

Innovative development of the socio-cultural sphere of the region

Alexander Evmenov¹, Irina Blagova¹, Taisiya Sorvina¹, and Svetlana Kuzmina^{1,}*

¹Saint Petersburg State Institute of Film and Television. 13, Pravdy Street, Saint Petersburg, 191119, Russia

Abstract. The paper discusses the features of the socio-cultural sphere in conjunction with the trends of economic development. For example, such as organizational and technological, creating a system to support their development and implementation. The paper presents the factors influencing the appearance of innovations in the socio-cultural sphere. The analysis of innovative activity of regional organizations is carried out. The assessment of existing gaps in innovative development is given. The prerequisites for the enhancement of regional differences in the innovative development of socio-cultural organizations have been identified. Based on the conducted analysis, the problems of innovative development are systematized, associated with globalization, the presence of protectionist barriers, and the underdevelopment of tools for goal-oriented planning of innovative development.

1 Introduction

The development trends of the economic system of the national economy of a country or an individual region are largely determined by the situation in the global economic system, which is also influenced by the processes of globalization, digitalization, and integration. In the modern post-industrial economy, the socio-cultural sphere is a complicated, multi-component industry complex. The assignment of business entities to the socio-cultural sphere is carried out according to the criterion of needs that are satisfied by organizations, which include artistic and aesthetic, creative, entertainment, educational, and informational needs, as well as the needs for self-development and a wide range of social needs of people. The role of these organizations in the formation of innovative systems and the development of institutes of innovative infrastructure and human potential is strategically important for ensuring the sustainable development of the national economy. In conditions of crises and instability, the search for new ways and forms of innovative development in education, health care, culture, sports, business services, etc becomes extremely important.

The appearance of innovations in the social sphere can be promoted by such factors as: aggravation of social problems, which requires new approaches to their solution; the lack of necessary resources for the development of the social sphere, which requires more efficient

*Corresponding author: kuzmina2003@bk.ru

ways of finding them; toughening requirements for the quality of provided services by social institutions; the need to ensure compliance with international quality standards of services [1].

In determining the main directions of the socio-cultural policy of the state, an important role is also played by taking into account the regional characteristics of the innovative development of the industries of the socio-cultural sphere. The formation of instruments and regulatory mechanisms involves identifying not only the main, but also specific channels and determinants of the innovative development of the socio-cultural sphere of the Russian regions with the obligatory identification of particular challenges that modern economic realities pose to the socio-cultural sphere.

The Russian economy has developed a significant variety of regional conditions for innovative development. It is determined, firstly, by objective conditions: the vastness of the territory with the diversity of natural conditions, with different transport accessibility, with uneven distribution of minerals, with different population density and differences in its educational and qualification structure, with uneven distribution of production capacity, research and educational institutions, etc. Secondly, the impact of these objective conditions on the innovation process largely depends on the favorable or unfavorable impact of the prevailing economic and institutional factors.

Analyzing the key factors of the innovative development of the subjects of the national economy as a whole, we can single out such a combination of them as: socio-economic conditions that include basic macroeconomic indicators; educational potential and level of innovative development of the region; scientific and technical potential including the amount of research funding, science personnel, and the effectiveness of research and development in the region; innovation activity, which includes a set of indicators reflecting the innovation activity of organizations, as well as the quality of innovation policy pursued by the regional authorities, including regulatory support, budgetary expenses for science.

2 Research Methodology and Statistics

Transferring the Russian economy to the innovative path of development, indicated in the “Strategy for the innovative development of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2020” [2], without providing for certain performance indicators for the innovation activity by industries of the socio-cultural sphere, offers a set of measures that have a direct impact on their innovative development. In particular, providing for mechanisms aimed at increasing the gross value added of the innovation sector in gross domestic product from 12.7% in 2009 to 17% in 2020. The effectiveness of the strategy can be judged by the final indicator - the innovative activity of organizations for the period from 2011 to 2016 in terms of federal districts, presented below in Table 1.

Table 1. Innovative activity of organizations in Russia for the period from 2011 to 2016 (share of organizations implementing innovations in the total number of surveyed organizations, %).

