

## Artículo de investigación

**Concept of state management doctrine**

Концепция государственной управленческой доктрины

Concepción de la doctrina de la administración estatal

Recibido: 22 de junio del 2019    Aceptado: 19 de agosto del 2019

Written by:

**Oleg N. Dmitriev**<sup>91</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4514-7519><https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?origin=AuthorProfile&authorId=57202382529&zone=>**Sergey V. Novikov**<sup>92</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6921-1760><https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57192318711>**Abstract**

The thesis about the priority of such a crisis-generating factor as total management imperfection was postulated. As a selected component of management innovating, it was chosen the initiation of the qualification requirements for a management system by the state through the introduction of the State management doctrine. There is the status idea of this management document and the vision of its heading structure and substantive content.

**Keywords:** Management innovating, management sphere, State management doctrine.

**Аннотация**

Постулирован тезис о приоритетности такого кризисообразующего фактора, как тотальное несовершенство управления. В качестве выделенной компоненты управленческого инновирования выбрано инициирование государством ценовых требований к управляющим системам через привнесение Государственной управленческой доктрины. Сформулирована статусная идея этого задающего управленческого документа и изложено видение его рубрикационной структуры, а также содержательного наполнения.

**Ключевые слова:** Государственная управленческая доктрина, управленческое инновирование, управленческая сфера.

**Resumen**

En el presente artículo se postula la tesis sobre la prioridad de un factor generador de crisis como la imperfección total de la gestión. Como componente de la gestión innovadora, se ha seleccionado la iniciación por parte del Estado de los requisitos de cualificación para un sistema de gestión a través de la introducción de la doctrina de gestión pública. En el documento se analiza la idea de gestión, la visión de su estructura de dirección y su contenido sustantivo.

**Palabras clave:** Ámbito de gestión, doctrina de gestión del Estado, gestión innovadora.

<sup>91</sup> PhD in Engineering, Full-doctor (Economics), Professor of management, Moscow Aviation Institute (National Research University), Professor of Department of management and marketing of high-tech industries, 125993 Volokolamskoe highway 4, Moscow, Russia, olegdmitriev@yandex.ru, elibrary.ru: [https://elibrary.ru/author\\_profile.asp?id=3295](https://elibrary.ru/author_profile.asp?id=3295)

<sup>92</sup> PhD in Economics, Associate Professor, Director of Institute of Engineering Economics and Humanities, Moscow Aviation Institute (National Research University), 125993 Volokolamskoe highway 4, Moscow, Russia, ncsrm@mail.ru, elibrary.ru: [https://elibrary.ru/author\\_profile.asp?id=807011](https://elibrary.ru/author_profile.asp?id=807011)

## Introduction

The main trends in the development of the modern world economy include its intensive globalization and the increase in the level of changing of production due to the explosive growth of its science and technology. One of the industries in which, due to both objective and subjective circumstances, the most visible signs of globalization and intellectualization of production are the high-tech complexes of Russia.

A modern generalized high-tech complex of the Russian Federation (Complex) is undoubtedly an important component of world industrial production. For example, the aviation-industrial complex of Russia is one of the few national aviation industries in the world (according to many estimates, two or four: United States, European Union, Russia and China), now having the ability to create, mass-produce and technically support in the after-sales period the entire range of aviation products of military, civil and dual-use with acceptable characteristics. However, it is still staying in crisis, which is devastating both for the Complex itself and for those who are inextricably related to it, directly or indirectly. Accordingly, high-tech production in Russia should be "sanitized", and in the first place in terms of management capacity and, without alternative is conceptually correct.

There is no doubt that the practice of further passive contemplation of the course of events is destructive without alternative. If this practice continues, the disintegration of the Complex is a problem of the near future (Zolotova, 2017; Bloshenko, 2009).

The existence or death of the Complex does not allow its rational consideration in isolation from the values and anti-values that it generates or, on the contrary, reduces.

With regard to the Complex, a number of value sections should be distinguished (Bodrunov, Dmitriev, Koval'kov, 2002; Dmitriev, 2017) for the case of a representative research polygon or the aviation-industrial complex, in which the productivity and counterproductivity of its existence as a functioning and developing organizational separation of one of the meso-levels should be analyzed.

