

УДК 334

STATE REGULATORY FUNCTIONS IN DEVELOPING TOURISM INDUSTRY IN RUSSIA

Ribokene E.V.,

*PhD in Economics, Associate Professor, Management Faculty,
e-mail: eribokene@miiv.ru,
Moscow Witte University,*

Flerov O.V.,

*PhD in Pedagogy,
Psychology, Pedagogy and Socio-Humanitarian Disciplines Department,
e-mail: olegflyoroff@yandex.ru,
Moscow Witte University*

The article proves the need for a thorough analysis and reconsidering of new forms and principles of interaction between Executive authorities at different levels and organizations working in tourism. It also presents a detailed activity analysis of this structure that allows us to identify the peculiarities of its functioning. Structural analysis of Federal Tourism Agency suggests that the priorities of tourism development are reflected only in the hotel industry. Besides in tourism there is no authority with control and supervision functions. Thus state management is not implemented for regulatory tasks and decisions.

Keywords: multiplicative effect, tourism legislation, tourism and recreation complex, tourism infrastructure, cultural tourism, consumer, inbound tourism, domestic tourism, interbranch coordination

К ВОПРОСУ О ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОМ РЕГУЛИРОВАНИИ ТУРИЗМА В РОССИИ

Рибокене Елена Владимировна,

*канд. экон. наук, доцент, декан факультета управления,
e-mail: eribokene@miiv.ru,
Московский университет им. С.Ю. Витте, г. Москва,*

Флёров Олег Владиславович,

*канд. пед. наук, заместитель заведующего кафедрой психологии, педагогики
и социально-гуманитарных дисциплин,
e-mail: olegflyoroff@yandex.ru,
Московский университет им. С.Ю. Витте, г. Москва*

В статье обосновывается необходимость подробного анализа и осмысления форм и принципов взаимодействия органов исполнительной власти различных уровней и организаций, работающих в сфере туризма. В ней также представлен детальный анализ данной деятельности данной структуры, который позволяет определить особенности ее функционирования. Структурный анализ Федерального агентства по туризму предполагает, что приоритеты его развитие реализуются только в гостиничной индустрии. Помимо этого не существует исполнительного органа с функциями контроля и надзора. Таким образом, государственное управление в данной сфере не применяется для решения задач регулирования.

Ключевые слова: мультипликативный эффект, законодательство в туризме, туристско-рекреационный комплекс, туристическая инфраструктура, культурный туризм, потребитель, въездной туризм, выездной туризм, межотраслевое взаимодействие

DOI 10.21777/2500-2112-2019-1-86-90

High rhythms of legal and economic social relationships require the state's regulating them. Tourism in all its forms is currently considered one of the promising economic branches. It has an impressive proven effect: a one-day income received from one tourist exceeds the sum spent by them during the stay 1,2-4 times. It motivates the necessity of analysis and reconsidering new forms and principles of state executive authorities interacting on different levels and their interaction with tourism organizations as well.

It is also dictated by practical objectives of working out laws, legal acts and other documents aimed at proving the competence and structure of organizations that manage tourism and perfecting forms and methods of their business that could meet present-day social requirements [4, 5].

The current management system that includes federal state authorities and regional authorities with particular competences in this sphere does not provide a complex approach to priority objectives in tourism.

This approach should be based on principles of distributing state authorities' competences that could have evident reflection of such functions as state planning and programming, effective managing state property and other resources, legal regulation, stimulating and control. Such an approach contributes to full implementation of universal policy that should be fulfilled by executive authorities under coordination of government.

We have to state that tourism legislature does not always meet present-day requirements. Current principles of state management are mostly out of date and not always applied in practice. State authorities bear prevalingly representative and advertising functions. It prevents them from duly participating in social relationships taking place in tourism.

Current federal executive power structure counts dozens of departments and subordinate establishments, which blurs the scope of responsibility of its elements and does not make possible to wholly implement program approach to developing tourism, which is key in the conception of federal program "National and Foreign Tourism in the Russian Federation (2011-2018)".

