

National Research University  
Higher School of Economics

As a manuscript

Svetlana Mareeva

***Monetary and non-monetary inequalities and their perception by the  
population in modern Russian society***

Thesis Summary for the purpose of obtaining academic degree of  
Doctor of Science in Sociology

Academic Supervisor:  
Doctor of Science in Sociology  
Natalia Tikhonova

*Moscow - 2024*

## **Relevance and statement of the research problem**

Inequality is now recognized as one of the key global challenges for sustainable socio-economic development. The discussion of the foundations, manifestations, consequences, and dynamics of inequality is the focus of discussions on possible vectors of socio-economic development, both globally and at national level. Interest in this topic remains high due to the transformation of societies, which requires a rethinking of the nature, causes, and role of inequalities in the modern world, while the expert community and policymakers focus on global and national policies to address inequality. Reducing inequality within and between countries has been included in the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Two recent surges of interest in socio-economic inequality, caused by the 2008-2009 global economic crisis and the Covid pandemic, have focused the research agenda on the multidimensionality of inequality, its non-monetary and subjective aspects, and on assessing the impact of policies aimed at reducing it. The current challenges, which significantly increase the uncertainty of the global development environment, increase the relevance of research in this area, especially given the fact that the negative consequences of inequality are not limited to the economic sphere and are manifested simultaneously at several levels –individual, interpersonal, and society as a whole [Wilkinson, Pickett, 2010].

Economists work mainly with monetary measures of inequality, which include inequalities of both income and wealth. In the most important publications on the subject, they point to the tendency of these measures to record growth, which suggests a further deepening of inequality in the future [Milanovic, 2017; Piketty, 2015; Stiglitz, 2015; Atkinson, 2015]. A number of international organizations are also constantly working both with statistical data on income inequality in the countries of the world (World Bank, Luxembourg Income Study, etc.) and with estimates of income and wealth concentration (World Inequality Database, Credit Suisse reports, etc.); a number of major reports of international organizations and conferences in recent years have been thematically focused on the problems of global inequality in its monetary dimension – its level, differences between countries, trends, negative effects and problems of its management [World Bank, 2016; EBRD, 2017; Hardoon et al., 2016].

Sociologists more often consider non-monetary inequalities and pay attention to the emergence of new forms of inequalities, while the old ones also remain in place: inequalities in cultural, social, civic, symbolic resources, human capital, etc. are added to material and power inequalities [Grusky, 2011]. The list of non-monetary inequalities is growing – for example, the pandemic has contributed to a greater understanding of the importance of a number of inequalities related to personal safety. Non-monetary dimensions of inequality are increasingly at the center of the policy agenda, shaping responses to key challenges.

The research on the subjective perception of inequality by the population is also actualized, since its specifics can generate or contain social tensions, shape the population's demand for the content of the social contract with the state, and influence the population's behavioral strategies at the micro level. A population's perception of inequality as excessive, unjustified, and generally inconsistent with the "ideal" social model can have important social consequences – it can generate social tension, create grounds for delegitimizing the government in the eyes of the population, and stimulate unproductive behavior at the micro level. On the other hand, the perception of inequality as meritocratic can be a resource for economic development and an incentive for the population to invest in human capital. The subjective perception of inequality can be seen as part of a broader discussion

about justice [Sztompka, 2017] and the need to take into account the subjective perceptions of the population when assessing public welfare and determining development priorities [Stiglitz et al., 2016].

Inequality is one of the key challenges for Russia's sustainable development, especially in the context of growing uncertainty. Opportunities to respond to the challenges associated with inequality require a comprehensive approach to its definition, measurement and formulation of goals to be achieved. It is necessary to understand the configuration of the existing multidimensional space of inequality, and its dynamics. The characterization of this space, the identification of its main axes, including new ones, the identification of groups occupying a relatively prosperous and disadvantaged position in it, and the assessment of their composition, stability and dynamics will contribute to the understanding of the social structure of modern Russia and possible prospects for its further transformation. Understanding the specifics of socio-economic inequality in Russian society is also important for the development of effective socio-economic policies aimed at supporting the population in the conditions of new turbulence, and for determining the possible framework for the formation of a new social contract between the state and the population.

The problem of inequality is often considered in connection with the problem of poverty [World Bank, 2016], although it is certainly not reducible to it. Reducing poverty does not mean an automatic reduction in inequality, although it can contribute to it by bringing the lower and lower middle strata of the population closer together. However, even in the discussion of this aspect of inequality, there are a number of points of debate that require closer examination, ranging from the location of the boundary between these groups to the qualitative characteristics of the disadvantaged subgroup that are not solely related to their lower income levels, and therefore require more than monetary measures to address the problem. As in the case of inequality in general, in addition to the analysis of the objective situation with poverty, the subjective perception of poverty by the population should also come into focus, since its characteristics will determine the willingness of the population to support this or that vector of social policy measures aimed at its reduction.

Thus, identifying, measuring and assessing first the nature and second the dynamics of the existing system of monetary and non-monetary inequalities in the country, and third, changes in their subjective perception by the population, are of fundamental importance in the conditions of new turbulence, determining the existing opportunities and limitations for the sustainability of Russian society. In order to address these issues, it is not enough to have data on the dynamics of inequality presented by traditional statistical indicators – it is also necessary to understand what the configuration of different types of inequality looks like, how they are reflected in the social structure of Russian society (in particular, what groups are formed on their basis, what are their specifics in relation to each other, and what are the features of their composition, degree of stability and dynamics), how they are perceived by the public consciousness, and what this means for Russian society as a whole.

The key **research question** that the study aims to solve is, therefore, the identification of the peculiarities and dynamics of monetary and non-monetary inequalities, as well as their perception by the population in modern Russia.

## Literature review

The topic of inequality is very broad and is represented not only in economic and sociological studies. In the scientific literature, several key areas can be distinguished in which inequality and its perception by the population are studied and which are therefore very relevant for this research.

Estimates of *monetary inequality* and its dynamics at a macro level in the global comparative context are analyzed in the world-famous works of leading economists [Milanovic, 2017; Piketty, 2015; Stiglitz, 2015; Atkinson, 2015]; their results indicate the aggravation of this problem at a global level in the XXI century. Another important issue that economists are also working on is the relationship between inequality and economic growth. Such analysis is usually carried out on macro-level data [Alesina, Perotti, 1996; Deininger, Squire, 1998; Forbes, 2000; Persson, Tabellini, 1994]. However, the results of research in this direction are ambiguous and speak more about the different direction and degree of this influence depending on specific socio-economic conditions – the depth of inequality, the pace of development of countries, its key factors, etc. – rather than about a universal correlation [Barro, 2000; Galor, Moav, 2004], as well as about different effects in different parts of the income distribution [Van der Weide, Milanovic, 2014; Voitchovsky, 2005]

Inequality of opportunity is also a focus of economic evaluations. A typical method of measuring it in economic research is by assessment of the role of birth circumstances (gender, ethnicity, place of birth, parental family characteristics) in overall income inequality [EBRD, 2017]. In other words, inequality of opportunity is seen as one of the components of inequality of outcomes (which is usually income inequality) and is assessed not only as unfair but also as inefficient. It is suggested that it is the consideration of inequality of opportunity that can determine the nature of the relationship between inequality and economic growth: high inequality of opportunity forms a negative relationship between income inequality and economic growth, while low inequality of opportunity leads to a lack of correlation between them [Aiyar, Ebeke, 2020].

A major contribution to the analysis of income stratification – the identification, on the basis of income inequality, of groups that differ qualitatively not only by income level but also by other key characteristics – has been made by researchers at the World Bank and others. The literature presents methodologies within the framework of absolute [Chen, Ravallion, 2010; Kharas, 2010; Milanovic, Yitzhaki, 2002; Ravallion, 2010; World Bank, 2014; World Bank, 2015] and relative [Alesina, Perotti, 1996; Atkinson, Brandolini, 2011; Barro, 2000; Birdsall et al., 2000; Chauvel, 2013; Dallinger, 2013; Easterly, 2001] approaches. Some of them focus on inequality in specific parts of the income distribution – for example, at the bottom (among other things, such works note the negative reversal in poverty reduction that has occurred in recent years [World Bank, 2016; World Bank, 2020]), or in the middle part (for example, an OECD study takes a closer look at the middle class in its economic definition and notes trends of its shrinking, impoverishment, decreasing sustainability and degree of economic influence [OECD, 2019]).

A separate direction of research in the context of income stratification is the analysis of poverty within the framework of absolute or relative monetary approaches to its definition, presented both in country-level and international studies [Chen, Ravallion, 2007; Foster, 1998; Garroway, De Laiglesia, 2012; Ravallion, Chen, 2011; Ravallion et al., 1991; Rowntree, 1901]; a subjective monetary poverty line is also used [Colasanto et al., 1984; Goedhart et al., 1977]. In parallel, the tradition of non-monetary approaches to the definition of poverty is actively developing, based on various axes of non-monetary inequality.

The analysis of income and wealth distribution also focuses on the polar group – the group of the super-rich. In the framework of economic research, the problem of the super-rich is considered through the prism of income and/or wealth concentration and its dynamics, including in the context of international comparisons [Boston Consulting Group, 2021; Capgemini Research Group, 2022; Credit Suisse, 2022]. There are papers that propose models that estimate the role of different institutional conditions for the formation of large fortunes or predict the number of billionaires based on other economic indicators [Neumayer, 2004]. Several works are devoted to the super-rich in Russia and their dynamics, as well as the composition and degree of heterogeneity of this group [Braguinsky, 2009; Guriev, Rachinsky, 2005; Novokmet et al., 2018; Treisman, 2016]. The research on the super-rich in a sociological framework raises questions about the group's structure, the mobility of its members, their social origin, intergenerational mechanisms of social status transmission, etc. Such analysis mainly has an intra-country character [Hjellbrekke et al., 2007; Kuusela, 2018; Lu, 2017; Lu et al., 2021; Savage, Hjellbrekke, 2021]. For Russian society, this line of research is also represented by several works on the groups of the super-rich and business elite defined in different ways [Agafonov, Lepele, 2016; Kryshchanovskaya, 2002; Schimpfössl, 2018].

The research of *non-monetary dimensions of inequality* refers mostly to sociological works. The basis for the analysis of social inequality in society goes back to the classic works of sociological thought by K. Marx, M. Weber, and E. Durkheim. In modern societies, the issues of the causes and manifestations of inequality are reflected in the works of a number of famous sociologists [Beck, 2000; Castells, 2022; Blau, 1977; Grusky, 2011; Sorensen, 2000]. The most well-known models of the social structure of modern societies, based on the main axes of inequality in societies, were developed in the traditions of neo-Marxism [Wright, 1997; Wright, 2005; Wright, 2009] and neo-Weberianism [Erikson, Goldthorpe, 1992; Goldthorpe, 2000; Goldthorpe et al, 1980]; alternative approaches based on the concept of multiple occupational classes [Grusky, Weeden, 2001] or the delineation of latent classes [Savage et al., 2013] have also been proposed. Non-monetary approaches to assessing the level and quality of life that reflect the position of individuals in multidimensional systems of inequality, including through their opportunities, are also presented [Nussbaum, 2002; Sen, 1980; Townsend, 1962], while various consequences of inequality are documented in a number of works [Wilkinson, Pickett, 2010].

The concept of life chances, which is also directly related to non-monetary inequality, originated in the works of M. Weber [Weber, 1978], who considered them as the basis for class distinctions. This concept has been further developed in the neo-Weberian tradition. It considers life chances in a broad sense: as chances for a quality life in a whole range of spheres, irreducible only to economic conditions and consumption. This leads to a variety of interpretations of this concept and its operationalization [Dahrendorf, 1979; Duncan et al., 1998; Eitzen, Zinn, 1989; Erikson, Goldthorpe, 1992; Giddens, 1973; Mayer, 1997; Waldfogel, 2004].

The research of non-monetary dimensions of inequality or their joint effect with monetary ones can also include the analysis of certain groups in the general social structure of society – in particular, disadvantaged, or poor groups, identified within the framework of non-monetary approaches on the basis of multidimensional deprivation [Nolan, Whelan, 2011; Townsend, 1962; Townsend, 1979]. The main axes of inequality in certain societies also serve as a basis for distinguishing these groups, and the analysis of the specifics of their composition and position enables the observation of specifics of manifestations of various dimensions of inequality.

Mobility is a vast topic in its own right. However, it is impossible not to mention it in connection with the study of inequality. The analysis of social mobility in this context enables the static picture of inequality and the resulting social structure of society to be complemented by a dynamic aspect that includes not only the configuration of the established structural positions and the differences between them, but also the movement of individuals between these positions [Shorrocks, 1978]. This movement is considered both in the space of positions defined by income [Fields, Ok, 1999; Jäntti, Jenkins, 2015; OECD, 2018] and between structural positions created by other axes of inequality [Goldthorpe, Llewellyn, and Payne, 1980]. The extent of intergenerational income mobility is used as a proxy for inequality of opportunity [Aiyar, Ebeke, 2020]. Research related to assessing the impact of social mobility on subjective perceptions of inequality within the framework of the "tunnel effect" hypothesis and the upward mobility hypothesis can be distinguished separately [Gimpelson, Monusova, 2014; Benabou, Ok, 2001; Graham, Pettinato, 2002; Hirschman, Rothschild, 1973; Larsen, 2016].

