



Retrospective Analysis of the Conceptual Model of Economic Management in Sub-regional Structures

**Inna L. Litvinenko¹, Svetlana V. Lobova², Lira K. Gurieva³, Svetlana S. Kamberdiyeva⁴,
Alexandr A. Mokrushin^{5*}**

¹Moscow State University of Humanities and Economics, Moscow, Russian Federation, ²Altai State University, Barnaul, Russian Federation, ³Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation (Vladikavkaz Branch), Vladikavkaz, Russian Federation, ⁴North-Caucasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy (State Technological University), Vladikavkaz, Russian Federation, ⁵Adyge State University, Maykop, Russian Federation. *Email: mokrushin_alex@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

Modern Russian model of building a system of economic management sub-localities based on the provisions of the Federal Law No 131-FZ of 06.10.2003 “On general principles of local self-government in the Russian Federation.” Terms and conditions of formation of the system of local government in Russia since the beginning of the reform of its political system and establishment of a model of mutual relations of the state and local levels of government are associated with a rigid opposition rival power elite. On the basis of generalization of foreign practice of granting local governments a certain jurisdiction may be concluded that most of the issues at the local level, if we abstract from their purely legal understanding, are public in nature. Based on the research practice of interaction of bodies of state power and local self-government bodies authors consider it possible to state that the municipal authority has a number of features inherent in the government: A distinct institutionalized character; time continuity, flexibility, universality; on the basis of laws and other regulations; implementation in a particular area in relation to all individuals within its entities; the possibility of using funds of legitimate violence; the establishment and collection of taxes; independent budgeting.

Keywords: Region, Economic Management Model, Sub-regional Structures

JEL Classifications: P5, R10, R58

1. INTRODUCTION

Models of economic management sub-regional localities include the structure and management hierarchy; intra-municipal communication; municipal finance and industrial organization; communication with the outside world; personnel policy; guarantees for municipal social standard of quality of life; system of selection and recruitment on a competitive and contractual basis of professional teams of municipal managers (Belokrylova, 2009).

Analysis of a large number of foreign and Russian publications on the system of local government has allowed to consolidate the information in this area and carry out an attempt to systematize

the existing models of economic management organization of sub-regional localities.

A systematic approach to the analysis of socio-economic and environmental problems of regional development in modern conditions. In the course of the study were used methods of historical-genetic, comparative, structural and functional analysis. In addition, we apply subject-object, economics and statistics and institutional approaches.

The theoretical significance of the study is to clarify the concept and definition of the economic supplement “sub-regional locality” category; more research exploring organizational schemes of territorial management using the synergy effect of sub-regional

association of organizations and territories, the adjustment mechanisms of business activity in line with the modern imperatives of modernization of the Russian economy.

2. DISCUSSIONS

Local representative bodies, following the Anglo-Saxon model, the formal act as autonomously acting within the powers granted to them, and almost do not obey the higher authorities. State control is carried out indirectly, i.e. through the courts and the central ministries and agencies. In recent years in the UK are carried out measures to move towards a one-tier system of local government.

Continental model, which is often called the French (the beginning of this variant of the local self-government laid down in France), has a special character. It is followed by the majority of French-speaking countries, as well as a number of European countries. The model is based on a combination of direct state control in the field and local government. Its specificity is rooted in the history of France, as the main pillar of royal power were authorized representatives of the monarch, and not the local authorities - the commune. Municipal reforms carried out in France and the UK, to a certain extent alleviated differences between the two systems of local government, not eliminating them, however, completely.

The process of organizing communities in federal Germany has several approaches. Magistrate is that the executive power in the community made a collective body - the magistrate. Magistrate consists of a chairman (the mayor), his deputies and the members elected by the representative body of the community. Burgomistersky approach is characterized by the fact that the representative and the executive body is one and the same person - the mayor. Local issues decide mayor. In the South-German approach, the main body of the community is the Lord Mayor, who is elected by the citizens. He is the chairman of the community assembly and executes the current function.

In modern German state delegates part of its functions to local authorities. Federation and the land - are not the only subjects of public administration. Communities and districts fulfill their function as either government institutions or on behalf of the State within their delegated functions.

