PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS ESTIMATION IN THE RF REGIONAL LEVEL

INTRODUCTION

The main goal of all large-scale public service reforms implemented over the past twenty years, both abroad and in Russia, is to increase the efficiency of public authorities and the quality of provided public functions and services (YUREVA et al., 2016). In Russia, the efficiency and effectiveness of the public authorities and management activities remains at a relatively low level. The results of many studies (SUSHKOV, 2018; SHIDAKOVA, 2020; IBRAEVA, YESHENKULOV, 2016) indicate the activity of public authorities very slowly acquires new characteristics and features are adequate to modern tasks and requirements. Moreover, negative tendencies are developing in this environment, which reduce the effectiveness of government and municipal employee and the authority of the State. In this regard, the goal of reforming the state civil service is to develop methods for public authorities effectiveness estimating.

In the framework of this study, we consider the influence of government and municipal employees activities on the level of socio-economic development of the region, we note this development indicators are affected by many factors, ranging from geographical location, resource potential, demographic processes to the culture, education, science, medicine condition and, of course, the public and municipal services condition (GALLYAMOVA, 2015; SAUBANOV et al., 2017; FAKHRUTDINOVA et al., 2015; MAKLAKOVA et al., 2019)

METHODS

In connection with the widespread adoption of the concept of new public administration in recent decades, various approaches to estimating the state of public and municipal services, based on key efficiency and effectiveness indicators (Table 1), have attracted much attention.

| Effectiveness estimation models | Balanced Scorecard (BULATETSAYA, 2019) | Effectiveness pyramid (FOMICHEV, 2017) | Overside board (MCNAIR et al., 1990) |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Activities Characteristics     | Finance                               | Finance                                | Production                        |
|                                | Market                                | Market                                 | Finance                           |
|                                | Internal environment                  | Customers                              |                                   |
|                                | Education and development             | Innovation and Learning                |                                   |
|                                |                                       | Productivity                           |                                   |
|                                |                                       | Quality                                |                                   |
|                                |                                       | Delivery time                          |                                   |
|                                |                                       | Production cycle                       |                                   |
|                                |                                       | Losses                                 |                                   |

Source: Search data.

In the system of state authorities, the concept of management by goals has become most widespread. The main theories developed in relation to this concept within the framework of the state civil service, and their evolution over the 20th century, are presented in Figure 1.
ANALYSIS

We made an attempt to identify the existence of a relationship between the public and management authorities activity quality and the state of the environment in the regions using the example of one of the Russian Federation regions - the Privolzhsky Federal District (hereinafter - the PFD). For this, we used indirect indicators:

- The volume of gross regional product as a whole;
- The volume of gross regional product per capita;
- The average monthly wage;
- Average per capita income;
- Retail sales per capita;
- Quality of life rating;
- Rating of governors (leaders) of the regions of the PFD;
- Number of state and municipal employees.

To characterize the effectiveness of state and municipal services at the regional level, we have formed three versions of the same type of tables under the general name “Positions of the PFD regions in the intra-district rating”. However, each version of the tables has its own set of estimation criterion (four in each table), which, in our opinion, indirectly reflect the degree of influence of government and municipal employees on the state of the main socio-economic indicators in each of the 14 regions PFD. At the same time, we assigned the first place and 1 point to the region which reached the highest values of each indicator. The second region, respectively, was assigned the second place and 2 points. The region, which had the worst values of indicators, was assigned the last, 14th place and 14 points. The sum of points for all four criteria characterizes the rating of each region. In this case, the dependence is observed: the smaller the sum of places, the higher the rating of this region. Each of the table options may have independent significance in the indirect estimation of the government employees effectiveness in the region. Nevertheless, of interest is the final integrated version, which
summarizes the three previous ones. We believe the thus obtained rating of the PFD regions, which incorporates 12 criterion, gives a more reasonable description of the problem we are studying. The following options are presented.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Option 1 “Positions of the PFD regions” (Table 2) includes 4 indicators.