*Subjective perceptions of inequality* are actively studied for their consistency with objective indicators. The literature shows that people tend to misjudge the depth of objective monetary inequality (both in income and wealth) as well as their own position in the inequality system [Chambers et al., 2014; Hauser, Norton, 2017; Norton, Ariely, 2011]. Cross-country studies that aim to assess the relationship between actual and perceived inequality report no such relationship or its moderate strength [Gimpelson, Treisman, 2018; Niehues, 2014]. A theoretical framework has been proposed in which perceptions of income inequality and the degree to which one overestimates or underestimates one's position in society change along with one's position in the income distribution [Knell, Stix, 2020], further emphasizing the differential effects among groups occupying different positions along different axes of inequality.

At the same time, a number of works have shown that it is subjective assessments that serve as the basis for social actions and the choice of behavioral strategies of the population at the micro level – they are associated with the level of trust, the significance of social comparisons, political preferences and demands for redistributive policies, long-term planning, etc. [Alesina, La Ferrara, 2005; Bak, Yi, 2020; Engelhardt, Wagener, 2014; Loveless, 2013; Sprong et al., 2019]. Objective inequality, as shown in some works, has only an indirect impact on the attitudes of the population towards inequality and demands on the state in relation to it, determining the subjective perception of its scale [Bussolo et al., 2021; Kuhn, 2020], although other works demonstrate the importance of also taking into account objective estimates of income distribution [Weisstanner, Armingeon, 2022]. A separate subject is the population's tolerance of inequality, which depends on the assessment of its legitimacy and the degree of meritocracy of its foundations [Cojocaru, 2014; Hadler, 2005; Kelley, Zagorski, 2004; Larsen, 2016; Roex et al., 2019].

Discussions on the degree of severity of objectively existing inequality, and its factors and consequences, are actively conducted in the Russian social sciences as well, and both economists and sociologists work on this problem from different sides [Anikin and Tikhonova, 2016; Kapelyushnikov, 2017; Kozyreva, Smirnov, 2018; Ovcharova et al., 2016]. A comprehensive analysis of social inequality and social stratification in Russia is presented in the works of the team led by O.I. Shkaratan [Shkaratan, 2009; Shkaratan, 2012]. Inequality of opportunity as part of income inequality is also assessed in a number of works [Ibragimova, Franz, 2019; Maleva et al., 2022]. However, it should be noted that in recent years, the attention of researchers has been focused more on individual groups in Russian society than on the social structure as a whole, with the exception of

the works of the research team led by N.E. Tikhonova [Tikhonova et al., 2018; Tikhonova et al., 2022] and some individual publications [Sokolov, Sokolova, 2020; Shkaratan, Yastrebov, 2007]. Special attention is paid to poverty [Anikin, Tikhonova, 2016; Zubarevich, 2019; Karabchuk et al., 2013; Maleva et al., 2019; Ovcharova, 2001; Ovcharova, 2008; Pishnyak et al, 2021; Slobodenyuk, Anikin, 2018; Tikhonova, Slobodenyuk, 2014; Tikhonova, Slobodenyuk, 2022; Abanokova, Dang, 2021] and the middle class [Abraamova, Maleva, 2014; Belyaeva, 2007; Middle Class..., 2008; Grigoriev et al, 2009; Maleva et al., 2015; Middle Classes..., 2003; Pishniak, 2020; Tikhonova, 2020; Tikhonova, Mareeva, 2009; Khakhulina, 2008]. It can be noted that both in relation to poverty and the middle class, researchers have repeatedly demonstrated the inconsistency of the statuses of their representatives in the hierarchies of the income dimension of inequality and its other dimensions (socio-professional, educational, etc.); separate works devoted to this problem are also presented [Kolennikova, 2019; Sablina, 2000].

The problems of social mobility in Russia as the movement of individuals between structural positions are addressed in the works of both individual researchers and scientific teams [Social Mobility..., 2017; Social Mobility..., 2019; Yastrebov, 2014; Yastrebov, 2016; Gerber, Hout, 2004]. Previous studies of income mobility in Russia mainly covered the period of the 1990s and early 2000s [Bogomolova, Tapilina, 1999; Jovanovic, 2001; Lukyanova, Oshchepkov, 2012] and demonstrated its consistently high scale during the post-Soviet development of the country; more recent estimates of mobility are just beginning to appear [Dang et al., 2020]. It is worth mentioning separately the work devoted to assessing the impact of social mobility on Russians' perception of inequality in the 1990s [Ravallion, Lokshin, 2000], which showed the influence of expectations about changes in one's own position in the future on demands for redistributive policies, especially among the population with the highest incomes. There are also works in the framework of the concepts of sustainability / resilience, which also consider the dynamics of the situation of the Russian population on the income axis [Voronin et al., 2020].

Comparatively less attention is still paid to the issue of the population's perception of inequality and the population's ideas about the social structure of society, although there are some works in this area [Kosova, 2016; Mareeva, Tikhonova, 2016]. A number of works on the perception of social justice by the population of the country, which is closely related to the perceptions of inequality, should also be mentioned [Andreenkova, 2017; Danilova, 2015; Rimsky, 2013].

In general, the scientific literature presents a very wide range of works devoted to the problem of inequality or touching on its individual aspects. Nevertheless, the issues of both theoretical understanding and empirical study of inequality patterns remain open; moreover, rapid changes in socio-economic realities raise new questions about their configuration, features and prospects for change. This research attempts to obtain a comprehensive picture of socio-economic inequality in Russian society, including its monetary and non-monetary dimensions, to identify the similarities and differences in their specifics, as well as to identify the features of the population's subjective perception of inequality.

## **Aims and objectives**

*The aim* of the study is to identify the characteristics and assess the dynamics of monetary and non-monetary inequalities and their perception by the population in modern Russian society.

The following *objectives* were set for the research:

*On monetary inequalities:*

- 1) Identification of the specifics of monetary inequality in Russia and determination of its position against the background of other countries through the prism of absolute and relative approaches to the analysis of income inequality and wealth inequality.
- 2) Characterization of the model of income stratification of Russian society and its dynamics.
- 3) Assessment of the scale of income mobility in Russian society, the shares and composition of polar non-mobile income groups ("sticky floor" and "sticky ceiling"), and the stability and composition of the group of super-rich Russians as a polar group in the hierarchy of wealth inequality.

*On non-monetary inequalities:*

- 4) Characterization of the system of non-monetary inequalities using various methods: building a model of social stratification on the basis of life chances and risks in key spheres of life; identification of zones of well-being and ill-being based on the population's self-assessments of their position on various axes of non-monetary inequalities; and assessment of the degree of concentration of various life opportunities.
- 5) Estimation of the dynamics of the stratification model based on non-monetary inequalities and its comparison with the income stratification model.
- 6) Analysis of the manifestations of new types of non-monetary inequalities related to socio-psychological well-being (subjective social dynamics, life-work balance, internal autonomy, etc.), and in particular assessment of the number and composition of groups with persistently low and high subjective assessments of their position in society.

*On the subjective perception of inequality by the population:*

- 7) Identification of the specifics of the population's perception of inequality and its dynamics, and assessment of the degree of its differentiation.
- 8) Analysis of the relationship between social mobility and the perception of inequality by the population.
- 9) Assessment of the relationship between Russians' perceptions of inequality and their investment in human capital.

*Generalization of the results*

- 10) General characterization of the system of monetary and non-monetary inequalities and the social structure of Russian society formed on that basis, as well as the subjective perception of inequality by the population in terms of its impact on the social sustainability of Russian society and opportunities for the country's development.



The dissertation research is presented as a set of scientific papers united by a common research framework and theoretical and methodological approaches, the results of which allow achieving the set goal.

## **Research Methodology**

The main theoretical and methodological framework of the research is the neo-Weberian approach, which assumes the multidimensionality of social inequality and, consequently, of the criteria of stratification. The key role in it is assigned to socio-economic criteria, which, on the one hand, are determined by the situation in the labor market and in the sphere of consumption, and, on the other hand, determine related opportunities in other spheres of life, including status characteristics and social well-being.

The concept of multidimensional stratification has been widely developed in the works of sociologists and today allows for a variety of interpretations, reflected both in the choice of key inequality axes used in the analysis and in the way they are operationalized [Goldthorpe, 2000; Savage et al., 2013]. In the course of the analysis, we also turned to different versions of multidimensional stratification depending on the specific objectives. In the study, we used it primarily to analyze the configuration of non-monetary inequalities, defining social groups that are in a similar position in terms of their life chances and risks in key areas of everyday life. Weber's idea of the importance of life chances [Weber, 1978] and his proposed notions of "positive" and "negative" privilege play a key role in this model. We used them, though not directly following the Weberian concept, but rather starting from these ideas and concepts, to determine the opportunities and risks of individuals that are expanded or narrowed in relation to those typical of a given society. On the basis of this, we further distinguished large strata in the mass strata of the population. In choosing the main axes of the multidimensional space of inequalities, we relied, *inter alia*, on the broad tradition of studying non-monetary deprivation within the framework of the relative approach to the analysis of poverty [Mack, Lansley, 1985; Nolan, Whelan, 2011; Townsend, 1962], as well as on multidimensional approaches to the analysis of the quality of life of the population as a whole [Stiglitz, 2015; Nussbaum, 2002; Sen, 1980].

Socio-economic inequalities were given a special role in the analysis, although the study was not limited to them. In particular, we addressed issues related to inequalities in non-economic domains: social well-being, subjective self-assessment of one's position, perceptions of available and unavailable life opportunities, etc.

The analysis of income inequality was based on the model of one-dimensional stratification constructed within the framework of the relative approach. In this approach, when determining the boundaries of income groups, the starting point is the income distribution that characterizes a given society at a particular time. In the course of the study, we used both the existing developments in this area, presented primarily in economic publications [Alesina, Perotti, 1996; Atkinson, Brandolini, 2011; Barro, 2000; Chauvel, 2013; Dallinger, 2013; Easterly, 2001], and the results of empirical tests of the consistency of the boundaries proposed in the literature with the current Russian realities. Within the framework of the same direction of analysis, we compared the number and composition of the poor groups identified using different relative lines. The study also tested various versions of the absolute approach [Chen, Ravallion, 2007; Ravallion et al., 1991], but the analysis showed that

its heuristic potential for contemporary Russian society is more limited than that of the relative approach.

Due to the dimensions of inequality chosen for the analysis, the specificity of the objectives set, and the available empirical data sets, the unit of analysis was the individual, although inequalities affecting them as members of a particular household were also taken into account.

In the analysis of the subjective position, we used a number of traditional methodological approaches, including both verbal and graphic tests that reflect both conscious and intuitively felt place in the status hierarchy: self-assessment of one's position on the "ladder", with steps from the lowest to the highest position in society on various grounds; verbal self-assessment of various aspects of one's position; assessment of the probability of achieving certain life goals, etc.

The analysis of the subjective perceptions of the country's population of inequality was carried out in the context of its interpretation as an element of normative-value systems in general and its interrelation with perceptions of justice. Methodologically, this was ensured through a series of questions aimed at identifying individuals' perceptions of the scale of inequalities, the degree of their fairness, their causes (including the views on poverty and well-being factors), the real and "ideal" type of social structure of society as a whole, etc.

The empirical basis of the dissertation research was formed by the data of all-Russian sociological surveys conducted in different years by the Institute of Sociology of the Federal Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, as well as the data of the Russia Longitudinal Monitoring Survey from the National Research University Higher School of Economics (RLMS HSE). We also used data from a comparative international survey, the ISSP (International Social Survey Program), with an additional block of questions, which were included for the Russian subsample of the survey in 2019 from the Institute of Social Policy of the NRU HSE. In addition, the study used data from official Russian statistics, as well as international databases of the World Bank, the World Income Database, analytical data of Credit Suisse, etc. To analyze the group of super-rich Russians, an empirical database specially collected for this purpose from open sources was used.

## **Scientific Novelty**

The dissertation study is the first to identify and comprehensively characterize the general model of inequality in modern Russian society, taking into account its monetary and non-monetary dimensions, to identify long-term trends in its transformation, and to characterize its reflection in the perception of the population. The obtained results contribute to the understanding of the nature of the social structure of modern Russian society.

The dissertation presents a systematization of approaches to the analysis of inequality in foreign and Russian scientific literature, based on the division of monetary and non-monetary inequalities. The models of monetary and non-monetary inequalities in the Russian society were compared and the common and specific features of their distribution were revealed. The zones of social well-being and disadvantage were identified and their characteristics were determined, including the shallowness of the zone of disadvantage and the instability of the zone of well-being, as well as the numerical dominance of the former over the latter. The results of the analysis of the dynamics of the models allowed to identify the tendency of "averaging" of the mass strata of society

by income and quality of life, which reinforces such a characteristic feature of the inequality configuration as the dominance of the middle groups in it.

