Threats to the Sustainable Development of the Russian Arctic: Poverty [*]

© **Elena A. KORCHAK,** Cand. Sci. (Econ.), associated professor, senior researcher
E-mail: elenakorchak@mail.ru
Luzin Institute for Economic Studies, Apatity, Russia

Abstract. The modern paradigm of the theory and practice of social development is the concept of sustainable development, the emergence and spread of which was associated with the emphasis on environmental pollution and overpopulation of the planet against the background of limited natural resources. Today, sustainable development is defined as the result of the interaction of a man, the economic system, and nature at the global, national, regional, and local levels. It is expressed, to a certain extent, by economic, environmental, and social sustainability. Modern goals in the field of sustainable development are to promote green growth, rational environmental management, ensuring access to quality health and education services, and improving the well-being of the population. The latter implies, first, the reduction of multidimensional poverty, the numerous groups of social localization, i.e., disabled people, families with children, single-parent families, and ethnic minorities. The aim of the study is to assess the level and extent of poverty and its social localization in the framework of achieving sustainable development of the regions of the Russian Arctic. The relevance of the study is determined by the fact that the rates and proportions of sustainable development of the Russian Arctic depend on the qualitative state of human potential (carried by the population). The qualitative state of human potential depends on the level of well-being of the population, which determines the degree of satisfaction of needs for benefits and access to social services. Poverty as a socio-economic phenomenon creates threats of degradation of human potential. The research hypothesis is based on the understanding that poverty is a systemic factor that limits the possibilities of a high-quality reproduction of human potential and, accordingly, promising opportunities for achieving sustainable development in the Russian Arctic. The research methods were a statistical analysis of the socio-economic situation of families with children in the regions of the Russian Arctic, as well as an analysis of regulatory legal documents governing measures of social support for families, motherhood, paternity, and childhood. The research results are focused on their use for achieving sustainable development of the Russian Arctic.
Keywords: *poverty, unemployment, Murmansk Oblast, Nenets Autonomous Okrug, Chukotka Autonomous Okrug, Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug, child poverty, social allowance*.

Introduction

At the end of the last century, the actualization of global contradictions between the increasing needs of society and the limited possibilities of the biosphere, which actually endangered further social development, led to the emergence of the concept of sustainable development [1, Shevchenko I.V., Litvinsky K.O., p. 3]. In accordance with this concept, a person, through participation in the processes that form his/her life, plays a central role in social development. It is under the influence of the qualitative characteristics of human potential as a set of physical and spiritual capabilities of a person in achieving individual and social goals [2, Mudretsov A.F., p. 99] the rates and proportions of sustainable development are formed. In turn, the condition for the development of human potential is the achieved level of well-being [3, Abdalhussain A., Santalova M.S., p. 9] – a socially acceptable level of provision of goods and services.

As a systemic education, well-being integrates the characteristics of the level, conditions, and quality of life and, according to the UN conceptual approach to human development, is subject to measurement based on a system of relevant indicators. Thus, the standard of living is characterized by such indicators of material well-being as the level of per capita money income in comparison with the cost of a set set of necessary goods and services (in Russia - the subsistence minimum) or the level of poverty (in Russia - the share of the population with average per capita money incomes below the ranks of the living wage). Among the indicators characterizing living conditions is the level of unemployment or the provision of the population with doctors (e.g., the number of doctors per 10 thousand people). Life quality indicators include life expectancy at birth, education level, morbidity rate, etc. At the same time, the achieved level of well-being is assessed using the method of maximum-critical values, when for each indicator, based on a pragmatic approach and on the basis of special studies and expert assessments, its maximum-critical value is established [4, Glazyev S.Yu., Lokosov V.V., pp. 22-24]. If the indicator goes beyond this value, it signals the emergence of a threat to provide real opportunities for the formation of high-quality human potential.

The poverty of the population poses a serious threat to undermine the economic foundations of a high-quality reproduction of human potential. That is why the leading idea of the concept of sustainable development is the need to reorient humanity's attention to solving the problem of poverty - a global problem of social development [5, Leibin V.M., p. 212].

Analysis of scientific approaches to the study of the problem of poverty [6, Ishmuratova I.G., p. 75] shows that their evolution took place in the direction from the perception of poverty as a personal problem of a person (conceptual views of British scientists T. Malthus, D. Ricardo, S. Rowntree, etc.) to the perception of poverty as a problem of society - research of the American economist J. Stiglitz "Great division. Inequality in society, or what should the remaining 99% of the population do?" (Stiglitz J.E. "The Great Divide: Unequal Societies And What We Can Do About Them", 2014 [7, Peach J., Warnecke T. and Watkins J., p. 370]) or the Russian economist Kapelyushnikov R.I. "Economic inequality - a universal evil?", 2018[1]. So, in modern concepts of the quality of life [8, Fakhrutdinova E.V., Shalamova N.V., p. 150] the problem of poverty is considered in the refraction of the human dimension - the improvement of well-being through the expansion of human capabilities in self-development [9, Gubarev R.V., Dzyuba E.I., Kulikova O.M., Fayzullin F.S., pp. 69-70]. Within the concept of risk society by the German sociologist U. Beck [10, Beck U., p. 97], poverty is considered a factor limiting the possibilities of the poor in resisting social risks since poverty is a guarantee of a low level of information literacy and a lack of opportunities in access to living conditions, quality goods and services [11, Tomskikh M. S., p. 27]. The Spanish sociologist M. Castells has a similar position ("The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture"; Castells M.

---

[1] Kapelyushnikov R.I., ed. Ekonomicheskoe neravenstvo — vselenskoe zlo?: preprint WP3/2019/01 [Economic inequality - a universal evil?: Preprint WP3 / 2019/01/]. (Seriya WP3 «Problemy rynka truda» [Series WP3 "Labor Market Problems"]).Moscow: Izd. dom Vysshey shkoly ekonomiki, 2019, 28p.