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
The Russian Federation as a whole	10.4	10.3	10.1	9.9	9.3	8.4
Central Federal District	10.2	10.9	10.7	10.9	10.9	10.3
Northwestern Federal District	11.2	11	10.7	10.3	9.6	8.3
Southern Federal District	6.5	7.4	7.2	7.7	7.5	7.1
North Caucasus Federal District	5.2	6.4	5.9	6.5	4.7	2.9
Volga Federal District	12.7	11.9	11.7	11.4	10.6	9.4
Urals Federal District	11.5	10.6	9.6	8.9	7.9	8.2
Siberian Federal District	8.8	8.5	9.1	8.8	8	6.9
Far Eastern Federal District	11.2	10.8	9.5	8.9	7.2	6.4

Note: compiled according to [2].

As follows from the data presented in Table 1, for the period from 2011 to 2016, in the country, the innovative activity of organizations introducing technological, organizational and marketing innovations decreased, on average, by 2%. Nearly all federal districts (except of the Southern Federal District with a slight increase of 0.6%) have shown a decline in innovative activity over five years. The most noticeable decline (by 3.3%) was observed in the Volga and Urals Federal Districts, as well as in the Far Eastern Federal District, where the organization's innovative activity was almost halved. Thus, stable attention as well as the growth of public investment in support of regional innovative development was not accompanied by an adequate increase in performance, which indicates that there are significant obstacles and problems in activating innovative development at the regional level.

The "Rating of innovative development of the subjects of the Russian Federation" [3] revealed the absence of interrelation between the balance of various aspects of the innovative development of regions and their final position in the rating; the improvement of the quality of innovation policy as the main parameter that allowed the regions to raise their position in the ranking; the problem of the scientific and technical potential of the regions that have worsened their position in the ranking.

In Russia, the territorial distribution of regions with different levels of innovative development can be characterized as uneven. In our opinion, there are several prerequisites for the intensification of regional differences in the innovative development of organizations in the socio-cultural sphere.

The first prerequisite is associated with persistent serious gaps in the general levels of socio-economic development of the Russian regions. The second prerequisite is related to the problem of institutional imbalance in sparsely populated regions, the incomplete reform

of the public sector, and the constant reorganization of regional social and cultural service networks.

The innovative development of social and cultural organizations is significantly affected by the trend of globalization. The degree of internationalization of industries of the socio-cultural sphere is not the same due to the fact that the growth in mutual consumption of individual services in the socio-cultural sphere, capable of overcoming cross-border barriers, such as products of creative industries, is significantly constrained by cultural and language differences. The development of the internationalization of the economic activity of creative industries is also realized through an increase in foreign investment flows in this industry.

In relation to branches of the cultural sphere, it is important to note the fact that there is a significant number of protectionist barriers designed to preserve cultural diversity and protect national culture from unification [4], which in fact leads to increased closure of this industry component from the spread of innovation. In this context, it is important to underline the fact that economic sanctions almost did not affect such components of the socio-cultural sphere as culture, education, business services, as well as humanization in the field of economic relations associated with people, attention to the conditions of their life and work, health, education, etc. [5].

Based on international experience, entrepreneurial activity makes a significant contribution to the innovative development of the region. Technological innovation, globalization and the growing importance of human capital form the environment for the development of entrepreneurial ideas that lead to the prosperity of a dynamic and knowledge-based economic sector [6].

Entrepreneurship is increasingly recognized as an effective resource for solving various social problems [7]. Thus, social entrepreneurship is able to provide answers to the most pressing social problems [8]. Therefore, it can be one of the most effective tools for sustainable regional development.

The presence of social signs in the Russian business environment has been observed for about ten years, while abroad this phenomenon has been observed for decades. The relevance of this phenomenon for the stabilization of socio-economic relations is confirmed by a number of studies that in the modern period are focused on the transition from discussing the term of “social entrepreneurship” to the problems of the goals of its activities, assessing impact results and finding mechanisms for effective functioning among other institutions.

The development of social entrepreneurship abroad is associated with the pre-education of the patterns of activity of traditional volunteer and charitable organizations that have acquired the features of social business: they produce and sell goods, enter into contracts and provide commercial services, and profit is used to solve social problems.

J. Dees offers 5 conditions as criteria for attributing to social entrepreneurship [8]:

1) define their mission in such a way that it ensures the creation and stable maintenance of social effect;

2) are able to recognize and constantly pursue new opportunities for the implementation of a mission;

3) are included in the continuous process of creating innovation, adaptation and learning;

4) act decisively and without taking into account the factor of limited resources currently available;

5) have a heightened sense of responsibility for their target group and for the achieved results.

