



Sergey Zheleznyakov
 PhD (Economics), Associate Professor,
 Head of the Department of Economics, Politics and Management,
 Southwest State University
 94, 50 Let Oktyabrya Str., Kursk, 305040, Russian Federation
zh-sergey@yandex.ru
 ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7586-3220>

UDC 332. 142



Igor Risin
 PhD (Economics), Professor,
 Head of the Department of Regional Economics and Territorial Administration,
 Voronezh State University
 1 Universitetskaya Sq., Voronezh, 394018, Russian Federation
risin@mail.ru
 ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5696-7585>

Reduction of social and economic asymmetry of territories in new economic conditions

Abstract

The article presents the research results of the economic and social situation in Russian territories in 2013-2015 obtained by calculation of indicators characterising the level and quality of life in the territories under analysis. The assessment of the quality of life in territorial entities of the Russian Federation, including the Central Federal District (CFD) of the Russian Federation (except Moscow and Moscow Region), was carried out using the following group of indicators: quality of the population; level of the income of the population; working conditions; population provided with comfortable housing; healthcare services; safety of the population; quality of environmental management system.

The authors assess strong and weak points of the reduction of social and economic asymmetry within territorial entities of the Russian Federation by 2016, which have to be considered when developing a qualitatively updated strategy of regional development for the 2020-2025 period.

After carrying out the analysis for the CFD, the following findings have been obtained:

The average income growth is observed in all the cities, except for Volgograd, Kostroma, Kurgan, Samara and Saratov. The population with the income below the subsistence level increased in all the analysed regions. The greatest natural population decline was observed in Vladimir, Smolensk, Tambov, Tver and Tula regions, whereas Belgorod, Yaroslavl, Voronezh, Lipetsk and Kostroma regions displayed a positive dynamic. The slow growth of housing indicator is observed in all the cities. The change in the number of doctors in the considered regions from 2013 to 2015 shows a beneficial situation in Oryol, Belgorod, Bryansk, Kostroma, Tambov and Tula regions where an increase in the number of doctors of all specialties per 10,000 inhabitants is observed. In other regions, we have noted a drop in the number of doctors. We noted an increase in the indicator «Number of the Registered Crimes per 100,000 inhabitants» in all the regions from 2014 to 2015, which is a negative trend.

Keywords: Territory; Level of Life; Quality of Life; Asymmetry; Strategy; Process; Development; Russia

JEL Classification: I31; I38

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V166-16>

Железняков С. С.

кандидат економічних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри економіки, управління та політики,
 Південно-західний державний університет, Курськ, Російська Федерація

Рисін І. Ю.

доктор економічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри регіональної економіки й територіального управління,
 Воронежський державний університет, Воронеж, Російська Федерація

Зниження соціально-економічної асиметрії територій у нових економічних умовах

Анотація

У статті представлено результати дослідження соціально-економічного становища територій, отримані в результаті проведених розрахунків міжнародних і російських індикаторів, що характеризують рівень і якість життя на досліджуваних територіях в 2013–2015 рр. Виявлено сильні та слабкі сторони сучасної практики зниження соціально-економічної асиметрії суб'єктів Російської Федерації по 2016 р. включно, які повинні бути враховані при розробці якісно оновлених стратегій регіонального розвитку на 2020–2025 рр. У статті визначено напрями зниження територіальної асиметрії в Росії.

Ключові слова: територія; рівень життя; якість життя; асиметрія; стратегія; процес; програма розвитку; Росія.

Железняков С. С.

кандидат экономических наук, доцент, заведующий кафедрой экономики, управления и политики,
 Юго-Западный государственный университет, Курск, Российская Федерация

Рисин И. Е.

доктор экономических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой региональной экономики и территориального управления,
 Воронежский государственный университет, Воронеж, Российская Федерация

Снижение социально-экономической асимметрии территорий в новых экономических условиях

Аннотация

В статье представлены результаты исследования социально-экономического положения территорий через выполненные расчеты международных и российских индикаторов, характеризующих уровень и качество жизни на исследуемых территориях в 2013–2015 гг. Выявлены сильные и слабые стороны современной практики снижения социально-экономической асимметрии субъектов Российской Федерации по 2016 г. включительно, которые должны быть учтены при разработке качественно обновленных стратегий регионального развития на 2020–2025 гг. В статье заданы направления по снижению территориальной асимметрии в России.

Ключевые слова: территория; уровень жизни; качество жизни; асимметрия; стратегия; процесс; программа развития; Россия.

