

THE MODERN WAYS TO IMPROVE CORPORATE CULTURE IN THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

^aSERGEI ZAINULLIN, ^bELENA EGORYCHEVA, ^cIRINA LIKHACHEVA, ^dDARIA KOLESNIKOVA, ^eLIUBOV KOLESNIKOVA

^aPeoples' Friendship University of Russia, 117198, 6 Miklukho-Maklay Str., Moscow, Russia

email: ^aLaw_union@mail.ru

Abstract: The relevance of researching the ways to improve the level of corporate culture in the military-industrial complex (MIC) is based on the increasing role of the MIC due to the growing tension in the world. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) data published in March 2018, total global sales of a weapon in 2013-2017 rose by ten percent compared to the previous five years (2008-2012). Among the five biggest exporters of armament are also France, Germany, and China. The economic significance of the MIC is based on the fact that it fosters the development of related industries such as metallurgy, electronic engineering, instrument-making and so on. At the same time the MIC faces the following industry-specific challenges: - Rigid state regulation of production; - State control over export and import operations; - High sensitivity to political factors of the external environment; - Ambiguous and polarized public attitude towards weapon and its manufacturers, from massive support of patriotically-minded part of the population to absolute aversion of its pacifist part. The authors of this article attempt to identify those particular methods of improving company performance which are successfully put into practice and are really beneficial for the MIC enterprises applying them which may later serve as a basis for developing a set of measures to increase corporate culture level in the MIC enterprises in Russia. The materials of the article have theoretical value for academic specialists studying corporate governance as well as a practical benefit for top-managers, members of the Boards of directors of the MIC companies, other competent specialists in corporate governance seeking to improve corporate governance quality. The analysis is based on comparing the corporate culture of global industry leaders in the USA, Russia and the UK, which are the world's biggest weapon exporters. The studies and conclusions presented in this article can be practically beneficial not only for the MIC enterprises the specificity of which is a stress test for corporate culture but also for other industrial sectors.

Keywords: corporate culture, fight against corruption, conflict of interest, corporate ethics, social policy.

1 Introduction

Studying corporate culture is an up-to-date direction of research, already quite relevant in the modern complex of management sciences. In the 1980s the idea that effective leadership and long-term business success are connected with creating a healthy corporate structure in the company was first put forward in the book "Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life" (1984) by Terence Deal. (1) The same ideas were outlined in the book "Organizational Culture and Leadership" by Edgar Schein. (2) The most comprehensive study of the interrelation between positive corporate culture and performance is considered to be the book "Corporate Culture and Performance" by John Kotter and James Heskett. (3)

In the corporate governance theory, there are a number of approaches to defining corporate culture. For example, M. Albert and F. Khedouri (4) define corporate culture in the following way, "Atmosphere or climate in an organization is called its culture. The culture reflects prevailing habits, customs, and reflections in an organization."

In Howard Schwartz's and Stanley Davis' opinion, (5) corporate culture is a "complex of convictions and expectations shared by the members of an organization, these convictions, and expectations shape norms which sufficiently determine the behavior of individuals and groups in an organization."

According to Elliott Jaques, (6) corporate culture is a "way of thinking and mode of action which grew into the habit and became a tradition, is more or less shared by all employees of the enterprise, and which should be learned and at least partly adopted by new staff members to "blend in."

Russian authors have also studied corporate culture. According to A. Krylov, (7) "Corporate culture is a set of a set of ideas, values, generally accepted patterns and norms of behavior typical for a particular organization; the joint experience of the members of an organization, formed in the course of collective activity and expressed in both material and spiritual forms."

The Asia Pacific region is increasingly perceived as the century's geopolitical center. With one-third of the world's population, a significant share of the world's trade and production, it seems that the weight of this region is going to be highly relevant in the foreseeable future.

Some nations in the Asia-Pacific region are major importers of conventional weapons, including South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and Australia. There are also defense industries in the region that are being developed towards a more self-sufficient production, such as the industries in North Korea and China. The growing economy of China, in particular, has facilitated an increase in military spending which provides consistent financial support to their defense industries.