At the same time, the most important requirement for social entrepreneurship, according to the researcher, is the innovative nature of the activity.

Also, disclosing the value of social entrepreneurship, J. Dees defines the inefficiency of individual social institutions as the reason for its appearance, which, in our opinion, is not confirmed by the practice of developing social business in developed countries.

It is possible to predict a significant increase in the popularity of the model of social entrepreneurship and an increase in its influence on regional development. This sector may lose its clear boundaries of business structures and management models, focusing its identification on specific results of social activities.

In the international community, social entrepreneurship acquires the scale of a social movement. Opening its essence according to the theory of resource mobilization by John McCarthy, it can be defined as “a set of opinions and attitudes of the public, aimed at changing the social structure or social institutions” [8].

There are a number of confirmations. Social enterprises are becoming the main promoters of the ideas of forming a “middle class”, gender and age equality in labor relations. The social enterprise management model is based on the development of relationships, the active exchange of workers between the commercial and social sectors, the formation of new business practices.

To obtain the status of a social enterprise, the main criterion is the measurability of social results of entrepreneurial activity, and not the business structure or business model. Transparency of business processes is becoming a kind of natural filter for organizations that, for marketing purposes, create an image of socially responsible enterprises for themselves.

Innovations in the socio-cultural sphere are the main determinants that make it possible to build a system for the reproduction of human capital with characteristics, such as its ability to actively transform the world around it, taking full responsibility for the results of its activities, for the preservation of the environment, and for present and future of mankind in general. The trends aimed at forming a high level of human capital are evidenced by the direction of budget spending in Russia (Table 2).

Table 2. Parameters of financial support for national projects (draft federal budget for 2019-2021), billion rubles.

Name	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2019-2024
TOTAL	1 685.5	1 862.7	2 084,8	2 512,5	2 452.8	2 341.3	13 032.0
Demography	512.0	522.2	528.8	474.5	451.6	417,8	2 906.8
Health care	159.8	299.1	238.8	256.1	172.2	210,5	1 336.5
Education	103.2	117.6	127.7	116.6	116.1	120,4	701.4
Housing and urban environment	105.3	105.3	108.4	172.8	172.4	212,0	876.2
Ecology	49.6	77.8	113.7	136.8	143,0	114.6	635.7
Safe and high-quality roads	129.7	104.3	137.4	23.9	23.2	22.5	440,9
Labor productivity and employment support	7.1	6.9	6.9	7.4	7.1	8.3	43.7
Science	35.2	41.4	53.5	80.4	97.9	91.4	399.7
Digital economy of the Russian Federation	107.9	128.7	177.9	258.3	217.0	218.9	1 108.7
Culture	12.7	13.6	16.7	19.9	21.0	16.1	100.0
Small and medium entrepreneurship and support for individual entrepreneurial initiative	57.3	32.5	46.8	94.9	91.4	72.6	395.4
International cooperation and export	82.5	70.4	119.6	186.3	229.8	202.2	890.9
Comprehensive plan for the modernization and expansion of trunk infrastructure	323.2	343.0	408.6	684.7	710.2	634.1	3 103.8

Note: compiled according to [2].

3 Results

As follows from the data presented in Table 2, the situation with expenditures on the industrial components of the SCS for the future from 2019 to 2024 is improving for national projects related to demography, where growth is 38%, education (16%), and culture (26.7%). At the same time, it is alarming to see a reduction in spending on health care, where the decline is 18%. In general, the amount of investments in national projects, which, in particular, raises a number of serious problems in the development of industries of the socio-cultural sphere. Thus, the main trends and prospects consist in the priorities that are formed in the distribution of budgetary expenditures towards the development of innovations in the sectors that form human capital.

Another major trend that influences the innovative development of the socio-cultural sphere in Russia is determined by the fact that the overwhelming majority of service organizations in Russia belong to small and medium-sized businesses. The instability of regional legislation in support of small and medium-sized businesses in the socio-cultural sphere against the backdrop of the uncertain economic situation in the regions; problems in the field of taxation, creating obstacles to the implementation of already developed tools and mechanisms to support innovative development, substantial costs for small and medium-sized business organizations in the socio-cultural sphere necessary for administrative procedures; problems with access to credit financing and a shortage of trained professionals with the necessary competencies for the preparation and implementation of innovative solutions.