Such a state of affairs also prevents from productive interdepartmental coordination of executive bodies at all levels, subjects of tourist business and other parties involved in the process. It also lays obstacles to inter-budget relationships and provokes precedents of dubbing functions that makes unnecessary administrative barriers.

Perfecting the legal system in tourism as a complex institution of administrative, civil and budget law will help this branch develop in definite legal framework.

Lacking state support and regulation of tourism in the nearest future in Russia may lead to further decrease in competitiveness of our tourist product both in global and domestic markets (including for the reason of infrastructure obsolescence); decrease in numbers of inbound and outbound tourists. The latter entails decrease in tax and other budget incomes and employment in tourism and adjacent branches, in life-level of population leading to social strain; increase in outbound tourism worsening country's balance of payment.

All mentioned above motivates an objective necessity of reflecting tourism issues in federal law, which would help use resources more rationally and get a better effect of their being used. Absence of this leads to regional discoordination of tourism development, disunion of federal executive, regional executive and self-governing bodies, reducing their responsibility and insystematism in coping with tasks arising in this sphere. This also puts budget funds at risk of being dispersed and/or bringing in off-budget funds for solving tourism issues [1].

In this case state policy of developing country's recreational complex may come down solely to perfecting legal norms of its functioning, which would ensure only local results in making premises of full using recreational resources.

Tourism is a peculiar phenomenon requiring good knowledge and consideration of natural, climatic, historic, cultural and economic conditions as well as customs and traditions, infrastructure. For this reason development of tourism is possible under parallel federal and municipal management with the federal policy dominating. Thus systematic approach implies considering the competence of governing bodies at all levels [6, 7].

In Russia we can see a permanent change of federal executive authorities implementing state policy, interbranch and interregional coordination in tourism.

Over recent decades our country has seen about a dozen reformations of the federal executive authority responsible for tourism development. Currently this development is characterized by deep and ambiguous changes in its organizational structure, in the vector as well as in quantitative and qualitative parameters.

Researching tourism state management implies considering Russia's federal structure, which means the state having autonomous territorial units with their own managing authorities and differentiation between federal and regional objectives. Regional authorities should exercise immediate managing functions whereas federal ones should have supervising and planning competences. Such differentiation excludes unreasonable dubbing of functions and gives a basis for invariable question solving.

Comparative analysis of legal regional acts allows us to distinguish the following groups of their functions in tourism management.

1. Sharing, managing and using with the Russian Federation the land in resort territories.
2. Planning and coordination of tourism development.
3. Implementing scientific and technological policy in tourism.
4. Ensuring safety on region's territory.
5. Informative functions.

We can also distinguish the following peculiarities of regional executive authorities in tourism regulation.

Firstly the heads of regional executive power form the system of executive authorities implementing state management in tourism. However delegating such competences means dubbing functions in many regions. Consequently working out legal basis of these authorities requires more precise differentiation of competences. Secondly state regulation of general questions in tourism should be fulfilled by federal executive authorities.

Analysing the structure of regional executive authorities we can distinguish the following groups of them.

1. Branch departments having directly to do with tourism matters. They include tourism departments, recreational and resort departments, hospitality departments.
2. Functional departments that exercise specific functions not connected with a definite tourism branch. They include advertising and informational departments, territory-development departments, legal, economic and investment departments.

Tourism committees consider tourism vector in a particular region. Thus branch direction of different regions' authorities does not coincide. Besides it should be mentioned that in certain regions structures with specific tourism competence belong to authorities with more general functions, for instance, economic ones.

It should be admitted that such current structure could be relevant. However without definite federal policy in tourism these authorities do not take leading positions among socio-economic executive bodies even in the regions where tourism is booming. The issues of tourism development often come down to those of infrastructure [2].