2 Materials and Methods

Works of foreign and Russian scientists have served as a methodological framework of this research. There are several typologies of corporate cultures, for convenience's sake, each of them will be represented in a table. Depending on the influence of an organization's activity on the final result positive and negative corporate cultures are discerned, their salient features are outlined in Table 1. (8)

Table 1. Positive and negative corporate cultures

Positive corporate cultures	Negative corporate cultures
Democratic	Authoritative
Person-centered	Function-oriented
Integrated	Disintegrated
Stable	Unstable

Typologies of cultures can also base on corporate structure flexibility. Corporate culture typology according to Jeffrey Sonnenfeld (9) is outlined in Table 2.

Table 2. Corporate culture typology according to Jeffrey Sonnenfeld

Type of corporate culture	Description
Baseball team	Decisions are made quickly; talent, innovation, and initiative are encouraged.
Club	This type is characterized by loyalty, devotion and good teamwork.
Academy	This type is characterized by a focus on the gradual growth of employees.
Fortress	This type is common for companies, which lost their former positions on the market as a result of wrong decisions or bad adaptation to the external environment changes.

Organizational psychologists and managers use different variants of corporate culture typology. For instance, an Irish expert on organizational psychology Charles Handy identifies the following types of corporate culture: (10)

1. Power culture
2. Role culture
3. Task culture
4. Person culture

One of the notable results of a strong corporate culture is low staff turnover thanks to the consensus among the staff on the mission and values of the organization. (11)

Another important result is the improvement of the company's reputation among such stakeholders as shareholders, customers, suppliers, and the government.

Basing on the factors that influence corporate culture formation and development, it is analyzed through the "externalist" approach, where corporate culture establishment strongly

depends on the national culture and is closely connected with the external environment, as well as through the "internalist" approach, where corporate culture is shaped in accordance with organizational culture. (8)

3 Results and Discussion

The authors tried to study the experience of corporate culture formation in the largest corporations basing on generally accepted international standards. The biggest companies of the MIC were chosen as the research base.

According to the ranking of hundred largest military-industrial companies in the world as of 2016 made by Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. The ranking was done by Gillam, Dr. Aude Fleurant, Alexandra Kuimova, Dr. Nan Tian, Pieter D. Wezeman and Siemon T. Wezeman 2017. The world's largest military manufacturers are Lockheed Martin (USA) Boeing (USA), Raytheon (USA), BAE Systems (UK), and Northrop Grumman Corp (USA).

Table 3. The world's largest military-industrial companies according to SIPRI ranking (12)

Position in SIPRI ranking	Name of the company	Annual volume of weapon sales, million US dollars
1	Lockheed Martin (USA)	40830
2	Boeing (USA)	29510
3	Raytheon (USA)	22910
4	BAE Systems (UK)	22790
5	Northrop Grumman Corp (USA)	21400

Analyzing corporate culture tools of the world's leading holdings of the MIC such as Lockheed Martin, Boeing,

Raytheon, BAE Systems, Northrop Grumman Corp, one can see a standardized approach to the corporate culture.

Table 4. Corporate culture documents

a	Lockheed Martin	Boeing	Raytheon	BAE Systems	Northrop Grumman
Code of conduct	+	+	+	+	+
Code of corporate governance	+	+	-	-	-
Anti-corruption policy	+	+	+	-	+
Social reporting	-	-	+	+	+

Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Raytheon, BAE Systems, Northrop Grumman Corp companies have formed a single standard package of regulatory documents: Code of conduct and Anti-corruption policy the main theses of which coincide almost verbatim. We should also note Raytheon's Social responsibility report in a single document, BAE Systems' Corporate responsibility report (2017), Northrop Grumman's Corporate responsibility report (2017) while the rest of the companies post this information on the official website. BAE Systems' Code of conduct also contains anti-corruption clauses, with a provision that the Code of conduct contains General corporate rules that may be applied in accordance with the local legislation. Northrop Grumman's standards of business conduct contain anti-corruption standards, and the company has a separate Anti-corruption compliance program.

This study supports an inference that anti-corruption policy is developed and implemented by the majority of the companies

under research. Anti-corruption mechanisms, such as regulation of receiving gifts and prevention of conflicts of interest are closely integrated with ethical norms and ethical policy mechanisms, almost all companies under research have hotlines and ethics commissions, which deal with both ethical issues and corruption violations (Tables 5 and 6). It should be noted that an essential gap in both global and national industry leaders is the lack of internal Corporate governance code, the fundamental document reflecting the quality of corporate culture and corporate governance, all the more so as its existence is recommended by the Corporate governance code approved by the Bank of Russia. (13) Another significant drawback is the absence of social reporting. The absence of such a single document is all the more surprising given that all the studied enterprises have a social policy that is implemented in practice.