Several Scandinavian apart is the system of local government, but the long-term impact significantly on the French system of Scandinavian countries, carried out both directly and through the Danish state. In Denmark, the government formed the tradition that unites the country with the Scandinavian countries: The development of community self-government, often relying on direct democracy. Since these are present in a greater extent and in Sweden and Norway.

In the US, local almost completely independent within their areas, many of the powers and activities delegated to the local authorities and are carried out without any interference. Moreover, the activities of local authorities are governed exclusively by the laws of the state:

The federal government in relationship management, state and local government practically does not intervene since 1868.

Analysis of the formation of management of development of economic systems in transition economies reveals the subsequent problems that need to be taken into account in improving the system of economic management sub-regional localities of Russia.

Local self-government in Russia in one form or another existed throughout the history of the country, as well as the issue of autonomy and self-organization of local bodies of power. This important fact is that, as at present, the government deliberately went for the revival of government in times of crisis, public authorities, forces inevitable need for reform (Korablev, 2009).

On the formation of Russian statehood for the first time we can say since the year 862, when the Prince of Novgorod Oleg conquered Kiev and freed the land of northerners and Radimichi from Khazar tribute. It was formed by the Kiev-Novgorod principality, inhabited by various Slavic tribes, who carried the main threat educated on their territory. It is for this reason that the original whole state power is exercised directly to the prince and his retinue (Zamaletdinov et al., 2014; Pyzhikova, 2003).

Joining the neighboring Slavic tribes to the Kiev-Novgorod state in the long term carried a possibility of conflict between the central unit and the powerful local elite. Accepted princely power solution to this problem marks the first attempt to establish the distribution of power between central and local nobility in order to stabilize relations in the new state (Dobrynin, 2005; Khairullina and Karabulatova, 2014).

Such relations were established between the center and the regions, which suits both parties concerned. The central authorities, going to limit his powers, has lost some of its power mechanisms, but acquired, at the same time, the state integrity and, more importantly, social stability on the ground. Local authorities, in turn, under the auspices of the central government, is able not only independently and solve their immediate problems, but also to some extent to maintain its savagery. In our opinion, this fact is evidence that at the very beginning of the formation of the old Russian state there is a certain order in the relations between the central office and individual local entities (Liubavsky, 2000).

According to other historians and jurists, the count of local government experience can start from the reign of Ivan IV. The classic examples of self-managed urban communities of ancient Russia were Novgorod and Pskov. Novgorod and Pskov developed, in their opinion, the most stable form of the authorized people's assembly. According to the adopted at the time of ratification, it establishes a certain composition of the Chamber for the recognition. However, the initiators of the convening of the Chamber could act as a nation as a whole, the princes, and separate individuals.

Public initiative at the level of local structures, up to the XVII century. It has not been normalized in law and in fact developed on the basis of folk custom, established traditions.

A significant contribution to the development of local government introduced a decree of Ivan IV, entitled “Czarist sentence about feeding and about the services” of summer 7064 (1555-1556 gg). It actually was about the conduct of the Zemstvo reform. It was canceled feeding, which contributed to the widespread establishment land authorities. The counties and townships, where there was no landlordism and palace peasants and townspeople were given the right to choose “favorite heads” (elders) and “the best people” - Land judges barmen. Paperwork led election clerk. In his work relied on the mayor elected by the peasant community - hundredth, tenths, fifties. All elective land elected for an indefinite period, but may be re-elected. Later, annual elections were introduced.

In the XVII century, in the Russian State took functional changes in the system of government, which could not but affect the structure and functioning of local government. Institute was introduced as the governor of the main unit of local government. In 1625, in 146 cities, counties appear to the governors appointed by the discharge order and approved by the king. As a rule, they are appointed for a term of up to 3 years, and for his services given cash salaries and estates. In large cities were several commanders.

In the XVII century, in most areas of Russia, there were two forms of “self-government” - “lip” and “sheriff.” Each district - “lip” - ruled “labial headman” and his assistants - “kissing.” They were administered by jail and prison ministers, butchers, elected by the population of hundredth and tenths. Free people chose “labial headman” of nobles and knights, barmen - taxpaying people of peasants or townspeople.

In the 20-30s XVII. Formed type of local clerk institutions, known as provincial huts (clerks, I will go). The labial and rural institutions have proliferated mainly in the cities of the European part of Russia.