Accordingly, the impact of the Complex should be considered in terms of target orientation:

- Level of ensuring national security of the Russian Federation, and not only in the defense aspect, but also in all major sections;
- Filling of budgets of different levels;
- Employment of a significant contingent of highly qualified specialists;
- Scientific and technical potential of the country;
- Commodity security of the Russian consumers of its commodity production;
- Increase the financial and economic potential of the Russian business community;
- Social and psychological state of Russian citizens.

The analysis revealed that the existence of the Complex in the positive future both productive (appropriate) consequences and counterproductive (inappropriate). However, first, the productive effects are seen as dominant, and second, the negative effects can be greatly weakened and the positive effects greatly enhanced if competent management is organized and implemented. Therefore, the Complex must be saved, but, of course, in "sanitized" ("healthy") condition (Demchenko, 2011; Dmitriev, 2005).

In order to carry out the "sanitization" of the Complex, it is necessary, first of all, to identify the causes that gave rise, preserve or exacerbate its crisis.

Three main problems, three main finish manifestations of a crisis condition of a Complex are the following: on financial and economic efficiency, on condition and on competitiveness.

It is well known that its financial and economic performance and financial and economic condition are generally not positive, however, as well as the bulk of the Russian industry. A significant part of the enterprises of the Complex are in the stage of long-term pre-bankruptcy, or its condition is extremely unstable, and it is extremely vulnerable. Studies have shown that even for many externally and relatively well-off enterprises of the Complex, the drop in sales of commodity products by 1-3% or the inflation of their production costs at the same level should initiate a progressive financial insolvency (Bodrunov, Dmitriev, Koval'kov, 2002; Dmitriev, 2017). In addition, the enterprises of the Complex are very dependent on the markets with global uncertainties, first of all, it concerns

the sphere of military-technical cooperation. Many enterprises have a strong dependence on foreign suppliers, the conference is a populist slogan than feasible industrial policy. The only thing that mainly saves many high-tech Complexes in Russia is their significant involvement in the export of commercial products for non-civilian purposes, state paternalism, activity in the field of non-core activities (including rental operations), as well as secondary employment of personnel.

The long-term crisis period adversely affected the competitiveness of enterprises and commercial products of the Complex, which in terms of type, volume, quality and price are increasingly inferior to analogues of the world's leading producers, as well as "catching up" high-tech economies such as the Chinese one.

Thus, it is necessary to state the violation of the basic prohibitions on the condition of the Complex.

The main causes of the crisis of the Complex are:

- Unacceptably low level of the preserved potential;
- Not enough favorable conditions for its existence;
- Unskilled development, including in terms of concepts with management concepts.

Existence of degradation and collapse of the potential of the Complex are quite diverse and include personnel dystrophy, insufficient quantity and quality of production facilities and equipment, the loss of a number of key knowledge and skills, the primitive nature of the management systems of intra-corporate and intra-divisional levels.

External adverse events are also quite strong and diverse. Among them there are the following ones: complete or almost complete disappearance of a number of traditional demand niches, destruction or low reliability of the cooperative system, existence of insufficient transparency and active defamation, excessive threats and extremely low quality, underdevelopment of external, non-Complex management systems by the legislative and executive bodies of the federal level, level of subjects of the federation and the municipal level.

It should be emphasized that the particular negative stays in the low development level of

management systems, in their actual absence as institutions of scientifically based self-organization and external one. The action of these causal factors is characterized by significant negative synergy. It is obvious that the most feasible way to change the situation is to move to the area of competent development. One of the effective ways is the use of state target censorship regulations.

### Theoretical basis

Public administration has been considered throughout all human history. Therefore, almost all publications on this subject can be recognized as specialized thematic.