1. Introduction

Nowadays, the priorities in the development of the 85 territorial entities of the Russian Federation, as well as the Russian economy itself, have been impacted by sanctions against Russia introduced by the European Union, the USA, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Australia and other countries.

Today, the search of ways to improve the well-being of the country's population is determined by the need to develop a strategic program related to better governance of the territorial entities of the Russian Federation at both the federal and the regional levels. Presidential Decree No. 683 of 31 December 2015 «On the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation» says that the main goals and tasks in ensuring the national security of the state are the quality of citizens' life, maintaining the high level of human development and meeting the basic human needs. The most immediate priority is to decrease inequality of the population with regard to their social environment and available property, which are significantly impacted by population and income growth.

The problem of improvement of the well-being of Russian citizens is addressed through social and economic development, as well as implementation of the May decrees of the President of the Russian Federation. The improvement of the well-being of Russian citizens and the quality of services rendered to them is defined in many ways, i.e. from the system established by regional authorities to monitor income differences between the rich and the poor to the reduction of income disparities at both the municipal and regional levels, and the achievement of development indicators of the 2020-2025 period.

The economic functioning of regional systems is a result of changes and transformations which proceed in the social, economic and ecological environment. The functioning of the social and economic spheres within the territorial entities of the Russian Federation can be characterised in terms of existing territorial stratification in these spheres, which should be taken into account when forming territorial programs under the prevailing circumstances. Issues related to the development of areas, regions, and districts have attracted the attention of representatives of public authorities and scientists who conduct scientific research on the territories and define the key factors which influence their development. Today, the approach to spatial inequality is gaining importance due to the assessment of the economic potential and promotion of economic development.

It can be argued that the inequality (asymmetry) in social and economic development of the territorial entities of the Russian Federation is viewed as interrelation between the elements (components) of regional systems shown in territorial deviations relating to different groups of social and economic indicators. When determining deviations in the development of areas (municipal districts), it is necessary to take into account historical aspects of the economic development of the state, its international rating and the development of the territorial entities of the Russian Federation in terms of the use of effective mechanisms (programs) in the social and economic environment. Social and territorial differentiation should be perceived through the prism of all spheres of life. The key task is to create adequate economic, legal and other conditions for all the entities to maintain the high rates achieved both in economy and social sphere (the territories of the advancing development) and to improve the capacity-building of the areas which are behind the leading regions.

2. Brief Literature Review

Issues relating to the reduction of social and economic asymmetry of territories are becoming particularly important. N. V. Zubarevich (2010) [1] considers the issues of the spatial development in terms of economic and social inequality of Russia's regions, as well as the CIS countries, and shows the effects of the crisis on the development of the territories. N. F. Naumov (1993) [2] studies the main criteria which are applied to estimate and regulate the social differentiation (asymmetry) with regard to the stimulation of

economic activities and promotion of social stability. Theoretical and methodological issues of the social inequality, as well as functions and tasks of managing the territorial inequality in modern Russia are considered in the work by S. V. Perfilyev and V. I. Terekhin (2000) [3]. The collective monograph «Regional problems of the transitional economy: issues of theory and practice», edited by V. G. Aliev (2002), describes the ways of overcoming regional depression [4]. D. Kuttur (2009) conducted a spatial analysis of countries in Europe and presented a group of territories with regard to their population density and economic potential [5]. O. I. Soskin (2013) focuses attention on the increasing gap between the rich and the poor in the world and the inequality of income and opportunities in the society, which causes social and economic inequality, as well as social discontent [6].

Russian scholars and practitioners S. S. Zheleznyakov (2016), Ya. Ya. Kayl and V. S. Epina (2013), I. E. Risin (2016) examined the interregional differentiation of the social and economic development of territories and offered a programme of actions on the decrease in asymmetry in the explored territories at the appropriate levels of their development [7-9].

J. A. Machado and G. A. L. dos Santos (2017) estimated the extent to which territorial inequality influences the potential and local conditions for rendering services in the national public policy with a decentralised implementation [10]. An analysis of the Brazilian policy in the field of health care, under which municipalities are responsible for rendering services, has revealed that there exists a strategy relevant to the use of funds from local taking into account the population and the regional location of the municipalities. S. Santos (2016) considers the social and spatial heterogeneity of Lisbon Metropolitan Area with regard to various types of mobility, which are considered to be a result and a factor of the reproduction of inequality in access to urban agglomeration space [11].

D. Zamfir, L. Dumitrasch, I.-V. Stoica and D. Virdol (2015) put the concentration of medical personnel and medical divisions in cities of Romania on the one hand, and an acute shortage of physicians in towns and rural areas on the other hand in the forefront of the inequalities which arise in providing medical services at the territorial level [13].