Significant experience of local government reform has been gained during the reign of Peter I. Changes in local government have been associated primarily with the reform of the entire administrative-territorial structure of Russia. The largest element of administrative reform was the creation of provinces: December 18, 1708 the king issued a decree “On the establishment of provinces and cities of the painting to him.”

Russia was divided into 8 provinces (led by the governors): Moscow, Ingermanland (in 1710 renamed to St. Petersburg), Kiev, Smolensk. Arkhangelogorod (later - Arkhangelsk), Kazan, Azov, Siberian. In 1711 the provinces were 9, and in 1714 were 11 (added Astrakhan, Nizhny Novgorod and Riga). Provinces were governed by governors appointed by the King, the Governor General.

Provinces consisted of the provincial town (administrative center) and attributed to him the cities. Each city had its own county, i.e., the creation of provinces not abolished counties and united them around a few centers. In 1719-1720 gg. Peter I spent the second administrative reform. Existed at that time 11 provinces were divided into 45 provinces (later - 50), which became the

basic units of the provinces. Counties united in the province, the province - in the province.

In 1723-1724 gg. was reformed urban birth control and established elected caste-communal institutions of municipal government, the magistrates received the title. In Moscow, it created a new local government - Burmistersk Chamber, soon renamed the town hall. It consisted of elected at election meetings bailiffs.

In other cities of Russia were established Zemstvo hut with elected bailiffs (subordinated to the City Hall, not governor), which, as mentioned in the documents “were in charge of the affairs of all sorts between tradespeople and trade, controlled state taxes and municipal levies,” etc.

However, the principle of formation of the estates of local authorities and strengthen supervision over their activities by public authorities in connection with the expansion of the state apparatus and its interference in the affairs of the city testified about the ongoing process of limiting and truncation prerogatives of municipal government.

By 1727 Russia was divided into 14 provinces, 47 provinces and 250 districts. The sole management body in the province was governor in the provinces and districts - the governor. The new system of local government was assigned the instruction of 12 September 1728, which strengthened the power of the governor and the governors subordinate to the district governor provincial, and the governor - which communicate with the central agencies. The governors and the governors carry out their functions through the Chancery, and since 1763 each governor to promote military command was given by the laws. Since the beginning of the 60s, in the subordination of the governors and the governors and the chief of police came. Restored in 1743, too, the town hall and magistrates were subordinate governors and magistrates.

In November 1775 it was published “The facility to control provinces of the Russian Empire.” In the introductory part of this document it pointed out that the need for a new reformation due to the fact that the existing provinces are extensive in size, perfect control of the provincial structure.

Under Catherine II the number of provinces was increased to 51. The city and the province of large regions (they included two provinces) now leads the major dignitaries and governors accountable to the queen. They are endowed with, as a rule, with extraordinary powers. Provinces were governed by governors appointed by the Senate, and the provincial government (the latter, as the Landrat were actually subordinate to the governors).

Of special interest is another document - “Charter to the rights and benefits of cities of the Russian Empire,” adopted by Catherine II in 1785 “Charter to the rights and benefits of cities of the Russian Empire” 1785 establishes the rights and privileges of cities and establishes the right of ownership of the city belonging to him “the land, orchards, fields, grazing, grasslands, rivers, fishing, forests, trees, shrubs, empty seats, windmills and watermills”

Cities were able to have a school, mills, taverns, inns, restaurants, organize fairs, set the place and time to trade. Citizens had to bear the fixed “burdens,” i.e., duties and fees that local authorities cannot increase without government permission. From taxes and services fully exempted nobles, military and civilian officials.

People the right to protect a policeman magistrate who watched, that it is not charged to the new levies and taxes without approval. The magistrate asked for the needs of the city to higher institutions.

Elections in general municipal duma held once in 3 years. Total Duma shall elect from among its members six-votes thought that led direct work of running a current city affairs. The structure of this institution included a mayor and six vowels - one from each category of “municipal society.” Six-votes thought was not only the executive authority at the General thought. Her conduct was subject to the same range of issues as to the general council. The difference was only in the fact that the latter was going to consider the more complex issues, and the first - for everyday conduct of current affairs.