New dimensions of non-monetary inequality were considered which, in a broad sense, are related to the possibility of achieving the desired model of life. It was shown that these dimensions of inequality do not smooth out monetary and other non-monetary inequalities but, on the contrary, increase them.

For the first time, the mobility of the population on the basis of subjective assessments of their material situation was analyzed. The comparison of the results with the obtained estimates of objective income mobility allowed to reveal a rather high instability of both the objective position of Russians in the hierarchy of income inequality and the subjective assessment of this position, as well as the absence of mass groups with relatively high incomes or relatively high assessments of their position stable over time.

Explanations were offered for the fact that the population's perception of inequality remains very acute even in the conditions of its objective reduction in the mass strata of the population. Based on the analysis of the dynamics, specificity and differentiation of the population's subjective perception of inequality, the key feature of its perception was revealed, which is connected with its being primarily a part of the system of normative values and perceptions of justice, rather than being formed according to the assessment of the individual situation. The mechanism of influence of subjective perception of inequality on the behavior of individuals at the micro level, associated with investment in human capital, was shown (in particular, the discouraging effect of the perception of inequality factors as non-meritocratic), which can have an important impact on the future vector of development of the country).

It was shown that a number of theoretical and methodological approaches (e.g. the relative poverty line set at the median of 0.6) and hypotheses (e.g. the hypothesis of expected upward mobility) developed in the socio-economic contexts of other societies do not work when directly transferred to Russian conditions and require adjustments to the country's specifics when used.

In general, the results of the dissertation research allow to identify the challenges of inequality for the sustainable development of the country, taking into account the specificity of its manifestations and dynamics in the conditions of modern Russian society.

## **Contribution to the discussion of the problem in the existing literature**

The scientific contribution of the study consists in the systematization of the main approaches to the assessment of monetary and non-monetary inequalities in the literature, the analysis of the reflection of inequality in the social structure of Russian society and in the subjective perception of the country's population, and, on this basis, the comprehensive assessment of the configuration and dynamics of multidimensional inequality characterizing Russian society.

The results of the dissertation research contribute to the understanding of the specifics of modern Russian society in terms of the distribution of the "burden" of monetary and non-monetary inequalities among the population, the attitude of Russians to these specifics, and their demands to the state in this regard, as well as to the understanding of the configuration of social stratification models based on various dimensions of multidimensional inequality. Such analysis enables us to see the problem points of society's sustainability, in particular, through the peculiarities of the ratio, composition, and position of groups occupying fundamentally different positions in the system of inequalities, as well as through the peculiarities of the population's perception of inequality, which

affects not only social tensions, but also real behavioral strategies at the micro level. In general, the results enable the identification of the challenges and opportunities for sustainable development of the country that are posed by the current configuration of the inequality system.

### **Statements to be defended**

1. The general configuration of monetary inequality in Russia is characterized by high, but not extreme, inequality in the mass strata of the population compared to the other countries. It features a shallow gap between Russians in the lower part of the income distribution and those in the middle part, with relatively large differences between the upper and middle parts of the income distribution; and a very large and growing gap between the mass of the population and the "top" of society, especially in terms of wealth, which determines the specificity of Russia among other countries of the world. Against the background of the discourse about the shrinking "middle classes" in Western countries, in Russia by contrast the number of middle-income groups is growing in the long term, even in times of crisis. This is due not only to the "pulling in" of low-income Russians, but also to the shrinking of relatively high-income groups (by the standards of the mass strata of the population). Moreover, Russian society is characterized by the absence of a zone of stable mass well-being by income: the group with relatively high incomes by mass standards is actively renewed. In contrast to this mass group, the narrow group of super-rich Russians is stable over time and its composition is renewed rather slowly, so that even today its generalized portrait is determined by those who started their working life before the reforms. In general, the model of income stratification of mass strata of Russian society looks as follows: about one-third is the lower stratum, whose income does not enable them to maintain a typical lifestyle of the average Russian; about 40% is the middle stratum, which has a typical income level for the whole population (median) and is characterized by a relatively modest standard of living, but exceeding the level required for survival; and the rest can be attributed to the upper part of the mass strata of the population, who, however, differ quite significantly among themselves.
2. The configuration of non-monetary inequalities, taking into account their manifestations in the key spheres of life (economic conditions, employment, education and health, consumption and leisure) mirrors the configuration of monetary inequality by income: It is characterized by a shallow but fairly widespread disadvantage of the lower stratum (comprising about one-fifth of the population), for whom deprivations and risks in these spheres dominate over life opportunities; a massive middle stratum (already comprising about two-thirds of the population), in which they are balanced; and the smallest in number, the upper stratum, which differs more markedly in its position due to the concentration of opportunities in different spheres. The relatively higher volatility of the upper stratum also seems to be similar in both models. The results of other approaches to the identification of groups characterized by different positions in the system of non-monetary inequalities – in particular, the analysis based on the population's self-assessment of their position in various axes of non-monetary inequalities – also show a relatively smaller number of advantaged groups compared to disadvantaged ones. At the same time, certain manifestations of non-monetary inequalities (availability of a "safety cushion", favorable employment conditions, good levels of health and education, etc.) are characterized by a high degree of concentration, and the nature of inequality is largely determined by qualitative differences between those who occupy higher

- position on these axes and the rest. The burden of relatively new dimensions of inequality, related, in particular, to the ability to control one's own life, to maintain a work-life balance etc., is similarly distributed among the population: they are superimposed on other monetary and non-monetary dimensions of inequality and tend to exacerbate rather than mitigate them.
3. In modern Russian society there is no zone of mass subjective well-being that is stable in time, and the "sticky ceiling" that is defined by the subjective assessment of one's material situation disappears in the medium term. This means that today there are no mass groups in society that consistently assess their position in the income hierarchy as high.
  4. The dynamics of monetary and non-monetary inequalities in recent years, viewed through the prism of social stratification, are similar in nature: there is an "averaging" of the mass strata of the population, both in terms of income and in terms of chances and risks, manifested in the expansion of middle groups. The majority of the country's population finds itself today in very similar living conditions both in terms of income and quality of life. As a result, today's Russian society can be considered a society of mass middle strata, but not of mass middle class in its traditional sociological definition. The social basis for the formation of middle class core in terms of its position in the system of monetary and non-monetary inequalities is shifted upwards, and the dynamics of "averaging" of the population by the level typical of its mass strata poses serious challenges to the expansion and sustainability of the middle class.
  5. The perception of inequality by the Russian population is primarily related to the general normative-value system of the population, in which the concept of social justice plays a key role, rather than to the specifics of the individual situation, including the current level of well-being and the experience or expectations of social mobility. The problem of inequality is acutely perceived by the country's population – the majority of Russians consider the inequality that characterizes Russian society today to be excessively deep and, more importantly, unfair, and this perception unites representatives of all segments of the population, including those who occupy an objectively advantageous position in the system of inequalities. One of the negative consequences of this perception of inequality is the reduction of investment in human capital at the micro level.

## **Analysis of data and findings**

The main results of the study are derived from several key areas of research:

- Monetary dimensions of inequality: the objective configuration of income inequality, its dynamics, the specifics of Russia in comparison with other countries, the model of income stratification of mass strata of the population, the number and dynamics of groups in this model (with a separate focus on the income poor group), income mobility of the population; and the stability and composition of the group of super-rich Russians as a polar group in the wealth hierarchy;
- Non-monetary dimensions of inequality: objective configuration, specifics of social stratification according to their manifestations in key spheres of life, the problem of the concentration of life chances of the population and its dynamics; subjective assessments of the position on various axes of non-monetary inequalities by the population; and new non-monetary dimensions of inequality (the ability to maintain a work-life balance, to maintain internal autonomy and a sense of controllability of one's own life, and the

stability of subjective well-being with the identification of groups that consistently evaluate assess their position as high or low, etc.)

- Subjective perceptions of inequality by the population: assessment of the depth and factors of monetary and non-monetary dimensions of inequality; differentiation and dynamics of these perceptions in different groups, including those with different experiences and expectations of mobility; demand for a certain model of inequality as an element of the social contract with the state; and behavioral consequences of the population's subjective perception of inequality.

The main results of the research are summarized below according to these areas. A number of results have been obtained in the course of the work of research teams in which the author was a member and are presented in publications with co-authorship. The author's contribution in the course of work in large research teams is indicated separately; in the works carried out with the participation of one or two co-authors, the author's contribution consisted in conceptualizing the goals and objectives of a particular research project within the theoretical and methodological framework of inequality research, developing appropriate approaches and interpreting the results obtained from the point of view of their contribution to understanding the specifics of inequality in modern Russia.

### *Objective configuration of monetary inequalities*

At first glance, monetary inequalities, considered under the concepts of income, wealth, or consumption inequality, seem to be more elaborated and their estimates more universal than those of non-monetary inequalities. However, a closer analysis shows that there is also disagreement about monetary inequality, its magnitude and dynamics, due to differences in the indicators used and approaches to its measurement. The first major direction of work within the framework of the dissertation research was related to the characterization of income inequality in Russian society through the prism of the sociological approach, in which the focus is not on income as such, but on individuals who differ in their level of income and, on this basis, form social groups occupying qualitatively different positions in the social structure of society. In the course of work in this direction, we have considered the general indicators of income and wealth inequality and the position of Russia against the background of other countries of the world in accordance with them, evaluated the model of income stratification of mass strata of the country's population, and obtained new estimates of income mobility. Wealth inequality among the mass strata of the population was deliberately left out of brackets in this case, since it is relevant mainly for the analysis of only the "top" strata where wealth is concentrated, creating high inequality even within a small subgroup, but which are not included in mass surveys (for Russia this problem is very acute, which makes it stand out against the background of other countries, and that caused a separate interest in the group of super-rich Russians within the dissertation research). As for the mass strata of the population, the differentiation of their assets that can be considered wealth is relatively small and is largely related to the legacy of the Soviet era, as the most expensive asset is housing.

It has been shown that different approaches to measuring monetary inequality position Russia differently on the world stage. In comparison with other countries, traditional economic indicators of income inequality in mass strata of the population (decile ratio, Gini index, etc.) position Russia as a country with a high level of inequality compared to European countries, but relatively lower inequality compared to other BRICS countries, and, in general, its indicators are not extreme. When

using equivalence scales that adjust incomes for economies of scale, Russia's inequality indicators improve against the international background, placing it in the group of typical European countries. In terms of income distribution by quintiles, Russia occupies intermediate positions, also ahead of most European countries, but not the BRICS countries [Mareeva, 2020b].

It has been shown that Russia is closer to European countries than to BRICS and Latin American countries in terms of the configuration of inequality in the lower part of the income distribution, in particular, in terms of the share and depth of absolute poverty, as well as its dynamics, characterized by the absence of poverty associated with physical survival and its relatively shallow nature [Mareeva, 2018d]. Moreover, income inequality associated with the gap between the poor and the mass strata of the population in the period 2000s–2010s decreased [Mareeva, 2020b], although the composition of the group of the poor has changed significantly [Tikhonova, Mareeva, 2016]. The small gap between the poor and the rest of the population, which characterizes income inequality in the lower part of the distribution, is also evidenced by the specifics of the relative monetary poverty line revealed in the course of the research, which consists in the fact that it passes at the higher level in terms of the share of the median than is commonly used in Western countries [Slobodenyuk, Mareeva, 2020]. It is important to take this into account when making international comparisons and practical adaptation of foreign experience in measuring poverty and inequality for the purposes of Russian social policy.

We have also analyzed the specifics of income inequality in the polar, upper part of the distribution. The upper quintile of the population by income is characterized by very high differentiation, and in the transition from the 20% of the population with the highest income to the top 1–5%, the positioning of Russia in the global landscape changes significantly: various estimates confirm that the country is one of the world leaders based on the gap between the "top" in terms of income and wealth, and the mass strata of the population. In general, the characteristics of the configuration of income inequality demonstrate that Russia is not a median example in this respect against the background of other countries, but has its own pronounced specificity associated with a combination of relatively low inequality between the lower and middle strata and huge and growing inequality between the "top" and the rest of the population, not only in income, but also to an even greater extent in wealth [Mareeva, 2020b].

The analysis of the composition and dynamics of the group of super-rich Russians as a polar group in the hierarchy of monetary wealth inequality has shown its high stability – the group reproduces annually by more than 90% – which is qualitatively different from the instability of mass income prosperity, discussed below, and ensures the maintenance of sustainable wealth inequality. The transformations taking place in this group in the last two decades reflect, on the one hand, the corresponding changes in Russian realities, with the growing role of new industries, the declining role of the public sector as a "starting point", the concentration of opportunities in metropolitan cities, and the growing importance of foreign education in the highest strata of the population, especially for children. On the other hand, the stability of this group ensures the inertness of its characteristics and the absence of qualitative changes in its composition and portrait – in contrast to the early period of its formation, when the group's renewal rate was high, and its portrait trends were almost completely opposite. The hypothesis that one of the factors of differentiation of the super-rich is the period of the beginning of their labor activity (before or after the beginning of active market reforms in Russia in the 1990s) was confirmed; however, even today the group is dominated by the super-rich

who began working before the reforms, to a greater extent determining its generalized portrait [Mareeva, Slobodenyuk, 2024].