A. Rodríguez-Pose and D. Hardy (2015) focus on the problems of poverty and inequality in rural areas [14]. They suggest various approaches to reduce territorial differentiation.

K. N. Kalashnikov analysed statistical data on territorial entities and municipalities of the Russian Federation. He shows territorial distinctions in providing the population with the main resources of health care in the section of separate indicators and focused on funding the mechanisms to decrease the revealed distinctions. S. Rastvorseva (2015) revealed and estimated the influence of integration factors on regional inequality and constructed an econometric model of such divergences [15].

Using the example of Romania, Z. Goschin (2015) estimated the influence of the territorial differentiation on the economic development of the state in the period from 1995 to 2012 by means of the economic growth model [16]. The author determined the relationship between GDP and a synthetic index for territorial inequalities. It is shown that systematic imbalances and differentiations tend to increase the regional development and economic growth in Romania.

E. M. M. Roda (2014) analysed social and territorial changes which had happened in China after the opening of the country to the process of market economy and globalisation [17]. Carrying out the research, the author used various regional statistical data for the analysis of the territorial inequality between industrially developed, prosperous and dynamic spaces and undeveloped territories in the social and economic spheres.

O. A. Sergienko, I. P. Golofaieva and M. A. Shavlak (2016) propose a methodology to provide monitoring and diagnosis of social and economic inequality in the development of

Ukrainian regions and the EU [18]. They describe economic and mathematical tools for assessment and analysis of social and economic inequalities and regional differentiations in territorial development. A. Rodríguez-Pose and D. Hardy (2015) showed the ways to solve the problems of poverty and inequality in agriculture from the global point of view.

3. Purpose

The purpose of the article is to synthesise domestic and foreign application-oriented experience of the level of the quality of human life measurement in the selected territories, as well as to examine territorial target programmes for the development of areas implementing and territorial discrepancies lowering by the main groups of social and economic indices.

4. Results

The international and Russian indicators for measuring the quality of life are used to assess the quality of human life. In the 20th century (1990), the index of human development, known as the Human Development Index (HDI), was introduced. The UN calculates this index annually, using the basis of the obtained data and comparing the reached values with the standards of living worldwide.

In accordance with the quantitative index, the categories of the Human Development Index by country in 2015 were as follows:

- very high level (49 countries);
- high level (56 countries);
- medium level (39 countries);
- low level (44 countries).

As reported by the UN, in 2015 the Russian Federation was able to improve its position and took the 50th place with its HDI equal to 0.798, which is seven points higher than the corresponding figure for the previous year, and was included in the group of countries with the high level of HDI. The total number of countries that were evaluated according to the abovementioned index was 187. In the same year, Denmark, Norway, Australia, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Germany, Ireland, the USA, Canada and New Zealand were included in the group of countries with the very high level according to this index. In compliance with HDI, countries are ranked in terms of life expectancy, education and per capita income indicators. To display the differences in both the quality of human life and the weights of selected components in different countries, auxiliary indexes are calculated.

In Russia, we use indicators such as the average life expectancy at birth, the average years of schooling and the gross national income per capita. It should be noted that the Russian Federation outpaces Brazil (the 75th place), China (the 90th place), South Africa (the 116th place) and India which ranked the 130th according to the HDI. Nevertheless, all these states are related to countries with high economic growth. The Economist Intelligence Unit publishes an annual report in which information on the achieved level of the quality of life in the cities of the world is provided.

The calculation of the Quality of Life Index by City is based on the group of the indicators (30) which are divided into control groups, characterising the state and the level of the quality of life in the urban environment: health care, culture, environment, stability, education, and infrastructure. For each of the 30 indicators in the ranking, the points range from 1 to 100, where 1 point corresponds to the bad living conditions and 100 points indicate the highest quality of life. The total assessment for each considered city is formed on a 100-point scale. An analysis on 140 cities of the world was carried out in 2016. According to its results, Melbourne (Australia) ranks first, Vienna (Austria) ranks second and Vancouver (Canada) is among the top three cities.

In 2005, the Quality of Life Index by City for the Russian Federation was 4.796 (the 105th position out of 111). In 2016, St. Petersburg and Moscow represented Russia's cities in the annual ranking. Those were ranked 76th and 80th, respectively.

Every year, RIA Rating agency analyses the quality of life of territorial entities of the Russian Federation. Their rating

system is based on various indicators which reflect the actual social situation and other aspects of life. Experts select 72 indicators and divide them into 11 groups. They reflect living conditions of the territorial entities of the Russian Federation, including the level of the economic development, climatic conditions and many others.