The first of them determines the rating of each PFD region by the number of government and municipal employees per 10 thousand inhabitants. We believe the number of government and municipal employees per 10 thousand populations should be as small as possible. Therefore, the place of the region in this indicator is the higher, the smaller the share of these categories employees in the population. The initial information was the data of federal statistical observation on the number of these categories of employees and the population in each region in 2019 (Russia regions. Socio-economic indicators, 2019).

The second indicator reflects the place of the region in life quality in the intra-district rating based on data on the place of this region in the All-Russian rating (http://www.riarating.ru).

The third indicator determines the place of the PFD region according to the leader rating. This indicator is based on the materials of the All-Russian Governors Rating (http://russia-rating.ru). We believe this criterion is as close as possible to estimation the government and management employees activities effectiveness of the region - the efforts of its leader to a large extent determine these categories of employees effectiveness. As the practice of recent years shows, the most successful results are shown by regions led by leaders who have long held high positions in the annual all-Russian ratings.

And finally, the fourth indicator characterizes the place of the region by the value of the gross regional product (hereinafter - GRP) per capita (Russia regions. Socio-economic indicators, 2019).

The positions of the PFD regions according to the first option were determined as the sum of the places occupied by each region for all four indicators in accordance with the above-mentioned principle: a higher rating is for the region where the sum of places is minimal. For example, the Samara region has a rating of II with a total of four places for 13 indicators, and the Ulyanovsk region has a rating of VI with a total of 27 places.

Table 2. Positions of the PFD regions in the intra-district rating (option 1)

| Region                  | Republic of Tatarstan | Republic of Bashkortostan | Nizhny Novgorod Region | Samara region | Perm region | Saratov region | Orenburg region | Udmurtia | Penza region | Kirov region | Ulyanovsk region | Chuvash Republic | Republic of Mordovia | Mari El Republic |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|----------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| by the number of        | 2                     | 1                         | 1                      | 1             | 5           | 1             | 1              | 4        | 2            | 3            | 5                 | 9                | 14                | 10              |
| government and          |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| municipal employees     |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| for 10 thousand         |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| population of the       |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| region                  |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| on the life quality in   | 2                     | 4                         | 2                      | 3             | 5           | 1             | 1              | 4        | 2            | 3            | 5                 | 9                | 14                | 10              |
| the all-Russian rating  |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| According to the place   | 1                     | 4                         | 2                      | 3             | 5           | 1             | 1              | 4        | 2            | 3            | 5                 | 9                | 14                | 10              |
| of the region head in    |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| the all-Russian rating   |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| by GRP per capita       | 1                     | 4                         | 2                      | 3             | 5           | 1             | 1              | 4        | 2            | 3            | 5                 | 9                | 14                | 10              |
| The sum of places in     | 5                     | 15                        | 20                     | 13            | 25          | 37            | 28             | 36       | 35           | 47           | 27                | 39               | 41                | 46              |
| the region for all 4     |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| indicators               |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| The final rating of      | I                     | III                       | IV                     | II            | V           | X             | VII            | IX       | VIII         | XIV          | VI                | XI               | XII               | XIII            |
| the region among the     |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| PFD regions by the       |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| minimum amount of        |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |
| places                  |                       |                           |                        |               |             |               |                |          |              |              |                   |                  |                   |                 |

Source: Search data.
Option 2 “Positions of the PFD regions” (Table 3) also includes 4 indicators.

The first indicator reflects the place of the PFD region in the rating according to the calculated number of inhabitants of this region per one employed in the government and municipal service according to the data for 2019. At the same time, we adhered to the principle: the larger the number of inhabitants pertaining to such an employee, the more efficiently organized this service is in this region and, therefore, the place of the region in the ranking is higher. For the calculation, the data of the statistical collection “Regions of Russia” were used (Russia regions. Socio-economic indicators, 2019).