However, the doctrines are much less "fortunate". They are most often considered quite abstractly (Chashin, 2019; Schubert, 2018) or we consider them in traditional areas such as military doctrine (Dmitriev, Koval'kov, 1993), national security doctrine, etc. In many cases, the doctrinal form as an independent one is replaced by policies, strategies, etc. In addition, for example, in the Russian State Library ([www.rsl.ru](http://www.rsl.ru), June 05, 2019) there are no sources not only on the subject of state management doctrine, but it is even impossible to find them with the key words "state doctrine" and "management doctrine". We can see a similar situation abroad (Library of Congress of USA on [www.loc.gov](http://www.loc.gov), June 05, 2019), although there is a strong activity in the consideration of submissions (Steiner, Miner, Gray, 1986), but published sources with specialized dictionary keys are not detected.

### Methodology

There is a structural interpretation of management methodology, in particular, in the works of some authors. (Kanashchenkov, Dmitriev, Yekshembiyev, Minaev, 2013; Dmitriev, 2018). Design allows interpretation as a local version of management.

In the methodology management operating there are:

- Glossary and conceptual constructions;
- Basic axiomatics;
- Principles of organization and operation of the system subjected to methodological design;
- Schematic execution of the operating mechanism in the sections of the environment, structure and functioning procedures. At the same time, as a rule, a system-technical representation of the

optimal operation problem is placed in terms of content formulation, formalization and solution technology;

- Procedures for a priori and a posteriori evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed methodology.

## Results

**General conceptual idea.** Characteristic feature of the modern stage of functioning and development of the Complex is the momentary and empirical nature of its management. It is recognized that in the past few years, the degree of the urgency of this management has changed, including as a result of some coincidence of budget processes. However, most of the management subjects of the Complex are characterized by stereotypes in the best case of short-term management and attraction to local, poorly integrated and routine scientifically unjustified management.

Meanwhile, the Complex is a difficult, multidimensional object of management for all levels of its institutional and organizational decomposition, it has a critical importance, the management of which and external influences on which generate prolonged and non-obvious reactions, and the management of it is very resource-intensive. This management in any situation is polysubject and hierarchical, carried out in relation to a complex object of management (Dmitriev, 2005).

Based on the composition of the material components of the management system (administrative and managerial personnel, technical, software and other means or resources), let us determine the system appearance of the means of processing information. Because of their multiplicity, diversity and interconnectedness, they constitute a system that implements information management technology.

Information management technology is a set of prescribed methods of development of management decisions and the order of their application. This technology regulates technological operations on information processing. These methods and information management technology are materialized in the form of software installed on computing facilities, accompanied by formal procedures for planning (designing) of computer research and interpreting their results, as well as the intelligence of administrative and managerial personnel. In this sense, information

management technology is a form of regulation of the corresponding part of the processor of the management system related to the system of development of management decisions (Dmitriev, Koval'kov, 1993).

When designing and developing a management system, it is necessary to choose the type of information management technology.

The most critical problem for the modern Russian society is the problem of ensuring acceptable optimal management in all spheres of management, including those delimited by the hierarchical level of it. In case of the failure or rejection of the decision, the Russian Federation will have no chance of acquiring the geopolitical status of a world power, even at a medium level, it will have no chance to have the status of a superpower or a leading world power even in the future.

This point of view is very different from the majority of conventional views of the scientific and management establishment, which associates the current long-term crisis of the Russian society as a whole and its economic component, as well as pessimistic assessment of the prospects of its development with external and internal disadvantages of objective and subjective nature (Dmitriev, Novikov, 2018).

Management at the state level in our country has a non-systemic nature and it is based on heuristics of leaders and elites of influence. On the one hand, this situation occurs due to the disorganizing influence of adaptation processes in society and processes with no regulations. On the other hand, there is a lack of system of public administration counter-enhances anarchism and indignation, as well as disorientation of management in other areas.

Public policies, both general and specialized, are well-known tools of public administration. The institute of public policy has been widely used in the United States, Japan, Germany, the United Kingdom and France, for example. They are widespread in South-East Asia. China, Malaysia and many other countries has brought in the practice of state management the super-long policy for the period of 60 years. However, all of these policies are mostly object- or object-oriented. Perhaps the only exception is Japan, which has developed and implemented some universal policies, mostly of a general industrial nature (Dmitriev, Novikov, 2017).