"The Rise of the Network Society, The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture", 2000), according to the concept of an information society in which poverty is a factor of the digital divide as a social contradiction in access to the digital world, when the poor categories of the population do not have access to the latest knowledge and, thereby, to employment opportunities [12, Skibitsky M.M., p. 66]. The problem of the digital divide in relation to the current epidemiological situation is especially urgent, when, in the conditions of self-isolation and quarantine in the field of education, distance learning is introduced: in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug in 2016, the share of households with access to the Internet was 36% of the total number of households, in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 60%, in the Murmansk Oblast – 78%, in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 86%[2].

In institutionalism (e.g., studies of the economic successes and failures of states by the American economist D. Acemoğlu and the British economist J. Robinson in the book "Why some countries are rich, and others are poor. The origin of power, prosperity and poverty" (Acemoğlu D. & Robinson J.A. "Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty", 2012) poverty is perceived because of changes in the institutional conditions for the functioning of territorial socio-economic systems [13, Korchak E.A., p. 145].

The UN approach to the study of poverty problems uses such characteristics as an acceptable standard of living, the level of satisfaction of basic needs, and the number of resources. These characteristics are determined by the specific features of the evolution of social territorial development and are determined by geographical features. Among the recent studies of poverty and human development of the United Nations, together with the Oxford University Initiative, is the Global Multidimensional Poverty Index, which allows analysis through sociological surveys (ten indicators for education, health and living standards) inequality between countries and among populations, and track changes in poverty over time [3].

To measure poverty, the "poverty line" is used, characterized by specific international and national indicators. The most widespread conceptual approach to measuring poverty is the concept of absolute poverty, according to which poverty is defined as the lack of necessary resources to meet the needs of life. In 2015, the World Bank [4] pointed the international poverty line, as an absolute global minimum (excluding access to education, health care, water, and electricity), at $1.90 per day (for countries with an average money income, this level was $3.2 per day, medium $ 5.5 per day, high – $ 21.7 per day).

---

[2]Abdrakhmanova G.I., Gokhberg L.M., Kevesh M.A. et al. Indikatory tsifrovoy ekonomiki: 2017: statisticheskiy sbornik [Indicators of the digital economy: 2017: statistical collection]. Moscow: NRU HSE, 2017. 320p.

[3]Bogatyy ili bednyy? Raznye izmereniya bednosti po novoy metodologii OON [Rich or Poor? Different dimensions of poverty according to the new UN methodology]. Informatsionno-analiticheskiy tsentr IATs [Information and Analytical Center of the IAC]. URL: https://ia-centr.ru/publications/bogatyy-ili-bednyy-raznye-izmereniya-bednosti-po-novoy-metodologii-oon/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

[4]Svobodnyy i besprepyatstvennyy dostup k dannym o global'nom razvitii [Free and Unimpeded Access to Global Development Data]. Vsemirnyy bank [The World Bank]. URL: https://www.vsemirnyjbank.org/ru/understanding-poverty (accessed 13.04.2020).

In the U.S.[5], the Poverty Thresholds is used as the poverty line, which is required to provide a household with food, housing, and basic necessities, and is differentiated depending on the size and age of the household. In 2019, the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) was recorded in the U.S. federal registry for the northern state of Alaska at $ 15,600 for a single-member household, $ 54,310 for an 8-member household (for comparison, the average for the US is $12,490 and $ 43,430, respectively).

In Canada[6], poverty is assessed using two methods: the "low-income cut-off" (LICO) and the "market basket measure" (MBM). In accordance with the first method, the poverty line is calculated depending on the number of household members (from 1 to 7) and separately for the type of locality (rural areas, local communities with a population of up to 30 thousand people, from 30 thousand people to 99.999 thousand people, from 100 thousand people to 499.999 thousand people, from 500 thousand people and above). So, in 2018, for a household of three members, the boundary of such income for rural areas was 21,296 Canadian dollars, for a large city (with a population of more than 500 thousand people) - 32,554 Canadian dollars. The second method sets the poverty line based on the consumer basket, the cost of which is determined for a family of two adults and two children, depending on the type of locality.

The conceptual basis for measuring poverty in Russia is the basic needs approach: here, poverty is measured by comparing average per capita money incomes with the subsistence minimum - the cost estimate of the consumer basket for the main socio-demographic groups of the population in each region. The consumer basket includes a set of food products, as well as a set of non-food goods and services determined in relation to its cost. The consumer basket is formed, inter alia, based on actual consumption volumes in low-income households and considering differences in consumption determined by natural and climatic conditions, according to which the territory of Russia is divided into 10 zones. The first and second zones include the Yamal-Nenets, Chukotka, Nenets Autonomous Okrugs, and the Murmansk Oblast - regions whose territories are fully attributed to the Russian Arctic. For the regions of the Russian Arctic, increased norms of energy value and chemical composition of a set of food products have been established. So, for the regions of the first zone, the energy value of a set of food products is 2,908 kcal, for the tenth zone - 2,525 kcal; for the working-age population of the regions of the first zone, the rate of meat consumption per year is 70.2 kg, the tenth - 58.5 kg, fruits - 65 kg and 60 kg, respectively[7]. In order to establish a percentage of the cost of a set of food products, a set of non-food products and ser-

---

[5] 2019 poverty guideline. Office of the assistant secretary for planning and evaluation (ASPE). URL: https://aspe.hhs.gov/2019-poverty-guidelines (accessed 13.04.2020).

[6] Statistics Canada. Table 11-10-0241-01 Low income cut-offs (LICOs) before and after tax by community size and family size, in current dollars. DOI: 10.25318/1110024101-eng.

