

## NORTHERN AND ARCTIC SOCIETIES

UDC: 316.4(470.1/.2)(045)

DOI: 10.37482/issn2221-2698.2020.41.163

### “Dying” or “New Life” of Single-Industry Towns (the Case Study of Socio-economic Adaptation of Residents of Single-industry Settlements in the North-West of Russia) \*

© Elena V. NEDOSEKA, Cand. Sci. (Soc.), Associate Professor, Senior Researcher

E-mail: nedelena@socinst.ru

Sociological Institute of the RAS — a branch of the Federal Research Sociological Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg, Russia

© Nikolay I. KARBAINOV, Research Fellow

E-mail: n.karbainov@socinst.ru

Sociological Institute of the RAS — a branch of the Federal Research Sociological Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg, Russia

**Abstract.** The article is devoted to the socio-economic adaptation of single-industry towns' population on the example of single-industry settlements in the North-West of Russia. The work's theoretical and methodological framework is the approaches of scientists who study the grassroots practices of survival of small towns and villages (seasonal work, commuting, a distributed way of life, the informal economy). The empirical base of the study are statistical data collected from the databases of EMISS, SPARK Interfax, the Foundation for the Development of Single-Industry Towns, websites of administrations of single-industry settlements in the Northwestern Federal District, as well as data from field studies collected by the method of semi-formalized interviews with representatives of administrations and deputies of city and regional councils, with ordinary residents of single-industry towns in Republic of Karelia, Leningrad and Vologda oblasts. The study's preliminary results are presented: first, an analysis of the contradictions in the management approach. Many single-industry settlements in the Northwestern Federal District do not meet the criteria according to which they are included in the official list of single-industry towns. Also, government support measures to rescue “dying” monotowns are ineffective. Secondly, empirical research results show that residents of single-industry towns have developed strategies for adapting to new socio-economic conditions of life, which are not associated with employment in a city-forming enterprise. These strategies include: 1) rotational work or seasonal work; 2) pendulum migration within spontaneous local agglomerations; 3) “distributed lifestyle”; 4) involvement in various spheres of the informal economy. Thus, single-industry towns “do not die” but survive primarily due to the population's grassroots economic practices.

**Keywords:** *single-industry town, North-West Federal District, survival strategy, economic practice.*

### Introduction

The spatial structure of modern Russia is an administrative-territorial diversity, a special place in which is occupied by monotowns [1, Karbainov N.I., Nedoseka E.V., p. 146]. Today, the list of single-industry municipalities of the Russian Federation includes 321 single-industry towns, where, as of the beginning of 2020, 13.5 million people lived (about 9.2% of the population of Russia)<sup>1</sup>. The national average population of a single-industry town is about 40 thousand people. Most

\* For citation: Nedoseka E.V., Karbainov N.I. “Dying” or “New Life” of Single-Industry Towns (the Case Study of Socio-economic Adaptation of Residents of Single-industry Settlements in the North-West of Russia). *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North], 2020, no. 41, pp. 163–181. DOI: 10.37482/issn2221-2698.2020.41.163

<sup>1</sup> Rasporyazhenie Pravitel'stva RF ot 16 aprelya 2015 g. № 668-r «Ob izmeneniyakh, kotorye vnosyatsya v perechen' monoprofil'nykh munitsipal'nykh obrazovaniy RF (monogorodov)» [Order of the Government of the Russian Federation of April 16, 2015 No. 668-r "On Changes to the List of Single-Industry Municipalities of the Russian Federation (Single-Industry Towns)"]. URL: <https://base.garant.ru/70988888/> (accessed 04 October 2020).

of Russian monocities are small (54%). There are monocities in 61 out of 85 regions of Russia, but they are mostly concentrated in the regions of the Volga region and Siberia<sup>2</sup>.

The problems of research of single-industry towns are distinguished by a wide range of subject areas and, in general, by increased attention from the academic community. Most of the works are devoted to the study of the problems and prospects of single-industry towns based on statistical data and analysis of economic indicators, as a rule, fixing the crisis phenomena that determine and support the discourse of "extinction". There is no single approach to the definition of a monotown either. As before, the prevailing opinions link the life of the settlement with the determining role of the city-forming enterprise [2, Lappo G.M.; 3, Turgel' I.D. ; 4, Makarov A.N. ; 5, Popovicheva N.E., Polyandin A.V. ; 6, Gusev V.V. ; 7, Kalmykov N.N. ; 8, Veselkova N.V. et al.].

Monoprofiling and narrow diversification of employment spheres are interpreted as key problems of single-industry towns. Within the framework of this approach, the authors propose various classifications of types of diversification, based on the financial condition of the settlement, modeling the infrastructure of diversification [9, Antonova I.S.; 10, Sevastyanova A.E.]; scenarios for the development of single-industry towns [11, Zemlyanskiy D.Yu., Lamanov S.V.; 12, Kottov A.V.; 13, Manaeva I.V., Boltenkova Yu.V. et al.] and so on.

An important role in the research baggage is played by works that analyze foreign experience in the development of single-industry towns [14, Urozhaeva T.P., 15, Kulay S.V., 16. Gusev V.V.]; justification of measures of state support [17, Dmitrieva E.O.; 18, Petrina O.A.], increasing the investment attractiveness and the role of small business in the development of single-industry towns [19, Skorobogatova Yu.A., Baldina A.A.; 20, Dmitrieva E.O.]

We share the position of the authors Zamyatina N.Yu. and Pilyasov A.N. [21, Zamyatina N.Yu., Pilyasov A.N., p. 7–8], who emphasize that most of the work and management decisions are based on the "old arsenal of methodological research tools and instruments of state policy of the previous industrial era," without taking into account the new economic realities. The authors note: "Practically none of the authors ... raises the question of changing the very nature of a city-forming enterprise, which loses its socio-cultural impact on the local community and a single-industry city, but retains levers of financial and economic influence, including in providing employment."