The key problem in tourism management is absence of up-to-date legislature meeting the economic state of the branch. In this absence regions autonomously set the goals and objectives for the competent bodies to solve. State management fulfilled by them results in acts or decrees by the heads of regional executive power.

Tourism as a complex economic sphere requires a complex management approach. It logically leads to the necessity for opening departments that would elaborate regional tourism strategy basing not only the current practice but on new types of tourism as well [8].

Another essential issue is shortage of tourism professionals in the management structure. A body consisting of employees with general competences will implement the most general approach. This issue is directly connected with training professionals in tourism educational establishments. It should be mentioned that currently their level is not high enough.

As tourism immediately positively and negatively influences definite territories it demands attention of local governing authorities[3]. Every populated territory should be locally governed as only such an approach makes possible to detect population's needs, solve definite questions and take emergency measures.

According to the Federal Law № 131 "General principles of organizing local governing" by the latter such a form of power is meant that ensures population's autonomous and fully responsible solving questions through the local bodies basing on population's interests and historical and other local traditions as well.

Current legislature make possible to distinguish the following features of local self-governing.

1. A form of implementing power.
2. Ensures solving local issues.
3. Population's autonomy and responsibility in decision-making.
4. Considering historic and other local traditions.

5. Limits of self-governing are set by Constitution, federal and regional laws.

The competences of local government can be divided into two groups.

1. Competences of solving local issues.

2. Particular state competences.

The peculiarity of local governing of tourism consists in its bearing such functions as implementing regional programs (programmed expending funds given and compiling reports of the programs implemented for regional governing bodies), direct interaction with entrepreneurship.

There are also the following functions fixed.

1. Working out legal basis of tourism.

2. Making forecasts, development projects for a certain territory, compiling reports.

3. Registering subjects providing tourism services.

4. Promotion of the territorial unit in tourism market.

All this leads to the conclusion about the necessity of fixing tourism competences of local self-governing bodies on federal level.

Currently the structure of Russian tourism management has a mixed character. However branch management principles as well as their connection with territorial ones and the necessity of developing cultural tourism make combining the notions of managing tourism and budget culture worthy of attention. Nevertheless currently this idea is used only with Parliamentary Culture and Tourism Committee. Branch management principle implies that combining these notions under the aegis of one managing subject presents a great interest for cultural tourism. As researching this tourism primely means outbound and inbound tourism we should pay attention to the issue of making administrative units, within which it could be possible to take certain measures contributing to complex development of cultural tourism in them.

Tourism zonation of this kind will serve as a basis of optimal functional and spatial structure of a region. Regional transport and hospitality development should be counted as well. Taking into account this situation we can see an emerging necessity of working out a complex approach to tourism development. It would optimize income from tourism and adjacent branches.

We have to state that in Russia with its high outbound and inbound tourism potential there is no definite idea of state's part in developing this sphere. Managing functions in this branch are dispersed among a big number of executive authorities [4].

Apart from the mentioned competent governing authorities it is worth mentioning such a specializing executive organ as Russian Federal Tourism Agency with interbranch management as its activity is connected with various economic branches.

Russian Government's decree from 31.12.04 № 901 enacts "Act about Russian Federal Tourism Agency". The detailed activity-analysis of this structure allows us to come to a number of conclusions about the specificity of its functioning.

Firstly, this analysis makes possible to state that tourism development priorities are reflected only in hospitality and accommodation sphere. Other tourism branches are developed on to a lesser extent or remain undeveloped at all.

Secondly, in tourism there is no executive body with control and supervision functions i.e. state management is not implemented in the aspects of control of following legal set norms.

Thirdly, among the functions assigned to Russian Federal Tourism Agency only two of them are really exercised: informational promotion of tourism and interaction with foreign tourism operators.

Fourthly, state management in tourism on Russian Federal Tourism Agency's part needs this body's functions to be diversified for optimizing its work.