[7] Postanovlenie Pravitel'stva RF ot 28.01.2013 g. №54 «Ob utverzhdenii metodicheskikh rekomendatsiy po opredeleniyu potrebitel'skoy korziny dlya osnovnykh sotsial'no-demograficheskikh grupp naseleniya v sub"ektakh Rossiyskoy Federatsii» [Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of January 28, 2013 No. 54 "On the approval of guidelines for determining the consumer basket for the main socio-demographic groups of the population in the constituent entities of the Russian Federation"]. Konsul'tant Plyus. URL: http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_ 22083/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

vices, the territory of Russia is divided into 3 zones: a zone with a cold and sharply continental climate (in which this ratio is set at 50-60%), a zone with a temperate climate (45–55%) and a zone with a warm climate (40–50%). From 01.01.2020, in Russia, the subsistence minimum per capita is 11,012 rubles, for the working-age population - 11,942 rubles, for pensioners - 9,090 rubles, for children - 10,838 rubles. In the Murmansk Oblast, respectively - 16 688 rubles, 17 379 rubles, 13 869 rubles, 16 670 rubles[8].

Rosstat data analysis[9] shows that today in the regions of the Russian Arctic, poverty is relevant for more than 116 thousand people. The largest poverty is in the Murmansk Oblast, i.e. 74 thousand people live below the poverty line. The factors of poverty spreading are unemployment and low-paid employment, which produce the spread of poverty among households with children. In this regard, child poverty in the regions of the Russian Arctic is of particular relevance, the phenomenon of which is determined by the so-called "poverty trap," when poor households reproduce poverty on an expanded scale, and children growing up in poverty, becoming adults, as a rule, wich remain poor.

Research methods

The study, the results of which are presented in this article, was carried out on the basis of an analysis of the official data of the Federal State Statistics Service (Rosstat) and its territorial bodies in the regions of the Russian Arctic. Official statistical compilations became the sources of statistical data[10]: "Socio-economic indicators of poverty", "Income, expenditure, and consumption of households", "Social status and standard of living of the population of Russia", "Health care in Russia", "Housing in Russia". The study was conducted based on materials from the Murmansk Oblast, the Yamal-Nenets, Chukotka, and Nenets Autonomous Okrugs, the territories of which are completely attributed to the Arctic zone of Russia (hereinafter - the Arctic regions of Russia).

During the study, an analysis of the poverty of the population was carried out according to indicators officially accepted in Russian practice. Particular attention is paid to the comparison of the indicators of the standard of living with their limiting critical values (Table 1), established by the author based on the results of many years of research, taking into account expert assessments and based on research by Russian and foreign scientists [4, Glazyev S.Yu. , Lokosov V.V., pp. 22-24; 14, Korchak E.A., pp. 90–93].

---

[8] O prozhitochnom minimume v Murmanskoj oblasti [On the cost of living in the Murmansk Oblast]. Jelektronnyj fond pravovoj i normativno-tehnicheskoj dokumentacii [Electronic fund of legal and regulatory technical documentation]. URL: http://docs.cntd.ru/document/913508381 (accessed 13.04.2020).
[9] Regiony Rossii. Social'no-jekonomicheskie pokazateli 2019 [Regions of Russia. Socio-economic indicators 2019]. Federal'naja sluzhba gosudarstvennoj statistiki [Federal State Statistics Service]. URL: https://gks.ru/bgd/regl/b19_14p/Main.htm (accessed 13.04.2020).
[10] Federal State Statistics Service of Russia. URL: https://www.gks.ru/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

Table 1

Extremely critical values of indicators of living standards

Index	Maximum critical value of the indicator	
	Russia	Arctic
The share of the population with an average per capita money income below the regional subsistence minimum,%	7	2
Ratio of average per capita money incomes with the value of the regional subsistence minimum, times	2	5
The ratio of the average monthly nominal accrued wages to the value of the regional subsistence minimum of the able-bodied population, times	3	6

Undoubtedly, while studying the poverty of the population, it is necessary to consider not only absolute indicators of poverty (monetary criteria), but also relative and subjective estimates. Social stability in society, which is an important condition for sustainable balanced development, largely depends on the indicator of the share of the population whose living conditions are significantly worse than the norm adopted in a given society: for full participation in society, the living conditions of a particular person should not differ significantly from the standard adopted in society standard of living. Integral poverty assessment is needed [11]. An important component of which is the subjective method of measuring poverty, based, in particular, on a survey of public opinion on the level of sufficient, low, or insufficient income, on the study of people's self-identification by income level, social exclusion, etc. However, today such an assessment of poverty is difficult due to the narrowness of official statistical indicators, due to the "randomness" of the sample of such measurements (excluding the possibility of measuring poverty in small groups of the population, e.g., among the indigenous small population) and other factors. In particular, in choosing a method for analyzing child poverty, the author proceeded, first, from the fact that its quantitative assessment in monetary form is most widely used - in terms of income; secondly, for reasons of the availability of estimated indicators, which is of particular importance for conducting interregional comparisons and conducting appropriate monitoring.

Study results and discussion

Today, the main idea of mankind remains sustainable development - the process of social development, in which the transformation of economic activity is consistent with ensuring environmental safety and achieving social sustainability. The fundamental principles of such development are rational use of natural resources and ensuring socially acceptable standards of the well-being of the population.

In a recent report to the Club of Rome, the Global Sustainable Development Report 2019, it was concluded that no country at the current stage of social development has been able to achieve a balance of human well-being and a healthy environment. Research carried out by an in-

---

[11] Korchak E.A. *Sovershenstvovanie institutsional'nykh mekhanizmov resheniya problemy bednosti v severnom regione RF (na primere Murmanskoy oblasti)* [Improvement of institutional mechanisms for solving the problem of poverty in the northern region of the Russian Federation (on the example of the Murmansk region)]: Cand. Econ. Sci. Diss. Abs. Apatity, 2007. 22 p.

dependent group of scientists from different countries of the four-year cycle of the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals showed that, against the background of a decrease in income poverty, multidimensional poverty remains relevant today, the social localization groups of which are women, indigenous peoples, and ethnic minorities, citizens of the - natural possibilities of health, children. According to scientists - authors of the report [12], it is the well-being of the population that determines the level of a high-quality reproduction of human potential that contributes to social, economic, and environmental transformations. At the same time, the only call to action in the field of improving the well-being of the population and, accordingly, expanding the possibilities for achieving sustainable development is the concentration of efforts of state, regional and local authorities, business, local communities in reducing inequalities of social groups at risk of poverty.