An important methodological guideline for us is the research of sociologists, historians and anthropologists, who interpret monotowns in a broad context, taking into account the historical, settlement and cultural characteristics. From this point of view, monotowns "do not die", but are transformed, and the population adapts to the new economic and sociocultural conditions of life [22, Meerovich M.G.; 23; 24, Lyubovnyy V.Ya.].

The theoretical and methodological substantiation of the article was the approaches of sociologists who studied such social phenomena as migration for seasonal work [25, Plyusnin Yu.M.,

---

<sup>2</sup> ICSS analytical report. URL: <https://icss.ru/vokrug-statistiki/obzor-rossijskix-monogorodov> (accessed 04 October 2020).

Zausaeva Ya.D., Zhidkevich N.N., Pozanenko A.A.], which is presented as a mass phenomenon, not reflected in statistics, which is a grassroots practice of survival for the population of small towns and villages; pendulum migration [Shitov Y., Shitova Y., 26, Bugaev M.A.], as a key strategy of shuttle movement from a small town to agglomeration centers; distributed lifestyle [27, Kordonskiy S.G.], representing alternative economic practices of survival; informal economy [28, Barsukova S.Yu.]

The purpose of the article is to consider the key practices of socio-economic adaptation of the population of post-Soviet single-industry towns using the example of single-industry settlements in the Northwestern Federal District<sup>3</sup>.

The empirical basis of the study is made up of statistical data collected from the databases of Unified Interdepartmental Statistical Information System, SPAMF Interfax, the Foundation for the Development of Single-Industry Towns, websites of administrations of single-industry settlements in the Northwestern Federal District. Besides, field research data collected by the method of semi-formalized interviews with representatives of administrations and deputies of city and regional councils, with ordinary residents of single-industry towns in the Republic of Karelia, Leningrad and Vologda regions was taken. A total of 72 interviews were conducted. An additional research method was the observation method. Interviews and observations were conducted in 2018–2019 within the framework of field research, where the main goal was to determine the opinions and visions of informants (experts) about the current situation, problems and changes taking place in monotowns.

The structure of the article is as follows. In the first section, we will show the contradictions of the management approach using the example of single-industry towns in the Northwestern Federal District of the Russian Federation. In the second section, we will consider some of the results of our study of the socio-economic situation in single-industry towns in the North-West of Russia.

### ***Management approach: "from a bird's eye view"***

For quite a long time there has been no single approach at the level of the highest executive bodies of power to understanding which settlements were classified as monotowns and which were not. In 2014, the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation proposed to consider a single-industry town as "a settlement (urban district), organizations and residents of which are not able to compensate for the risks of the external economic environment on their own, excluding the possibility of sustainable development of this settlement, which usually has a city-forming enterprise, which employs at least 25% of the working-age population of this settlement"<sup>4</sup>. Thus, the main criteria proposed by the Ministry are: 1) the presence of an enterprise or

---

<sup>3</sup> The object of the study was defined by us as an available sample and the main conclusions are not extrapolated to all settlements of the single-profile type of the Russian Federation.

<sup>4</sup> Postanovlenie Pravitel'stva ot 29 iyulya 2014 goda № 709 «O kriteriyakh otneseniya munitsipal'nykh obrazovaniy k monogorodam i o kategoriyakh monogorodov v zavisimosti ot riskov ukhudsheniya ikh sotsial'no-ekonomicheskogo

several enterprises operating within a single production and technological process, which employs more than 25% of the economically active population in the main job; 2) the presence of an enterprise or several enterprises operating within the framework of a single production and technological process, which account for more than 50% of the volume of industrial production; 3) additional criteria for assigning settlements to the category of single-industry settlements: the share of taxes and fees received by the budget of the municipal formation from an enterprise or several enterprises operating within a single production and technological process located in a settlement is at least 20% of the total the volume of taxes and fees received by the municipal budget from all organizations and enterprises.

In one of our publications, we noted that the above criteria are quite generalized and imply consideration of only quantitative characteristics, which is necessary for the formal endowment of the municipality with the appropriate status. These criteria are most often the number of people employed in the city-forming complex, the share of the city-forming enterprise in the total volume of shipment of the settlement [1, Karbainov N.I., Nedoseka E.V.].

Next, we will consider the contradictions of the management approach using the example of single-industry towns in Northwest Russia. Most of the single-industry towns in the Northwestern Federal District arose as a result of the policy of Soviet industrialization in the 1930s – 1950s. Initially, such settlements were mainly inhabited by special resettlement contingents and political prisoners; this is especially typical for the Murmansk and Arkhangelsk oblasts and the Republic of Karelia. These are relatively young settlements with a poorly rooted population and a short history of existence (with rare exceptions: for example, some settlements of the Novgorod and Vologda oblasts have a longer history). Industrialism, remoteness from the transport infrastructure, population variation in combination with northern natural and climatic conditions are inherently characteristic features of single-industry settlements in the Northwestern Federal District. The main sectors of the economy for the monotowns of the Northwestern Federal District continue to be metallurgy, the extraction of fuel and energy minerals, the extraction of other minerals and the timber industry.

Today there are 42 monotowns (about 15% of the total) in the North-West Federal District. Of the total number of single-industry towns in the Northwestern Federal District, 31 are classified as small (74% of the total number of single-industry towns), 1 — as medium (2%), 2 — as large (4%). According to regulatory documents (PP RF No. 709 dated July 29, 2014<sup>5</sup>), in order to include

---

polozheniya» [Decree of the Government of July 29, 2014 No. 709 "On the Criteria for Classifying Municipalities as Single-Industry Towns and Categories of Single-Industry Towns Depending on the Risks of Deterioration of Their Socio-Economic Situation"]. URL: <http://government.ru/docs/14049/> (accessed 02 October 2020).