According to the 2016 results, Moscow and St. Petersburg took the lead among the territorial entities of the Russian Federation in terms of the quality of life. In the list below, there are Moscow Region, the Republic of Tatarstan, Krasnodar Krai, Belgorod Region, Voronezh Region, Khanty-Mansiysk Autonomous Region, Lipetsk Region and Tyumen Region. In 2015, the above-named territorial entities of the Russian Federation were in the top ten. According to the 2015 rating, Tyumen Region was ranked 11th, and placed 10th in the following year.

In 2016, Kursk Region was ranked 15th, which is two points higher than in 2015. In practice, a number of techniques and approaches are used to assess the quality of human life. However, there exists no universal technique which would allow to carry out an instant comparative assessment of the entities and to identify areas of improvement with regard to the quality of human life.

The assessment of the quality of life in territorial entities of the Russian Federation, including the Central Federal District of the Russian Federation (except Moscow and Moscow Region), was carried out with regard to the following group of indicators:

- quality of the population (K1);
- level of the income of the population (K2);
- working conditions (K3);
- population provided with comfortable housing (K4);
- healthcare services (K5);
- safety of the population (K6);
- quality of environmental management system (K7).

At the *first stage* of assessment, it is necessary to collect statistical data. At the *second stage*, it must further be standardised to diverse statistical stimulant indicators (S_{ij}) and destimulant indicators (dS_{ij}) with the help of the method of linear scaling on the maximum and minimum values of regional indicators, using Formulas 1 and 2, respectively:

$$K_{ij}^S = \frac{S_{ij} - \min(S_{ij})}{\max(S_{ij}) - \min(S_{ij})}, \tag{1}$$

$$K_{ij}^{dS} = 1 - \left(\frac{dS_{ij} - \min(dS_{ij})}{\max(dS_{ij}) - \min(dS_{ij})} \right), \tag{2}$$

where S_{ij} and dS_{ij} are the actual j -values of the stimulant indicator and destimulant indicator per i -year;

$\max(S_{ij}, dS_{ij})$, $\min(S_{ij}, dS_{ij})$ are the maximum and minimum j -values of the stimulant indicator and destimulant indicator per i -year.

At the *third stage*, it is essential to aggregate the standardised indicators of the quality of life $K_{ij}^{s, ds}$ by means of the arithmetic average size of the indices of the stimulant indicators (S_{ij}) and the destimulant indicators (dS_{ij}).

At the *fourth stage*, the complex indicator of the quality of human life $K_{ij}^{s, ds}$ is calculated by means of the average geometrical size for the standardised indicators of the quality of life ($K_{ij}^{complex}$).

At the *fifth stage*, the gradation of the received complex regional values is carried out ($K_{complex}$).

At the *sixth stage*, the gradation of the private indicators of the quality of human life of Kursk Region in the period of 2013-2015 is carried out. After that, we identify the areas of improvement for the territorial entity of the Russian Federation, which should be addressed by the regional authorities.

The analysis of the quality of human life in the Central Federal District of the Russian Federation in the 2013-2015 period is presented in Tables 1-3.

After carrying out the analysis of the structural components, it is possible to make the following conclusions:

1. The average income growth is observed in all the cities, except for Volgograd, Kostroma, Kurgan, Samara and Saratov.
2. The population with the income below the subsistence level increased in all the analysed regions of the Central Federal District of the Russian Federation in the 2013-2015, which shows a negative trend.
3. The greatest natural population decline was observed in Vladimir, Smolensk, Tambov, Tver and Tula regions, whereas Belgorod, Yaroslavl, Voronezh, Lipetsk and Kostroma regions displayed a positive dynamic.
4. The change in the natural increase or decline in the population is impacted by migration which is significant in Kursk, Voronezh, Belgorod and Yaroslavl, when compared with that of other cities. At the same time, the migratory outflow from Tambov, Oryol and Bryansk regions becomes relevant.
5. In the modern context, well-planned housing is directly connected with the level of household income, unlike the Soviet period when the provision of housing in cities did not depend on the financial position of a family. The housing indicator can be inferred from the study of family budgets. The slow growth is observed in all the cities. Nevertheless, the largest growth was observed in Tver, Belgorod, Ryazan and Kursk regions. The lowest housing indicator is for Ivanovo region with 25.2 square meters per capita. The highest rate is in Tver and Belgorod regions (30 square meters and 29.1 square meters, respectively);