In Russia, the problem of poverty became more urgent in the 90s the last century in connection with the collapse of the USSR and the formation of market relations, which led to a drop in the standard of living of the population. In fact, poverty has emerged as a socio-economic phenomenon of the post-Soviet period of the country's development - a consequence of institutional and economic transformations in conjunction with demographic and geographic factors.

Significant at the current stage of Russia's socio-economic development is the problem of poverty of the population of the Russian Arctic, the regions of which constitute the zone of strategic interests of the country [15, Korchak E. and Serova N., p. 1736]. The regions of the Russian Arctic have formed a relatively high economic potential. So, with a population of only 0.94% of the country's population, the share of the GRP produced here in the total GRP of the country is 4.6%. The average GRP per capita in 2018 here amounted to 2 859.5 thousand rubles with an average level in Russia of 578.7 thousand rubles. The Nenets, Yamal-Nenets, and Chukotka Autonomous Okrugs are traditionally in the top three in the ranking of Russian regions in terms of per capita income (the Murmansk Oblast in 2018 ranked 13th). Despite this, 8.4% of the population of such regions today lives below the poverty line (Table 2).

Table 2

GRP per capita, average per capita cash income and the scale of poverty in the Russian Arctic regions, 2018[13]

Region	GRP per capita, thousand rubles	Average per capita cash income, rubles	Poverty rates, thousand people
Nenets Autonomous Okrug	6 950.4	78 549	4.2
Murmansk Oblast	642.7	41 564	74.0
Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug	5 710.1	79 398	33.5
Chukotka Autonomous Okrug	1 578.5	78 812	4.4

---

[12] United Nations, 2016, Global Sustainable Development Report 2016, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York, July.
[13] Federal State Statistics Service of Russia. URL: https://www.gks.ru/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

Comparison of the values of living standards indicators with their extreme critical values (Table 1) is disappointing: in terms of poverty, the regions of the Russian Arctic are below the critical line (Table 3).

Table 3

Indicators of the living standard of the population of the Russian Arctic regions, 2018 [14]

Region	Poverty rate, %	Ratio of average per capita cash income to the subsistence minimum, times	The ratio of the average monthly wage to the subsistence minimum, times
Nenets Autonomous Okrug	9.7	3.86	3.93
Murmansk Oblast	9.9	2.84	4.08
Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug	6.2	5.10	5.88
Chukotka Autonomous Okrug	8.8	3.65	4.68
The range of the critical value of the indicator	[2–7]	[2–5]	[3–6]

The Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug is in the most "advantageous" position, where the size of monetary incomes is quite high, and the level of poverty is in the range of the critical value. In other regions, the poverty level exceeds its maximum critical value, while the ratio of cash income to the subsistence minimum does not reach the upper limit of this range - the maximum critical value for the Arctic region.

In this kind of research, it is necessary to take into account the ethnic specifics of the human potential of the regions of the Russian Arctic: about 5% of the population here is a small indigenous population (Chukchi, Sami, Nenets, Khanty, Eskimos, etc.). According to the 2010 All-Russian Census, in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug, about 33% of the population were representatives of indigenous peoples, in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug - 19%, in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug - more than 8%, in the Murmansk Oblast - about 0.2%[15]. The indigenous small-numbered population of the regions of the Russian Arctic live in rural areas, which, against the background of the specifics of their traditional activities, predetermines a low standard of living. In particular, the average per capita monetary income of the rural population of the Nenets Autonomous Okrug is about 60% of the urban; average per capita money income per household member in rural areas - 63%[16].

The actual standard of living of the population reflects consumer spending: the poor is a part of the population, in the structure of expenses of which food costs prevail (the law of the

---

[14] Regiony Rossii. Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie pokazateli 2019 [Regions of Russia. Socio-economic indicators 2019]. Federal'naya sluzhba gosudarstvennoy statistiki [Federal State Statistics Service]. URL: https://gks.ru/bgd/regl/b19_14p/ Main.htm (accessed 13.04.2020).
[15] VPN 2010 [All-Russia Census 2010]. URL: https://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi 1612.htm (accessed 13.04.2020).
[16] Federal'nye statisticheskie nablyudeniya po sotsial'no-demograficheskim problemam [Federal statistical observations on socio-demographic problems]. URL: https://arhangelskstat.gks.ru/standards_of_life (accessed 13.04.2020).

German economist E. Engel [16, Kochkin S.A., pp. 66-70]). Today, the share of spending on food in countries with a high standard of living is no more than 15% of household spending, in countries with a low standard of living - more than 50%[17]. In Russia, the share of food expenditures in the structure of household consumer spending in 2018 was 33.5%, incl. in the Murmansk Oblast – 27.8%, in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 33.1%, in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 34.7%, in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug - 48.2%. The largest share of such expenditures is in the first decile, the smallest – in the tenth decile group of the population (e.g., in the Murmansk Oblast, more than 37% of consumer spending in the first decile is spent on food, and in households with the largest disposable resources per capita – no more than 15%[18]). This situation testifies not only to existing differences in consumption but also to restrictions on access to development resources. Today, more than 20% of households in the regions of the Russian Arctic share more than 50% of spending on food purchases, incl. in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug – 50.5% of households, in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 20.9%, in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 15.1%, in the Murmansk Oblast – 8.2% of households[19]. The situation is aggravated by the "tightness" of living conditions. According to Rosstat[20], in 2018, in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 23.1% of families were registered as needing housing, of which 5.6% were large families; in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 9.4% and 11.5%, in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug – 6.2% and 11.3%, in the Murmansk Oblast – 3.5% and 9.3%, respectively. The provision of the population with good-quality drinking water (meeting mandatory safety requirements) in the Murmansk Oblast was 57.1%, in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug – 49.8%, in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 52.7%, in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 67.2 %. In general, an analysis of the distribution of households by assessing their financial situation[21] in 2018 indicates that on average in the regions of the Russian Arctic, 48% of households were included in the category of poor (Table 4); the largest rate (63.3%) –

in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug.