<sup>5</sup> Postanovlenie Pravitel'stva RF ot 29 iyulya 2014 g. N 709 «O kriteriyakh otneseniya munitsipal'nykh obrazovaniy Rossiyskoy Federatsii k monopofil'nym (monogorodam) i kategoriyakh monopofil'nykh munitsipal'nykh obrazovaniy Rossiyskoy Federatsii (monogorodov) v zavisimosti ot riskov ukhudsheniya ikh sotsial'no-ekonomicheskogo polozheniya» [Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of July 29, 2014 No. 709 "On the Criteria for Classifying Municipalities of the Russian Federation as Single-Industry (Single-Industry Towns) and Categories of Single-Industry Municipalities of the Russian Federation (Single-Industry Cities), Depending on the Risks of Deterioration of Their Socio-Economic Situation"]. URL: <https://base.garant.ru/70707142/> (accessed 01 October 2020).

a municipality in the list of monotowns, the population in this entity should be at least 3 thousand people. Since the population of a number of towns is declining, and, in addition, some small settlements were included in the list of single-industry towns before this restriction came into force, at the moment there are 6 single-industry towns in the Northwestern Federal District with a population of less than 3 thousand people (settlement Vyartsilya, Muezerskoe urban settlement (Republic of Karelia); settlement of Sazonovo (Vologda oblast); settlement of Kizema (Arkhangelsk oblast); settlement of Uglovka and Krasnofarfornyy (Novgorod oblast) The largest single-industry town of the Northwestern Federal District in terms of population is the city of Cherepovets, Vologda oblast – 314.8 thousand people, the smallest is the Georgian rural settlement of the Novgorod oblast — 1.3 thousand people.

For a long time there was no unified approach in management practice to both understanding the place of single-industry towns in the spatial structure of the Russian Federation, and management strategies in relation to those crisis manifestations that have matured over the more than 30-year history of the new economic reality. In 2014, the main parameters were determined and the categories of single-industry towns were formed, taking into account the financial and economic situation of the city-forming enterprise, analysis of the situation on the territorial labor market and possible scenarios for the development of such municipalities. In particular, there are three such groups: the first category is red zone, the second — yellow and the third — green.

According to these criteria, most of the monotowns of the Northwestern Federal District (20) belong to the "yellow" zone — to cities with risks of worsening socio-economic situation; 18 monotowns are in the "red" zone — single-industry towns with the most difficult situation and 4 monotowns are in the "green" zone — a stable socio-economic situation (Fig. 1).

In fact, every region of the Northwestern Federal District has settlements classified as "red zone". In total, there are 18 monotowns of the North-West Federal District in a difficult socio-economic situation, proceeding from the logic of the economic and management approach, of which 6 are in the Republic of Karelia, 3 are in the Murmansk and Vologda oblasts, 2 are in the Arkhangelsk and Novgorod oblasts, 1 is in the Leningrad oblast and the Komi Republic.

Table 1

*Indicators of the size of the able-bodied population of single-industry towns and the average number of employees of the city-forming enterprises of the "red zone" of the Northwestern Federal District*<sup>6</sup>

	Monotown	Region	City forming enterprise <sup>7</sup>	Able-bodied population, people	Average number of employees of city-forming enterprises, people
Category 1. Single-industry municipalities of the Northwestern Federal District (single-industry towns) with the most difficult socio-economic situation (including problems of functioning of city-forming organizations)					
1	Kizema village	Arkhangelsk oblast	Dmitrievskoe separate subdivision of LLC PKP "Ti-	1 121	185

<sup>6</sup> The data were calculated by the author based on information from the Foundation of the Russian monotown.

<sup>7</sup> Enterprises that have gone through bankruptcy and closure procedures are italicized.

			tan"		
2	Onega	Arkhangelsk oblast	LLC "Onega LDK", OJSC "Onegales", OJSC "Onega-Energia", LLC "PKTS"	10032	763
3	Krasavino	Vologda oblast	Branch of GEP "Vologdaobl-kommunenergo"	2874	94
4	Sazonovo	Vologda oblast	JSC Glass Factory "Rusjam-Pokrovsky"	1339	12
5	Cherepovets	Vologda oblast	JSC CherMK "Severstal"	151963	22237
6	Pikalevo	Leningrad oblast	JSC "Pikalevskaya Soda"; JSC "Pikalevsky cement"; LLC "Pikalevsky Alumina Plant"	11343	2819
7	Kirovsk	Murmansk oblast	JSC "Apatite"	16081	5207
8	Kovdor	Murmansk oblast	OJSC "Kovdorsky Mining and Processing Plant"	9935	3642
9	Revda village	Murmansk oblast	LLC "Lovozerky Mining and Processing Plant"	4638	1100
10	Krasnofarfornyy vil- lage	Novgorod oblast	LLC "Porcelain on Volkhov" (liquidated)	783	
11	Pestovo	Novgorod oblast	Pestovo sawmill LLC "UPM-Kyumene Chudovo"	8369	н.д.
12	Suoyarvi	Republic of Karelia	CJSC "Zapkarelles"	4696	125
13	Kondopoga	Republic of Karelia	JSC "Kondopoga"; JSC "Kondopoga PPM"	16723	3316
14	Muezerskiy vil- lage	Republic of Karelia	OJSC "Muezersky Lespromkhoz"	1433	1
15	Nadvoitsy vil- lage	Republic of Karelia	OJSC "Siberian-Ural Aluminum Company" branch "NAZ-SUAL"	4541	100
16	Pitkyaranta	Republic of Karelia	LLC RK "Grant" Pulp Mill "Pitkyaranta"	5403	848
17	Pudozh	Republic of Karelia	LLC "Pudozhlesprom" (liquidated)	5038	
18	Emva	Komi Republic	LLC "LesServicePlus" and "Emva Development"	7161	30
Category 2. Single-industry municipalities of the Northwestern Federal District (monotowns) with risks of deterioration of the socio-economic situation					
19	Oktyabr'skiy vil- lage	Arkhangelsk oblast	OJSC "Ustyales", OJSC "Oktyabrsky DSK"	4937	33
20	Koryazhma	Arkhangelsk oblast	Branch of OJSC "Ilim Group"	19297	3463
21	Novodvinsk	Arkhangelsk oblast	OJSC "Arkhangelsk PPM"	20620	4117
22	Slantsy	Leningrad oblast	JSC "Slantsevo Cement Plant "Tsesla"; LLC "Peterburgcement"; LLC "Slantsy"	18464	1295
23	Nikel' vil- lage	Murmansk oblast	OJSC "Kola Mining and Metallurgical Company"	6949	1350
24	Monchegorsk	Murmansk oblast	OJSC "Kola MMC"	25642	7445
25	Zapolyarnyy	Murmansk oblast	OJSC "Kola Mining and Metallurgical Company"	8971	3308
26	Olenegorsk	Murmansk oblast	OJSC "OLKON"	17700	1870
27	Sokol	Vologda oblast	OJSC "Sokolskiy DOK", "Sokolskiy PPM", OOO "Sukhonskiy PPM"	17604	1402
28	Parfino vil- lage	Novgorod oblast	LLC "Parfinsky plywood"	3646	714