Tab. 1: Results of assessment of the quality of human life in the Central Federal District of the Russian Federation (excluding Moscow and Moscow Region) in 2013

	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	K-complex	Rank
Belgorod Region	0.705	0.781	0.804	0.572	0.356	0.904	0.704	0.665	1
Kursk Region	0.323	0.539	0.556	0.685	0.644	0.429	0.965	0.562	2
Yaroslavl Region	0.749	0.626	0.734	0.248	0.844	0.499	0.399	0.545	3
Voronezh Region	0.470	0.784	0.405	0.532	0.698	0.409	0.618	0.544	4
Smolensk Region	0.393	0.312	0.720	0.497	0.799	0.315	0.816	0.510	5
Bryansk Region	0.422	0.456	0.376	0.794	0.415	0.416	0.834	0.504	6
Lipetsk Region	0.501	0.724	0.594	0.566	0.442	0.451	0.336	0.503	7
Ryazan Region	0.472	0.379	0.356	0.475	0.572	0.531	0.691	0.485	8
Tambov Region	0.503	0.676	0.288	0.519	0.284	0.452	0.882	0.479	9
Tver Region	0.359	0.323	0.596	0.551	0.567	0.331	0.742	0.473	10
Kostroma Region	0.513	0.221	0.579	0.246	0.544	0.643	0.883	0.469	11
Ivanovo Region	0.558	0.307	0.515	0.377	0.561	0.283	0.793	0.457	12
Vladimir Region	0.618	0.475	0.970	0.461	0.073	0.244	0.708	0.401	13
Oryol Region	0.394	0.373	0.206	0.499	0.653	0.184	0.889	0.399	14
Tula Region	0.465	0.506	0.654	0.124	0.185	0.701	0.312	0.359	15
Kaluga Region	0.453	0.732	0.832	0.338	0.398	0.010	0.803	0.313	16

Source: Calculated by the authors based at proposed methodology and the latest data available as for September, 2017

Tab. 2: Results of assessment of the quality of human life in the Central Federal District of the Russian Federation (excluding Moscow and Moscow Region) in 2014

	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	K-complex	Rank
Belgorod Region	0.577	0.745	0.789	0.542	0.363	0.932	0.674	0.635	1
Kursk Region	0.305	0.610	0.712	0.705	0.667	0.466	0.967	0.600	2
Yaroslavl Region	0.685	0.667	0.942	0.295	0.856	0.531	0.384	0.580	3
Voronezh Region	0.375	0.819	0.470	0.526	0.744	0.408	0.614	0.544	4
Kaluga Region	0.502	0.698	0.680	0.348	0.347	-	0.781	0.531	5
Smolensk Region	0.430	0.310	0.484	0.509	0.791	0.472	0.817	0.518	6
Lipetsk Region	0.400	0.794	0.522	0.536	0.508	0.574	0.318	0.504	7
Bryansk Region	0.417	0.392	0.248	0.833	0.386	0.559	0.833	0.482	8
Oryol Region	0.421	0.395	0.482	0.457	0.709	0.263	0.888	0.482	9
Kostroma Region	0.438	0.255	0.662	0.255	0.589	0.576	0.882	0.477	10
Ryazan Region	0.403	0.432	0.337	0.505	0.478	0.569	0.665	0.474	11
Ivanovo Region	0.478	0.356	0.510	0.309	0.652	0.307	0.781	0.458	12
Tver Region	0.354	0.256	0.513	0.465	0.613	0.340	0.713	0.440	13
Tambov Region	0.448	0.561	0.338	0.430	0.184	0.508	0.885	0.436	14
Tula Region	0.391	0.558	0.747	0.164	0.246	0.651	0.287	0.384	15
Kaluga Region	0.495	0.397	0.691	0.467	0.072	0.261	0.706	0.364	16

Source: Calculated by the authors based at proposed methodology and the latest data available as for September, 2017

Tab. 3: Results of assessment of the quality of human life in Central Federal District of the Russian Federation (excluding Moscow and Moscow Region) in 2015