The second indicator characterizes the region place in the rating according to the ratio of the volume of gross regional product per capita and the average per capita income in 2019. In this case, we adhered to a similar principle: the more significant the result of this ratio, the higher the region’s place in the ranking.

The third indicator illustrates the region’s place in the PFD, depending on the region’s place in the all-Russian rating of the socio-economic situation in 2019, presented by the rating agency LLC “RIA Rating” (http://www.riarating.ru).

The fourth of the indicators relates to the place in the regions ranking in the by the volume of GRP per one employed in the system of government and municipal service. It is calculated as the quotient of dividing the volume of GRP of the region in 2019 the number of government and municipal employees in this region in the specified year.

Table 3. Positions of the PFD regions in the intra-district rating (option 2)

| Region                  | Position of the region in the intra-district rating | The final rating of the region among the PFD regions by the minimum amount of places |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                         | by the number of inhabitants per 1 government and municipal employee | by the ratio of the volume of GRP per capita and the average per capita income of citizens | According to the region place in the all-Russian social-economic rating. | by the volume of GRP per 1 government and municipal employee | The sum of places in the region for all 4 indicators |
| Republic of Tatarstan   | 2                                                   | 2                                   | 1                                   | 1                                   | 6                                   | I |
| Republic of Bashkortostan | 1                                                | 13                                  | 2                                   | 3                                   | 19                                  | III |
| Nizhny Novgorod Region  | 11                                                | 10                                  | 4                                   | 6                                   | 31                                  | VIII |
| Samara region           | 3                                                 | 9                                   | 3                                   | 2                                   | 17                                  | II |
| Perm region             | 12                                                | 3                                   | 5                                   | 5                                   | 25                                  | V |
| Saratov region          | 6                                                 | 7                                   | 7                                   | 9                                   | 29                                  | VII |
| Orenburg region         | 9                                                 | 1                                   | 6                                   | 4                                   | 20                                  | IV |
| Udmurtia                | 8                                                 | 4                                   | 8                                   | 7                                   | 27                                  | VI |
| Penza region            | 7                                                 | 9                                   | 10                                  | 10                                  | 36                                  | X |
| Kirov region            | 14                                                | 14                                  | 12                                  | 14                                  | 54                                  | XIV |
| Ulyanovsk region        | 5                                                 | 11                                  | 9                                   | 8                                   | 33                                  | IX |
| Chuvash Republic        | 4                                                 | 12                                  | 11                                  | 11                                  | 38                                  | XI |
| Republic of Mordovia    | 13                                                | 6                                   | 13                                  | 13                                  | 45                                  | XII |
| Mari El Republic        | 10                                                | 8                                   | 14                                  | 12                                  | 44                                  | XII |

Source: Search data.

Option 3 “Positions of the PFD regions” (Table 4) also includes 4 indicators.

The first indicator reflects the region’s place in the PFD in terms of retail trade per capita in accordance with the place occupied by this region in the All-Russian rating (Russia regions. Socio-economic indicators, 2019).

The second indicator indicates the place of the region in terms of the average per capita income per month (Russia regions. Socio-economic indicators, 2019).
Table 4. Positions of the PFD regions in the intra-district rating (option 3)

| Region                  | Position of the region in the intra-district rating | The final rating of the region among the PFD regions by the minimum amount of places |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                         | retail turnover per capita | by average per capita income per month | By the ratio of the average per capita income and the living wage | In the category "Donor Regions and Subsidized Regions" | The sum of places in the region for all 4 indicators |
| Republic of Tatarstan   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | I |
| Republic of Bashkortostan | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 12 | II |
| Nizhny Novgorod Region  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 18 | IV |
| Samara region           | 2 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 19 | V |
| Perm region             | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 15 | III |
| Saratov region          | 10 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 41 | X |
| Orenburg region         | 7 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 28 | VI |
| Udmurtia                | 9 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 32 | VII |
| Penza region            | 8 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 33 | VIII |
| Kirov region            | 14 | 9 | 14 | 5 | 37 | IX |
| Ulyanovsk region        | 6 | 8 | 13 | 13 | 44 | XIII |
| Chuvash Republic        | 11 | 14 | 9 | 6 | 42 | XI |
| Republic of Mordovia    | 12 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 52 | XIV |
| Mari El Republic        | 13 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 43 | XII |

Source: Search data.