4 Discussions

The situation in the Russian economy demonstrates that the accumulated internal and external problems do not contribute to the innovative development of the social and cultural sphere, both at the federal level and at the regional level, increasing the gaps in the levels of innovative development. In general, existing problems can be divided into four key groups.

The first problem is the low volume and low quality of investments in innovative development. In the structure of state support of the socio-cultural sphere in the scientific and technological context is presented insufficiently.

The second problem is that the modern Russian system of scientific and technological priorities, indicated in the List of Critical Technologies of Russia, contains an insufficient (in comparison with world practice) number of critical technologies related to the socio-cultural sphere. This problem is complemented by the inefficiency of already implemented national projects in the socio-cultural sphere. Consequently, there are no real fundamental changes in the state of industries of the socio-cultural sphere, although the priority national projects in the field of education and health have recently been implemented [9].

The third problem is that the stated goals of innovative development are not reflected in the current Federal target programs and State programs because they mainly concern the tasks of the scientific and technological development of high-tech manufacturing industries. Consequently, in relation to the innovative development of the socio-cultural sphere, there is no interrelation in the triad of “scientific and technological forecasting”, “strategic planning”, and “programming of the national economy” [10]. As a result, the establishment of the most significant problems of innovative development in this area is not fully solved.

The fourth group includes the underdevelopment of tools for goal-oriented planning of innovative development in the socio-cultural industries. The task of the innovative development of the socio-cultural sphere is to a certain extent solved with the help of

regional goal-oriented tools of the state innovation policy. These include, first of all, the concept or strategy of innovative development and/or the core section on supporting innovation in the development strategy of the region. It is possible to strengthen the innovative component in the development of the socio-cultural sphere, ensuring the presence in the territorial planning scheme of the designated zones (territories) of the priority development of the innovation activity in the socio-cultural sphere, the development of a specialized legislative act defining the main principles, directions and measures of state support of innovation activities in the socio-cultural sphere of the region, to develop specialized programs or complexes of measures of state support development of innovation, innovation activities, as well as specialized coordinating bodies to support innovation with the assistance of the principal officer of the subject.

5 Conclusions

Thus, the socio-cultural sphere as a set of organizations that satisfy the spiritual and social needs of people simultaneously serves as the basic category of strategic development in a post-industrial economy. The factors of instability in the activities of enterprises in the socio-cultural sphere can be classified in general terms into factors of indirect and direct external influence, both internal and specific.

Socio-economic policy, a set of tools and mechanisms to support innovative development implemented by federal and regional authorities, forms a new architecture of regional spaces, contributing to socio-cultural modernization at the regional level. But in recent years, there has been a tendency to strengthen regional gaps, which is reflected in the ratings of innovation activity. It seems that significant prospects for bridging the gaps in the innovative development of organizations of the socio-cultural sphere in various regions are to implement infrastructure projects, including through public-private partnerships and infrastructure mortgages. The limited labor force is also a significant challenge, but it is precisely this challenge that hides one of the key potentials of innovative development - increasing labor productivity and digitization of the economy.

References

1. M. Coccia, *Technology in Society* **36**, 13-25 (2014)
2. L. Gokhberg, A. Sokolov, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **119**, 256-267 (2017)
3. D. Medvedev, *Russian Journal of Economics* **1(2)**, 109-129 (2015)
4. T.F. Kryaklina, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* **200**, 273-277 (2015)
5. D. Medvedev, *Russian Journal of Economics* **2(4)**, 327-348 (2016)
6. N. Duttaa Russell, S. Sobel, *International Review of Economics & Finance* **57**, 319-332 (2018)
7. P. Delgado, G. Macarena, D. González, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* **139**, 168-174 (2014)
8. M. Kowalska, *Entrepreneurship and its role from the European Union perspective, Challenges of the global economy Working Papers Institute of International Business* (University of Gdańsk, Gdańsk, 2012)

9. A. Chernikova, S. Golovkina, S. Kuzmina, T. Demenchenok, IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science **90** (2017) DOI <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/20199105007>
10. G. Morunova, S. Gorbushina, V. Okrepilov, S. Kuzmina, MATEC Web of Conferences **239**, 08005 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/201823908005>