In order to comprehensively analyze the specifics and dynamics of inequality in the mass strata of the population of Russian society, the income stratification model was developed and tested<sup>1</sup>. From the theoretical and methodological point of view, it is significant that in the course of this work it was shown that in modern Russian conditions, which have qualitatively changed in the last two decades in terms of the population's income, the use of the boundaries set by the most popular versions of the absolute approach in the world is inefficient, since they do not enable the differentiation of the main mass of the population, placing the majority of Russians to the "middle class" in terms of income. In 2000, the situation in Russian society was qualitatively different from today, which allowed this approach to be used effectively. Today, Russia is closer to European countries in terms of absolute income stratification patterns, which correlates with the traditional inequality indicators mentioned above. This determines the ineffectiveness of using absolute boundaries to analyze the situation in our country, which were developed mainly with an eye on the developing countries of the former "Third World" [Mareeva, 2018d; Mareeva, Lezhnina, 2019]. In the course of the research, it was shown that the relative approach associated with the use of the median income as a typical standard of living is more effective in developing a model of income stratification for Russia than the absolute one. In addition, it allows, if necessary, adjustments to be made for regional and settlement income inequality, which is relevant in the Russian conditions of uneven socio-economic development in different territories. The following classification of income groups was proposed: the poor (income below 0.5 median for the population as a whole); vulnerable to poverty (0.5–0.75 medians), median group (0.75–1.25 medians), middle-income group (1.25–2 medians), and high-income group (more than 2 medians) [Mareeva, 2018d].

This model was used to examine the characteristics of income inequality in the country through the prism of the share, composition, specifics of position and dynamics of different income groups. It was shown that the median group, which includes about 40% of the population and represents the typical income level of the entire population, is quantitatively dominant in Russian society today. Its representatives are characterized by a modest standard of living, which is determined by a rather low value of the median income in absolute terms, but which exceeds the level required for survival. When using the median income values by types of settlements or regions, the dominance of the median group in income stratification is even stronger [Mareeva, Lezhnina, 2019]. Thus, the general configuration of income inequality in the mass strata of the population is characterized by the dominance of the median strata, and the share of the low-income population exceeds the share of high-income Russians by mass standards. This enables us to characterize Russian society as a society of mass middle-income strata.

The analysis of features of consumer behavior of income groups, including in dynamics, was carried out. The results of this analysis showed that the "breakpoints", where the trends of prevalence of negative assessments over positive ones change to the opposite, mostly pass between the median

---

<sup>1</sup> This work was carried out by a research team with the participation of the author. The author's contribution consisted in participating in the conceptualization of the study, testing various methods of income stratification on empirical data sets, analyzing the characteristics of everyday life and consumption of representatives of different income strata, analyzing the dynamics of the model (both with and without the use of equivalence scales), participating in the formulation of the final conclusions. The results of the work are presented in a collective monograph [Tikhonova et al., 2018], in which the author prepared two chapters [Mareeva, 2018d; Mareeva, 2018e] and an introduction (co-authored).



income and the middle-income groups. This indicates that between these groups lies a boundary between the advantaged and disadvantaged population in modern Russia: the former includes middle and high-income Russians (together less than 30% of the population), while the latter includes the poor, vulnerable (about a third of the population) and, in some respects, representatives of the median group. At the same time, in some aspects of life, the median group leaves the boundaries of disadvantage and occupies rather an intermediate position on the border of the disadvantaged and advantaged population, which reflects the general state of modest and unstable well-being typical for the population of modern Russia [Mareeva, 2018e].

The analysis of the dynamics of the quality of life of groups occupying different positions in the hierarchy of income inequality has shown that during periods of economic growth or stability positive changes in the standard of consumption primarily affected the middle-income group of Russians. The gradual increase in the consumption standard of durable goods (associated, among other things, with the fact that Russians actively used the money left after essential expenditures to buy them) led to the fact that the typical sets of durable goods in different income groups became closer and to a lesser extent differentiated, indicating the smoothing of inequality in the ownership of durable goods in the 2000s-2010s [Mareeva, 2018e].

Analysis of the dynamics of the shares of income groups over the last two decades has shown a noticeable increase in the "middle" with a decrease in the polar groups – high and low income; in other words, during this period an "averaging" of the incomes of the mass strata of the population took place [Mareeva, 2020a]. This trend is even more pronounced when using equivalence scales. The expansion of the middle, including by reducing the size of the mass welfare zone, does not meet the needs of the most qualified and educated part of the population, reducing their opportunities for vertical income mobility.

Finally, another focus of analysis within this research area is income mobility. Indicators of income inequality, as well as models of income stratification, present a static picture of income "dispersion" by structural position, without taking into account the fact that specific individuals occupying these positions may change, moving up or down. The mobility of individuals between positions in this sense may, on the one hand, partially compensate for the inequalities existing between these positions themselves, but on the other hand it may imply high income instability and hence insecurity and social tensions. In order to assess this dynamic aspect of income inequality, the measurement of individual income mobility in Russia was carried out and its level was compared with those typical for earlier periods of the country's development and for other countries. The results showed that income mobility in Russian society, as in previous periods of post-Soviet development, remains quite high, which is generally more characteristic of countries in transition. At the same time, the situation in Russian society, as in other countries, is characterized by the presence of a "sticky floor" and "sticky ceiling" (relatively greater stability of the position of representatives of the lowest and highest income quintiles). However, in the international context (compared to the average data for OECD countries), Russian society is characterized by a lower level of sustainable inequality due to a smaller share of the population that does not change its positions in the upper income groups in the medium term. This, in particular, indicates the instability of the zone of mass income welfare in Russian society [Mareeva, Slobodenyuk, 2023]. High mobility in the Russian context is characterized not so much by the opportunities for everyone to be in the zone of relatively high incomes at one or another stage of the life cycle, but by the instability and volatility of even a fairly modest level of income for the majority of the population. In these conditions, in order to belong to the zone of stable

and relatively high income, it is enough to have only a stable income stream (which is reflected, among other things, in the wide representation of pensioners in the "sticky ceiling" zone) [Mareeva, Slobodenyuk, 2023]. The greatest instability among the most advantaged group in terms of income affects their perception of inequality and once again emphasizes the problematic situation of the most qualified and educated part of the population.

### *Objective configuration of non-monetary inequalities*

The second area of the dissertation research was the study of non-monetary dimensions of inequality. As in the case of income inequality, one of the tasks was to develop a model of the social stratification of mass strata of Russian society based on their position in the hierarchies of non-monetary dimensions of inequality. This task was solved within the theoretical and methodological framework of the analysis of Russians' life chances and risks<sup>2</sup>. Four key spheres of life were identified as the main "axes of social coordinates" of the multidimensional space of opportunities and risks that characterize the life of the Russian population: economic security (economic conditions of life), production relations (the situation at work), education and health (opportunities to preserve and increase their human capital), and consumption and leisure. These axes form, in fact, a kind of "skeleton" of the multidimensional space of non-monetary dimensions of inequality.

It has been shown that according to the position in the space of these four axes the mass population is divided into three main strata – the upper stratum (the position and well-being of whose representatives are qualitatively different from other Russians), and the middle and lower strata. Estimates of the model of stratification by life chances and risks on various empirical data sets for different years have shown that the number in the middle stratum is the highest – in different periods and according to various estimates it unites from one-half to two-thirds of Russians – while the upper stratum is smaller in number than the lower stratum (this was especially evident after the beginning of the pandemic crisis [Mareeva, Slobodenyuk, 2022a]). Thus, the model of distribution of non-monetary inequalities, as well as the model of income stratification, shows that Russian society turns out to be a society of mass middle strata. However, both income and quality of life, measured in terms of risks and opportunities, are rather modest at this middle level.

The results of other approaches to the identification of groups characterized by different positions in the system of non-monetary inequalities - in particular, the analysis based on self-assessments of the population of various spheres of their lives – also show a rather small number of well-off groups compared to disadvantaged and middle groups [Mareeva, 2018c]. Belonging to the zones of well-being or disadvantage identified on the basis of self-assessments of various aspects of their lives (thus reflecting the position on various axes of non-monetary inequalities), as well as belonging to different strata in terms of life chances, is largely determined not only by the lack or sufficiency of income, but also by a wider range of life circumstances with which people have to reckon, as well as their ability to cope independently with solving various kinds of problems.

---

<sup>2</sup> This work was carried out by a research team with the participation of the author. The author's contribution consisted in participating in the conceptualisation of the study, testing the methodology of stratification by life chances and risks on one of the empirical datasets, analysing the composition of the strata and the dynamics of the model in recent years, comparing the lowest stratum by life chances and risks with the poverty identified by the absolute approach, assessing the perception of inequality by representatives of different strata, and participating in the formulation of the final conclusions. The results of the work are presented in a collective monograph [Tikhonova et al., 2022], in which the author prepared three chapters [Mareeva, Slobodenyuk 2022a; Mareeva, Slobodenyuk 2022b; Mareeva, 2022d] and the introduction (co-authored).

As part of further work on the model of social stratification by life chances and risks, a comprehensive analysis of the composition and characteristics of the position of the three strata in its composition was carried out [Mareeva, Slobodenyuk, 2022a]. It was shown that the characteristics of their position in the multidimensional system of non-monetary inequalities are closer for the middle and lower strata than for the upper and middle strata. In other words, inequality in the position of representatives of the upper stratum in relation to the middle stratum is more pronounced than the inequality between the middle and lower strata. At the same time, the deprivations of the majority of the representatives of the lower class were not so deep. All this suggests a specific configuration of non-monetary inequality in Russia, which is noticeably reminiscent of its monetary model – a shallow but fairly widespread zone of disadvantage; a mass "middle" zone, characterized by typical living conditions of the population, which is relatively closer to the lower than to the upper strata; and the smallest zone of well-being, which differs more noticeably in its position from the rest of Russians. As for individual axes of non-monetary inequalities, the analysis of the dynamics of the situation showed that in recent years the degree of digital inequality between different strata has been decreasing, while the most pronounced inequality was in the sphere of human capital. Inequality in terms of leisure and consumption opportunities is also high, although under the influence of the pandemic it decreased due to the outstripping deterioration in this respect of the situation of the upper strata.

A separate analysis of the main non-monetary dimensions of inequality has shown that they are characterized by a high degree of concentration. Only a minority of the population has a "safety cushion", favorable employment conditions, a good level of health and education, and a positive assessment of their well-being. In all these axes, the nature of inequality is determined first and foremost by the qualitative differences between the small number of those at the "top" and the rest of the mass strata. In other words, the position in the coordinate system of non-monetary inequalities differentiates the most rather than the least prosperous strata of the population in comparison with the rest of the population [Mareeva, 2021b]. However, in some axes this situation is changing over time. Thus, it is shown that today the situation with digital inequality in its basic understanding looks different – it is no longer the availability of relevant opportunities that is concentrated in the upper strata of society, but their absence that characterizes the lower strata, reflecting a kind of "digital poverty". As for employment inequality, the differences in the situation of working Russians are primarily related to the degree of violation of basic rights and alienation of labor, i.e., deprivation, while the availability of additional benefits is characterized by high accessibility only for a minority of them.

In the course of the research, the dynamic aspect of the analysis of the space of non-monetary inequalities was also considered and an analysis carried out of the sustainability of three strata identified by life chances and risks [Mareeva, Slobodenyuk2022a]. The results showed that the position of representatives of the upper strata, which is most actively renewed, is the most unstable. It is also characterized by greater inconsistency of the status of its representatives in comparison with the other two strata. The lower stratum is the most stable in composition and is characterized by the lowest degree of renewal. It has also been shown that in recent years the reduction of inequality by life chances and risks in the mass strata of the population has been due to the disproportionate deterioration of the situation in the upper stratum, which has reduced its gap with the middle stratum. This vector of inequality reduction runs counter to the demands of Russians and worsens the prospects for the most educated and qualified part of the population. This also mirrors the situation that

characterizes the dynamics of inequality in the model of income stratification, in which the position of the high (by mass standards) income groups is unstable.

Comparison of stratification models built on different bases (by income and by life chances and risks) shows that Russian society today is a society of mass middle strata, both in terms of income and position in the system of non-monetary inequalities. This means that the majority of the country's population today finds itself in very similar living conditions, both in terms of current income and the ratio of available opportunities and threatening risks in different spheres of life (although the specific sets of chances and risks may differ). At the same time, in both models the middle strata, which occupy an intermediate position between the polar groups, are closer to the upper strata in some aspects of their position, but more often to the lower strata. Thus, the general inequality in Russian society today is largely determined by the difference between the position of the upper strata and the rest of the population. These models are similar in that the zones of disadvantage in both cases are quite widespread and relatively stable, although shallow. The zones of mass well-being, however, are characterized by a problematic situation; they demonstrate the greatest instability and are shrinking in the course of the ongoing "averaging" and expansion of the middle groups, including at the expense of the upper ones. Such dynamics are not situational and are not a reaction to external shocks in recent years but are a continuation of long-term trends. All this indicates the challenges to the sustainability and expansion of the middle class in Russia in its traditional sociological understanding, since the social basis for the formation of its core in terms of its position in the system of monetary and non-monetary inequalities is not in the middle but shifted upwards.