To sum up the findings of the research done we can state the following. Currently in Russia there is a practically formed multifunctional structure of tourism management on federal level with a wide range of competences. However issues connected with working out effective mechanisms of relationships of all economic subjects are gaining topicality. To these subjects belong the following: regional governing authorities, municipal authorities, public sector, business-structures and consumers (tourists). The result of such interaction can be growing role of tourism and as a consequence, increasing its share in state budget, which is important in the current difficult socio-economic situation.

Список литературы

1. *Аверин А.В.* Внутренний контроль и мониторинг качества консультационных услуг в системе обеспечения эффективности государственной поддержки субъектов малого и среднего предпринимательства / А.В. Аверин, В.В. Григорьева, Д.В. Петухов // Вестник Университета (Государственный университет управления). – 2015. – № 5. – С. 91–95.
2. *Аверин А.В., Барт Т.В.* Инструменты внутреннего контроля и мониторинга качества государственных услуг в сфере поддержки субъектов малого и среднего предпринимательства г. Москвы // Вестник Ульяновского государственного технического университета. – 2015. – № 2 (70). – С. 71–73.
3. *Аверин А.В.* Стандартизация и регламентация государственных услуг: российский и зарубежный опыт // Экономика и предпринимательство. – 2015. – № 10-1 (63). – С. 721–727.
4. *Гусев Д.А.* Информационное общество и цифровая экономика в полемике между детерминизмом и индетерминизмом как мировоззренческими моделями // Актуальные проблемы современного общества и пути их решения в условиях перехода к цифровой экономике. – 2018. – С. 364–372.
5. *Михопаров Н.И.* Специфика развития туризма в современной России // Современные проблемы социальной работы. – 2016. – Т. 3. – № 4. – С. 22–29.
6. *Руденко Ю.С.* Современное общество как коммуникативная среда: междисциплинарные аспекты / Ю.С. Руденко, Е.А. Алямкина, О.В. Флеров [и др.] – М.: МУИВ, 2018. – 231 с.
7. *Рукомойникова В.П., Полухина А.Н.* Развитие кластерного подхода в туризме // Журнал прикладной инженерной науки. – 2016. – Т. 14. – № 1. – С. 61–67.
8. *Федотенко Т.С.* Развитие международного туризма в России // Регулирование устойчивого развития регионов. – 2016. – С. 87–90.

References

1. *Averin A.V.* Internal controlling and monitoring quality of consulting service in the system of ensuring efficiency of SME state support / A.V. Averin, V.V. Grigorieva, D.V. Petukhov // State Management University bulletin. – 2015. – №5. – P. 91–95.
2. *Averin A.V., Bart T.V.* Instruments of internal controlling and monitoring quality of state service in the system of Moscow SME support // Ulyanovsk Technological University Bulletin. – 2015. – № 2 (70). – P. 71–73.
3. *Averin A.V.* Standardization and reglamentation of state service in Russia and abroad // Economy and entrepreneurship. – 2015. – № 10-1 (63). – P. 721–727.
4. *Gusev D.A.* Informational society and digital economy in discussion of determinism and indeterminism as world-view models // Topical issues of modern society and ways of their solution under transition to digital economy. 2018. P. 364-372.
5. *Mikhoparov N.I.* The specificity of development of tourism in modern Russia // Contemporary Problems of Social Work. – 2016. – V. 2. – № 4 (8). – P. 22–29.
6. *Rudenko Y.S.* Et al. Modern society as a communication medium: interdisciplinary aspects / Y.S. Rudenko, E.A. Alyamkina, O.V. Flerov. Moscow Witte University, 2018. 231 p.
7. *Rukomoinikova V.P., Polukhina A.N.* Development of cluster approach in tourism // Journal of Applied Engineering Science. 2016. V. 14. № 1. P. 61-67.
8. *Fedotenko T.S.* Development of international tourism in Russia // Regulation of regional sustainable development. – 2016. – P. 87–90.