At present, there is an unacceptably small number of disparate state policies in Russia, which mainly have a slogan content and they are oversaturated with prognostic assessments with an unacceptable level of uncertainty, which not only have no target character, but they are even non-indicative, including due to their lack of comparability in terms of results. Some policies still have not been developed, including industrial and economic ones.

The situation is similar at the level of regions and economic entities.

The state policies formed in Russia are practically not subject to wide, public declaration and they are not presented. Many of them are not only updated, but radically changed, they do not have evolutionary continuity.

It is proposed to focus on the basic issue and to form a public policy, which, on the one hand, will help to resolve the above-mentioned priority management problem of the organization sufficiently optimal management for microlevel, mesolevel and macrolevel, and, on the other hand, it will be a methodological framework for all other policies.

This implies a public management policy, which has not been mentioned anywhere before.

In this sense, it can be declared as a fundamentally new type of state policy, especially important for the conditions of globalization and post-industrialization, and considering Russian specifics mainly for the conditions of post-crisis development of this country.

It should be noted that public administration should be largely typified for all levels of government.

**The usefulness of the State management doctrine.** The implementation of the State management doctrine will help to achieve a number of important results.

The State management doctrine may be used for application in all spheres of management related to individual and group interests of the citizens of the Russian Federation.

The State management doctrine is a basic management methodology, using as a public measure of disciplining regulation administrative-appointed or externally driven. In addition, the State management doctrine has a

typed vocabulary and a structure of presentation of management tasks and problems, as well as a standard form of description of methods and results of their solution.

Covered by the State management doctrine, hierarchical levels of management are the following:

- International (interstate): in case of direct or indirect involvement of the interests of the Russian Federation or the interests of human civilization;
- Federal (state): extended to all Russian society in terms of the activities of the legislative and executive authorities, as well as law enforcement and judicial activities;
- Macro-regional: federal districts, subjects of the federation, groups of federal districts and subjects of the federation;
- Microregional: municipal formations of various levels and groups, as well as regional microsocium (gardening associations, condominiums, etc.);
- Departmental: departments, industries, sub-sectors and their groups, including industry groups such as a fuel and energy complex, military-industrial complex, metallurgical complex, etc.;
- Internal corporate: corporate (integrated) structures – groups of enterprises (financial and industrial groups, holdings, etc.);
- Intra-firm: for the level of individual enterprises;
- Intra-divisional: for units of different levels and their groupings;
- Intrapersonal: for the level of a particular employee and stable groups of individuals;
- Party: for the level parties, public movements and public organizations, clubs on interests, and also their groups.

At the international, state, macroregional, micro-regional and departmental hierarchical levels of management, the State management doctrine is a conceptual regulation of intentions, declarations and actions for legislators, state and municipal employees, it sets the protocol style of system state thinking and the staff model of management behavior of state and municipal employees, as well as management personnel of organizations whose activities are directly regulated by the executive authorities (Novikov, Veas Iniesta, 2018).



At these levels, the State management doctrine is a directive methodological basis for the organization of state and municipal service.

Other levels of management have a similar direction, if the relevant management errors can lead to large-scale, particularly serious consequences (for example, in nuclear power, air and sea transport, etc.). Perhaps it should cover all areas related to licensed activities.

For the other levels, it has a methodological recommendation, which is made by the relevant management bodies on a voluntary basis (for example, in the self-extension regime). It can be a methodological prototype of the corresponding management system, using management standards or their components for various self-organizing communities, enterprises and divisions.

State bodies use a system of incentives for the relevant management entities for their extension to the State management doctrine and adherence to it, as well as ensure the functioning of this incentive system.

At the same time, the State management doctrine will be different comparing with ISO-standards and other similar recommendations such as the "Code of corporate behavior" by the specificity of regulations and unified dissemination to all levels and subject areas of management. A priori useful borrowings from existing documents regulating management activities are not excluded.

The State management doctrine extends to all subject areas of activity.

The State management doctrine regulates:

- Development of management tactics and strategies in terms of content formulation of the tasks of their development, formalization and order of solving of these problems and in terms of their presentation and presentation of the results of their solutions (appropriate strategies and tactics);
- Preferred conceptual framework of management decisions. As such, the feasibility study of these decisions is proclaimed. Exceptions (the use of other conceptual schemes, including the type of intuitive-empirical or stereotypical) are allowed only if they are well-founded;

- General procedure for the development, application and liquidation of control systems.