			mill"		
29	Borovichi	Novgorod oblast	JSC "Borovichi Refractories Plant"	27135	4664
30	Uglovka village	Novgorod oblast	JSC "Uglovsky lime plant"	2078	353
31	Segezha	Republic of Karelia	JSC "Segezha PPM" (OJSC "Segezha PPM")	14590	1935
32	Kostomuksha	Republic of Karelia	JSC "Karelsky Okatysh"	16919	3290
33	Vyartsilya village	Republic of Karelia	CJSC "Vyartsilskiy hardware plant"	1704	210
34	Pindushi village	Republic of Karelia	JSC "Karelia DSP"	2489	353
35	Lakhdenpokh'ya	Republic of Karelia	<i>Lahdenpohskiy plywood mill "Bumex"</i>	3774	
36	Inta	Komi Republic	JSC "Mine"Intaugol"	15353	179
37	Zheshart village	Komi Republic	CJSC "Zheshart Plywood Mill"	4648	1822
38	Vorkuta	Komi Republic	OJSC "Vorkutaugol" (including OJSC "Mine Vorkashorskaya")	51598	6173
Category 3. Single-industry municipalities of the Northwestern Federal District (monotowns) with a stable socio-economic situation					
39	Severodvinsk	Arkhangelsk oblast	OJSC "PO "Sevmash"", OJSC "CS "Zvyozdochka"	100974	38601
40	Syas'stroy	Leningrad oblast	OJSC "Syas'sk Pulp and Paper Mill"	6948	1960
41	Severoonezhsk vil-lage	Arhangelsk oblast	OJSC "SOBR"	2498	447
42	Pechory	Pskov oblast	LLC "Euroceramics"	5148	839

Source: The table was compiled by the authors on the basis of statistics from municipalities, the Foundation for the Development of Single-Industry Towns, the SPARK system<sup>8</sup>.

If we rely on the criteria of the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation, then a number of settlements included in the list of single-industry towns do not correspond to one or more criteria (Table 1). So, for example, only 17% of mono-cities of the Northwestern Federal District meets the first criterion (25% of the economically active population of a monotown should be employed in a city-forming enterprise): Zheshart (39.2%), Severodvinsk (38.2%), Zapolyarnyy (36.9 %), Kovdor (36.7%), Kirovsk (32.4%), Monchegorsk (29.0%), Syas'stroy (28.2%) and Pikalevo (24.9%). In most single-industry towns of the Northwestern Federal District (78.5%), the average indicator of the employed population in city-forming enterprises in relation to the economically active population is 14.7%. The list of single-industry towns also includes settlements where city-forming enterprises went bankrupt or suspended their activities (about 34% of the entire "red" zone). Thus, the urban-type settlement Krasnofarfornyy, the urban settlement of Lakhdenpokh'ya, the urban settlement of Pudozh, the cities of Pestovo and Nadvoitsy were virtually left without city-forming enterprises.

In 2015, a new support tool was proposed for single-industry towns in the form of the opportunity to create zones with a special tax regime and mandatory payments from extra-budgetary funds on their territory, the so-called territories of advanced socio-economic develop-

<sup>8</sup> Enterprises that are either in the stage of bankruptcy or liquidated as of 01 January 2020 are italicized in the table.

ment (TASED or TOR). There are 11 such zones in the NWFD. Information on residents and the number of jobs created by them is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Data on the number of residents and jobs in the TASED NWFD, 2020

Subject of TASED	Resident name	Number of jobs provided by residents
Cherepovets city	LLC "Bakery" Schaslivochnaya" (former short name of the resident of LLC "YugFinance") LLC "Mechanica" LLC "Fibroplit" LLC "ChTK "Novy" LLC "TD "Russian Tea" LLC "ChSZ" LLC "ChMK" LLC "Plant NARTIS" LLC "CHEK" LLC "Technoperspektiva" LLC "Teplovoy Element" LLC "Vologda Milk Plant" LLC "Stroy Beton"	430
Nadvoitsy city	LLC "Russian Radiator" LLC "TDM" LLC "Spetskroy" LLC "KU Data Center" LLC "Nadvoitskiy carborundum plant"	181
Pikalevo city	LLC "PITEK" LLC "RemAvtoPik" LLC "F. Skrupskoy"	175
Kirovsk city	JSC "PO" Complex " LLC "NITRO SIBERIA ZAPOLARE" LLC "Reman" LLC "UMPTEK" JSC "PO" Complex" LLC "TG Service"	120
Kostomuksha city	LLC "Laplandia Trans" LLC "INVEST GROUP" LLC "BORYU" LLC "NS ENGINEERING"	93
Borovichy city	LLC "Vilina"	89
Uglovka settlement	LLC "Valdai cosmetics" LLC "SIL-Plast"	52
Kondopoga city	LLC "KLEZ-Astar" LLC "TKK-T"	36
Emva settlement	LLC "LesServicePlus"	26
Onega city	LLC "RodArktur"	19
Pechory city	-	-

Source: The table was compiled on the basis of data from the SPARK system, the Foundation for the Development of Single-Industry Towns, the official websites of the administrations of single-industry settlements.