The final stage of our calculations is the final table, combining all three of the above options. Its result is an integrated rating of each region calculated by the minimum amount of places.

Table 5. The final position of the PFD regions in the intra-district rating

| Region                  | Position of the region in district ratings by options | The sum of positions in the region for options 1-3 | Integrated rating of the region among the PFD regions by the minimum amount of positions |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                         | By option 1 | By option 2 | By option 3 |                                                                                      |
| Republic of Tatarstan   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | I |
| Republic of Bashkortostan | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | II |
| Nizhny Novgorod Region  | 4 | 8 | 4 | 16 | V |
| Samara region           | 3 | 2 | 5 | 10 | III |
| Perm region             | 7 | 5 | 3 | 15 | IV |
| Saratov region          | 6 | 7 | 10 | 23 | VII |
| Orenburg region         | 8 | 4 | 6 | 18 | VI |
| Udmurtia                | 11 | 6 | 7 | 24 | VIII |
| Penza region            | 9 | 10 | 8 | 27 | IX |
| Kirov region            | 14 | 14 | 9 | 37 | XII |
| Ulyanovsk region        | 5 | 9 | 13 | 27 | X |
| Chuvash Republic        | 10 | 11 | 11 | 32 | XI |
| Republic of Mordovia    | 12 | 13 | 14 | 39 | XIV |
| Mari El Republic        | 13 | 12 | 12 | 37 | XII |

Source: Search data.

As we noted, all three intermediate options may have independent significance in government employee effectiveness estimating. But their integration into the "Integrated Rating" allows a deeper look at the indicated problem and suggests the following: the region positions high are largely determined not only by favorable natural and geographical position, but also by the volume of GRP per capita, the life quality in the region, and the size of average per capita income etc. However, it would be unfair not to notice the connection between the head of the region and his team successful work with all the government and municipal employees effectiveness in the region, their qualifications level, and executive discipline.
SUMMARY
All three options of “Positions” and the Integrated Rating calculated on their basis illustrate a certain regularity: both in any of the given options and in the final one, in the leading group are constantly the same three regions with high rating values - Tatarstan, Samara and Bashkortostan and three regions - Nizhny Novgorod, Orenburg regions and Perm region - adjacent to the first group, take places from fourth to sixth. By the way, in five of the above-mentioned regions, capitals are million-plus cities (except Orenburg), which play the role of peculiar growth drivers. It should also be noted the leading positions of the Republic of Tatarstan. Calculations confirm in all three and in the final options, the republic has the highest rating values. Being a leader in the, Tatarstan is also included in the group of Russia leading regions.

The group of “mid” includes 5 regions which are close in almost all rating parameters - their positions in the group is not higher than sixth, but not lower than eleven. With the successful development of these regions economy, they are able to rise higher and a kind of trigger for such a rise, of course, can be human capital, which includes the government and municipal employees professionalism.

The group of outsiders in all options is also stable - three regions: the republics of Mari El and Mordovia, as well as the Kirov region. Such “stability” does not do these regions any good, but, unfortunately, the PFD as a whole. Probably, this requires both the set of economic, social, administrative measures development, and the search for internal reserves in each of these regions.

CONCLUSION
Summing up the work done, we note the following.

Firstly, the government and municipal employees effectiveness estimation is an urgent problem has undoubted practical value, but so far has not found the optimal solution. Existing quantitative and qualitative estimating procedures has not given the expected results yet.