Table 5. The main directions of anti-corruption policy

Directions	United Aircraft Corp	United Shipbuilding Corp	Almaz-Antey	Russian Helicopters	Tactical Missiles Corp
Prevention of conflicts of interest	+	+	-	+	+
Intolerance for corruption	+	+	-	+	+
Gift policy	+	+	-	+	-

Table 6. Ethical policy implementation mechanisms

Mechanisms	United Aircraft Corp	United Shipbuilding Corp	Almaz-Antey	Russian Helicopters	Tactical Missiles Corp
Bureau/Commission on ethics	+	+	-	+	-
Hotline	+	+	-	+	+
Obligatory training	-	-	-	+	-
Protection against accountability in case of reporting	-	-	-	-	-

Table 7. The main directions of ethical policy

Directions	United Aircraft Corp	United Shipbuilding Corp	Almaz-Antey	Russian Helicopters	Tactical Missiles Corp
Fair treatment	+	+	-	+	+
Human rights protection	+	+	-	+	+
Intolerance for discrimination and harassment	-	+	-	+	+
Inclusiveness	-	-	-	-	-
Labor protection	+	+	-	+	+
Calculation of labor costs and other expenses	+	+	-	+	+
Responsibility for the use of assets	-	-	-	+	+
Protection of confidential information	+	+	-	+	+
Prevention of conflicts of interest	+	+	-	+	+
Fair competition	-	-	-	+	+
Fight against insider trading	+	+	-	+	+

Studying the ethical policy of Russian companies, we can conclude that companies are guided mainly by the mandatory rules adopted in Russia by the state and society, the emphasis is made on observing human rights, fairness, labor protection, protection of confidential information, prevention of conflicts of interest and fight against corruption, with lack of attention to issues of special rights of minorities and inclusiveness which are relevant in the society of the United States, the EU, the countries of the British Commonwealth.

The main directions of social policy were analyzed on the basis of corporate reporting data (Table 8). The Almaz-Antey Air and Space Defence Corporation (14) does not provide internal documents and reports for public access, the information on social and personnel policy is posted on the official website of the corporation. JSC "Russian Helicopters" reflects its social policy in its annual report. The company developed the Code of corporate ethics, Anti-corruption policy. JSC "Corporation "Tactical Missiles Corp" developed the Anti-corruption regulation and the Basic social policy.

Table 8. The main directions of social policy

Directions	United Aircraft Corp	United Shipbuilding Corp	Almaz-Antey	Russian Helicopters	Tactical Missiles Corp
Additional social guarantees	+	+	+	+	+
Employees training	+	+	+	+	+
Cooperation with universities and schools	+	+	+	+	+
Support for militaries and their families	-	-	-	-	-
Volunteering	-	+	-	-	-
Support for sports	-	+	-	-	+
Support for culture	-	+	-	-	+
Support for children	-	+	+	-	+
Support for pensioners and disabled people	-	+	+	+	+
Support for the local population	-	-	-	-	+
Support for trade unions					

Table 9. Step 1. Results of the first step of evaluation of the effectiveness of the corporate culture tools implementation

Corporate culture tools / the expert's №	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Corporate documents	8	7	7	8	7	8	7	8	7	6
Social reporting	7	6	8	7	8	7	8	7	8	7
Minorities	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Inclusiveness	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2
Volunteering	4	5	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	4
Militaries	5	4	6	5	5	6	5	3	5	5

Veterans	6	8	5	6	6	5	6	6	4	8
Schoolchildren / students	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3

Step 2. Calculation of weight values of experts' opinions depending on their competence

Kk and Ka are evaluated on a scale from 1 to 2, where 1 is the medium level of competence, 2 is the high level of competence

- Ki-coefficient of competence of the i-th expert, considering the degree of familiarity with the question discussed (K3) and substantiation of the answer (Ka):

i=1..m — sequential numbers of experts;

m – the quantity of experts m=10;

$$Ki = \frac{K3 + Ka}{2}$$

Table 10. Step 2. Calculation of weight values of the experts' opinions depending on their competence