---

[17] Reyting stran Evropy po dole raskhodov semey na produkty pitaniya — 2016 [Rating of European countries by the share of family spending on food - 2016]. RIA rating. URL: https://riarating.ru/countries/20161206/630048668.html (accessed 13.04.2020).

[18] Statisticheskiy byulleten' «Dokhody, raskhody i potreblenie domashnikh khozyaystv» (po itogam obsledovaniya byudzhetov domashnikh khozyaystv) [Statistical bulletin "Income, expenditure and consumption of households" (based on a survey of household budgets)]. Federal'naya sluzhba gosudarstvennoy statistiki [Federal State Statistics Service]. URL: https://gks.ru/bgd/regl/b18_102/Main.htm (accessed 13.04.2020).

[19] Ibid.

[20] Regiony Rossii. Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie pokazateli 2019 [Regions of Russia. Socio-economic indicators 2019]. Federal'naya sluzhba gosudarstvennoy statistiki [Federal State Statistics Service]. URL: https://gks.ru/bgd/regl/ b19_14p/Main.htm (accessed 13.04.2020).

[21] Statisticheskiy byulleten' «Dokhody, raskhody i potreblenie domashnikh khozyaystv» (po itogam obsledovaniya byudzhetov domashnikh khozyaystv) [Statistical bulletin "Income, expenditure and consumption of households" (based on a survey of household budgets)]. Federal'naya sluzhba gosudarstvennoy statistiki [Federal State Statistics Service]. URL: https://gks.ru/bgd/regl/b18_102/Main.htm (accessed 13.04.2020).

Poor households in the Russian Arctic regions, 2018.

Region	Share of poor households, %	Share of households with children under the age of 16 in the composition of poor households, %[22]
Nenets Autonomous Okrug	63.3	85.0
Murmansk Oblast	47.1	70.6
Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug	35.2	96.5
Chukotka Autonomous Okrug	45.9	87.7

Today, about 80% of low-income households in the regions of the Russian Arctic are families with children under the age of 16 (Table 4), including 96.5% in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug, 87.7% in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug. %, in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 85%, in the Murmansk Oblast – 70.6%. One of the factors of the current situation, in addition to the unfavorable demographic load (large or single-parent families), are the features of economic activity – low-paid employment and unemployment. So, according to Murmanskstat [23], in the Murmansk Oblast in 2018, 47.5 thousand employees (or 17.7% of the average number of employees) had an average monthly wage at the level of fewer than 3 times the subsistence minimum of the working-age population. The centers of low-paid employment in the region are such types of economic activities as "wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles" (24.3 thousand employees with an average monthly wage of 1.94 times the subsistence level of the working-age population), "activities of hotels and catering establishment" (7 thousand employees and 1.7). The lowest level of wages is in the sphere of "clothing production" (here the level of the average monthly wage is 1.27 times the subsistence minimum of the working-age population), "wood processing and production of wood and cork products" (1.20), "furniture production" (1.08). The poverty of "budgetary" categories of workers is of relevance. In particular, in the city of Kovdor the average monthly salary of the nursing (pharmaceutical) personnel of municipal organizations is 2.14 times the subsistence level of the working-age population, in Apatity – 2.16; average salary of nursing staff in years. Kirovsk and Olenegorsk – 2.23. Such figures indicate that the resources of these categories of workers do not allow for the development of the potential not only of the employee himself but also of his family members, being limited only to a set of primary needs [17, Kalashnikova O.N., Gruzdeva M.A., p. 147].

Unemployment makes a significant contribution to the poverty situation in households with children. In 2018, in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug, its level was 8.1%, while more than 40%

---

[22] Byulleten' «Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie indikatory bednosti» [Bulletin "Socio-economic indicators of poverty"]. Federal'naya sluzhba gosudarstvennoy statistiki [Federal Service of State Statistics]. URL: https://gks.ru/bgd/regl/b19_110/ Main.htm (accessed 13.04.2020).

[23] Territorial'nyy organ Federal'noy sluzhby gosudarstvennoy statistiki po Murmanskoy oblasti [Territorial body of the Federal State Statistics Service for the Murmansk Oblast]. URL: https://murmanskstat.gks.ru/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

of the unemployed were citizens living in rural area[24]; by marital status, 45.6% of the unemployed are married citizens, of whom about 50% are women. In the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug[25], the unemployment rate of women aged 20–49 with one child (under the age of 18) is 1.5%, two children – 5.1%, three and more – 5%; in rural areas – 3.9%, 13.4%, and 7.6%, respectively. The indigenous small-numbered population is in the poverty zone: today the traditional use of natural resources does not bring a satisfactory level of income, while the volumes of ethno-economics are limited by the ecological capacity of the territories of such nature use, incl. in connection with the "predatory" activities of large industrial corporations[26].

Poverty as a socio-economic phenomenon has a negative impact on the prospects for sustainable development of the regions of the Russian Arctic, creating a threat of degradation of human potential since it reproduces the phenomenon of child poverty. As the number of children increases, the standard of living of families declines by 30% among complete families with two children, by 50% - among complete families with three or more children. For instance[27], in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug (data for 2016), the average money income for a family with two children is 56% of the income of a family with one child, on average for one family member - 47%; single-parent families with children - 53% of the income of a married couple with a child. In the Murmansk Oblast, the average income per member of a married couple with children under the age of 18 is 58% of that of a married couple without children; the average monetary income per member of a household consisting of one person is 30,176 rubles, for a household with one child - 24,811 rubles, two children - 19,365 rubles.

The family is a social institution [18, Kalashnikova O.N., p. 81], the main function of which is to ensure the physical and social reproduction of new generations [19, Abdullina V.S., p. 276]. Manifestations of social vulnerability of families with children are, first of all, limited opportunities to perform their functions, which negatively affect the qualitative reproduction of human potential.