The positive results of using of the State management doctrine include improving the efficiency of functioning, development and the state of all components of the Russian society due to a reduction in the error and inconsistency of management. One of the main results of this type should be the improvement of financial and economic indicators at the macrolevel, mesolevel and microlevel. In particular, the proposed state innovation will ensure parity in competitiveness in the domestic and foreign markets.

Accordingly, we expect:

- Raising the income of citizens of the Russian Federation to a level of developed countries of the European community;
- Preservation of existing and, possibly, mass creation of new "jobs" for citizens of the Russian Federation, and mainly in the field of high-tech production;
- Increase in revenues of the consolidated budget of the Russian Federation;
- Reduction of the number of subsidized regions (with the possible preservation of a number of historical national autonomies and extreme climatic conditions);
- Ensuring acceptable levels of profitability and financial solvency of Russian enterprises;
- Ensuring an acceptable level of investment attractiveness, including from foreign investors and Russian reinvestors;
- Obtaining non-discriminatory access to world resources (financial, economic, information, intellectual, etc.);
- Reducing the risk of the economic situation, including in terms of both economic and non-economic risk factors;
- Creation of fundamentally higher quality conditions for the implementation of production activities in Russia, including for management personnel, including the fundamentally higher level of management culture. In this context, stimulating barriers to the internal and external emigration of qualified Russian workers will be formed and prerequisites for re-

emigration and attracting unique foreign specialists will be created;

- Improving the quality of the Russian workforce, the level of its intellectual, professional and ethical development, ensuring its competitiveness in the Russian and global human resources markets.

Along with these final benefits, the introduction of the State management doctrine will contribute to the achievement of the following intermediate, side and indirect positive results:

- Improving the quality of the management process due to the formation of more correct, specific and public prohibitions, as well as formation, presentation and adjustment of management innovations in relation to legislative and administrative acts and verbal actions. Introduction of State management doctrine will cause the weakening of the preconditions for the acceptance and transmission of administrative errors. In this sense, the quality of management decisions and their regulatory and administrative documents, the preparation of which will be carried out in some sense on the conceptual template, as well as simplify, accelerate and become less costly procedural in terms of their fine-tuning and harmonization, will increase;
- Rational increase of transparency of management, because the main management points in public documents will become information-specific and amenable to more constructive discussion, coordination and perception;
- Reduce the cost of management activities, so, the documentary peer-review will have come to the verification of the template document, wherein the set of errors will be typical and predictable, and perhaps more easily corrected.

**The proposed rubrication structure of the State management doctrine.** Structurally, the State management doctrine may exist as:

- Preamble;
- Status of it and the procedure for its dissemination;
- Procedure for declaring the introduction, cancellation and change;
- Basic management concepts;

- Main areas of management;
- Basic principles of management;
- Composition of persons whose interests are subjects to mandatory accounting;
- Rules of prioritization of interests;
- Typical focus of management;
- Composition of the management actions;
- Structure of a typical prohibition;
- Procedure for selecting the type of management environment;
- Differentiation of spheres of managerial competence;
- Selection of the conceptual management method;
- Typical management functions;
- Typical types of management system support;
- Typical characteristics of management system and their acceptable levels;
- Order of choosing the designer of management system and interaction;
- Responsibility for management mistakes;
- Order of state and other regulation of spheres of management;
- Order of state stimulation of development of the sphere of management;
- Final provision.

**Way of introduction.** It is proposed to use a verbal instrument as a decree of the president of the Russian Federation or as a first step a decree of the Government.

Further registration in the form of the federal law is not excluded.

**The intended sequence of actions.** It is proposed to implement the project of introducing the State management doctrine through the implementation of the following stages:

- 1) Announcement of the project;
- 2) Choice of the developer;
- 3) Formation of the tape development schedule;
- 4) Determination of the project financing procedure;
- 5) Design of the regulations for development, discussion and coordination;

- 6) Development of the concept document;
- 7) Discussion and agreement on the concept of the document;
- 8) Development of the draft doctrine;
- 9) Working discussion and harmonization of doctrine;
- 10) Administrative approval of the doctrine;
- 11) Legal registration of the doctrine.