	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	Kcomplex	Rank
Belgorod region	0.548	0.749	0.919	0.616	0.386	0.922	0.702	0.666	1
Kursk region	0.402	0.545	0.707	0.640	0.734	0.439	0.971	0.609	2
Bryansk region	0.469	0.459	0.462	0.844	0.404	0.576	0.838	0.555	3
Voronezh region	0.412	0.845	0.572	0.534	0.713	0.325	0.632	0.552	4
Oryol region	0.411	0.437	0.382	0.631	0.767	0.339	0.895	0.518	5
Kostroma region	0.465	0.335	0.542	0.404	0.599	0.555	0.882	0.518	6
Yaroslavl region	0.678	0.638	0.639	0.482	0.727	0.274	0.376	0.518	7
Kaluga region	0.432	0.578	0.844	0.486	0.222	-	0.782	0.511	8
Lipetsk region	0.411	0.666	0.558	0.583	0.573	0.518	0.329	0.508	9
Smolensk region	0.370	0.267	0.513	0.556	0.742	0.506	0.803	0.506	10
Tambov region	0.464	0.534	0.394	0.483	0.289	0.464	0.853	0.474	11
Ryazan region	0.457	0.315	0.346	0.587	0.448	0.554	0.678	0.468	12
Tula region	0.389	0.557	0.849	0.410	0.221	0.615	0.381	0.453	13
Ivanovo region	0.481	0.252	0.572	0.427	0.440	0.339	0.813	0.447	14
Tver region	0.378	0.295	0.622	0.464	0.491	0.288	0.733	0.443	15
Vladimir region	0.552	0.459	0.578	0.594	0.141	0.182	0.715	0.399	16

Source: Calculated by the authors based at proposed methodology and the latest data available as for September, 2017

6. Public health is one of the most important characteristics of the quality of human life. Therefore, health care quality comes to the forefront. The important indicators are the number of doctors per 10,000 inhabitants and the capacity of outpatient clinics.

The change in the number of doctors in the considered regions from 2013 to 2015 shows a beneficial situation in Oryol, Belgorod, Bryansk, Kostroma, Tambov and Tula regions where an increase in the number of doctors of all specialties per 10,000 inhabitants is observed. In other regions, we have noted a drop in the number of doctors.

The research of changes in the number of hospital beds per 10,000 inhabitants revealed that there was a decrease in the number of hospital beds in all the considered regions, except Vladimir region. The largest decrease was observed in Kaluga, Ivanovo and Bryansk regions.

7. Having analysed the indicator «Number of the Registered Crimes per 100,000 inhabitants», we noted an increase in the indicator in all the regions from 2014 to 2015, which is a negative trend.

The ranking of the regions of the Central Federal District (CFD) of the Russian Federation by the level of quality of human life is presented in Table 4.

Based on the calculations, it is possible to conclude that Belgorod, Kursk, Yaroslavl, and Voronezh regions held the leading positions for three years.

The quality of life of the leading regions in many respects is defined by the development of the economy and social sphere, as well as by favourable climatic conditions.

By specifying the complex indicator of the quality of human life for Kursk region, problematic areas and competitive advantages of the quality of human life in the region in compliance with its structural components are presented in Table 5.

According to the assessment carried out by RIA RATING agency and the assessment done with the help of E. A. Mosyakina's technique, the results presented in Table 6 show that Belgorod region is the leader in the quality of human life in the region. Further, it should be noted that the presented results differ. The explanation lies in the indicators used in the calculations.

Tab. 5: Distribution of values of private indicators of structural components of level of quality of human life in Kursk region in 2013-2015

The structural components of the population's quality of life	Year	Values of the private indicators of the structural components of level of the population's quality of life				
		High	Higher than average	Average	Lower than average	Low
K1 - the quality of the population	2013				0.323	
	2014				0.305	
	2015			0.402		
K2 - the level of the income of the population	2013			0.539		
	2014		0.610			
	2015			0.545		
K3 - working conditions	2013			0.556		
	2014		0.712			
K4 - the population providing with comfortable housing	2013		0.685			
	2014		0.705			
	2015		0.640			
K5 - the providing with services of health care	2013		0.644			
	2014		0.667			
	2015		0.734			
K6 - the safety of the population	2013			0.429		
	2014			0.466		
	2015			0.439		
K7 - the quality of ecological system	2013	0.965				
	2014	0.967				
	2015	0.971				

Source: Calculated by the authors based at proposed methodology and the latest data available as for September, 2017

Based on the assessment of the quality of human life in Kursk region, it has been found out that the values of the private indicators range from 0.3 to 0.97, which demonstrates the level of the population's quality of life in the region above average.

5. Conclusions

The issue of improving the quality of human life is a priority to solve social and economic problems at any level.

A decrease in the real income of the population, as well as the growth of poverty, was caused by hyperinflation and depreciation of the main types of income of the population, i.e. salaries, pensions, grants and citizens' savings. A decrease in the outputs and the closure of many enterprises has led to job cuts, dismissal of workers and increases in open and hidden unemployment. As a result, about a quarter of the country's population is below the poverty line.

