.Ya. *Single-industry cities in a crisis: state, problems, rehabilitation opportunities*, M.: ZAO "Dortranspechat", 2009, 104 p.
- [11] Mezhevich M.N. *Social development and the city*, Science, 1979, 176 p.
- [12] On the general principles of the organization of local self-government in the Russian Federation: federal law of 06.10.2003, No. 131, *Rossiyskaya gazeta*, 2003, Oct 8.
- [13] Rizov A.D. Socio-economic development of company towns in the conditions of reconstruction of city-forming enterprises (on the example of the city of Chusovoy of the Perm Krai), *Theory and practice of service: economy, social sphere, technology. S-Pb. gov. economical Univ*, 2014, Vol. 1 (19), pp. 118-123.
- [14] Rusanov A.A. Experience of applying self-taxation in the Perm Krai, *Municipal finances, taxes and investments*. Received from http://131fz.ranepa.ru/uploads/files/2017/05/Rusanov_A.A._02-2017_mun_imu.pdf (appeal date September 17, 2018).
- [15] Samboretzky I.S. *Social management of the mono-city of the Tyumen North*: author. Dis. Cand. soc. Sciences, Tyumen, 2016, 32 p.
- [16] Turgel I.D. *Monospecialized city: theory and practice of strategic management of social and economic development*, Ekaterinburg: Publishing house Ural.gog.gorno-geol.akademii, 2001, 259 p.
- [17] Taylor F. Scientific Organization of Labor, *Management is a science and art*, M.: Republic, 1992, 352 p.
- [18] Amin Ash. Collective Culture and Urban Public Space. *City, Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action*, 2008, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 5-24.
- [19] Banejeree Tridib. The future of Public Space, *APA Journal*, 2001, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 5-24.
- [20] Deles P., Mendoza R.U., Vergara G. *Social Budgeting Initiatives and Innovations: Insights using a Public Finance Lens*, Received from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228958685_Social_budgeting_initiatives_and_innovations_Insights_using_a_public_finance_lens
- [21] Parkinson John *Democracy and Public Space, The Physical Sites of Democratic Performance*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- [22] Poposki Zoran Spaces of democracy, art, politics, and activism in the post-socialist city, *Studia Politica: Romanian Political Science Review*, 2011, vol 11 no. 4, pp. 713-723.
- [23] Purcell Mark The right to the city: the struggle for democracy in the urban public realm, *Policy and Politics*, 2013, vol 43, no. 3, pp. 311-327.
- [24] Shaftoe Henry *Convivial Urban Spaces: Creating Effective Public Places*, London: Earthscan, 2008.
- [25] Whyte William *The social Life of Small Urban Spaces*