Since 2007, in Russia as a tool for long-term public investment [20, Kormishkina L.A., Koroleva L.P., p. 25], maternal (family) capital was introduced into the development of human potential for families in which the second (and every subsequent child) was born or adopted. The implementation of maternity capital provides for the improvement of housing conditions, the receipt of education by the child, the formation of a funded pension for the mother of the child, as

---

[24] Upravlenie Federal'noy sluzhby gosudarstvennoy statistiki po Arkhangel'skoy oblasti i Nenetskomu avtonomnomu okrugu [Office of the Federal State Statistics Service for the Arkhangelsk Oblast and the Nenets Autonomous Okrug]. URL: https://arhangelskstat.gks.ru/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

[25] Upravlenie Federal'noy sluzhby gosudarstvennoy statistiki po Khabarovskomu krayu, Magadanskoy oblasti, Evreyskoy avtonomnoy oblasti i Chukotskomu avtonomnomu okrugu [Office of the Federal State Statistics Service for the Khabarovsk Krai, Magadan Oblast, the Jewish Autonomous Okrug and the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug]. URL: https://habstat.gks.ru/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

[26] Na Yamale obespokoeny bednost'yu i bezrabotitsey sredi tundrovikov [Yamal is concerned about poverty and un-employment among tundra people]. Regnum. URL: https://regnum.ru/news/economy/2531004.html (accessed 13.04.2020).

[27] Federal'nye statisticheskie nablyudeniya po sotsial'no-demograficheskim problemam [Federal statistical observa-tions on socio-demographic problems]. URL: https://arhangelskstat.gks.ru/standards_of_life (accessed 13.04.2020).

well as the purchase of goods and services intended for the social adaptation of disabled children[28] (the size of such capital in 2018 amounted to 453 thousand rubles). In the Murmansk Oblast in 2007–2018, 42.8 thousand families used the maternity capital program[29] (less than 15% of households in the region), and the main direction of its use was the improvement of housing conditions (repayment of housing loans, participation in shared construction, purchase of housing). In the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug during this period, only 35% of the total number of maternity capital certificate holders disposed of maternity capital (the main direction of its implementation here was also the repayment of housing loans)[30]. Since 2011, regional maternity capitals have been introduced in the regions of Russia as a one-time cash payment at the birth of the second, third, and subsequent children. For example, in the Murmansk Oblast, the amount of such payment in 2018 amounted to 121.6 thousand rubles (in the region, funds from the regional maternity capital can be used, in addition to the standard areas of "federal" maternity capital, to repair housing and pay for medical services for a child), in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug – 131.5 thousand rubles, in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 234.6 thousand rubles, in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 334.5 thousand rubles. Most of the regional maternity capital in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug is directed to the purchase of vehicles[31]. In the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug, maternity capital is not targeted (its funds can be directed to any needs), the condition for its receipt is the receipt of federal maternity capital, while the use of capital funds is possible 2 years after the birth (adoption) of the third and subsequent children[32]. It is difficult to assess the impact of maternity capital on the welfare of families with children due to the lack of relevant statistical data; nevertheless, it should be noted that the effect of the implementation of such an instrument of long-term public investment is associated with the improvement of housing conditions.

The main burden in the implementation of measures of social support for families with children in Russia is carried out by the regions in accordance with federal and regional regulatory legal documents. Regional budgets receive funds from the federal budget in the form of subventions and subsidies for child support payments. The most important criterion in establishing social support measures is the amount of per capita money income and its ratio with the

[28] Chto nuzhno znat' o materinskom (semeynom) kapitale [What you need to know about maternal (family) capital]. Pensionnyy fond Rossiyskoy Federatsii [Pension Fund of the Russian Federation]. URL: http://www.pfrf.ru/grazdanam/family_capital/chto_nuzh_znat/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

[29] Bolee 42,8 tys. semey Murmanskoy oblasti poluchili sertifikat na materinskiy kapital [More than 42.8 thousand families of the Murmansk region received a certificate for maternity capital]. Lovozerskiy rayon. Ofitsial'nyy sayt administratsi [Lovozersky district. Official website of the administration]. URL: http://www.lovozeroadm.ru/zhizn_rayona/otdel_pensionnog/3065/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

[30] Realizatsiya federal'noy programmy materinskogo (semeynogo) kapitala v YaNAO [Implementation of the federal program of maternity (family) capital in the YNAO]. Materinskiy kapital [Maternity capital]. URL: http://materinskiy-kapital.molodaja-semja.ru/regiony/yanao/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

[31] 61 sem'ya poluchila regional'nyy materinskiy kapital za 6 mesyatsev 2018 goda [61 families received regional maternity capital in 6 months of 2018]. Administratsiya Nenetskogo avtonomnogo okruga [Administration of the Nenets Autonomous Okrug]. URL: http://adm-nao.ru/press/government/18994/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

[32] Materinskiy kapital v Chukotskom AO [Maternity capital in Chukotka Autonomous Okrug]. Materinskiy kapital [Maternity capital]. URL: http://materinskiy-kapital.molodaja-semja.ru/regiony/chukotskij-ao/ (accessed 13.04.2020).

subsistence minimum. Thus, the monthly child allowance is provided to families with an average per capita income below the subsistence level (Table 5).

Table 5

The amount of child support in the regions of the Russian Arctic, 2018, rubles per month [33]

Region	Child support		Subsistence minimum for a child, rub.
	Basic child benefit	For single mother's children	
Nenets Autonomous Okrug	556	1 112	21 688
Murmansk Oblast	364	729	15 121
Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug	295–738	591–1477	15 328
Chukotka Autonomous Okrug	500	750	22 591

In the Murmansk region in 2018, the amount of the basic child allowance was 364 rubles. or 2.4% of the child's subsistence minimum. In addition to this allowance, low-income families of the region, whose average per capita income is below 1.5 times the subsistence level, are provided with a one-time allowance when a child enters the 1st grade; 2 values of the subsistence level - monthly utility payment to large families; 2.5 times the subsistence level - the right to purchase a single social ticket. In general, in the structure of monetary incomes of households in the Murmansk region, social payments amount to 8.1%, of which 41% fall on allowances and compensation payments to children[34].