Calculation of weight values	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ki	2	2	2	1,5	1	2	1,5	2	1	1,5

Ki (average) 1.65

Xij – evaluation of the relative importance (in points), set by the i-th expert to the j-th element;

Step 3. Calculation of weight values of the experts' opinions depending on their competence

j=1 ... n – sequential numbers of the studied elements;

n — the number of elements of the objectives tree n=8.

$$x_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m x_{ij} \cdot K_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m K_i}$$

Table 11. Step 3. Calculation of the effectiveness of the corporate culture tools implementation, considering the experts' competence

Corporate culture tools/ the expert's №	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Weighted average
Corporate documents	9,6	8,4	8,4	7,2	4,2	9,6	6,3	9,6	4,2	5,4	7,3
Social reporting	8,4	7,2	9,6	6,3	4,8	8,4	7,2	8,4	4,8	6,3	7,1
Minorities	1,2	1,2	2	0,9	1,2	1,2	1,8	1,2	0,6	0,9	1,2
Inclusiveness	2,4	2	1,2	1,8	0,6	2,4	0,9	2,4	1,2	1,8	1,7
Volunteering	4,8	5	3,6	3,6	2,4	4,8	3,6	6	3	3,6	4
Militaries	6	4	7,2	4,5	3	7,2	4,5	3,6	6	4,5	5,1
Veterans	7,2	9,6	6	5,4	3,6	6	5,4	7,2	2,4	7,2	6
Schoolchildren / students	3,6	3	4,8	3,6	1,8	3,6	2,7	4,8	1,8	2,7	3,2

Step 4. Identifying the most promising ways to improve corporate culture

analysis of the individual factors influence separately and as a whole on the modeled object.

To identify more accurately the importance of the corporate culture tools and to develop an algorithm for their implementation, an abstract economic model is suggested for consideration. This model determines the qualitative characteristics of the modeled object, which is the modernization of corporate culture. When building the model, the main approaches of the multifactor model are used, namely, the

GfK Consumer Life conducted international research that identified 10 crucial types of corporate social responsibility from the consumers' point of view, which got top positions in the rating (Table 12). (15)

Table 12. Crucial types of corporate social responsibility from the consumers' point of view

No.	Type of corporate social responsibility	Importance Russia, %	Importance world, %
1	Providing good jobs	61	48
2	Production of high-quality goods and services	45	41
3	Fair prices of products and services	41	27
4	Protection of the employees' health and safe production	40	37
5	Participation in social programs	23	9
6	Being environment-friendly	20	37
7	Fair tax payments	12	19
8	Investments in research and technology	11	16
9	Supporting the local area	10	8
10	Educational support	9	8

Within the framework of the study conducted by KPMG and Effie in 2018, the finalists of the competition between companies implementing the sustainable development goals Effie Awards

Russia 2017 in their social projects were marked. The finalists pointed out in their projects the following sustainable development goals out of 169 sustainable development goals (Table 13). (16)

Table 13. Rating of sustainable development goals

No	Sustainable development goals	% of the goal representation in the finalists' projects
1	Good health and well-being	30
2	Industrialization, innovation, and infrastructure	30
3	Quality education	8
4	Responsible production and consumption	8
5	Partnership for sustainable development	8
6	Decent work and economic growth	5
7	Peace, justice and effective institutions	5
8	Eradication of poverty	3
9	Clean water and sanitation	3
10	Sustainable cities and communities	3

The corporate culture tools analyzed by the authors are currently highly recommended for all companies and mandatory for large businesses and companies with public ownership.

Internationally this is regulated by:

- The United Nations Convention against Corruption adopted by the UN General Assembly on 31 October 2003, which applies a broadside approach to identifying and preventing corruption risks in both public and private sectors;
- The Organization for economic cooperation and development (OECD) Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions;
- The US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA);
- The UK Bribery Act 2010, etc.

In Russia, there are the following legislative norms that recommend and require to implement anti-corruption policy and prevent conflicts of interest:

- The Federal law of December 25, 2008, N 273-FZ "On Countering Corruption";
- The Corporate governance code approved by the Bank of Russia.
- Methodical recommendations of The Federal Agency for State Property Management (Rosimushchestvo) on the organization of risk management and internal control in the field of prevention and combating corruption and on the organization of the Board of Directors work in a joint-stock company;
- Anti-Corruption Charter of the Russian Business approved by The Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation.

