

COMMUNICATION AND THE NEW ECONOMY

Andrei-Emil MOISE*

***Abstract.** Present paper tends to convey a study regarding communication and it's most important role in adapting public and private sectors of economy to the best interest of the citizens. The continuous dialogue between the two mechanisms is interactive and cannot be solved. This dialogue covers a wide range of issues, from the mere exchange of views, to the creation of a complex device that allows the evaluation of one mechanism by the other and to analyze the complementarity between them in terms of policies implemented by each. Dialogue allows not only an exchange of ideas between the actors involved in the act of communication. Dialogue between the state and the private sector can favor the adoption of "good policies" as regards the welfare of the majority.*

Keywords: Communication, Public, Private, Economy, Public policies.

1. Introduction

Language and dialogue allow not only an exchange of ideas between the actors involved in the act of communication. They allow the expression of general interest issues, public policies that are necessary for society as a whole. Good examples would be: the fight against galloping inflation or the liberalization of trade (free trade), taking into account the economic, political and social context of certain countries concerned by such policies. Administrative communication supports the concrete and objective delimitation between what is anticipated by the economic, political and social sides in the superior interest of the state and the expectations of its citizens. In this respect, the dialogue between government and non-state actors, usually NGOs should be managed with the utmost caution. Public-private dialogue should also be viewed as a stand-alone institution with a set of roles of its own importance.

2. Theory and implementation

Such as, the 20th century has brought forth a new type of economy. An innovative and intrigued system of relations not only between

* Hyperion University of Bucharest, Romania, andrei_e_moise@yahoo.com.

companies but also and foremost between them and the state. Optimal communication is thus needed in order to support such changes. Public-private dialogue should thus be regarded as a stand-alone institution with a set of roles of its own importance:

A. Defines the rules of the game for interactions between the private sector and the state. These rules specify the form, the procedures to be followed for initiating the dialogue, and the content (aspects that can be inserted or requested). In this sense, public-private dialogue is a formidable coordination mechanism, consisting of an exchange relationship with mutual benefits for both actors involved. The system is governed by both the principle of hierarchical subordination and the principle of integration.

B. Public administration as well constitutes an interactive platform through communication between the state and the private environment. The interactions taking place within the platform mentioned above are both formal and informal. At the same time, such a dialogue is first and foremost beneficial to society. It operates in accordance with the principles of mutual trust and mutual trust for all involved parties. Strict adherence to these rules makes it possible to overcome the most difficulties encountered. Compliance with the rules of the game becomes an objective in itself and thus removes potential conflicts between participating parties.

Under these circumstances, administrative policies that are essential in influencing private agent decisions are adjusted by relevance and effectiveness by dialogue with the private sector that provides vital information and enables political and administrative decision-makers to build appropriate public policies. Mutually, the information provided by the public sector to the private sector is equally decisive for the latter. Forecasts, investment plans and market strategies are subject to information coming from the state sphere. They provide predictability and visibility to the private sector. The continuous dialogue between the two mechanisms is interactive and cannot be solved. This dialogue covers a wide range of issues, from the mere exchange of views, to the creation of a complex device that allows the evaluation of one mechanism by the other and to analyze the complementarity between them in terms of policies implemented by each.

In the majority of countries with democracies in development or consolidation, the private sector is a relay, a real blessing for the state in terms of developing and sustaining social, industrial and financial policies. There are two distinct dimensions relative to this issue.

On the one hand, the private sector can be an important step in launching public policies through its active involvement in the

development and improvement of civil society, its importance and roles. It has advantages in terms of transparency and accountability of civil society and its needs. At the same time, the private sector is helping to improve the scope of public policy through key activities. Through effective communication to the public sector of any irregularities found in the evolution and good course of society, entrepreneurs support the well-being of society. In other words, the private sector is and has always been a thermometer as accurate as possible of the state of aggregation of a nation. Fraud, crimes and various inadequacies in the formulation and implementation of the legislative framework, institutional corruption would be on a permanent increase in the absence of continued civil society action. The political, economic and social stability of the state invariably depends on the constant involvement of the private environment in the welfare of the state.

The appropriation of state-specific public policies by the private sector is of crucial importance in today's global development. It depends on the successful implementation of public policies, especially when the latter are aimed at socio-economic areas. *Per a contrario*, in the absence of adequate communication and relationships, unjustified involvement and lack of well established rules of the private environment in the act of government can have disastrous results, ultimately leading to anarchy.

On the other hand, in the case of developing countries, the financial and industrial contribution of the private sector taking into account the development of public policies, concerns insurance and survival. Communication through the private environment becomes essential when it comes to areas of national interest, and public administration again has the main role. The complementary and consistent involvement of the private sector alongside the public sector, with all the resources at its disposal, is highlighted as the path to administrative success. Public-private partnership is underlined and reinforced by the legal form that it enters.

The private segment is therefore more conscious of the social reality and it is its duty to bring to the attention of its partner the issues raised. The public sector, the Treasurer of Finance, can thus implement the necessary policies for the good progress of society and the rule of law. The optimal communication between the two must be supported on all levels where the two actors meet. Public administration is such an area, and optimizing communication should become a desideratum for both sides.

The in-depth dialogue between private operators and state structures on economic, social and legislative issues is necessary for sustainable development, and its conclusions are in the form of national state policy.

Fragmentation of the clear conclusions, deterioration of information transmitted by citizens or their alteration on the basis of defective political communication may be the premises of a disastrous failure. It is for these reasons that the state regularly contributes to the development of staff in administrative positions through subsidized continuous development courses.