In addition to general and six-votes regulations 1785 installed a third body - A collection of “municipal society.” It can involve all members of the “municipal society” but the right to vote and passive suffrage had only reached 25 years of age and possessed capital, the interest on which brought revenue of not <50 rubles. The competence of this meeting included:

- Election of the mayor and aldermen, juror’s provincial magistrate and conscientious court chiefs and deputies for the preparation of a policeman narrow-minded book;
- Presentation of the governor their views on the needs of the city;
- Publication of regulations;
- Preparation of responses to the proposals of the governor.

However, in the province of realization of city regulations faced with many difficulties, and had to introduce a simplified self-government. Instead of three bodies - assembly “municipal society,” and the general and six-votes Duma - turned out just two: Direct assembly of all citizens and a small elected council of representatives of different groups of the urban population for the common affairs.

The most significant reform changes were made in the early 60s of XIX, when, shortly after the abolition of serfdom, Alexander II signed a decree of the Governing senate on the introduction with effect from 1 January 1864 the regulation on land institutions.

The land (1864) and the city (1870) reforms were aimed at decentralization and development of local self-government began in Russia. At the heart of the reform were the two ideas. The first - the election of the authorities: All local authorities elected and controlled by the voters. In addition, these bodies are under the control of representative government, and the two branches of government controlled by law. Lands were supporters of the government, to maintain law and stability in society. The second idea: The local government had a real financial basis for its activities. In the XIX century. up to 60% of all payments collected

from areas remained at the disposal of the lands, i.e., the cities and counties, and 20% was spent in the state treasury and the province (Mouromtsev et al., 2014).

The jurisdiction of the lands was asset management, capital, cash taxes and charitable institutions Zemstvos, the device and the contents land buildings, communications, food security, the development of local trade and industry, welfare of public education and health care, the military and civil administration. “Land position” (1864) rural and urban power was separated from the state (Glazunova, 2009).

According to the 1865-1867 biennium, in 29 provinces (in those where it was introduced by the district council) landlords, nobles and officials among the county “vowels” were about 42%, farmers - more than 38%, the merchants - in excess of 10%, representatives of other classes - about 10%.

In one of the first provinces in which Zemstvos immediately after the adoption of the “Regulation” started their activities were Samara, Penza, Kostroma, Novgorod, Kherson, Pskov, Kursk, Yaroslavl, Poltava, Moscow, Kazan, St. Petersburg, Ryazan, Voronezh, Kaluga, Nizhny Novgorod and Tambov.

Lands county agencies involved Zemstvo assembly and county council if they were held with institutions. Viability Zemstvos ensured its two fundamental principles: Self-management and self-financing.

Municipality lands manifested itself in many ways: In the election of the governing bodies, in the formation of management structures, determining the main directions of its activity, the selection and training of specialists, the formation and distribution of the local budget.

During the development of local government in pre-revolutionary Russia, it is possible to identify the main principles that are characteristic of the Russian school of economic management sub-regions:

- The principle of diversity of the organization of local self-government, which is associated with the peculiarities of the socio-economic development of the territory of the Russian Empire, with significant differences of cultural and national traditions;
- The principle of non-participation (ban) local authorities in an active political life, because it was believed that the main task of local authorities was to meet the priority needs of the population;
- The principle of distribution of resources between levels of government (distinction not built on the principle of adequacy, and on the principle of high efficiency of use of their data level);
- The principle of transfer to local authorities regarding the empowerment in the economic and business sphere (of course, while maintaining the power center of reference). The reasons for this were several: The vast territory of the empire; and the rapid development in the second half of the XIX and early XX century. Urban and land education, health and culture.

After the October Revolution began widespread elimination of lands, which ended in the summer of 1918. In the country there is such a system of government, in which all representative bodies were part of a unified system of state power.

The October revolution has brought radical changes in the formation of the local government system and its structure. In October 1917, proceed over 1430 workers' councils, soldiers' deputies and peasants' deputies and more than 450 of the councils of peasants' deputies. After the consolidation of the councils in provincial and district centers, the latter proceeded to the organization of the councils in the townships and villages.

Analyzing the legislation of that period, we can distinguish three characteristic features inherent in the local councils. Firstly, local councils were the bodies of power and administration, acting within the boundaries of existing administrative areas then. Secondly, there was an organizational relationship of subordination and vertically. Finally, in determining the competence and scope of powers of local councils, established their independence in dealing with local issues, but their activities are permitted only in accordance with the decisions of the central government and parent councils.