In the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug, the amount of the basic child benefit is set considering the child's age (preschool or school). In addition, low-income families with children "are entitled" to the following measures: reimbursement of expenses in the amount of 100% of the cost of travel through the territory of Russia during the holidays twice a calendar year for full-time students; payment of the cost of travel through the territory of Russia for students who are organized on trips to sanatoriums or health camps; reimbursement of expenses 50% of the cost of travel through the territory of Russia by rail, and in areas without a rail link, by water, air and intercity road transport. In the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug, at the expense of the district budget, monthly and one-time payments and allowances to large families are provided for the purchase of housing (from 300 thousand rubles to 5 million rubles), for the payment of an initial payment when receiving a mortgage loan (up to 1.5 million rubles) and subsequent monthly partial reimbursement of interest on the mortgage loan (50% of the monthly payment); compensation for the cost of vouchers to country camps (up to 35 thousand rubles) and utilities (up to 50% of the total amount). Families from among the indigenous peoples of the North are also provided with annual payment (25 thousand rubles), additional support in the form of payments for the purchase of clothes and shoes, as well as other household needs.

---

[33] Sotsial'noe polozhenie i uroven' zhizni naseleniya Rossii 2019 g. [Social situation and standard of living of the population of Russia in 2019]. Federal'naya sluzhba gosudarstvennoy statistiki [Federal State Statistics Service]. URL: https://gks.ru/bgd/regl/b19_44/Main.htm (accessed 13.04.2020).

[34] Federal'nye statisticheskie nablyudeniya po sotsial'no-demograficheskim problemam [Federal statistical observations on socio-demographic problems]. URL: https://arhangelskstat.gks.ru/standards_of_life (accessed 13.04.2020).

In general, the analysis of the level and structure of "children's" benefits shows that in the regional aspect there is a significant level of differentiation of such benefits depending on the number of children in the household and depending on the place of residence. Thus, in the Murmansk region, in the structure of social payments to households with one child, "child's" allowances make up 74.4%, with two children – 31.2%; in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 57.1% and 60.4%, respectively (households with three or more children – 49.9%); in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug - 28.8%, 41.5%, 24.2%; in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug - 34.1%, 51.2%, and 57.9%, respectively. In the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug, the amount of "child" benefits per member of the "rural" household on average is 44% of the "urban"; in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug – 121%; in the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug - 170%.

Low-paid employment and unemployment are the main factors in the phenomenon of child poverty, while the effect of the social support system in improving the living standards of low-income families with children is limited, as evidenced by calculations of child poverty indicators (Table 6).

Table 6

Child Poverty rates in the Russian Arctic, 2018.

Region	Share of children under the age of 16 in the structure of the poor, %[35]	Child poverty rate, %
Nenets Autonomous Okrug	50,5	19,4
Murmansk Oblast	42,3	22,3
Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug	52,5	12,7
Chukotka Autonomous Okrug	46,9	18,3

Today, in the regions of the Russian Arctic, there is a critical situation with the standard of living for the child population, the worst one is in the Murmansk Oblast - the region with the highest concentration of child poverty, where almost every fifth child is socially vulnerable. According to the author's calculations (based on the official data of the Federal State Statistics Service), in the Murmansk Oblast, the child poverty rate is 31.3 thousand children, in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug - 16.5, in the Chukotka and Nenets Autonomous Districts - 2.1 thousand each.

Conclusion

Undoubtedly, the problem of poverty is relevant, since its complexity and ambiguity give rise to a lot of questions. One of them is that due to the impossibility of an adequate assessment of non-monetary aspects, poverty in this study meant, first of all, income poverty (when the average per capita money income in a household is below the subsistence level). In our opinion, it is necessary to take into account not only poverty in terms of income but also other types of non-monetary deprivation (malnutrition, inaccessibility of pre-school or school services, limited access

---

[35] Byulleten' «Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie indikatory bednosti» [Bulletin "Socio-economic indicators of poverty"]. Federal'naya sluzhba gosudarstvennoy statistiki [Federal Service of State Statistics]. URL: https://gks.ru/bgd/regl/b19_110/ Main.htm (accessed 13.04.2020).

to information and communication technologies, etc.), which, unfortunately, are not always amenable to adequate assessment. Moreover, the methodology used in this study has several limitations, since the absolute poverty assessment adopted in Russia has its drawbacks, and due to the limited statistical data at the level of municipalities. In particular, the composition of the consumer basket in Russia is established on the basis of a too narrow set of positions, while the norms of consumption of certain food products by socio-demographic groups of the population do not seem to correspond to modern realities. Measuring child poverty also raises specific problems. For example, in Russian reality, the subsistence minimum is actually the border of the physiological survival of a person, while the structure of the consumer basket de facto does not take into account regional specifics in the costs of purchasing clothing, medicines, and vitamins associated with the climatic features of the Arctic regions. Child poverty is not only a phenomenon, the presence of which is shameful for society and the state. This is a systemic factor that determines the dynamics of economic and social development of the country and its regions in the strategic perspective, in the perspective of achieving sustainable development, since the phenomenon of child poverty is caused by the emergence and aggravation of long-term negative trends - an increase in the incidence rate, a decrease in the level of education, an increase in the level of unemployment and, as a consequence, an increase in crime and social tension in society, a decrease in the quality of human potential and a reduction in opportunities for achieving sustainable development of the Russian Arctic.