The correlation between monetary and non-monetary inequalities looks ambiguous in modern Russia. On the one hand, there is a correlation between them, while on the other hand, non-monetary manifestations of chances and risks in various spheres of life are not reduced to income [Mareeva, 2018c; Mareeva, Slobodenyuk 2022a]. In particular, high income does not always ensure a favorable position in the system of non-monetary inequalities, and low income does not always mean the dominance of risks over opportunities. Moreover, despite the fact that some representatives of the lower stratum, occupying a disadvantaged position in the system of non-monetary inequalities, have a level of income that does not formally classify them as poor, this group is characterized by a number of features that mean it can be considered as a real social "bottom" in the overall structure of modern Russian society; additionally, it is also closely linked to a sense of subjective poverty [Mareeva, Slobodenyuk, 2022b]. The study of the reasons for such discrepancies is one of the directions of future research, but it can already be stated that they are related to the specifics of expenditures and availability of other resources, as well as the social origin of individuals and their level of education. As a number of sectors and organizations (education, health, culture, etc.) become more commercialized, the relationship between the monetary and non-monetary dimensions of inequality is likely to increase.

Non-monetary dimensions of inequality are not limited to those spheres of life that have been used to distinguish strata by life chances and risks. New axes of inequality related to socio-psychological characteristics or the social sphere of life (including social contacts, communication, work-life balance, etc.) are beginning to play an increasingly important role. It has been shown that inequality due to socio-psychological well-being and opportunities to achieve life-work balance does not smooth out other monetary and non-monetary dimensions of inequality in life chances (especially those related to the economic sphere of life), but on the contrary deepens them. As a result, it can be stated that vertical stratification remains dominant in Russian society, and those dimensions of non-

monetary inequality related to lifestyle and lifestyle are superimposed on it, rather than becoming the basis of horizontal stratification [Mareeva, 2019]. The achievement of a balance between life and work in Russian society today acts as a sign of a generally prosperous position in the vertical hierarchy of other non-monetary dimensions of inequality.

In the course of the research the opportunities for Russians to achieve certain life goals was also considered, the distribution of which among the population also reveals the contours of the socio-psychological dimension of inequality. In this respect, the sphere of family and friendly relations is not characterized by high inequality – the goals in this sphere are not only important for the majority of Russians, but also quite achievable for the majority, judging by their self-assessment. Other spheres are characterized by higher inequality; for example, the sphere of labor relations, where heterogeneity is manifested both in the existence of goals related to achieving success in this sphere and in life plans, as well as in assessments of their achievability. The disparity is even greater for goals related to the quality of leisure time. In general, the greatest potential for the formation of social tensions is in those areas where Russians would like to be successful, but do not see these opportunities for themselves. In the sphere of production relations, it is the opportunity to get a prestigious job and make a career; in the sphere of free time, the opportunity to visit different countries and have a lot of free time; and in the sphere of personal goals, the opportunity to become rich [Mareeva, 2019]. These results contribute to the understanding of the non-monetary aspect of inequality, which is related to the ability to create for oneself a model of life that seems desirable and affects the overall social stability in society.

As part of the research on the dimensions of non-monetary inequality related to subjective well-being, subjective mobility on the "poverty-richness" scale was also analyzed. This analysis revealed a significant discrepancy between subjective and objective mobility by income and between immobile advantaged and disadvantaged groups in these coordinates. The results showed that subjective mobility turns out to be higher than objective mobility – i.e. subjective assessment of one's position on the poverty-richness scale is even more volatile than objective belonging to income groups. As for the persistent inequality in the subjective assessment of one's position, the phenomenon of the "sticky ceiling" is practically absent in this respect, which demonstrates the absence of groups in modern Russian society that persistently assess their position highly [Mareeva, Slobodenyuk, 2023]. At the same time, the peculiarities of self-assessment of one's position have certain behavioral consequences that are important for the sustainable development of the country as a whole – in particular, a differentiating role in terms of investment in children's human capital, which is important for the processes of intergenerational reproduction, has been shown. The discrepancy revealed between the zones of sustainable well-being and disadvantage in terms of income on the one hand, and subjective self-assessment on the other, once again emphasizes the importance of analyzing inequality as a complex phenomenon, the insufficiency of considering only its monetary aspect, and the importance of its subjective dimensions. The excess of persistent subjective disadvantage over persistent subjective well-being and the high volatility of subjective assessments of the material situation, even in periods of relatively stable economic development, are additional features of the model of non-monetary inequalities specific to Russian society.

The focus of the dissertation research was on the manifestations of inequality rather than its bases, but it also touched on issues related to such important factors of inequality in Russia as age (with a focus on the position of young people) and type of settlement. In the course of this work, it was shown that the space of objective statuses of young people, characterized by the position of their

representatives in key hierarchies by level of education and professional positions, does not show significant differences compared to middle-aged and older Russians, and the same is true for the patterns of income stratification of these groups. This enables us to state that young people are not disadvantaged in this respect due to the specific stage of the life cycle – on the contrary, within the youth group the existing configuration of the social structure, which is characteristic of Russians of working age in general, can already be observed (which is reflected, in particular, in the similar share of the middle class in the composition of these groups) [Mareeva, 2022a].

As for the settlement inequality, while its objective significance in the country remains, the main trend in 2000–2010, judging by the results obtained, was the convergence of the opportunities that exist for the residents of different settlements in the eyes of the population, i.e. a decrease in the acuteness of the perception of settlement inequality. This also contributes to a calmer perception of the confrontation between Moscow and "non-Moscow". On the one hand, among Russians there is still a dominant opinion about the advantage of living in capitals from the point of view of the life opportunities there, related to attainable goals, obtaining the desired education and work, and power resources, and, as a result, the opportunity to form a freer and more diverse way of life. At the same time, the inhabitants of capitals themselves are more satisfied with various aspects of their lives and evaluate their opportunities higher, and not only monetary ones. On the other hand, the degree of realization of their own life plans is lower among capital city residents than among provincial residents, and life in capitals is associated not only with a wider space of opportunities, but also with a higher incidence of certain risks associated with non-monetary aspects of life, which is understood by the majority of Russians. It has been demonstrated that in the capitals, alternative models of life success are beginning to form, more related to the values of free self-realization and diversity than the elements of a comfortable microcosm (family-friends-work, honest and stable life) characteristic of traditionalist systems, although they are not yet dominant [Mareeva, 2018b].

### *Inequalities in the perceptions of the population*

In the course of work on the first two research aspects, various aspects of the objective configuration of inequality in modern Russian society, both monetary and non-monetary, were considered. The third aspect was devoted to issues related to the perception of inequality characterizing Russian society in the public consciousness, its factors, and consequences. The analysis was carried out in the context of interpreting the population's perception of inequalities as an element of normative-value systems in general and in its interrelation with perceptions of justice.

It was shown that the concept of justice remains a key element of the normative-value model of the population, and its content is closely related to the issues of inequality – namely, ensuring equal opportunities for all and income differentiation based on factors that are legitimate from the population's point of view: work efficiency, level of education, etc. The results show that Russians have a rather high tolerance to income inequalities as such, if they occur in conditions of equal opportunities. Moreover, the principles related to non-monetary aspects of inequality – such as equal access to medicine and the labor market, equality before the law – turn out to be the key to a fair society in the perception of the population [Mareeva, 2018a]. However, the non-implementation of the principle of equal opportunities in practice, combined with the reduction of opportunities for non-monetary solutions to a number of everyday problems, leads to the exaggeration of the role of income inequality in modern Russian society in the perception of the population and the demand for its

reduction. There is a high discrepancy between the reality and the expectations of the population with regard to inequality. This is manifested, among other things, in the observed gap between the "ideal" and "real" models of the social structure of modern Russian society in the assessments of Russians, which leads to a growing public demand, directed at the state, for "equalization" and changes to the model of the social structure of society.

The analysis revealed the specifics of the perception of poverty by Russians, including in dynamics. It is shown that changes in the perception of poverty by the population reflect the objective trends in the development of the phenomenon of poverty in Russia in the period since the beginning of the 2000s: the reduction of the scale of poverty and changes in its causes, the transformation of the attitude of Russians to the poor (in particular, its individualization), and the displacement of this problem to the periphery of public consciousness. As a result, Russians today are not so much concerned about poverty per se, but rather about the problem of inequality in general, which affects the entire Russian society [Mareeva, Tikhonova, 2016]. The feeling of unfairness of inequality, which will be discussed below, is more related to the perception of the factors of well-being than to the factors of poverty, while as for poverty, in recent years the role of illegitimate factors in its formation has been decreasing in the eyes of the population.

The analysis of the perception of income inequality revealed that, unlike poverty, this problem is consistently perceived as important by the population and its acuity does not decrease even in times of crisis. It was shown that despite the transformation of income inequality in recent decades, the population's perception of income inequality remains similar to the picture characteristic of the 1990s – a qualitatively different stage of the country's development in terms of income levels, the share of the poor, and the quality of life. The overwhelming majority of Russians continue to perceive income inequality as excessively high and unfair, and the confrontation between the rich and the poor is perceived as the most acute among others (moreover, with the gap between the super-rich and the rest coming to the fore, demonstrating the reflection of the objectively high concentration of wealth in the hands of the "top" in the subjective perception of the population). The data of international comparative studies show that Russia is one of the leaders not only in terms of the population's demands for redistribution of income addressed to the state, but also in terms of the level of dissatisfaction with the way the state is dealing with this challenge today [Mareeva et al., 2022].

In the course of assessing the differentiation of the population's perception of income inequality, it was found that the perception of income inequality as excessively high and unfair, and the associated high demand for redistribution, do not differ qualitatively in sociodemographic or socioeconomic groups and are universal for the entire population [Mareeva, 2018a; Mareeva, 2022b].

Special attention was paid to testing the hypotheses of the perspectives of upward mobility (POUM) and the "tunnel effect" in modern Russia, which suggest the existence of a relationship between actual or expected social mobility on the one hand and the perception of inequality on the other. It was found that in modern Russian society, the experience of social mobility does not lead to a significant differentiation of opinions about income inequality, and the influence of the expected medium-term mobility is also weak. Only short-term expectations "work" relatively noticeably in this respect, and to a greater extent negative ones - they exacerbate the negative perception of income inequality and the demand for redistribution [Mareeva et al., 2022]. At the same time, all types of upward mobility smooth out the sharpness of the opinion of inequalities as high, unfair, and requiring reduction, while downward mobility increases the absolute belief in this. However, these changes among the extreme and moderate supporters of one or other position do not affect the overall

consensus of the population. This complicates the state's response to the challenges of inequality, as it shows that the acuity of the population's perception of inequality does not decrease significantly even when poverty is reduced.

The analysis of the population's perception of non-monetary inequalities showed that, as in the case of monetary inequalities, these perceptions and demands for their reduction are formed more on the basis of the population's normative ideas about the "correct" structure of society and its conformity with the observed reality than on the basis of the individual situation, including expected or actual mobility. Objective country-specific inequalities lead to the fact that the experience or expectation of mobility does not change the general perception of the unacceptability of such a situation, because the change of one's own position or the position of others does not affect the general configuration of the existing system of monetary and non-monetary inequalities.

The requests of Russians for state assistance, which, according to their estimates, is necessary in their own lives, were also analyzed [Anikin et al., 2019]. The results of the study made it possible to determine in which areas of non-monetary inequality the population would like to rely on state assistance, based on the specifics of their individual situation, rather than on general normative ideas about what the role of the state should be. It is shown that the most widespread demand relates to labor market policies, and it is based on institutional constraints that produce inequalities in access to good jobs; it is made primarily by young people who have problems in this area. The demand for social investment stems from health inequalities and the need to address them, rather than from the need to accumulate and maintain other components of human potential. The demand for state assistance with social support is formed primarily under the influence of inequality in the ability to independently solve material and housing problems. At the same time, groups with different demands are little differentiated in terms of normative perceptions of the necessary actions of the state in the sphere of reduction of non-monetary inequalities. This once again emphasizes the importance and universality of these perceptions as an element of the general normative-value system of the population as a whole.

The results of the study show that even the middle class, which includes the most educated and qualified Russians (defined in the sociological tradition on the basis of the neo-Weberian multicriteria approach, characterized, among other things, by a certain level of human capital), shares with other segments of the population ideas about inequality in modern Russian society, considering it too deep and illegitimate. The role of the key actor in solving this problem is assigned to the state, but its actions in this regard seem insufficient and ineffective. Although the middle class is distinguished from the rest of the population by a more favorable objective position in the system of inequality (in terms of both monetary and non-monetary dimensions), its representatives consider themselves to be in the "middle" of society, but by no means in the wealthy strata. Therefore, when they speak of inequality, they do not mean the gap between their positions and those of the rest of the mass population, but a significant and growing gap between the small "upper class" and other Russians, the group to which they themselves belong. Dissatisfaction with the state's lack of action in this regard is becoming an important challenge, raising the issue of revising the implicit social contract [Mareeva, 2021a].