As follows from the table 3, TASED includes the monotowns of the Republic of Karelia, where it has been possible to create about 300 new jobs, but the question how much this meets the needs of settlements in the field of employment of the population remains open. The most successful project in the Northwestern Federal District, according to the estimates of the Foundation for Single-Industry Towns of the Russian Federation, is the single-industry town of Cherepo-



vets: the territory has achieved significant success in diversifying the spheres of economic activity and moving away from mono-dependence of city-forming enterprises. TASED of Cherepovets accommodates 13 active residents, and the maximum number of jobs has been created here in relation to other TASED zones in the Northwestern Federal District. As follows from the table, residents cannot meet the employment needs of most single-industry towns.

Thus, we can see that an important part of the existing survival practices of the mono-urban population is slipping away from official statistics. This serious limitation also has its consequences in the process of making management decisions. As shown above, even taking into account the existing list of single-industry settlements, most of them simply do not meet the stated criteria. This problem is extrapolated to settlements that, for some reason, do not fall into the lists of single-industry towns, while having all the necessary set of criteria, for example: the city of Boksitogorsk (Leningrad oblast), the city of Apatity (Murmansk oblast), and others. Getting on the "list" is weakly correlated with the normatively defined criteria.

### *Looking from below: the role of spontaneous socio-economic practices*

The gradual decline in the economic importance of the city-forming enterprises led to serious consequences of a crisis, from which the residents of single-industry towns emerged in different ways. The capitalist reality of the 1990s turned out to be more alien and difficult to overcome for them than in settlements of another type. Special economic, political, social conditions, a special territorial identity have developed here, which have been interpreted in the works of such researchers as Chirikova A.E., Ledyayev V.G. [29], Kotov A.V. [12], Pilyasov A.N. [30], Davydov D.A. [31], Karbainov N.I., Nedoseka E.V. [1], Zhigunova G.V. [32] and others.

Transformational processes of the 1990s affected the state of mono-profile towns in different ways: in most cases, city-forming enterprises continued to function, which to a certain extent supported the illusion of relative stability. The processes of privatization, change of owners, sales markets and re-profiling of production, although alarming, were not comparable to the closure of the entire enterprise.

As part of our empirical study, a survey among representatives of municipal authorities (heads of administrations, deputy heads for various issues, deputies of city councils) was carried out. The main problems of realizing the economic potential of the studied territories, according to the informants, were:

- unattractiveness of the territories for young people — as the main resource of the settlements. The respondents indicated that young people, seeing difficulties in self-realization due to limited opportunities to obtain the desired level of education, medical care, profession, as well as to satisfy their cultural needs, do not consider the territory of their native settlement as a promising place. Indeed, this assumption finds its confirmation in the data of official statistics. Data on the migration loss are presented in table 3.

Table 3

*Migration decline in the population of single-industry settlements in the Northwestern Federal District from 2000 to 2020*

№	Settlement name	% of migration loss from 2000 to 2020	№	Settlement name	% of migration loss from 2000 to 2020
1	Cherepovets	-3%	22	Pikalevo	-23%
2	Kostomuksha	-7%	23	Zapolyarnyy	-23%
3	Pestovo	-9%	24	Segezha	-25%
4	Vyartsilya	-9%	25	Parfino	-25%
5	Pos. Oktyabr'skiy	-10%	26	Kirovsk	-25%
6	Sokol	-13%	27	Olenegorsk	-25%
7	Novodvinsk	-13%	28	Onega	-26%
8	Syas'stroy	-13%	29	Emva	-26%
9	Severooonezhsk	-16%	30	Zheshart	-29%
10	Pindushi	-18%	31	Krasavino	-29%
11	Krasnofarfornyy	-19%	32	Pitkyaranta	-30%
12	Pudozh	-19%	33	Kovdor	-32%
13	Koryazhma	-19%	34	Lakhdenpokh'ya	-32%
14	Slantsy	-20%	35	Kizema	-32%
15	Borovichi	-20%	36	Muezerskiy	-33%
16	Severodvinsk	-21%	37	Nikel'	-33%
17	Kondopoga	-21%	38	Pechory	-34%
18	Monchegorsk	-21%	39	Nadvoitsy	-35%
19	Revda	-22%	40	Uglovka	-37%
20	Suoyarvi	-23%	41	Vorkuta	-41%
21	Sazonovo	23%	42	Inta	-51%

Source: UISIS data

According to informants' estimates, one of the most active migration groups is youth from 16 to 25 years old. The informants indicated human capital loss in the territories of their settlements. With regard to the ongoing optimization of social institutions, the number of social infrastructures (schools, hospitals, cultural and sports institutions) is constantly declining or disappearing. An important methodological note is that only the "tip of the iceberg" is included in the official statistics, as the informants noted, it is not possible to estimate the real migration losses of the population due to fixing only the registration rates at the place of residence. Thus, about 1.5 thousand of the economically active population of Pikalevo city work outside the settlement.

With regard to social infrastructure facilities in monotowns, the memory of the decisive financial role of the city-forming enterprise in maintaining these institutions is still fresh. Even with a stable financial situation of enterprises, social initiatives are usually directed at workers in city-forming enterprises, which aggravates inequality in single-industry towns. The heads of municipalities pointed to a rather weak connection with the management of enterprises, pointing out their real inaccessibility, since most decision-makers do not live in the territory of the settlement, as well as insignificant interest in dialogue with the municipal authorities. New company owners are interested in efficiency and profit, the only connection with the regional society is the assessment

of the population in terms of an effective or ineffective labor force. In this sense, the case of one of the monotowns of the Republic of Karelia is interesting, where a conflict of interests arose related to attracting shift workers to the city-forming enterprise, to whom the company provided housing and jobs (thereby avoiding taxes and additional northern payments, according to informants), practically ignoring the resources of the local population. According to the head of the administration, this issue was directly resolved with the company's management, as it led to a serious aggravation of the situation in the town<sup>9</sup>.