Note that there may be several cycles in stages 3, 5, 6-7, 8-9 and 10.

### Conclusions

These considerations give rise to the following observations, conclusions and recommendations:

- Level of management development in the Russian Federation is unacceptably low. This situation continues to deteriorate. It is possible that the emergence of management collapse and its degrading transformation into atomized localization, engaged in subsistence farming of low-tech nature, exists. There are no prospects for the emergence of an intelligent hierarchical total control system. All types of security (perhaps with the exception of technical support) do not correspond to the realities of the economy of post-industrial and even developed industrial society;
- Management failure should be addressed as soon as possible. The development level of the administrative sphere is a critical factor in the formation of the complex potential of society and therefore the preservation of a passive position, including on the part of public administration, will inevitably generate an irreversible economic catastrophe;
- Among all measures of management anti-crisis innovation should be allocated to state activity, which should stimulate the development of the management sphere, including measures of regulatory enforcement;
- Development and adoption of the State management doctrine is the defining managerial impact of this kind;
- State management doctrine gives rise to a significant number of positive

outcomes for all stakeholders. Significant negatives from its introduction does not appear;

- State management doctrine should determine the general regulations for the implementation of the life cycle of the management system of any localization;
- Described situation is a characteristic of many countries, including the most developed ones. Therefore, statements, conclusions and recommendations seem to be quite universal.

### References

- Zolotova V.A. (2017). Management problems and tasks of forming the program of anti-crisis management innovation in the high-tech enterprise industry of Russia. KnoRus. Moscow.
- Bloshenko A.A. (2009). Technology of integrated assessment of stability of financial and economic condition of the enterprise of the Russian industry. Thesis. Moscow Aviation Institute. Moscow.
- Bodrunov S.D., Dmitriev O. N., Koval'kov Ju. A. (2002). Aviation-industrial complex of Russia on eve of XXI-th century: problems of effective management. Parts 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Corporation "Aerospace equipment" Publishing House. Saint-Petersburg.
- Dmitriev O.N. (2017). Strategic problems and directions of developing rehabilitation of managing systems of Russian high-tech complexes. *Microeconomics*, 6(5), 24.
- Kanashchenkov A.I., Dmitriev O.N., Yekshembiyev S.Kh., Minaev, E.S. (2013). Strategic Corporate Management: Fundamental and Applied Problems. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Corrected and Amended. Dobroe slovo. Moscow.
- Demchenko O.F. (2011). Methodology for mathematics modelling of organization structures of Russian aviation industrial complex. KnoRus. Moscow.
- Dmitriev O.N. (2005). System analysis in management. The 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Dobroe slovo. Moscow.
- Dmitriev O.N., Koval'kov Ju. A. (1993). Management aspect of the military doctrine of the Russian Federation. Scientific and technical collection "Informatics", № 3.
- Dmitriev O.N. (2018). Conception of system-technical design and redesign of legislative space of Russia as the environment for realization of enterprises' life cycle. *Microeconomics*, 2, 48-57.



- Chashin A.N. (2019). Legal doctrine as a source (form) of Russian law. Monograph. INFRA. Moscow.
- Schubert T.E. (2018). Doctrine, lawmaking, judicial practice: issues of mutual influence. Monograph. INFRA. Moscow
- Steiner G.A., Miner J.B., Gray E.R. (1986). Management policy and strategy: text, readings, and cases. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Macmillan. New-York.
- Dmitriev O.N., Novikov S.V. (2017). Conception of managing of fuzzy-institutional mesolevel organizational separations in a context of product projects internationalization. *European Research Studies Journal*, 20(4), 277-289.
- Dmitriev O.N., Novikov S.V. (2018). Economic Assessment of Federal Scientific Programs. *Russian Engineering Research*, 38(4), 326-329.
- Novikov S.V., Veas Iniesta D.S. (2018). State regulation of the development of the connectivity of the Russian territory. *Espacios*, 39(45), 8.