The Constitution of the RSFSR in 1918 of local councils' objectives regarding economic management were determined as follows:

- The enforcement of decisions of the supreme bodies of the soviet power;
- To take all measures to raise the territory economically;
- The resolution of all matters of a purely local (for the area) value.

All income and expenses of the local Soviets were placed under central control.

At the end of 1919 local governments regardless of size (province, county, township, town, village) have been identified. They were called communes. The Boards of special bodies have been established to guide the "communal services." In April 1920, the central regulatory body was created - General Directorate of Public Utilities.

Independent economic activity of the Soviets began the autumn of 1924 with the selection of independent municipal budgets. With the development of commodity-money relations in the local Soviets appear means to form their own budgets. They are the basis of the income from the newly restored taxes, fees for housing and other public services.

In general, the period of the Council's activities were characterized by:

- Some decentralization of a single hierarchical soviet system, the redistribution of prerogatives toward a strengthening of the rights and powers of its lower levels;
- The expansion of the economic powers of local councils in the face of their executive bodies due to the absorption of the local territorial bodies, central government bodies, the formation of special bodies of municipal management;

- The formation of an independent financial and material resources of local Councils, the restoration of the system of taxation in a resuscitation of commodity-money relations.

At 60-80 of the XX century. the USSR was adopted many resolutions on the problems of improving local governance. This decision of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On improving the activity of the councils and strengthening their ties with the masses" (1957), "On the improvement of the work of village and settlement councils" (1967), "On measures to further improve the work of the district and urban councils" (1971), the Central Committee of the CPSU, the presidium of the USSR supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers "On further enhancing the role of councils in economic development" (1981) and others.

But, as historians say, these innovations do not give the desired result: The role played by the command-administrative system. The fact that the setting in the next act of the new regulations, the Council, the center did not provide them with material, organizational and structural arrangements, and these innovations are doomed to pretentiousness.

Local self-government system in the USSR, including the Russian Federation in the 80s. XX century. It should lead to its territory of economic construction; approve plans for economic development and the local budget; provide guidance subordinate state bodies, enterprises, institutions and organizations.

Within the limits of their authority local councils were to provide a comprehensive economic and social development in their territories; exercise control over compliance with legislation in this area located by enterprises, institutions and organizations subordinate to higher; coordinate and monitor their activities in the field of land use, construction, use of labor resources, the production of consumer goods.

The Soviet model of organization of local authorities has been recently widespread in the countries of the world socialist system, as well as in some developing countries. The main features of this model are: Undivided representative bodies, the rigid centralization of the system of representative and executive bodies, the hierarchical subordination of all its units. Now in one form or another, it takes place in a few countries that have retained a socialist orientation (China, Cuba), as well as in some states of the former Soviet Union, including the Republic of Belarus.

Note to self-problems in our country has increased in the second half of the 80s, when it was recognized that the transition from administrative to predominantly economic methods of management. The first practical step in this direction was the adoption of 9 April 1990 of the USSR Law "On general principles of local self-government and the local economy in the USSR."

Pursuant to the system of local government included local councils, bodies of territorial public self-government of the population (councils and committees of districts, house, street, block, village committees and other bodies), as well as local referenda, meetings,

gatherings of citizens, other forms of direct democracy. The primary territorial level of local self-governance acknowledged the village council, the village (neighborhood), city (district in the city). The law granted to Union and autonomous republics the right to determine other levels (based on the local conditions).

Constitutional recognition of local government as a control, separated from the public authorities, in the Russian legislation has been gradual.

With the reform of May 24, 1991 to replace the executive committees of local Soviets came to the local administration, which was accountable to the local councils and the higher executive and administrative bodies. But the fundamental innovation was the fact that the local administration is no longer the authority of the local Council, in contrast to the former executive committees, that although they were in fact independent of the Soviets, but legally considered to be their executive and administrative bodies.

RSFSR law dated July 6, 1991 "on local self-government in the RSFSR" including the local administration in the system of local self-government, and called their representative bodies (Article 1, Part 1) (Shkurkin et al., 2015).