Secondly, the authors’ proposed approach to the government and municipal employees effectiveness estimating, which combined qualitative and quantitative estimation criterion, is only a step towards identifying the relationship between the quality of government and administration and the state of the environment in the regions. We made an attempt not to identify, but, most likely, to indicate the presence of this relationship by the example of the Privolzhsky Federal District regions of the Russian Federation.

Thirdly, a number of calculated indicators proposed and used by the authors to compile the rating of the PFD regions can be applied within the region (at the level of municipalities) in the development of measures provided for by national projects in 12 areas of strategic development established by the Decree of the President of Russia of May 7 2018 No.204 “On national goals and strategic objectives of the development of the Russian Federation for the period until 2024”. Knowing the basic calculated indicators, it is possible to predict those were the basis of the calculation and plan their values to achieve a level of the calculated indicator at which municipalities will be able to occupy leading positions.
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Resumo

O artigo discute os problemas de estimativa da eficácia dos serviços públicos estaduais e municipais em nível regional. Comparando os principais indicadores do desenvolvimento socioeconômico da República do Tartaristão e outras regiões do Distrito Federal de Privolzhsky e usando os indicadores estimados propostos, os autores tentam traçar a relação entre esses indicadores e a eficiência da gestão das autoridades públicas e municipais no nível regional. Versões formadas das classificações das regiões do Distrito Federal de Privolzhsky, segundo os autores, permitirão identificar a relação entre a qualidade do poder público e a gestão e o estado do meio ambiente nas regiões. Uma série de indicadores calculados propostos pelos autores podem ser aplicados dentro da região (no nível dos municípios) no desenvolvimento de medidas previstas por projetos nacionais para muitas áreas de desenvolvimento estratégico. Além disso, o trabalho tem como foco o aumento da performance pública e municipal.

Keywords: Estimativa da eficácia do serviço público. Classificação. Indicadores de desenvolvimento regional. Critério de estimativa.

Abstract

The article discusses the problems of state civil and municipal services effectiveness estimation at the regional level. Comparing the main indicators of the socio-economic development of the Republic of Tatarstan and other regions of the Privolzhsky Federal District and using the proposed estimated indicators, the authors try to trace the relationship between these indicators and the efficiency and effectiveness of public authorities and management in these regions. Formed versions of the ratings of the regions of the Privolzhsky Federal District, according to the authors, will allow identifying the relationship between the quality of public authorities and management and the state of the environment in the regions. A number of calculated indicators proposed by the authors can be applied within the region (at the level of municipalities) in the development of measures provided for by national projects for many areas of strategic development. In addition, the work focuses on increasing the professionalism of government and municipal employee.

Keywords: Civil service effectiveness estimation. Rating. Regional development indicators. Estimation criterion.

Resumen

El artículo discute los problemas de la estimación de la efectividad de los servicios municipales y civiles estatales a nivel regional. Comparando los principales indicadores del desarrollo socioeconómico de la República de Tartaristán y otras regiones del Distrito Federal Privolzhsky y utilizando los indicadores estimados propuestos, los autores intentan rastrear la relación entre estos indicadores y la eficiencia y eficacia de las autoridades públicas y la gestión en estas regiones. Las versiones formadas de las calificaciones de las regiones del Distrito Federal Privolzhsky, según los autores, permitirán identificar la relación entre la calidad de las autoridades públicas y la gestión y el estado del medio ambiente en las regiones. Una serie de indicadores calculados propuestos por los autores se pueden aplicar dentro de la región (a nivel de municipios) en el desarrollo de las medidas previstas por los proyectos nacionales para muchas áreas de desarrollo estratégico. Además, el trabajo se enfoca en incrementar la profesionalidad de los empleados gubernamentales y municipales.

Palabras-clave: Estimación de la efectividad del servicio civil. Clasificación. Indicadores de desarrollo regional. Criterio de estimación.