- limited opportunities in decision making. Substantial dependence on the verticals — regional and federal authorities. These restrictions, according to representatives of municipalities, significantly affect the volume of budgets (this is especially typical for settlements with actively operating enterprises) and powers. We noticed that the relationship between the budget and the fundamental quality of life of the settlement was not found: the average budget of a single-industry town of about 20-25 thousand people is about 90 million rubles, the budget of Koryazhma is fundamentally different, which in 2019 was 1,1 billion rubles. It should be noted here that most of the budgets of single-industry settlements in the Northwestern Federal District remain deficient.
- low entrepreneurial activity of the population. According to the informants, the existing system of grants is poorly justified. Thus, grantees are mainly focused on the implementation of projects in the service sector in those segments of the economy that are not significant and promising due to market saturation. As a rule, these are hairdressing and numerous educational services. An important remark from the side of the informants was an indication of the proliferation of regional and federal trade networks, in comparison with which individual entrepreneurship cannot withstand competition.
- lack of offers from potential residents. The search for residents and the selection of existing proposals according to the criteria of compliance with the TASED is a serious obstacle to the realization of the economic potential of the territories. Despite a number of preferences that TASED promises in the field of financial support and a special tax regime, not all organizations, even those that started working in the zone, were able to use them in full.

Nevertheless, despite the statistics of settlements that are far from optimistic economic indicators, within the framework of our empirical study, we were able to identify the following strategies for adapting the population of single-industry towns in North-West Russia to new socio-economic conditions, which are spontaneous grassroots survival practices.

**1. Migration for seasonal work or rotational work.** A common strategy for survival in the post-Soviet economic conditions, especially for residents of small towns, is seasonal work [25]. The

---

<sup>9</sup> For ethical reasons, the article does not include the name of the monotown and the city-forming company.

results of our empirical study also showed that a significant part of the residents of single-industry towns began to leave in search of work in large cities (in the North-West of Russia, primarily to Saint Petersburg) and to the "North".

**2. Circular migration within spontaneous local agglomerations.** The creation of spontaneous local agglomerations is a common practice for settlements of this type. They are, for example, Boksitogorsk, Pikalevo, Tikhvin in the Leningrad oblast; Segezha, Nadvoitsy and Kondopoga with Petrozavodsk in the Republic of Karelia; Monchegorsk, Apatity, Kirovsk in the Murmansk oblast, etc. The circulation of the labor force within the local agglomerations is a characteristic feature of the everyday life of single-industry towns. Such satellite towns, located in close proximity either from each other, or at a relative distance from the regional or district center, are in a more stable position in relation to isolated settlements. So, for example, Krasavino, Inta, the villages of Sazonovo, Krasnofarfornyy, Pindushi, Severoonezhsk do not have a developed infrastructure [33, Golivtsova N.N., p. 14], which greatly aggravates the socio-economic situation of the settlements. The emerging local agglomerations play an important economic and leisure role in the life of satellite territories. The discrepancy between the place of residence and place of work is a fairly common practice, under which entire market segments (renting out housing, private taxi, etc.) are actively formed and operate successfully.

**3. Distributed lifestyle.** An important survival strategy both for Russians in general and for residents of single-industry towns in particular has become what Simon Kordonskiy calls "a distributed lifestyle" [27]. As S. Kordonskiy notes: "The life of most families in Russia is divided between a city apartment, a summer residence, a cellar, a barn and a garage. Most often, a family in an ordinary city has a city apartment, a dacha house with a plot of land in a suburb or village, a bathhouse, a poultry house (pigsty, cowshed), a cellar (shed) in the city where food products produced at the "dacha" are stored, a car (and a garage), the main function of which is to provide communication between a city apartment and a summer cottage. The garage can be combined with a cellar (shed). In the village, the functions of a house and a summer residence are combined, and there is — except for the garden plot — also mowing, land "for potatoes", as well as forest and river lands used under unclear conditions" [27, Kordonskiy S.G., p. 23]. A distributed lifestyle began to take shape in single-industry towns back in Soviet times, but it flourished especially in the 1990s. Many residents of single-industry towns have, in addition to city apartments, summer cottages both in the suburban area, and in neighboring villages. For example, some residents of Pikalevo buy houses in the villages of the Boksitogorsk region and use them either as a dacha or as their main place of residence. In the latter case, they explain that there is a bad ecological situation in Pikalevo, while in the village "air is clean". Vegetables and even pigs, poultry and other animals are grown at dachas and in village farmsteads. For truck farming, plots of land are also used right next to the apartment buildings. We saw such a picture in Luchki, a suburb of Slantsy. Small vegetable gardens were planted right next to the houses. An interesting example of a distributed

lifestyle is in Syas'troy. Residents of damaged houses were relocated to new houses, and they built sheds on the illegally seized land near their new homes.

**4. Informal economy.** Informal economies play an important role in the life of single-industry towns. They are, for example, private taxi service, private repairs and construction works, tutoring, and so on. Residents of single-industry towns are also involved in such spheres of the informal economy as gathering, hunting, fishing and others. Clearly, in most cases, these incomes are not taxed.

An important note is that the socio-cultural and economic space of the monotowns of the Northwestern Federal District is not homogeneous, these are very different settlements, which can be divided into three main groups: 1. Monotowns of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation, the obvious specificity is the remoteness and inaccessibility of settlements, and weak embeddedness. The strategies of migration for seasonal work and rotational work methods are most evident here. 2. Monotowns of the Leningrad oblast, where the proximity of St. Petersburg is a key characteristic that determines the strength of agglomeration trends, where circular migration is a common practice. 3. Single-industry towns located in the Vologda oblast, Novgorod oblast and the southern part of the Arkhangelsk oblast, are characterized by a high embeddedness of the population, which manifests itself in the active use of the potential of the territories through tourism and a distributive lifestyle.