It was found that the subjective perception of inequality can act as a factor influencing behavior at the micro level, which in turn determines the potential of society as a whole. The hypothesis about the influence of Russians' perception of inequality on their behavior with regard to investments in human capital was tested in the course of the analysis. It was shown that such a



relationship does exist, and that the perception of inequalities as meritocratic leads to an increased propensity to invest in the human capital of adults, while the perception of them as related to the institutional environment has a discouraging effect [Mareeva et al., 2023]. However, this picture has nuances related to the specifics of measuring both investment (both monetary and time expenditures are important) and various aspects of the perception of inequality.

## **Limitations of the research**

This study examines inequality from the perspective of structural analysis. The results of the study show what contemporary Russian society and its social structure look like through the prism of inequality as a multidimensional phenomenon. The focus was deliberately placed on the various manifestations of inequality rather than on its foundations, and no special attention was paid to assessing its class or non-class character, although the results make a certain contribution to the understanding of this issue as well. Another limitation is related to the empirical data sets available for analysis, which did not enable analysis of all the new forms of inequality that deserve to be analyzed.

## **Key findings**

The results obtained in the course of the work in different areas enable us to outline the opportunities and challenges for socio-economic policy in relation to inequality, which arise from the specifics of the country and are related not only to its objective configuration, but also to the perceptions of the population. Among the key features that define these challenges are the dominant number of strata of medium income and quality of life in the population structure, characterized by a rather modest level and quality of life and proximity to the disadvantaged strata in a number of aspects; the continuing trend of "averaging", the predominance of the share of disadvantaged population over the advantaged population compared to the average standard; a rather narrow and limited social base for the formation of the middle class in its traditional sociological sense, characterized, among other things, by a certain level of human capital; specifics of mobility, characterizing the population's rather volatile position; and the absence of a zone of sustainable mass well-being, contrasted with high sustainability and increasing concentration of income and wealth in a minimal top group. As for subjective perception, regarding inequality as high and illegitimate is universal among the entire population, varying little depending on individual positions and mobility experiences, and is an element of the population's general normative-value system.

The study also revealed the resources of productive use of inequality from the point of view of its perception by the population, which still exist in Russian society. For example, when talking about equality, most Russians still mean equality of opportunity, not equality of income; moreover, they accept a fairly high degree of income inequality if it is based on legitimate factors. What they want from the state is first and foremost a level playing field for all, clear "rules of the game" and control over their observance. In recent years, however, this potential has shown a downward trend – the population's perceptions in this regard are getting more blurred, tolerance for all causes of inequality has decreased, and there has been a growing demand for "equalization" of living conditions. Such processes indicate a reduction in the possible potential of using legitimate inequality as a productive incentive for competition [Mareeva, 2020a].

Thus, in the course of the dissertation research, the multidimensional space of inequality in Russia in its monetary and non-monetary dimensions was characterized: the main axes were identified, and the size and composition of groups occupying a relatively advantageous and disadvantaged position in it was shown. Estimates of the stability of these groups were obtained, the dynamics of their number were shown, and changes in their composition and characteristics in recent years revealed. It has been shown how this objective picture of inequality is reflected in the subjective perceptions of Russians, what factors influence their perception of inequality, and what consequences this may have.

For socio-economic policy purposes, the important results are the following:

- Estimates of the number and composition of disadvantaged groups and their dominance over advantaged groups, both in terms of income inequality and non-monetary measures of inequality, as well as in Russians' own subjective perceptions of their position in society;
- Identified discrepancies between the models of society built on the coordinates of income inequality and inequality of life chances and risks, which once again emphasize the irreducibility of measures to combat and prevent social disadvantage to the policy of income redistribution;
- The revealed influence of subjective perceptions of inequality on economic decisions made at the micro level, demonstrating the importance of monitoring subjective assessments of inequality (not only its depth, but also the population's perceptions of its causes and legitimacy);
- Identified peculiarities of the population's perception of the fairness and unfairness of different dimensions of inequalities, primarily related to ensuring equal opportunities and setting a general framework for the formation of a social contract with the state;
- The absence of a sustainable zone of mass well-being in today's Russian society, which emphasizes the need to work with the middle class as a separate object of social policy and suggests the development of measures related to the creation of prerequisites for its sustainable development.

Other research directions, on which work has already begun, include the analysis of the discrepancy between models of social stratification built on different bases, including the identification of factors of divergence in the position of certain groups in different hierarchies of inequality. Attention will also be paid to assessing changes in the significance of various dimensions of inequality and the emergence of new ones under the influence of the changing socio-economic context in the country.

## **Approbation of the research**

The results of the dissertation research have been presented at Russian and international scientific conferences, round tables, congresses and scientific seminars, including the April International Academic Conference on Economic and Social Development (2015, 2017, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2023), the International Russia Longitudinal Monitoring Survey of the Higher School of Economics User Conference (2021, 2023), the Russian Economic Congress (2016, 2020, 2023), the SASE Annual conference (2023), the St. Petersburg International Conference on Inequality and Diversity (2023), the Annual Conference of the Alexander Institute in Helsinki (2017, 2021), the Russian-French Conference on Social Problems, "Socio-economic Inequality and Poverty in the Modern World: Measures, Dynamics, and Prospects in an Age of Uncertainty" (2021), the International scientific conference, "Factors of Social Well-Being in Russia and in the World: Comparative Analysis" (2021), IV ISA Forum of Sociology (2021), the International Conference,

"Social dynamics. Inequalities, integration, mobility, and migration" (2020), the International scientific conference, "The Future of Sociological Knowledge and Challenges of Social Transformation" (2019), the CASS Forum (2019), the IARIW Conference, "Experiences and Challenges in Measuring Income and Wealth in Eastern Europe and CIS Countries" (2019), and others.

## **List of publications**

### ***The defense is carried out based on the following publications (main list):***

1. Mareeva S. (2020a) Socio-economic inequalities in modern Russia and their perception by the population. *Journal of Chinese Sociology*. Vol. 7. Article 10.
2. Mareeva S. (2020b) Monetary inequality in Russia in the sociological dimension. *Bulletin of the Institute of Sociology*, 11(3), 78-98 (in Russian) (Мареева С.В. (2020b) Монетарное неравенство в России в социологическом измерении // Вестник Института социологии. Т. 11. № 3. С. 78-98).
3. Mareeva S., Slobodenyuk E. (2023) A Society of Unstable Well-Being: Income Mobility and Immobility in Russia. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 75(9), 1475-1493.
4. Mareeva S. (2019) Inequality of Life Chances in Work-life Balance of Russians. *Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes*, 3, 324-344 (in Russian) (Мареева С. В. (2019) Неравенство жизненных шансов россиян в сфере баланса жизни и труда // Мониторинг общественного мнения: Экономические и социальные перемены. № 3. С. 324-344).
5. Mareeva S. (2018a) Social Inequalities and the Social Structure of Modern Russia as Perceived by the Population. *Bulletin of the Institute of Sociology*, 3(26), 101-120 (in Russian) (Мареева С.В. (2018a) Социальные неравенства и социальная структура современной России в восприятии населения // Вестник Института социологии. Т. 3. № 26. С. 101-120).
6. Mareeva S., Slobodenyuk E., Anikin V. (2022) Support for Reducing Inequality in the New Russia: Does Social Mobility Matter? *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics*, 8 (2), 175-196.
7. Mareeva S., Karavay A., Slobodenyuk E. (2023) Perceptions of Inequality as a Factor of Investments in Human Capital. *Sociological Research*, 6, 16-28 (in Russian) (Мареева С.В., Каравай А.В., Слободенюк Е.Д. (2023) Представления о неравенстве как фактор инвестиций в человеческий капитал (опыт эмпирического анализа) // Социологические исследования. 2023. № 6. С. 16-28).

### ***Other publications by the author submitted for defense:***

8. Mareeva S. (2021) Middle-Class Perceptions of Inequality Compared to Other Russians: Consensus or Disagreement? *Sociological Research*, 1, 38-49 (in Russian) (Мареева С. В. (2021) Представления среднего класса о неравенствах на фоне других россиян: консенсус или раскол? // Социологические исследования. № 1. С. 38-49).
9. Slobodenyuk E., Mareeva S. (2020) Relative Poverty in Russia: Evidence from Different Thresholds. *Social Indicators Research*, 151 (1), 135-153.
10. Mareeva S., Slobodenyuk E. (2024) Super-Rich in Modern Russia: Who Are They and Are They Changing? *Russian Politics*, 9 (2) (*in print*).

11. Anikin V. A., Lezhnina Y. P., Mareeva S. V., Slobodenyuk E. D. (2019) Russian Public Demand for State Assistance: Social Investment or Social Support? Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes, 3, 345-366 (in Russian) (Аникин В. А., Лежнина Ю. П., Мареева С. В., Слободенюк Е. Д. (2019) Запросы россиян на содействие государства: социальное инвестирование или социальная поддержка? // Мониторинг общественного мнения: Экономические и социальные перемены. № 3. С. 345-366).
12. Mareeva S. (2022a) The Social Status of Russian Youth: Ideas and Reality. Bulletin of the Institute of Sociology, 2, 158-183 (in Russian) Мареева С.В. (2022a) Социальный статус российской молодёжи: представления и реальность // Вестник Института социологии. №2. С. 158-183.
13. Mareeva S. (2018b) Life Chances of Population in Capitals and Provinces in Mass Consciousness. Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes, 6, 365-385 (in Russian) (Мареева С.В. (2018b) Жизненные шансы жителей столиц и провинций в массовом сознании // Мониторинг общественного мнения: Экономические и социальные перемены. № 6. С. 365-385).
14. Mareeva S. (2018c) Subjective Well-Being and Ill-Being Zones in the Russian Society. RUDN Journal of Sociology, 18 (4), 695-707 (in Russian) (Мареева С.В. (2018c) Зоны субъективного благополучия и неблагополучия в российском обществе // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Социология. Т. 18. № 4. С. 695-707)
15. Mareeva S., Lezhnina Y. (2019) Income Stratification in Russia: What do Different Approaches Demonstrate? Studies of Transition States and Societies, 11 (2), 23-46.
16. Mareeva S., Tikhonova N. (2016) Public Perceptions of Poverty and Social Inequality in Russia. The Universe of Russia. Sociology. Ethnology, 25(2), 37-67 (in Russian) (Мареева С.В., Тихонова Н.Е. (2016) Бедность и социальные неравенства в России в общественном сознании // Мир России: Социология, этнология. Т. 25. № 2. С. 37-67)
17. Tikhonova N., Mareeva S. (2016) Poverty in Contemporary Russian Society: Formation of a New Periphery. Russian Politics, 1(2), 159-183.

***Additional publications (chapters in monographs):***

18. Mareeva S., Slobodenyuk E. (2022a) Model of Russian Society Stratification by Life Chances and Risks: Specifics, Dynamics, Intergroup Mobility. In: Society of Unequal Opportunities: Social Structure of Modern Russia / ed. by N.E. Tikhonova. - M.: Ves' Mir. (in Russian) (Мареева С.В., Слободенюк Е.Д. (2022a) Модель стратификации российского общества по жизненным шансам и рискам: особенности, динамика, межгрупповая мобильность // Общество неравных возможностей: социальная структура современной России / под ред. Н.Е. Тихоновой. – М.: Весь Мир)
19. Mareeva S., Slobodenyuk E. (2022b) Relation between Negative Privilege and Poverty. In: Society of Unequal Opportunities: Social Structure of Modern Russia / ed. by N.E. Tikhonova. - M.: Ves' Mir. (in Russian) (Мареева С.В., Слободенюк Е.Д. (2022b) Соотношение негативной привилегированности и бедности // Общество неравных возможностей: социальная структура современной России / под ред. Н.Е. Тихоновой. – М.: Весь Мир).
20. Mareeva S. (2022b) Perception of Social Structure and Social Inequalities in Modern Russian Society by Representatives of Different Strata. In: Society of Unequal Opportunities: Social Structure of Modern Russia / ed. by N.E. Tikhonova. - M.: Ves' Mir. (in Russian) (Мареева С.В. (2022b)

Восприятие социальной структуры и социальных неравенств в современном российском обществе представителями разных страт // Общество неравных возможностей: социальная структура современной России / под ред. Н.Е. Тихоновой. – М.: Весь Мир).

21. Mareeva S. (2018d) Identification of Homogeneous Income Groups: Methodological Issues. In: Model of Income Stratification of Russian Society: Dynamics, Factors, Cross-Country Comparisons / ed. by N.E. Tikhonova. - M.: Nestor-Istoriya (in Russian) (Мареева С.В. (2018d)

Выделение гомогенных доходных групп: вопросы методики // Модель доходной стратификации российского общества: динамика, факторы, межстрановые сравнения / Под общ. ред. Н.Е. Тихоновой. Издательство Нестор-История).

22. Mareeva S. (2018e) Specifics of Life and Consumption of Different Income Groups Representatives. In: Model of Income Stratification of Russian Society: Dynamics, Factors, Cross-Country Comparisons / ed. by N.E. Tikhonova. - M.: Nestor-Istoriya (in Russian) (Мареева С.В. (2018e)

Особенности жизни и потребления представителей различных доходных групп // Модель доходной стратификации российского общества: динамика, факторы, межстрановые сравнения / Под общ. ред. Н.Е. Тихоновой. Издательство Нестор-История).

