

Control in the System of Public Administration in Russia

¹Khanif Sh. Mullakhmetov, ¹Eduard F. Nazmiev and ²Elvir M. Akhmetshin

¹Naberezhnye Chelny Institute of Kazan Federal University, Kazan Federal University, Chelny 68/19 (1/18), 423812 Naberezhnye, The Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation

²Elabuga Institute of Kazan Federal University, Kazan Federal University, Kazanskaya Street 89, 423600 Elabuga, The Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation

Abstract: The activity of monitoring systems and control systems in general is often criticized. This is applied primarily to the systems of state and municipal government. The opinions that management and control systems always criticize, regardless of an organization and the results its performance, applied technologies, the forms and methods of work widespread among officials and does not exclude the need to find other options of a situation clarifying. The methodological basis of the study is the dialectical method of knowledge and a systematic approach to the study of historical facts and events in conjunction with the state government in Russia. The study is based on extensive use of system analysis various methods. The research conducted a monographic study of the control activity evolution within the government system over a long period, which in its turn increases the reliability of conclusions and generalizations. The facts and events that reflect the control evolution in the system of the state government in Russia, the relationship of management and control systems are systematized. The influence of environmental factors (the level of economy, the characteristics of political power, etc.) on the development of monitoring activities is revealed. Identified and substantiated The reasons of public administration low efficiency and the impacts on the effectiveness of management systems and control technologies are revealed and substantiated. Management as a young science, has a number of unresolved problems of their own but, at the same time, there is a centuries-old practice of management, which has established time-tested principles of management. In the most general form the issue considered in this study is the following one: "Today the situation of control organization in the system of public administration in Russia has the following reason: we do not know how to or do not want to do what needs to be done and why we do not want this? The reasons for the problems existing in the system of state and municipal management which allow to develop and implement the measures improving the efficiency of these systems in the practice of management are revealed and substantiated. The performed historical analysis provides some explanations for the low efficiency of control in the system of state administration.

Key words: Public administration, state control, evolution of management thought, the efficiency of public administration and control, the problems of governance and control

INTRODUCTION

Researchers distinguish two approaches to the understanding of the term "control" in the state history of Russia. The first approach reflects the essence of military command and identifies control with goal setting, the determination of troops action vector; the second approach reflects the order of decision-making in rural and urban gatherings through joint discussions. The information about the control in this period of Russian history are not available, the management was carried out

based on the understanding of justice and expediency, developed by the most influential members of the community (Mullakhmetov, 2011).

The state management in the form of the Prince's reign appeared in the IX-X centuries during the developed system of local government. Then an expansion of princely power took place at the reduction of veche institution powers, which necessitated the development of control forms and methods (XIC). One may assume that the introduction of the prince's law, the interpretation of Byzantine Model of governance based on Roman law

Corresponding Author: Khanif Sh. Mullakhmetov, Naberezhnye Chelny Institute of Kazan Federal University, Kazan Federal University, Chelny 68/19 (1/18), 423812 Naberezhnye, The Republic of Tatarstan, Russian Federation

and with a highly developed bureaucratic system, could serve as the basis for the beginning of a permanent control system in the public administration Russia (Mullakhmetov, 2011).

The tsarist management model of the XVIth century in the most complete form contained in the works of I. Peresvetov assumed, first of all, a rigid centralization of power in the same hands; boyars and the church were refused from the control subject right. The rigid centralization of government functions and a combination of imperial power with the stratum of local serving people, together with the system of harsh punitive measures for all violations of service and military duty, demanded the control development in the system of the tsarist government.

An autocratic management model of the XVIIth century is characterized by absolutism and further centralization of management; the narrowing of representative bodies of power takes place, the transition of powers to bureaucratic authorities, the growth of administrative layers in society takes place. This, in its turn, together with systemic abuse in the newly created orders, the concentration of financial resources in state bodies contributed to the creation of a special state control body.

During the development of the Grand Duchy of Moscow and the emergence of new lands its management tasks become more complex; the creation of new control authorities and the delegation of certain powers to these bodies provisioned the necessity of control and the increase of activity volume and coordination a separate control structure. Besides, the rise of productive forces, the growth of commodity-money relations and the emerging all-Russian market demanded the development of management and state finances control system. In 1654, on the occasion of the Russian-Polish war the Accounting Affairs Order was established. "The basis of control development shall be sought in order control system" (Anonymous, 2006). The history of control and, in particular, state control bodies in Russia starts from this event.

Thus, the control in Russia emerged as a management mechanism; accounting was an initial monitoring tool in order to ensure cost-effectiveness. The close association of management and accounting control aspects is reflected in this historical fact. In the future, it is traced in all periods of management and control development in Russia (Mullakhmetov, 2013).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The accounting chamber did not perform an actual control. It performed its evaluation and made its decisions

on the activities of orders concerning the spending of funds on the basis of data provided by the orders. However, the creation of a special state control body led to an increased attention to the orders of public funds accounting, helped to order public finance system.