References

1. Shevchenko I.V., Litvinskiy K.O. Ustoychivoe razvitie: mirovoy opyt i problemy Rossii [Sustainable Development: International Experience and Problems of Russia]. *Regional'naya ekonomika: teoriya i praktika* [Regional Economics: Theory and Practice], 2007, no. 13 (52), pp. 3–10.
2. Mudretsov A.F. Chelovecheskiy potentsial ustoychivogo razvitiya [Human Potential of Sustainable Development]. *Regional'nye problemy preobrazovaniya ekonomiki* [Regional Problems of Transforming the Economy], 2016, no. 8, pp. 98–103.
3. Abdalhusseyn A., Santalova M.S. Chelovecheskiy potentsial i chelovecheskiy kapital v proizvodstvennoy deyatel'nosti predpriyatiya [Human Potential and Human Capital in the Production Activities of the Company]. *Aktual'nye voprosy ekonomiki i upravleniya* [Relevant Issues of Economy and Management], 2013, no. 6 (052), pp. 9–11.
4. Glazyev S.Ju., Lokosov V.V. Otsenka predel'no-kriticheskikh znacheniy pokazateley sostoyaniya rossiyskogo obshchestva i ikh ispol'zovanie v upravlenii sotsial'no-ekonomicheskim razvitiem [Assessment of the Extreme Critical Values of Indicators of the State of Russian Society and Their Use in Managing Social and Economic Development]. Ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz [Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast], 2012, no. 4 (22), pp. 22–41.
5. Leybin V.M. Rimskiy klub: khronika dokladov [Club of Rome: Chronicle of Reports]. *Filosofiya i obshchestvo* [Philosophy and Society], 1997, no. 6, pp. 204–221.

6. Ishmuratova I.G. Soderzhanie kategorii «bednost'» v noveyshey istorii Rossii [The Content of the Category of "Poverty" in the Recent History of Russia]. *Problemy sovremennoy ekonomiki* [Problems of Modern Economics], 2010, no. 4 (36), pp. 75–78.

7. Peach J., Warnecke T., Watkins J. The Great Divide: Unequal Societies and What We Can Do About Them. *The Social Science Journal*, 2017, no. 54 (3), pp. 370–371. DOI: 10.1016/j.soscij.2017.07.004

8. Fakhrutdinova E.V., Shalamova N.V. Evolyutsiya nauchnykh kontsepciy issledovaniya kachestva naseleniya [The Evolution of Scientific Concepts of Population Quality Research]. *Ekonomicheskie nauki* [Economic Sciences], 2010, no. 12 (73), pp. 69–73.

9. Gubarev R.V., Dzyuba E.I., Kulikova O.M., Fayzullin F.S. Upravlenie kachestvom zhizni naseleniya v regionakh Rossii [Quality of Life Management in the Regions of Russia]. *Zhurnal institutsional'nykh issledovaniy* [Journal of Institutional Studies], 2019, no. 11 (2), pp. 146–170. DOI: 10.17835 / 2076-6297.2019.11.2.146-170

10. Beck U. From Industrual Society to the Risk Society. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 1992, no. 9 (1), pp. 97–123.

11. Tomskikh M.S. Kachestvo zhizni v konceptsii «obshchestva riska» U. Beka [The Quality of Life in U. Beck's "Risk Society"]. *Gumanitarnyy vektor. Seriya: Filosofiya, kul'turologiya* [Humanitarian Vector. Philosophical Sciences], 2016, no. 2 (11), pp. 24–29. DOI: 10.21209 / 2307-1826-2016-11-2-23-239

12. Skibickiy M.M. Informatsionnaya epokha i novaya ekonomika v trudakh Manuyelya Kastel'sa [The Age of Information and the New Econnomy in the Works of Manuel Castells]. *Mir novoy ekonomiki* [The World of New Economy], 2015, no. 4, pp. 62–68.

13. Korchak E.A. Institutsional'naya sreda bednosti naseleniya severnogo regiona Rossii [Institutional Environment of Poverty in the Northern Region of Russia]. *Nauchnye vedomosti Belgorodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Istorya. Politologiya. Ekonomika. Informatika* [Belgorod State University Scientific Bulletin: History. Political Science. Economics. Information Technologies], 2007, no. 1 (32), pp. 142–148.

14. Korchak E.A. Dinamika social'noy ustoychivosti i uroven' zhizni v severnykh regionakh [The Dynamics of Social Sustainability and Living Standards in the Northern Regions]. *EKO* [ECO], 2016, no. 3, pp. 80–96. DOI: 10.30680/ECO0131-7652-2016-3-80-95

15. Korchak E., Serova N. High-Quality Reproduction of Labor Potential of Arctic Territories: Migration Factor. *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences EpSBS LXXVI*, 2019, pp. 1736–1742. DOI: 10.15405/epsbs.2019.12.04.235

16. Kochkin S.A. Proverka Zakona Yengelya s pomoshchyu statisticheskogo analiza potrebleniya produktov pitaniya naseleniem Rossii [Verification of Engel's Law Using a Statistical Analysis of Food Consumption by the Population of Russia]. *Vestnik sovremennoy nauki* [Bulletin of Modern Science], 2016, no. 5–1 (17), pp. 66–70.

17. Kalashnikova O.N., Gruzdeva M.A. Sotsial'naya uyazvimost' semey s det'mi v sovremennoy Rossii [Social Vulnerability of Families with Children in Modern Russia]. *Ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz [Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast],* 2019, no. 2 (12), pp. 147–160. DOI: 10.15838/esc.2019.2.62.9

18. Kalashnikova O.N. Semya kak osnovnoy institut vosproizvodstva naseleniya [Family as a Major Reproduction Institute Population]. *Problemy razvitiya territorii* [Problems Territory's Development], 2010, no. 6 (52), pp. 81–86.

19. Abdullina V.S. Semya v sisteme vosproizvodstva naseleniya [Family in the System of Population Reproduction]. *NovaInfo*, 2016, no. 42 (2), pp. 276–278.

20. Kormishkina L.A., Koroleva L.P. Materinskiy kapital kak instrument pereraspredelitel'noy politiki gosudarstva [Maternal Capital as a Tool of Redistributive Policy of the State]. *Finansovyy zhurnal* [Financial Journal], 2019, no. 4, pp. 24–35. DOI: 10.31107/2075-1990-2019-4-24-35