## List of references

1. Avraamova E. M., Maleva T. M. Evolution of the Russian middle class: Missions and methodology // *Social Sciences and Modernity*. 2014. № 4. Pp. 5-17.
2. Agafonov Y. G., Lepele V. R. "Golden doors" to the Russian business elite: Recruitment and change in the structure of big business in post-Soviet Russia // *The Universe of Russia. Sociology. Ethnology*. 2016. Vol. 25. № 3. Pp. 97-125.
3. Andreenkova A. V. Representations of justice and economic inequality in a comparative cross-country context // *Social Sciences and Modernity*. 2017. № 5. Pp. 18-30.
4. Anikin V. A., Tikhonova N. E. Poverty and inequality in the BRICS countries: Russian specifics // *Society and Economy*. 2016. № 1. Pp. 78-144.
5. Beck U. *Risk Society. On the way to another modernity*. - Moscow: Progress-Tradition, 2000.
6. Belyaeva L. A. Once again about the middle class of Russia // *Sociological Studies*. 2007. № 5. Pp. 3-13.
7. Voronin G. L. L., Zakharov V. Y., Kozyreva P. M. Measuring the sustainability of households: 1994-2017 // *Sociological Journal*. 2020. Vol. 26. № 1. Pp. 55-86.
8. Gimpelson V. E., Monusova G. A. Perception of inequality and social mobility // *Economic Journal of the Higher School of Economics*. 2014. Vol. 18. № 2. Pp. 216-248.
9. Grigoriev L., Salmina A., Kuzina O. *Russian middle class: analysis of structure and financial behavior*. - Moscow: Econ-Inform, 2009.
10. Danilova E. N. Periods of changes in social policy and perceptions of social justice in Russia // *Sociological Science and Social Practice*. 2015. Vol.10. № 2. Pp. 18-50.
11. Zubarevich N. V. Poverty in Russian regions in 2000-2017: factors and dynamics // *Population and Economy*. 2019. Vol. 3. № 1. Pp. 63-74.
12. Ibragimova Z. F., Franz M. V. Inequality of opportunity in the Russian Federation: measurement and evaluation on microdata // *Applied Econometrics*. 2019. Vol. 54. № 2. Pp. 5-25.
13. Kapelyushnikov R. I. Inequality: how not to primitivize the problem // *Questions of Economics*. 2017. № 4. Pp. 117-139.
14. Karabchuk T. S., Pashinova T. R., Soboleva N. E. Poverty of households in Russia: what the data of the RLMS HSE say // *The Universe of Russia. Sociology. Ethnology*. 2013. Vol. 22. № 1. Pp. 155-175.
15. Castells M. *The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture*. - Moscow: Litres, 2022.
16. Kozyreva P. M., Smirnov A. I. Scale and dynamics of socio-economic inequality in modern Russia // *Russia Reforming: Yearbook / Edited by M. K. Gorshkov*. Vol. 16. M.: New Chronograph, 2018. Pp. 290-318.
17. Kolennikova N. D. Status consistency of the employed population in modern Russia // *Sociological Studies*. 2019. № 11. Pp. 52-62.
18. Kosova L. B. What kind of society do we live in? Analysis of factors determining mass choice, on the example of the perception of social structure // *Bulletin of Public Opinion*. 2016. Vol. 3-4. № 122. Pp. 43-52.
19. Kryshantovskaya O. V. Business-elite and oligarchs: the results of the decade // *The Universe of Russia. Sociology. Ethnology*. 2002. Vol. 11. № 4. Pp. 3-60.
20. Maleva T. M., Burdyak A. Y., Tyndik A. O. Middle classes at different stages of the life path // *Journal of the New Economic Association*. 2015. Vol. 3. № 27. Pp. 109-138.
21. Maleva T. M., Grishina E. E., Tsatsura E. A. *Social policy in the long term: multidimensional poverty and effective targeting*. - Moscow: Delo Publishing House RANEPa, 2019.
22. Maleva T. M. M., Kartseva M. A., Kuznetsova P. O. Inequality of opportunities in Russian regions: objective assessments and peculiarities of the population's perception // *Regional Economics*. 2022. Vol. 18. № 3. Pp. 673-686.
23. Milanovic B. *Global Inequality. A new approach for the era of globalization*. - Moscow: Gaidar Institute Publishing House, 2017.
24. Ovcharova L. N. Poverty in Russia // *The Universe of Russia. Sociology. Ethnology*. 2001. Vol.

10. № 1. Pp. 171-178.
25. Ovcharova L. N. Poverty and economic growth in Russia // *Journal of Social Policy Research*. 2008. Vol. 6. № 4. Pp. 439-456.
  26. Ovcharova L. N., Popova D. O., Rudberg A. M. Decomposition of income inequality factors in modern Russia // *Journal of the New Economic Association*. 2016. Vol. 3. № 31. Pp. 170-185.
  27. Piketty T. *Capital in the XXI century*. - Moscow: Ad Marginem, 2015.
  28. Pishnyak A. I. Dynamics of the share and mobility of the middle class in Russia in 2000-2017 // *The Universe of Russia. Sociology. Ethnology*. 2020. Vol. 29. № 4. Pp. 57-84.
  29. Pishniak A. I., Khalina N. V., Nazarbayeva E. A., Goryainova A. R. Scale and profile of chronic poverty in Russia // *Journal of the New Economic Association*. 2021. № 2. Pp. 56-73.
  30. Rimsky V. L. Justice in modern Russia: dreams and use in social practices // *Social Sciences and Modernity*. 2013. № 5. Pp. 27-36.
  31. Sablina S. G. Crystallization of the status of middle strata in modern Russia // *Sociological Journal*. 2000. № 1-2. Pp. 100-111.
  32. Slobodenyuk E. D., Anikin V. A. Where is the "poverty line" in Russia // *Questions of Economics*. 2018. № 1. Pp. 104-127.
  33. Sokolov M. M., Sokolova N. A. Strata, not classes: patterns of horizontal stratification in modern urban Russia // *Economic Sociology*. 2020. Vol. 21. № 4. Pp. 12-29.
  34. *Social mobility in Russia: generational aspect* / ed. by V. V. Semenova, M. F. Chernysh, A. V. Vanke. - Moscow: Institute of Sociology RAS, 2017.
  35. *Social mobility in an increasingly complex society: objective and subjective aspects* / ed. by V. V. Semenova, M. F. Chernysh, P. E. Sushko. M.: FCTAS RAS, 2019
  36. *Middle Classes in Russia. Economic and Social Strategies* / Edited by T.M. Maleva. - Moscow: Gendalf, 2003.
  37. *The Middle Class in Modern Russia* / ed. by M. K. Gorshkov, N. E. Tikhonova. - Moscow: Institute of Sociology RAS, 2008.
  38. Stiglitz J. *The Price of Inequality. How today's divided society threatens our future*. - Moscow: Eksmo, 2015.
  39. Stiglitz J., Sen A., Fitoussi J. P. *Mismeasuring our lives: Why GDP doesn't add up. Report of the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress* - Moscow: Gaidar Institute Publishing House, 2016.
  40. Tikhonova N. E. Middle class in the focus of economic and sociological approaches: boundaries and internal structure (on the example of Russia) // *The Universe of Russia. Sociology. Ethnology*. 2020. Vol. 29. № 4. Pp. 34-56.
  41. Tikhonova N. E., Slobodenyuk E. D. Poverty of Russian professionals: prevalence, causes, trends // *The Universe of Russia. Sociology. Ethnology*. 2022. Vol. 31. № 1. Pp. 113-137.
  42. Tikhonova N. E., Slobodenyuk E. D. Heterogeneity of Russian poverty through the prism of deprivation and absolute approaches // *Social Sciences and Modernity*. 2014. № 1. Pp. 36-49.
  43. Tikhonova N.E., Lezhnina Y.P., Mareeva S.V., Anikin V.A., Karavay A.V., Slobodenyuk E.D. *Model of income stratification of Russian society: dynamics, factors, cross-country comparisons* / ed. by N.E. Tikhonova. - Moscow: Nestor-History, 2018.
  44. Tikhonova N.E., Mareeva S.V. *Middle Class: Theory and Reality*. - Moscow: Alfa-M, 2009.
  45. Tikhonova N.E., Mareeva S.V., Anikin V.A., Lezhnina Y.P., Karavay A.V., Slobodenyuk E.D. *Society of unequal opportunities: social structure of modern Russia* / ed. by N.E. Tikhonova - Moscow: Ves' Mir, 2022.
  46. Khakhulina L. A. Subjective middle class: sociological analysis // *Living standards of the population of Russian regions*. 2008. № 11-12. Pp. 115-119.
  47. Shkaratan O. I. *Socio-economic inequality and its reproduction in modern Russia*. - Moscow: "OLMA Media Group", 2009.
  48. Shkaratan O. I., Yastrebov G. A. Allocation of real (homogeneous) social groups in the Russian society: methods and results // *Applied Econometrics*. 2007. № 3. Pp. 95-118.
  49. Shkaratan O.I. *Sociology of Inequality. Theory and reality*. - Moscow: National Research

University Higher School of Economics, 2012.

50. Stompka P. Justice / transl. by A.A. Zotov. Chapter from the book: Fundamenty dobrego społeczeństwa. Wartości / pod red. Małgorzaty Boguni-Borowskiej. - Kraków : Znak, 2015. P. 232-250. // Monitoring of public opinion: Economic and social changes. 2017. № 6. Pp. 381-399.
51. Yastrebov G. A. Social mobility in post-Soviet Russia: a new look at the problem (using advanced methods of analysis) // Economic Sociology. 2014. Vol. 15. № 2. Pp. 127-136.
52. Yastrebov G. A. Social mobility in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia: new quantitative estimates based on the materials of representative surveys in 1994, 2002, 2006 and 2013. Part II // The Universe of Russia. Sociology. Ethnology. 2016. Vol. 25. № 2. Pp. 6-36.  
*(all above in Russian)*
53. Abanokova K., Dang H.-A. Poverty in Russia: a bird's-eye view of trends and dynamics in the past quarter of century. IZA Discussion Papers. 2021.
54. Aiyar S., Ebeke C. Inequality of opportunity, inequality of income and economic growth // World Development. 2020. Vol. 136. Pp. 105-115.
55. Alesina A., La Ferrara E. Preferences for redistribution in the land of opportunities // Journal of Public Economics. 2005. Vol. 89. № 5. Pp. 897-931.
56. Alesina A., Perotti R. Income distribution, political instability, and investment // European Economic Review. 1996. Vol. 40. № 6. Pp. 1203-1228.
57. Atkinson A. Inequality: What can be done? London: Harvard University Press, 2015.
58. Atkinson A., Brandolini A. On the identification of the "middle class". ECINEQ, Society for the Study of Economic Inequality. 2011.
59. Bak H., Yi Y. When the American dream fails: The effect of perceived economic inequality on present-oriented behavior // Psychology & Marketing. 2020. Vol. 37. № 10. Pp. 1321-1341.
60. Barro R. J. Inequality and growth in a panel of countries // Journal of Economic Growth. 2000. Vol. 5. № 1. Pp. 5-32.
61. Benabou R., Ok E.A. Social mobility and the demand for redistribution: The POUM hypothesis // The Quarterly Journal of Economics. 2001. Vol. 116. № 2. Pp. 447-487.
62. Birdsall N., Graham C., Pettinato S. Stuck in the tunnel: Is globalization muddling the middle class? LIS Working Paper Series No. 277. 2000.
63. Blau P. M. Inequality and heterogeneity: A primitive theory of social structure. Free Press New York, 1977.
64. Bogomolova T. Y., Tapilina V. S. Income mobility in Russia in the mid-1990s. Economic Education and Research Consortium Russian Economic Research Program Working Paper No. 99/11. 1999.
65. Boston consulting group. Global Wealth 2021: When clients take the lead. 2021.
66. Braguinsky S. Postcommunist oligarchs in Russia: quantitative analysis // Journal of Law and Economics. 2009. Vol. 52. № 2. Pp. 307-349.
67. Bussolo M., Ferrer-i-Carbonell A., Giolbas A., Torre, I. I perceive therefore I demand: the formation of inequality perceptions and demand for redistribution // Review of Income and Wealth. 2021. Vol. 67. Pp. 835-871.
68. Capgemini research group. The World Wealth Report 2022. 2022.
69. Chambers J., Swan L., Heesacker M. Better off than we know: distorted perceptions of incomes and income inequality in America // Psychological Science. 2014. Vol. 25. № 2. Pp. 613-618.
70. Chauvel L. Welfare regimes, cohorts, and the middle classes. In: Income Inequality: Economic Disparities and the Middle Class in Affluent Countries. CA, 2013.
71. Chen S., Ravallion M. Absolute poverty measures for the developing world, 1981-2004 // Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2007. Vol. 104. № 43. Pp. 16757-16762.
72. Chen S., Ravallion M. The developing world is poorer than we thought, but no less successful in the fight against poverty // The Quarterly Journal of Economics. 2010. Vol. 125. № 4. Pp. 1577-1625.
73. Cojocaru A. Prospects of upward mobility and preferences for redistribution: Evidence from