One of the brightest proofs of the social disaster is the integrated indicator characterising the level and quality of human life in Russia.

Tab. 4: Ranking of the regions of the Central Federal District of the Russian federation by the level of quality of human life in 2013-2015

CFD entity	Rating point (K-complex - 2015)	Region's position in the 2015 rating	Region's position in the 2014 rating	Region position in the 2013 rating
Belgorod region	0,666	1	1	1
Kursk region	0,609	2	2	2
Yaroslavl region	0,518	7 v	3	3
Voronezh region	0,552	4	4	4
Smolensk region	0,506	10 v	6 v	5
Bryansk region	0,555	3 ^	8 v	6
Lipetsk region	0,508	9 v	7	7
Ryazan region	0,468	12 v	11 v	8
Tambov region	0,474	11 ^	14 v	9
Tver region	0,443	15 v	13 v	10
Kostroma region	0,518	6 ^	10 v	11
Ivanovo region	0,447	14 v	12	12
Vladimir region	0,399	16	16 v	13
Oryol region	0,518	5 ^	9 v	14
Tula region	0,453	13 ^	15	15
Kaluga region	0,511	8 v	5 ^	16

Source: Calculated by the authors based at the latest data available as for September, 2017

Tab. 6: Ranking of the CFD regions in terms of the quality of human life in 2013-2016

CDF subject	RIA RATING	E. A. Mosyakina's technique			
	Region's position in the 2016 rating	Region's position in the 2015 rating	Region position in the 2014 rating	Region position in the 2013 rating	
Belgorod Region	1	1	1	1	
Kursk Region	4 v	2	2	2	
Yaroslavl Region	8 v	3	3	3	
Voronezh Region	2 ^	4	4	4	
Smolensk Region	12 v	5 ^	6 v	5	
Bryansk Region	14 v	6 ^	8 v	6	
Lipetsk Region	3 ^	7	7	7	
Ryazan Region	11 v	8 ^	11 v	8	
Tambov Region	9	9 ^	14 v	9	
Tver Region	16 v	10 ^	13 v	10	
Kostroma Region	15 v	11 ^	10 v	11	
Ivanovo Region	13 v	12	12	12	
Vladimir Region	10 ^	13 ^	16 v	13	
Oryol Region	11 ^	14 ^	9 v	14	
Tula Region	7 ^	15	15	15	
Kaluga Region	5 ^	16 v	5 ^	16	

Source: Calculated by the authors based at proposed methodology and the latest data available as for September, 2017

The conducted comparative analysis is focused on defining general and special tasks and measures to the decrease the social and economic asymmetry in the regions, as well as on identifying the tools by which regional authorities can intensify this process.

We believe that the reduction of social and economic asymmetry can lead to an integrated approach to addressing the relevant problems, which may create greater efficiency.

The major issues relating to the reduction of social and economic inequality within the territorial entities of the Russian Federation are the following: creation of conditions for more equitable distribution of the private investments between the territories (territorial entities, municipal districts); rapprochement (association) of the municipal districts (territories) with

the parallel allocation of the basic centres of social and cultural support ensuring in rural areas; realisation of the investment potential in the elaboration of road maps with the involvement of all municipal districts and cities; identification of new points of economic growth; establishment of the zones of intensive economic development with the involvement of neighbouring territories; promotion and development of inter-municipal cooperation.

The complexity of the issues related to the reduction of the social and economic differentiation in the regions requires best practices on territory management, which should be considered when developing a qualitatively updated strategy of regional development and setting priorities in reducing the territorial asymmetry in the Russian Federation.