Today there are three main concepts, on which modern theories of corporate social responsibility are based.

1. Stakeholders concept. A stakeholder is an individual or organization that exerts influence on or is influenced by the activities of another organization, its products, services, and related production performance indicators. (17)
2. Corporate citizenship implies the responsibility of companies for what is happening in the country and the mutual responsibility of the state and business to the society. (18)
3. The concept of corporate sustainability, which is the newest concept in the field of corporate social responsibility. Its founder J. Elkington introduced the concept of a triple bottom line of a corporation's activities, which includes financial and environmental dimensions complying with the idea of eco-efficiency with the addition of the assessment of social and broad economic impact. (19)

In Russia, large companies and companies with public ownership are guided by the approach to social responsibility, defined by the Concept of long-term socio-economic development of the Russian Federation. (20) There are no binding forms of social reporting, similar to annual financial statements, but the most widely used ones in the world at present

are the UN Global Compact, and The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). (21)

The stability of the Asia-Pacific region is attracting major attention owing to its increasing relevance in the current globalized world. China has been predicted to be a world power in a few decades. The size and progress of the development of its defense industry are one of the most relevant factors influencing the current global arms market and the security stability in the region.

The region's nations place greater emphasis on foreign sales and exportation of their defense products. However, they face a highly competitive international arms market where a large number of companies compete to sell their products and only the development of niche technologies appears to have greater prospects for generating success.

Most South Korean defense companies have greatly diversified their production into the commercial sector, which may compensate for the above problems of overcapacity and poor economies of scale (and subsequent lack of competitiveness). The Chinese defense companies have similarly, although less significantly, achieved certain diversification of their production. (22) Conversely, Indonesian arms producers remain highly dependent on the state's procurement programs.

South Korea and Singapore have had unlimited access to modern weapons systems technologies and to the global arms market; China, on the other hand, has been under an arms embargo placed by the U.S.A. and the E.U. since 1989, and Indonesia was under a U.S. arms embargo between 1999 and 2005. In consequence, China relied on dual-use technologies and reverse engineering techniques applied to Russian weapons systems in order to then develop its defense sector, while Indonesia has been unable to develop its defense industrial base until recent years.

The mercantilist approach, in which the state exercises a large amount of control over the defense industry, may lead to extensive investments in the defense industry, lack of competitiveness, and an eventual decrease in the nation's security; whereas the application of liberal principles, in which there is minimum intervention by the state in the defense sector, may result in more competitive military equipment production and therefore greater security, although may also create certain vulnerability as there is greater dependence on foreign suppliers.

4 Conclusion

The study substantiates the relevance of the choice of the research object – the largest enterprises of the military-industrial complex, as the political instability in the world, has led to a significant increase in demand for weapons, besides, the military-industrial complex is one of the most important sectors of the economy because its development fosters the expansion in the related industries – metallurgy, electronics engineering, instrument-making, etc. With significant dependence of the industry on internal and external factors corporate culture is becoming increasingly important for the development of corporations in the industry.

The study revealed that introducing such tools as human rights protection policy, anti-corruption policy, fight against discrimination, protection of information and assets, prevention of insider trading is universal in nature and these tools are implemented by the largest corporations in all the countries under research, namely the USA, the EU, the UK, Russia.

Depending on the calculated rating it is suggested that the companies of the military-industrial complex introduce the corporate culture tools in the following order:

1. Development of corporate documents (first of all the Corporate governance code).
2. Social reporting. Priority introduction in the short term up to 1 year.
3. Support for veterans, retirees, and reservists.
4. Support for militaries and their families. Introduction on a second-priority basis in the medium term from 1 to 3 years.
5. Support for volunteers.
6. Training events for profession-oriented schoolchildren and students. Introduction on a third-priority basis in the long-term period from 1 to 3 years.
7. Support for minorities.
8. Inclusiveness. The introduction is not recommended.