In 1701, the functions of the Accounting Chamber were transferred to the nearest office and significant measures were taken to improve the control. First of all, the revision of the accounting books of orders was carried out with the assistance of specially sent deacons and deacon officials and after the completion they were approved by the deacons of an audited order and the nearest office. Secondly, it was required that the account books had primary documents confirming the validity of the generated income and expenditure (decrees and petitions) as well as their actual fulfillment (end of subscription, statements and receipts). Thus, an attempt was made to transit to control essentially what would make a significant contribution to the ordering of public finances at successful implementation.

The researchers of management thought noted that there was a fundamental change in the management activities of Russia in XVII-XVIII centuries. Strict administration in the state management of this period assumed a firm control of subordinate activities. The proposals for monitoring system improvement are held in a number of extant sources. According to Pososhkov (2003)'s opinion, the state apparatus had to be put under the control of representative legislative authority. He believed that the public knowledge of laws by population, which allows to evaluate the actions of officials, is essential for an effective operation of the bureaucracy. Thus, the author holds the idea that not only the definition of "game rules" but also its understanding by all participants is necessary. In our view, the idea of law knowledge by population proposed by I. Pososhkov, became the beginning of the future public control in the management system (Mullakhmetov, 2013).

The Empress Catherine II introduced the management model of enlightened absolutism in her "Order" (1767): to divide the governance into two parts with their approaches to management. The public administration is expected in the form of a two-tier control system: bureaucratic control bodies monitor the correct implementation of laws by subjects, the Empress controls the bureaucratic apparatus and if necessary, makes the adjustments to the decisions of officials, or changes some laws.

The principle of evaluation by results proposed for the first time by the Catherine II contributes to the continuous improvement of internal regulations on the basis of the obtained results and provides the organization adaptability to new conditions by the change of management decisions (Mullakhmetov *et al.*, 2014).

In 1711-1714, the functions of financial control were performed by the Senate and they did not take any significant actions in terms of control improvement. Thus, in 1714 the financial control was transferred to the Nearest office once again.

In 1718, the order system begins to be converted into a collegial one. The supervision over the activities of the boards and their subordinate agencies is performed by prosecutors. In January 1722, the decree of Peter I introduced the post of Procurator-General and the Attorney General for the supervision of the Senate (Markov, 2004). Nine boards were established, three of which performed the financial management. The senate, established to perform the control at the highest level of management hierarchy had real control instruments in the form of "financial" boards.

The transformation of state control under Peter I, Anna Ioanovna, Elizaveta Petrovna led, first of all, to the decentralization of control some areas were removed from the control of the Audit College, special supervisory bodies were established for a number of them. The fragmentation and the subordination of state control did not allow the revision board to conduct a common policy and low executive rate and untimely and incomplete reporting, insufficient number of board officials delayed audit for years, all of which made the state control inefficient and formal.

During the reign of Elizabeth all special control institutions were destroyed and the revision board was restored. An interesting method of motivation was applied which was subsequently used repeatedly in the history of the state body control: the revision-board staff was offered to pay salary only from the amounts of performed surcharges.

Large-scale reforms of Catherine II influenced both the organization of state control system and the substantive aspects of the control. The staff of the Auditing College was increased, the institution itself was divided into six departments. In 1775, with the establishment of provinces in the field state chambers were established which were entrusted to control the state-owned business of a province. They audited the accounts, drew up the statements of income and provided them in a revision-board. State chambers had a double subordination: functionally they were submitted to Auditing College and administratively they were submitted to the Senate.

In our view, the changes introduced by Catherine II in the state control structure are more important. She was the first one who drew attention to the need not only for the actual proof of costs and revenues but also on the validity of the action on the spending of funds. Catherine

pointed to the strict accountability of all state institutions, without an exception, for the audit board, the inadmissibility of ignoring the legitimate claims and demands of the audit board. And finally, the State chambers in the provinces began to conduct audits on the original documents which gave a real picture on the state of affairs. This circumstance, together with the presence of a relative independence and empowerment, as the institutions subordinated to the senate, made the state chambers the first control body in the history of Russia, which carried out the actual control.

Then, the rights of state control were reduced more and more as the number of institutions and persons exempted from reporting to government control increased. The reforms of Alexander I as a reaction to an unsatisfactory state of public control affairs were referred to control system organization and were likely to be formal.

RESULTS

The formal control was established in Russian state administration for many years which also had the selective character due to the exemption of a number of management branches from the general system of control.

The significant changes in the system of state control in Russia during the second half of the XIXth century were introduced by the following events and facts. In 1859, the decision on the introduction of prior control is taken in 1862 "The rules of drawing up, implementation and conclusion of the financial estimates from the ministries and main departments". The state control began to take part in the preliminary examination of the department estimates. Since, 1866 the drawing up of reports on the performance of the financial estimates of the ministries was transferred from the Ministry of Finance to the competence of the State Audit Office. In 1864, the unity of funds is introduced all cash budget shall be focused at the Ministry of Finance. In the same year, a temporary Audit commission was established under the state control, with the right to a documentary check of central and local government agencies.