### *Conclusion*

Thus, the criteria for classifying settlements as single-industry towns does not correspond to the reality (the average level of employment of the economically active population at the city-forming enterprises does not meet the 25% level stated in the criteria, and on average does not exceed 15%). It is important to note that city-forming enterprises in a significant number of settlements in the red zone are "dead souls" that are in the stage of bankruptcy or liquidated. Attempts to diversify employment through the introduction of zones of special economic and tax regimes, as evidenced by the data, is a long-term measure. The number of new jobs, even in the aggregate, is far from the real needs of the population of single-industry towns. The termination of work or a decrease in the volume of production of a city-forming enterprise, as well as a reduction in the number of employees at these enterprises, do not lead to the "death" of single-industry towns. The data of empirical research showed that representatives of the administrations of single-industry towns are clearly oriented in the main problems of settlements, but limited powers in decision-making leave them hostages of situations where adherence to the formality of instructions and regulations does not correlate in any way with an improvement in the quality of settlements life, since the remaining residents of these settlements were able to adapt to new social and economic conditions. The results of the interviews and included observations allowed us to determine survival strategies, grassroots practices of the population, which spontaneously integrates into the new economic realities that rarely fall into the management vision.

## References

1. Karbainov N.I., Nedoseka E.V. Transformatsiya sovetskoy modernosti v rossiyskikh monogorodakh [Transformation of Soviet Modernity in Russian Single-Industry Towns]. *Malye goroda v sotsial'nom prostranstve Rossii* [Small Towns in the Social Space of Russia]. Moscow, Federal Center of Theoretical and Applied Sociology RAS Publ., 2019, pp. 146–155. DOI 10.19181/monogr.978-5-89697-323-2.2019
2. Lappo G.M. *Goroda Rossii. Vzglyad geografa* [Towns of Russia. A Geographer's Perspective]. Moscow, Khronograf Publ., 2012. 504 p. (In Russ.)
3. Turgel' I.D. *Monofunktional'nye goroda Rossii: ot vyzhivaniya k ustoychivomu razvitiyu* [Monofunctional Towns in Russia: from Survival to Sustainable Development]. Moscow, Direkt Media, 2014. 765 p. (In Russ.)
4. Makarov A.N. Evolyutsiya monogorodov kak infrastruktornogo potentsiala innovatsionnogo importozameshcheniya [Company Towns Evolution as Infrastructure Building Innovative Import Substitution]. *Regional'naya ekonomika: teoriya i praktika* [Regional Economics: Theory and Practice], 2013, no. 41 (320), pp. 53–57.
5. Popovicheva N.E., Polyandin A.V. Problemy razvitiya monogorodov v sovremennykh usloviyakh [Problems of Development of Monocities in the Modern World]. *Srednerusskiy vestnik obshchestvennykh nauk* [Central Russian Journal of Social Sciences], 2015, no. 4, vol. 10, pp. 186–193. DOI: 10.12737/11965
6. Gusev V.V. Rossiyskie monogoroda: proekty budushchego ili arkhaychnoe nasledie proshlogo [Russian Mono-Cities: Projects of the Future or Heritage of the Past?]. *Vlast'* [The Power], 2012, no. 10, pp. 23–27.
7. Kalmykov N.N., Menshchikova V.I., Merkulova E.Yu., Konstantinov I.B., Konstantinova E.P., Teten'kina O.L. Klyuchevye napravleniya stabilizatsii sotsial'no-ekonomicheskogo polozheniya rossiyskikh monogorodov [The Key Directions for Stabilization of Socio-Economic Situation of Russian Single-Industry Towns]. *Razvitie territoriy* [Territory Development], 2018, no. 2 (12), pp. 14–18. DOI: 10.32324/2412-8945-2018-2-14-19
8. Veselkova N., Pryamikova E., Vandyshev M. Monogorod: dilemmy konstruirovaniya prostranstva [Monocity: Dilemmas of Designing Space]. *TOPOS*, 2011, no. 1, pp. 208–224.
9. Antonova I.S. Teoriya diversifikatsii ekonomiki monogoroda [Diversification Theory for Company-Town Economy]. *Vestnik nauki Sibiri* [Siberian Journal of Science], 2015, no. 2 (17), pp. 179–192.
10. Sevastyanova A.E. Strategicheskie aspekty diversifikatsii i modernizatsii ekonomiki monogorodov [Strategic Aspects of Diversification and Modernization in the Economy of Single-Industry Settlements]. *Vestnik Kemerovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Politicheskie, sotsiologicheskie i ekonomicheskie nauki* [Bulletin of Kemerovo State University. Series: Political, Sociological and Economic sciences], 2018, no. 2, pp. 139–145. DOI: 10.21603/2500-3372-2018-2-139-145
11. Zemlyanskiy D.Yu., Lamanov S.V. Stsenarii razvitiya monopofil'nykh gorodov Rossii [Scenarios of Development for the Single Industry Towns in Russia]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 5, Geografiya* [Moscow University Bulletin. Series 5, Geography], 2014, no. 4, pp. 69–74.
12. Kotov A.V. «Polyarnyy Rur»: strukturnaya politika v monogorodakh rossiyskoy Arktiki ["Polar Ruhr": Structural Policy in Monotowns of the Russian Arctic]. *Vserossiyskiy ekonomicheskii zhurnal EKO* [ECO journal], 2017, no. 7, pp. 34–52.
13. Manaeva I.V., Boltenkova Yu.V. Metodicheskie rekomendatsii po vyboru stsenariya razvitiya monogorodov [Methodological Recommendations on Selection of Scenarios for the Development of Single-Industry Towns]. *Problemy razvitiya territoriy* [Problems of Territory's Development], 2016, no. 6 (86), pp. 196–208.
14. Urozhaeva T.P. Monogoroda v 1980–1990-e gody: zarubezhnyy, rossiyskiy i regional'nyy opyt resheniya sotsial'no-ekonomicheskikh problem [Mono-Industry Towns of the 1980-1990-ies: Foreign and National Experience in Solving Social and Economic Problems]. *Uchenye zapiski Petrozavodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* [Proceedings of Petrozavodsk State University], 2016, no. 3, pp. 35–39.