The law provided for division of functions between the representative and executive bodies. Local Council was designated as the authority, and the local administration - as a governing body. At the same time, it intensified the independence of the latter. And instead of the local executive council as a collective body committee, subordinate and accountable to the Council, established the local government under the leadership of the head of administration sole elected by the people. To set their own competence administration, which weakened its responsibility to the higher executive and administrative bodies and local councils. Local Council proclaimed as the main body of the local government, he has a lot of opportunities to influence the administration (in special cases even to remove from office the head of the administration), but in fact the administration has received considerable independence.

Formation and establishment of local self-government in the required joint efforts of new municipalities in order to create favorable conditions for their functioning and development. During this period, there are state and federal associations, unions, associations of local governments. One of the first March 13, 1991 The Union of Russian cities and regional entities AWG was established.

A new stage in the formation and development of Russian local government, really modern municipal management to deal with the Russian experience and effective foreign practice, started in the country in 1993 by the Decree of 26 October 1993 approved the regulation on principles of local self-government in the Russian Federation for the period phased constitutional reform.

The process of municipal reform in Russia in the late XX - early XXI centuries. It can be divided into two main phases, referring to

the federal program of state support of local government, approved by the RF Government Decree of 27 December 1995 #1251. In the first stage (during 1996), created the organizational and legal bases of local self-government, on the second (during 1997-1998). Should be real self-government was complicated, i.e. formed its economic foundations.

3. CONCLUSIONS

According to some experts, the main tasks of the first phase of the reform of local government, albeit with some delay, were carried out in principle. Much work has been done not only in the field of legislation, but also in the organizational sphere. However, despite this, the country functioning local government system was still far from its constitutional model. Although the regulatory framework and a set of organizational measures confirm the fact of Russia's transition to an autonomous model of local self-government, a negative factor previous system continues to be the economic dependence of local governments on the higher bodies of state power.

That economic problems are significant, the main constraint on the development of local self-government in Russia. In this regard, the main efforts in the framework of the second stage of municipal reform should be focused primarily on the completion of the formation of the economic foundations of local self-government (Kurbanov et al., 2016), which are the guarantor of the financial and economic autonomy of local authorities. Start this process was initiated the adoption of the Federal Law "On general principles of local government organization in the Russian Federation" in 2003.

Thus, the appearance of the local government in its current form should be considered as a result of the decentralization of power and strengthening of its democratic principles. Federal Law "On General Principles of Local Self-Government in the Russian Federation" for the first time created the basis for the functioning of the autonomous institutions of local self-governance and empowerment of local authorities quite extensive powers.

REFERENCES

- Belokrylova, O. (2009), *Regional Economics and Management*. Moscow: Alfa-M.
- Dobrynin, N. (2005), *Russian Federalism: Formation, a Modern Condition and Prospects*. Novosibirsk: The Science. p40.
- Glazunova, N. (2009), *State and Municipal Management System*. Moscow: Prospect.
- Khairullina, N., Karabulatova, I. (2014), *Bailiff's social portrait*. Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, 19(3), 417-420.
- Korablev, D. (2009), *The history of local government in Russia and the problems of the independence of local authorities*. Municipal Law, 4(48), 61-67.
- Kurbanov, A., Gurieva, L., Novoselov, S., Gorkusha, O., Novoselova, N., Kovalenko, A. (2016), *Features sub-regional localities in the structural-level organization of the economic system*. International Review of Management and Marketing, 6(1S), 287-292.
- Liubavsky, M. (2000), *Lectures on Ancient Russian History until the end of the XVI Century*. Saint Petersburg: Lan. p206.

- Mouromtsev, D., Pshenichny, C., Yakovlev, A. (2014), Semantic and structural delineation of market scenarios by the event bush method. *Decision Support Systems*, 57, 34-41.
- Pyzhikova, A. (2003), *Administrative Territorial Structure of Russia: History and Modernity*. Moscow: Olma-Press. p320.
- Shkurkin, D., Novikov, V., Kobersy, I., Kobersy, I., Borisova, A. (2015), Investigation of the scope of intellectual services in the aspect of virtualization and information economy of modern Russia. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(5S3), 217-224.
- Zamaletdinov, R., Karabulatova, I., Yarmakeev, I., Ermakova, E. (2014), *Linguo-propaedeutics of ethnic conflicts as a basis for stability in complex polyethnic regions*. *Asian Social Science*, 10(20), 164-173.