The implementation of the suggestions given in the article may have the following positive effects for the corporations of the military-industrial complex:

1. Creating a positive image in the host country and in the countries which are customers of the products.
2. Establishing a positive image in the eyes of the state customer, for instance, the support for military personnel/veterans creates a positive image in the eyes of the main consumer - the military department.
3. The development of the Corporate governance code, other important corporate documents, and transparent social reporting can increase credibility in the eyes of prospective shareholders.
4. Transparent social reporting, training programs for both personnel and future employees who are retiring militaries, students, schoolchildren will contribute to establishing a positive image among the staff.
5. Reducing, for the company, the risks from corruption losses.
6. Reducing for the company the risks from illegal/unethical behavior of the employees, as detailing ethical responsibilities, procedures, training its employees, the company acts in good faith and reasonably.

The research and conclusions presented in this article can be beneficial not only for the enterprises of the military-industrial complex but also for corporations in other industries making adjustments for an industry specificity.

Acknowledgment

The publication has been prepared with the support of the "RUDN University Program "5-100."

Literature:

1. Deal T. *Corporate culture: The rites and ritual of corporate life*. The University of Southern California; 1984.
2. Schein EH. *Organizational culture and leadership*. 5th edition. The Jossey-Bass Business & Management Series; 1985.
3. Kotter JP, Heskett JL. *Corporate culture and performance paperback*. Free Press; 2011.
4. Albert, M., Khedouri, F, Mescon, M, editor. *Management basics*. Moscow: Delo; 2000.
5. Schwartz H, Stanley, D. *Matching corporate culture and business strategy*. Moscow: AMACOM, a division of American Management Associations; 1981.
6. Jaques E. *The changing culture of a factory*. Psychology Press; 1951.

7. Krylov AN. *Communication management. Theory and practice of the interaction between business and society*. 2nd edition. Moscow.
8. Kvatchko AV. *The meaning of corporate culture – evidence from a group of companies. Economics and innovations management*. 2014; 3(2).
9. Sonnenfeld JA. *Corporate views of the public interest*. Boston: Auburn House; 1981.
10. Handy C. *Understanding organizations*. London: Penguin; 1976.
11. Shinkarenko ON. *Corporate culture. Myths and reality. Kadry predpriyatiya*. 2011; 9.
12. SIPRI [Internet]. SIPRI Update: March 2018; 2018. Available from: <https://www.sipri.org/media/newsletter/2018-march>
13. Bank of Russia. *On the Corporate Governance Code. Letter of the Bank of Russia of April 10, 2014, no. 06-52/2463*. 2014.
14. Almaz-Antey Air and Space Defence Corporation [Internet]. *Staff and social policy*; n.d. Available from: <http://www.almaz-antey.ru/en/kadrovaya-i-sotsialnaya-politika/>
15. Demidov A. *Global Trends and Russian Consumer 2017. According to the results of the international research "GfK Consumer Life."* Moscow: GfK Consumer Life Publ.; 2017.
16. Effie Russia, KPMG [Internet]. *The study under the Program of Effie and the United Nations to promote the 17 Sustainable Development Goals in Russia*; 2018. Available from: <https://assets.kpmg/content/dam/kpmg/ru/pdf/2018/09/ru-en-effie-russia-and-kpmg-joint-study-on-sustainable-development-goals-in-Russia.pdf>
17. Freeman RE. *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. 1st edition. Boston: HarperCollins College Div.; 1984.
18. Matten D, Crane A, Chapple W. *Behind the Mask: Revealing the True Face of Corporate Citizenship*. 15th Annual Eben Conference "Sustaining Humanity beyond Humanism". *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2003; 45(1/2).
19. Elkington J. *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Oxford: Capstone; 1997.
20. Government of the Russian Federation. *The concept of long-term socio-economic development of the Russian Federation approved by the order of November 17, 2008, no. 1662-r*.
21. KPMG [Internet]. *The KPMG Survey of Corporate Responsibility Reporting 2017*; 2017. Available from: <https://assets.kpmg/content/dam/kpmg/xx/pdf/2017/10/kpmg-survey-of-corporate-responsibility-reporting-2017.pdf>
22. Chang A. *Indigenous weapons development in China's military modernisation, U.S.-China economic and security review commission staff research report*. 2012; pp. 8-13.

Primary Paper Section: K

Secondary Paper Section: KA, JY, AH, AE