The stake in the game for political alliances aimed at implementing administrative reforms is a special one. Political authorities are, of course, often in favor of preserving existing order at some point. At the same time, the opposition is in a permanent search for a charismatic leader who can overthrow the existing hierarchy and rules. Dialogue between public administration and political decision-makers is likely to often provide leadership to implement the desired reforms. Its development is, however, based on successful communication in most areas of public life, on a particular national cohesion and on leadership. The strategy involves using the lobby and harmonizing the conceptual framework specific to the doctrines concerned.

However, the ability of governments to initiate public-private dialogue and to facilitate the implementation of reforms, despite the potential benefits, remains questionable. The inappropriate wording associated with the incorrectly transmitted political message, along with many inconsistencies and the need to achieve the desired goal, are the premises of a growing need to improve the act of political communication.

The development of the aforementioned dialogue contributes to the understanding of the global situation as an extension of national reforms. It favors the implementation of appropriate public policies and the improvement of the socio-economic situation in line with the external environment. The limited capacity of local public authorities to build a viable dialogue with the private sector is often the reason for the complaints complained of by civil society through its representatives. The inappropriate development of the political and institutional communication segment between state institutions on different zonal and hierarchical levels leads to public instability and discontent. This instability is manifested through public movements, through governance failures and ultimately by anarchy.

The pressure of the private sector over the state to reform and become more transparent in matters concerning it is inherent to most democratic societies. It is a living proof of the democratic spirit and its proper functioning. Indeed, the state has a seemingly superior position, at least in terms of the legitimacy it invokes in relation to the private sector. The

public administration, as a binder of the two sectors, does not enjoy the same privileges as its state counterpart, being often challenged and blamed for various irregularities that concern it and not only. The legitimacy of the public administration has suffered greatly during time; the only solution to revive it and to regain its basic role is the optimal fit in the state landscape and the optimization of the activity. Success communication, rebranding and political marketing can provide ways to improve the administrative process both locally and nationally.

The need for the private sector to influence the legislative framework in order to serve its financial interests is obvious. Equally, the state's desire to maintain its monopoly on certain sectors, considered key to the well-functioning of society, has not diminished over time. The ability to rely on the privileged position of the public sector is and will always be a matter of interest to the specialists in the field. Facilitating empathetic communication between the two entities should be the priority and subject of successful public / political communication.

Accelerating phenomena such as European integration or globalization requires the optimization of the public communication act. It can indeed be said that communication is a universal “language” that can unite or separate individuals. The blur and improper activity of the public administration, along with a so-called lack of transparency, are the most common criticisms of the public administration apparatus.

Dialogue between the state and the private sector can favor the adoption of “good policies” as regards the welfare of the majority, but it also offers the opportunity to redefine public act in social terms. The private sector may instead claim the advantage of transparency and integrity on the part of the state. Professional associations, such as civil society, are currently playing a major role in the effort to reduce corruption and dysfunctionality in the political and administrative apparatus. Liberalism and the correct implementation of democratic principles undoubtedly add to the effort of improving public administration, including from the point of view of communication. Another positive aspect to be mentioned in relation to the implementation of innovative techniques in administrative communication is the gradual removal of the bureaucracy of the institutions. Fundamentally, public-private dialogue can at least define and circumscribe the role of the public factor in state life as a good example of the principle of subsidiarity, which gives the public environment those missions that the private sector cannot do with the same effectiveness. A good example of this is the public administration. As I pointed out earlier, the public apparatus is neither “all-knowing” nor necessarily “benevolent”.

As a result, the state is not necessarily accurately informed by individuals about the issues that it can improve in its performance, including public administration. Citizens' preferences on public administration are not always at the fingertips of decision makers who could help improve public service. Private sector agents are largely responsible for increasing public performance and the development of public-private binomial. Similarly, it is not imperative to compare the evolution of the private segment with that of the state, but rather to find solutions for their coordination for the sake of civic interest. It is a constantly assumed paradigm by the state, the improvement of its own activity and the tendency to monopolize lucrative activities at the market level.

3. Conclusions

Between this, perhaps the only area in which the state has managed to acquire and preserve it is the intriguing field of public administration. In this sense, the state tries to establish the public administration's attributions in a normative way following the principle of saying "not what can be but what to do". It can be said that the state often has a positive, often idealistic view on the good performance of the public administration. Correcting imperfections and inefficiencies in the allocation and use of human resources in optimal conditions is one of the principle attributes of successful governance. All the above aspects converge towards a relationship of stability and mutual development between private and public communication. The completion of the two segments optimizes the activity of public administration at local and general level. Even if such improvements are not visible very quickly, the constant and certainty of the process begins to become plausible both for the informed individuals, but also for the simple citizens.

REFERENCES

- [1] Crane Andrew, *Corporate Social Responsibility: Readings and cases in a Global Context*, Routledge Publishing, London, 2013.
- [2] Lipovetsky Gilles, *Paradoxical Happiness – Essay on hyper-consumption society*, Polirom Publishing Bucharest, 2007.
- [3] Stoiciu Andrei, *Political Communication – how to sell ideas and people*, Humanitas Publishing, Bucharest, 2000.
- [4] Ticlea Alexandru, Ghimpu Sanda, *Rhetoric – Selected texts*, Sansa Publishing, Bucuresti, 1993.
- [5] Jennifer Lees-Marshment, Jesper Strömbäck, Chris Rudd, *Global political marketing*, Routledge Publishing, Londra, 2010.

- [6] Ionel Petrea, Ana Cioriciu Stefanescu, *Theoretical and practical considerations regarding promotion in public administration*, ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF LABOUR LAW, No. 4, Bucharest, 2008.
- [7] Nichols Michael P., *Listen to me as I listen to you: ability of listening can improve our relationships*, Trei Publishing, Bucharest, 2010.
- [8] Novack Kenneth, *From Insight to Improvement: Leveraging 360-Degree Feedback*, Envisia Learning Inc., Santa Monica, U.S.A., 2016.