References

- Zubarevich, N. V. (2010). *Regions of Russia: inequality, crisis, modernization*. Moscow: Independent Institute of Social Policy (in Russ.).
- Naumov, N. F. (1993). Regulation of social differentiation: criteria, cycles, models. *Society and Economy*, 3, 3-20 (in Russ.).
- Perfilyev, S. V., & Terekhin, V. I. (2000). *Analysis of territorial inequality and budgetary regulation of territories*. Moscow: Economy (in Russ.).
- Aliev, V. G. (Ed.). (2002). *Regional problems of a transitional economy: issues of theory and practice*. Moscow: Economy (in Russ.).
- Kuttar, D. (2009). Territorial inequalities in central Europe-spatial analysis of the Visegrad countries. *Romanian review of regional studies*, 5(1), 25-36. Retrieved from <http://rrrs.reviste.ubbcluj.ro/Arhive/Artpdf/v5n12009/RRRS051200904.pdf>
- Soskin, O. I. (2013). Role of state regulation in formation of modern economic model: changing imperative in the conditions of chaos. *Economic Annals-XXI*, 1-2(1), 3-7. Retrieved from http://soskin.info/en/ea/2013/1-2/contents_1.html (in Ukr.).
- Kayl, Ya. Ya., & Epinina, V. S. (2013). Increasing of population life quality in the subjects of Russian Federation as a priority of improving of public management. *Management of economic systems: an Electronic Research Journal*, 57(9), 1-22. Retrieved from <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/povysheniye-kachestva-zhizni-naseleniya-subektov-rf-kak-prioritet-sovshchenstvovaniya-gosudarstvennogo-menedzhmenta> (in Russ.).
- Zheleznyakov, S. S., & Risin, I. E. (2016). The modern practice of strategy development process, reducing the social and economic asymmetries in the regions. *Vestnik Kurskoi Gosudarstvennoi Selskhozhoziaystvennoi Akademii (Herald of Kursk State Agricultural Academy)*, 9, 41-47. Retrieved from <http://www.journal-kgsha.ru/data/documents/2016-09.pdf> (in Russ.).
- Zheleznyakov, S. S., & Risin, I. E. (2016). Scheme of development and placement of productive forces as instrument of strategic planning of decrease in spatial social and economic asymmetry *Izvestiya Yugo-Zapadnogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Seriya ekonomika. Sotsiologiya. Menedzhment (Proceedings of the South-West State University. Economic Series. Sociology. Management)*, 24(4), 11-17. Retrieved from <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=28116217> (in Russ.).
- Machado, J. A., & dos Santos, G. A. L. (2017). Decentralization and equality in access to health services: case of Brazil. *Revista Do Serviço Público*, 68(1), 37-64. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21874/rsp.v68i1.1582> (in Portuguese)
- Santos, S. (2016). Who are you calling sub/urban? Socio-spatial inequality and mobility in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*, 15(3), 387-407. Retrieved from <http://pjss.iscte-iul.pt/index.php/pjss/article/view/234>
- Shelton, T., Poorthuis, A., & Zook, M. (2015). Social media and the city: Rethinking urban socio-spatial inequality using user-generated geographic information. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 142, 198-211. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.02.020>
- Zamfir, D., Dumitrache, L., Stoica, I.-V., & Virdol, D. (2015). Spatial inequalities in health care provision in Romania: milestones for territorial sustainable development. *Carpathian Journal of Earth and Environmental Sciences*, 10(3), 177-188. Retrieved from <http://www.ubm.ro/sites/CJEEES/viewTopic.php?topicid=560>
- Rodríguez-Pose, A., & Hardy, D. (2015). Addressing poverty and inequality in the rural economy from a global perspective. *Applied Geography*, 61, 11-23. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2015.02.005>
- Rastvortseva, S. (2015). The impact of integration on social and economic inequality of regions. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts. Albena, Bulgaria 26 aug.-1 sept. 2015* (pp. 937-945). Retrieved from <http://dspace.bsu.edu.ru/handle/123456789/14065>
- Goschin, Z. (2015). Territorial inequalities and economic growth in Romania. A multi-factor approach. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 22, 690-698. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00285-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00285-3)
- Roda, E. M. M. (2014). Territorial imbalances in the Chinese economic boom. *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles*, 66, 473-475. Retrieved from <http://www.age-geografia.es/ojs/index.php/bage/article/viewFile/1804/1720>
- Sergienko, O. A., Golofaieva, I. P., & Shavlak, M. A. (2016). Methodology of applied statistical and econometrical analysis in disparities and uneven of Ukraine and EU countries regions development. *Finansovo-kredytna dijalnist: problemy teorii i praktyky (Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice)*, 21(2), 151-165. Retrieved from <http://fk.d.org.ua/article/view/91056> (in Ukr.).
- Rodríguez-Pose, A., & Hardy, D. (2015). Addressing poverty and inequality in the rural economy from a global perspective. *Applied Geography*, 61, 11-23. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2015.02.005>

Received 25.04.2017

ORCID and Scopus author profiles

Elsevier's Scopus is the world's largest abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed literature and it features smart tools to track, analyze and visualize research.

When you've published an article in any peer-reviewed journal, you automatically have a Scopus profile.

It is a good idea to check and update your profile containing the right publications.

ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID) seeks to remedy the systemic name ambiguity problems seen in scholarly research by assigning unique identifiers linkable to an individual's research output.

You can now update both your Scopus and your ORCID at orcid.scopusfeedback.com.

Please follow the easy steps online.

by Elsevier