15. Kulay S.V. Zarubezhnyy opyt modernizatsii i restrukturizatsii ekonomiki monogorodov [Foreign Experience of Single-Industry Towns Modernization and Economic Restructuring]. *Gosudarstvennoe upravlenie. Elektronnyy vestnik* [E-journal. Public Administration], 2019, no. 73, pp. 224–248.
16. Gusev V.V. Monoprofil'nye poseleniya (monogoroda): zarubezhnyy opyt resheniya sotsial'nykh problem [Monoprofile Settlements (Monocities): Foreign Experience Solving Social Problems]. *Izvestiya Saratovskogo universiteta. Novaya seriya. Seriya Sotsiologiya. Politologiya* [Izvestiya of Saratov University. New Series. Series: Sociology. Politology], 2014, vol. 14, iss. 4, pp. 5–8.
17. Dmitrieva E.O. Gosudarstvennaya podderzhka monogorodov RF v usloviyakh vosstanovleniya ekonomicheskogo rosta [State Support of the Russian Single-Industry Towns in Terms of Economic Growth]. *Naukovedenie*, 2017, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 37.
18. Petrina O.A. Gosudarstvennaya podderzhka monogorodov v Rossii [State Support for Single-Industry Towns in Russia]. *Vestnik universiteta*, 2015, no. 6, pp. 151–156.
19. Skorobogatova Yu.A., Baldina A.A. Rol' malogo predprinimatel'stva v sotsial'no-ekonomicheskom razvitiy monogorodov Irkutskoy oblasti [Role of Small Business in Socio-Economic Development of Single-Industry Towns in Irkutsk Oblast]. *Baikal Research Journal*, 2015, vol. 6, no. 6. DOI: 10.17150/2411-6262.2015.6(6).13
20. Dmitrieva E.O. Modeli razvitiya malogo predprinimatel'stva v monogorodakh Rossiyskoy Federatsii [Development Model of Small Businesses in Single-Industry Towns of the Russian Federation]. *Ars Administrandi (Iskusstvo upravleniya)* [Ars Administrandi], 2017, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 195–216. DOI: 10.17072/2218-9173-2017-2-195-216
21. Zamyatina N.Yu., Pilyasov A.N. *Innovatsionnyy poisk v monopofil'nykh gorodakh: blokirovki razvitiya, novaya promyshlennaya politika* [Innovative Search in Single-Industry Cities: Development Blockages, New Industrial Policy]. Moscow, URSS Publ., 2015. 216 p.
22. Meerovich M.G. Sovetskie monogoroda: istoriya vozniknoveniya i spetsifika [Soviet Monoprofile Cities: The Story behind and Key Features]. *Vestnik Kemerovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* [Bulletin of Kemerovo State University], 2018, no. 1, no. 53–65. DOI: 10.21603/2078-8975-2018-1-53-65
23. Lyubovnyy V.Ya. *Goroda Rossii: al'ternativy razvitiya i upravleniya* [Russian cities: development and management alternatives]. Moscow: Ekon-Inform Publ., 2013. 614 p. (In Russ.)
24. Lyubovnyy V.Ya., Kuznetsova G.Yu., Vlasova N.I., Grivina I.V. *Puti aktivizatsii sotsial'no-ekonomicheskogo razvitiya monopofil'nykh gorodov Rossii: monografiya* [Ways to Activate the Socio-economic Development of Single-industry Cities in Russia]. Moscow, Moskovskiy obshchestvennyy nauchnyy fond Publ., 2004. 224 p.
25. Plyusnin Yu.M., ed. *Otkhodniki : monografiya* [Seasonal Workers]. Moscow, Novyy Khronograf Publ., 2013. 288 p. (In Russ.)
26. Bugaev M.A. Mayatnikovye migratsii na rynke truda Sankt-Peterburga i Leningradskoy oblasti [Labor Commuting in the Labor Market of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region]. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta* [St Petersburg University Journal of Economic Studies], 2015, no. 4, ser. 5, pp. 86–116.
27. Kordonskiy S.G. V real'nosti i na samom dele [In Reality, and in Fact]. *Logos*, 2000, no. 5–6 (26), pp. 53–64.
28. Barsukova S.Yu. *Neformal'naya ekonomika: ekonomiko-sotsiologicheskii analiz* [Informal Economy: Economics-Sociological Analysis]. Moscow, National Research University HSE Publ., 2004. 448 p. (In Russ.)
29. Chirikova A.E., Ledyayev V.G. Vlast' v monogorode [Power in the Mono-Industrial Company Town]. *Vlast' i elity* [Power and Elites], 2016, vol. 3, pp. 206–234. DOI: 10.31119/pe.2016.3.7
30. Pilyasov A.N., Kotov A.V. Monogoroda rossiyskoy Arktiki: analiz strategiy razvitiya po kompleksnym investitsionnym planam [Monotowns of the Russian Arctic: Analysis of the Development Strategy for Comprehensive Investment Plans]. *Arkticheskie vedomosti* [Arctic Herald], 2017, no. 1, pp. 116–124.
31. Davydov D.A. Monogorodskaya identichnost' i problemy «promyshlennoy mental'nosti» (na primere g. Magnitogorska) [Monotown Identity and Problems of Industrial Mentality (on Example of Magnitogorsk)]. *Vestnik Permskogo federal'nogo issledovatel'skogo tsentra. Seriya Sotsiologiya* [Perm Federal Research Centre Journal], 2014, no. 5, pp. 73–79.
32. Nedoseka E.V., Zhigunova G.V. Osobennosti lokal'noy identichnosti zhitel'ey monogorodov (na primere Murmanskoy oblasti) [Features of Local Identity of Single-Industry Town Residents (the Case of

- the Murmansk Oblast)]. *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North], 2019, no. 37, pp. 118–133. DOI: 10.17238/issn2221-2698.2019.37.118
33. Golitsova N.N. Analiz naselennykh punktov monoprofil'nogo tipa SZFO RF [Analysis of Settlements of Single-Industry Type in the Northwestern Federal District]. *Innovatsionnaya ekonomika: perspektivy razvitiya i sovershenstvovaniya*, 2018, no. 2, pp. 10–16.

*Received on October 04, 2020.*