- the Life in transition survey // *European Journal of Political Economy*. 2014. Vol. 34. Pp. 300-314.
74. Colasanto D., Kapteyn A., Van der Gaag J. Two subjective definitions of poverty: Results from the Wisconsin basic needs study // *The Journal of Human Resources*. 1984. Vol. 19. № 1. Pp. 127-138.
  75. Credit Suisse. *Global Wealth Report*. Switzerland: Credit Suisse, 2022.
  76. Dahrendorf R. *Life chances: approaches to social and political theory*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979.
  77. Dallinger U. The endangered middle class? A comparative analysis of the role played by income redistribution // *Journal of European Social Policy*. 2013. Vol. 23. № 1. Pp. 83-101.
  78. Dang H.-A. H., Lokshin M., Abanokova K., Bussolo M. Welfare dynamics and inequality in the Russian Federation during 1994-2015 // *The European Journal of Development Research*. 2020. Vol. 32. № 4. Pp. 812-846.
  79. Deininger K., Squire L. New ways of looking at old issues: inequality and growth // *Journal of Development Economics*. 1998. Vol. 57. № 2. Pp. 259-287.
  80. Duncan G. J., Yeung W.J., Brooks-Gunn J., Smith J. How much does childhood poverty affect the life chances of children? // *American sociological review*. 1998. Vol. 63. №3. Pp. 406-423.
  81. Easterly W. The middle-class consensus and economic development // *Journal of economic growth*. 2001. Vol. 6. № 4. Pp. 317-335.
  82. EBRD. *Transition Report 2016-2017. Transition for all: Equal opportunities in an unequal world*. 2017.
  83. Eitzen D. S., Zinn M. B. *The reshaping of America: Social consequences of the changing economy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989.
  84. Engelhardt C., Wagener A. Biased perceptions of income inequality and redistribution. CESifo Working Paper Series No. 4838. 2014.
  85. Erikson R., Goldthorpe J. H. *The constant flux: A study of class mobility in industrial societies*. Oxford University Press, 1992.
  86. Fields G. S., Ok E. A. Measuring movement of incomes // *Economica*. 1999. Vol. 66. № 264. Pp. 455-471.
  87. Forbes K. J. A Reassessment of the relationship between inequality and growth // *American Economic Review*. 2000. Vol. 90. № 4. Pp. 869-887.
  88. Foster J. E. Absolute versus relative poverty // *The American economic review*. 1998. Vol. 88. № 2. Pp. 335-341.
  89. Galor O., Moav O. From physical to human capital accumulation: Inequality and the process of development // *Review of Economic Studies*. 2004. № 71. Pp. 1001-1026.
  90. Garroway C., De Laiglesia J. R. On the relevance of relative poverty for developing countries. OECD Development Center Working Papers No. 314. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2012.
  91. Gerber T. P., Hout M. Tightening up: Declining class mobility during Russia's market transition // *American Sociological Review*. 2004. Vol. 69. № 5. Pp. 677-703.
  92. Giddens A. *The class structure of the advanced societies*. London: Hutchinson, 1973.
  93. Gimpelson V., Treisman D. Misperceiving inequality // *Economics and Politics*. 2018. Vol. 30. Pp. 27-54.
  94. Goedhart T., Halberstadt V., Kapteyn A., Van Praag B. The poverty line: concept and measurement // *Journal of human resources*. 1977. Pp. 503-520.
  95. Goldthorpe J. H. Social class and the differentiation of employment contracts // *On Sociology: Numbers, Narratives and the Integration of Research and Theory*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
  96. Goldthorpe J. H., Llewellyn C., Payne C.. *Social mobility and class structure in modern Britain*. Clarendon Press Oxford, 1980.
  97. Graham C., Pettinato S. Frustrated achievers: Winners, losers and subjective well-being in new market economies // *Journal of Development Studies*. 2002. Vol. 38. № 4. Pp. 100-140.
  98. Grusky D. The stories about inequality that we love to tell // *The Inequality Reader*.

- Contemporary and Foundational Readings in Race, Class, and Gender. Westview Press., 2011. Pp. 1-13.
99. Grusky D., Weeden K. Decomposition without death: A research agenda for a new class analysis // *Acta Sociologica*. 2001. Vol. 44. № 3. Pp. 203-218.
  100. Guriev S., Rachinsky A. The role of oligarchs in Russian capitalism // *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 2005. Vol. 19. № 1. Pp. 131-150.
  101. Hadler M. Why do people accept different income ratios? A multi-level comparison of thirty countries // *Acta Sociologica*. 2005. Vol. 48. № 2. Pp. 131-154.
  102. Hardoon D., Ayele S., Fuentes-Nieva R. An economy for the 1%. How privilege and power in the economy drive extreme inequality and how this can be stopped. Oxfam Briefing Paper. 2016.
  103. Hauser O. P., Norton M. I. (Mis)perceptions of inequality // *Current Opinion in Psychology*. 2017. Vol. 18. Pp. 21-25.
  104. Hirschman A. O., Rothschild M. The changing tolerance for income inequality in the course of economic development // *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 1973. Vol. 87. № 4. Pp. 544-566.
  105. Hjellbrekke J., Le Roux B., Korsnes O., Lebaron F., Rosenlund L., Rouanet H. The Norwegian field of power anno 2000 // *European Societies*. 2007. Vol. 9. № 2. Pp. 245-273.
  106. Jäntti M., Jenkins S.P. Income mobility // *Handbook of income distribution*. Vol. 2. Elsevier, 2015. Pp. 807-935.
  107. Jovanovic B. Russian roller coaster: expenditure inequality and instability in Russia, 1994-98 // *Review of Income and Wealth*. 2001. Vol. 47. № 2. Pp. 251-271.
  108. Kelley J., Zagorski K. Economic change and the legitimization of inequality: The transition from socialism to the free market in Central-East Europe // *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*. 2004. Vol. 22. Pp. 319-364.
  109. Kharas H. The emerging middle class in developing countries. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2010.
  110. Knell M., Stix H. Perceptions of inequality // *European Journal of Political Economy*. 2020. Vol. 65. Pp. 101927.
  111. Kuhn A. The individual (mis-)perception of wage inequality: measurement, correlates and implications // *Empirical Economics*. 2020. Vol. 59. № 5. Pp. 2039-2069.
  112. Kuusela H. Learning to own: Cross-generational meanings of wealth and class-making in wealthy Finnish families // *The Sociological Review*. 2018. Vol. 66. № 6. Pp. 1161-1176.
  113. Larsen C. A. How three narratives of modernity justify economic inequality // *Acta Sociologica*. 2016. Vol. 59. № 2. Pp. 93-111.
  114. Loveless M. The deterioration of democratic political culture: Consequences of the perception of inequality // *Social Justice Research*. 2013. Vol. 26. № 4. Pp. 471-491.
  115. Lu P. The Horatio Alger myth in China: Origins of the first generation of visibly richest Chinese private entrepreneurs // *China: An International Journal*. 2017. Vol. 15. Pp. 75-97.
  116. Lu P., Fan X., Fu F. Profile of the super rich in China: A social space analysis // *The British Journal of Sociology*. 2021. Vol. 72. № 3. Pp. 543-565.
  117. Lukiyanova A., Oshchepkov A. Income mobility in Russia (2000-2005) // *Economic Systems*. 2012. Vol. 36. № 1. Pp. 46-64.
  118. Mack J., Lansley S. *Poor Britain*. Allen & Unwin London, 1985.
  119. Mayer S. *What money can't buy: Family income and children's life chances*. Harvard University Press, 1997.
  120. Milanovic B., Yitzhaki S. Decomposing world income distribution: Does the world have a middle class? // *Review of Income and Wealth*. 2002. Vol. 48. № 2. Pp. 155-178.
  121. Neumayer E. The super-rich in global perspective: a quantitative analysis of the Forbes list of billionaires // *Applied Economics Letters*. 2004.
  122. Niehues J. Subjective perceptions of inequality and redistributive preferences: An international comparison. Cologne Institute for Economic Research. IW-TRENDS Discussion Paper. 2014. Vol. 2. №1.

123. Nolan B., Whelan C. T. Poverty and deprivation in Europe. Oxford University Press, 2011.
124. Norton M. I., Ariely D. Building a better America - one wealth quintile at a time // Perspectives on psychological science. 2011. Vol. 6. № 1. Pp. 9-12.
125. Novokmet F., Piketty T., Zucman G. From Soviets to oligarchs: inequality and property in Russia 1905-2016 // Journal of Economic Inequality. 2018. Vol. 16. № 2. Pp. 189-223.
126. Nussbaum M. Capabilities and social justice // International Studies Review. 2002. Vol. 4. № 2. Pp. 123-135.
127. OECD. A broken social elevator? How to promote social mobility. OECD Publishing, 2018.
128. OECD. Under pressure: The squeezed middle class. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2019.
129. Persson T., Tabellini G. Is inequality harmful for growth? // The American Economic Review. 1994. Vol. 84. № 3. Pp. 600-621.
130. Ravallion M. The developing world's bulging (but vulnerable) middle class // World Development. 2010. Vol. 38. № 4. Pp. 445-454.
131. Ravallion M., Chen S. Weakly relative poverty // Review of economics and statistics. 2011. Vol. 93. № 4. Pp. 1251-1261.
132. Ravallion M., Datt G., Van de Walle D. Quantifying absolute poverty in the developing world // Review of Income and wealth. 1991. Vol. 37. № 4. Pp. 345-361.
133. Ravallion M., Lokshin M. Who wants to redistribute? The tunnel effect in 1990s Russia // Journal of Public Economics. 2000. Vol. 76. № 1. Pp. 87-104.
134. Roex K., Huijts T., Sieben I. Attitudes towards income inequality: 'Winners' versus 'losers' of the perceived meritocracy // Acta sociologica. 2019. Vol. 62. № 1. Pp. 47-63.
135. Rowntree B.S. Poverty: A study of town life. Macmillan, 1901.
136. Savage M., Devine, F., Cunningham N., Taylor M., Li Y., Hjellbrekke J., Le Roux B., Friedman S., Miles A. A new model of social class? Findings from the BBC's Great British Class Survey experiment // Sociology. 2013. Vol. 47. № 2. Pp. 219-250.
137. Savage M., Hjellbrekke J. The sociology of elites: a European stocktaking and call for collaboration. LSE International Inequalities Institute Working Paper No 58. 2021.
138. Schimpfössl E. Rich Russians: From oligarchs to bourgeoisie. Oxford University Press. 2018.
139. Sen A. Equality of what? Tanner lectures on human values, Vol. 1. Cambridge University Press, 1980.
140. Shorrocks A. Income inequality and income mobility // Journal of Economic Theory. 1978. Vol. 19. № 2. Pp. 376-393.
141. Sorensen A. Toward a sounder basis for class analysis // American Journal of Sociology. 2000. Vol. 105. № 6. Pp. 1523-1558.
142. Sprong S. et al. "Our country needs a strong leader right now": Economic inequality enhances the wish for a strong leader // Psychological science. 2019. Vol. 30. № 11. Pp. 1625-1637.
143. Townsend P. Poverty in the United Kingdom: A survey of household resources and standards of living. University of California Press, 1979.
144. Townsend P. The meaning of poverty // The British Journal of Sociology. 1962. Vol. 13. № 3. Pp. 210-227.
145. Treisman D. Russia's billionaires // American Economic Review. 2016. Vol. 106. № 5. Pp. 236-241.
146. Van der Weide R., Milanovic B. Inequality is bad for growth of the poor (but not for that of the rich). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No.6963. 2014.
147. Voitchovsky S. Does the profile of income inequality matter for economic growth? Distinguishing between the effects of inequality in different parts of the income distribution // Journal of Economic Growth. 2005. Vol. 10. № 3. Pp. 273-296.
148. Waldfogel J. Social mobility, life chances, and the early years // LSE STICERD Research Paper No. CASE088. 2004.
149. Weber M. Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology. University of California press, 1978.
150. Weisstanner D., Armingeon K. Redistributive preferences: Why actual income is ultimately

- more important than perceived income // Journal of European Social Policy. 2022. Vol. 32. № 2. Pp. 135-147.
151. Wilkinson R., Pickett K. The spirit level: Why equality is better for everyone. Penguin UK, 2010.
  152. World Bank. Poverty and shared prosperity 2016: Taking on inequality. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2016.
  153. World Bank. Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2020: Reversals of fortune. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2020.
  154. World Bank. Russia economic report: Confidence crisis exposes economic weakness. №31. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2014.
  155. World Bank. Russia economic report: The dawn of a new economic era? No. 33. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2015.
  156. Wright E. O. Approaches to class analysis. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
  157. Wright E. O. Class counts: Comparative studies in class analysis. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
  158. Wright E. O. Understanding class: Towards an integrated analytical approach // New left review. 2009. Vol. 60. № 1. Pp. 101-116.