The role of the National Audit Office was reduced to the function of a violation observer and at the introduction of control in a number of industries control rules were established either by an agreement with an inspected department or an internal act agency. The state bodies did not allow any state control over their activities, or set the ways of its implementation. In such a situation, a state control could not prevent massive abuses and the embezzlement of public funds aimed at the development

of rail networks, industry, on the creation of a public lending system which is confirmed by the reports of the state controller of those years.

V.A. Sakovich noted that the control of “up to now does not have all the necessary authorities to carry out its tasks. First of all, the range of activities of Russian state control activities does not seem quite complete, since some of the financial management of the state is not accountable to it” (Evszlin, 2014).

In the history of the Russian government, the tendency of bureaucratic controls to limit the breadth of control (by the way of exemption of separate industries and facility management from state control) and the depth of control (by changing the composition of control into the trend of formal procedures) is clearly observed. The limitation of control competence in terms of protection from the activities unusual for supervisory bodies may be justified theoretically by the functional unstructured management at that time, however, it must be noted that the main resistance to control by its facilities and state authorities is caused by the qualitative characteristics of the Russian system of governance in general and the bureaucracy in particular.

The activity of state chambers may be noted as good practice after the establishment of provinces in 1755 (prior to the approval of the General reporting system), which performed the control according to the authentic documents. Also, the state control shall be mentioned which participated in the budgeting of departments, i.e., carried out the preliminary control.

During the reign of Catherine II, the most significant changes in the system of state control and the improvement of control procedure composition were implemented. Catherine II drew attention to the need not only for an actual proof of revenues and expenses but also on the validity of the acts on public funds spending for the first time. Thus, she pointed to the need of control procedures implementation not only by form but also in substance.

DISCUSSION

The state control in Russia was virtually devoid of real rights and powers. In some industries (e.g., banking, construction and operation of railways) its activity was regulated by regulatory acts of controlled agencies. Thus, the actual status of state control was set by control departments. It belittled the role of state control to a violation observer.

The elements of transparency embedded in the practice of state control were formal ones: the published budgets and its performance reports were presented in a

contracted form that did not allow to determine an actual state of affairs. The identified deficiencies were secret ones and were reported to the king personally.

The study of the origin and the evolution of state control allows you to identify the causes of many problems which is still faced by the system of government in Russia. Today, we are dealing with the consequences of the decisions taken by the state management system since the XVIIth century.

CONCLUSION

Our goal was not the systematic chronological study of all aspects of state control origin and evolution in Russia. Some historical periods and facts were studied to the extent necessary to identify the main trends of relationships and interdependencies in the control system, the role of control and their justification. Considering control as an integral and essential part of the management function there was an attempt to trace the changing role of monitoring depending on the changes of objectives, methods and forms of control which, in its turn, reflect the essence of the economic processes taking place in society.

During our research, we relied primarily on the Russian experience of control and studied Russian heritage, reflected in historical documents. In our opinion, the comparative analysis of the origin and evolution of the state management and control in Russia and other countries would provide an opportunity to reveal the deeper reasons for the low efficiency of state management and control, to develop recommendations for their improvement on this basis. At that the Western Europe countries (Germany, France, England) are more interesting objects for study, as our neighbors and business partners and also taking into account the recent geopolitical trends, Asian countries, especially China.

IMPLEMENTATIONS

The Russian state control was not and could not be an effective one at the current state of affairs because:

- A legislative framework development for the organization of a state control system met the systematic resistance from bureaucratic bodies and bureaucracy, the adopted regulations were mainly sabotaged
- The structures of management and control bodies were not matched, the control authorities did not have sufficient human and administrative resources

- The result of mainly follow-up control application, the delay of control procedures, taking of measures on the violations often lost their relevance; the causes of the violations were not eliminated

Russian state control was not an independent one from the government. This is its fundamental difference from the Western European state control.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

Anonymous, 2006. Anthology of accounting thought. From the history of accounting. Nazarov, D.V., M.Y. Medvedev (Eds.), M.: Economist, pp: 352, 70-85.

Evzlin, Z., 2014. Budgetary control and state report accountability in the system of state constitutional government. Kazan: Publishing House of Kazan University Press, pp: 1-2, 160.

Markov, K.V., 2004. State Control. K.V. Markov (Eds.), M.: Proceedings, 408, pp: 7, 73.

Mullakhmetov, K.S., 2011. Control in the governmental management of Russia. State and municipal management. Scientific notes of SKAGS. No. 3, pp: 40-44.

Mullakhmetov, K.S., 2013. Control-management. Moscow: JSC Ekonomika Publishing House.

Mullakhmetov, K.S., R.M. Aminova and E.M. Akhmetshin, 2014. Control in a management system in modern conditions. Asian Soc. Sci., 10 (24): 237-247. ISSN: 1911-2017, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n24p237>.

Pososhkov, I.T., 2003. Book on Poverty and Wealth. M.: Nauka, pp: 253.