

Classification of Region's Municipalities by Structure and Level of Incomes and Consumer Spending



Vladislav Yakovlevich

FOKIN

Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor

Perm National Research Polytechnic University, Chaykovsky Branch

73, Lenin Street, Chaykovsky, Perm Krai, 617760, Russian Federation,

vlad-f62@yandex.ru

Abstract. The paper presents a classification of region's municipalities that differ according to two criteria – the structure and level of incomes, and the level of consumer spending. The author investigated the combination of income sources (wages, pensions and unemployment benefits) that form in the aggregate the amount of disposable money income of the people who live in the administrative-territorial units of Perm Krai. The author also analyzed the influence of people's incomes on retail trade turnover in the region's municipalities. The data were collected, grouped and analyzed; they show that the level of people's income in large and medium cities, which are industrial centers, exceeds considerably the values of these indicators registered in rural municipalities, single-industry settlements and depressed areas. The reason for this lies in low wages of working population, a large proportion of retirees and the unemployed in the rural areas, single-industry settlements and depressed areas. The article defines nine types of territorial entities in the region that differ in level and structure of income and consumer spending in the municipalities. The author concludes that the territorial differentiation of municipal formations influences the formation of stratified population groups distinguished by the level of income and consumption. The solution to this problem requires joint efforts by the regional administration and municipal authorities to develop management actions with regard to specific features of each municipality.

Key words: municipality, territorial differentiation, city, single-industry settlement, rural municipal district, income, wage, the unemployed, pensioners, consumption, social stratification.

According to Article 15 of the Constitution of the USSR of 1977, the most complete satisfaction of the growing material and spiritual needs of the people was the supreme goal of social production under socialism. It is known that the satisfaction of needs is based on the consumption of material and spiritual goods. Therefore, an increase in the level of consumption was one of the prime tasks of the state under the conditions of planned economy.

The Constitution of the Russian Federation adopted through nationwide vote on December 12, 1993, declares the implementation of state policy aimed at creating conditions for a decent life and free development of man. The concept of "decent life" can be regarded in the context of assessment of the quality of life, a component of which, along with health, life expectancy, environment conditions, is the level of consumption of material and spiritual goods. The level of consumption is derived from people's income level. Given the fact that all citizens in the social state must have an opportunity to live a decent life, the alignment of people's income and consumption should be a current priority task for the government. And this requires analyzing different aspects of the issue of social inequality in the country.

Differentiation by place of residence is a factor that influences social stratification in Russia; it creates different opportunities for gaining income and making consumer spending among people who live in different types of municipalities. Therefore, socio-economic heterogeneity in the development of rural and urban settlements, cities with diversified industry and depressed areas affects stratification of the population by level of

income and consumption and leads to negative demographic and migration processes; therefore, it is a priority issue that requires theoretical research and practical solutions at the national, regional and municipal levels.

In order to work out solutions aimed at maintaining the necessary balance in the development of region's administrative-territorial entities, to prevent their excessive differentiation in terms of socio-economic development and quality of life, it is necessary to classify municipalities into homogeneous groups through inter-municipal comparison.

It should be noted that Russian scholars have been recently paying more attention to the issues of deepening social inequality in terms of standard of living and its individual components nationwide and at the municipal level.

For example, B.V. Tokarskii points out the importance of research into this aspect of social administration; he writes that the standard of living – an important component of the quality of life – is largely determined by the availability of goods and services and by the level of their consumption [10, pp. 160-161].

Social significance and urgency of the issue of deepening people's income differentiation in the period of market transformations and consequences of this differentiation allowed I.Yu. Il'ina to prepare her doctoral dissertation in which she investigated the specifics of formation of consumer strategies in different socio-demographic groups [3].

It should be noted a multidimensional nature of the issue of territorial differentiation of income and the issue of population stratification by level of consumption. Several scientific works are devoted to

the issues of continuum – insufficient – excessive consumption. For example, V.A. Shamlikashvili points out the increasing importance of consumption that is used “as a tool of social identification of individuals and their integration into society on the basis of social and consumer status” [13, p. 45].

In pursuit of raising this status, the consumption of various goods by certain groups of people becomes excessive. Overconsumption is most widely prevalent in metropolitan and regional centers and in major cities. It is capital cities and regional centers that have a high concentration of “insatiable consumers”, as A.A. Ovsyannikov puts it. He writes: “An insatiable consumer is the center of any policy of consumer society, the society that is managed not by Durkheim’s values of political ideals, but by a system of virtual signs and symbols of social identity with power and success” [6, p. 230].

A separate area of scientific research is represented by the works that analyze the depth of differentiation of people’s incomes, their level of consumption corresponding to these incomes and related trends in socio-economic development of different types of territorial units of the country and its regions.

According to Z.I. Kalugina, income inequalities cause inequalities in the level, structure and quality of consumption. Z.I. Kalugina writes that the structure of consumption expenditure of rural residents is dominated by a high proportion of expenditure on food; as for expenditures on recreational and cultural activities and on education, their share is small compared to that of urban residents. Thus, it follows that Russia has a combination of income inequality

and inequality of opportunities; peasant labor is underestimated, which results in the dominance of extremely poor and poor population in rural areas [4, pp. 125-127].

L.V. Kostyleva used the Vologda Oblast as an example and analyzed the impact of income on the lifestyle and stratification of urban and rural population with the use of the following indicators: volume and structure of expenditure; food consumption; comfortable housing; endowment with property; consumption of services; spending leisure time and opportunities for recreation [5].

Several research papers analyze statistical data and findings of sociological surveys that prove the presence of considerable negative effects resulting from the fact that socio-economic development of rural areas in different regions of the Russian Federation is lagging behind that in urban areas.

T.V. Uskova considers that these negative effects are manifest in the degradation and reduction in size of the structure of settlement network in the Vologda Oblast, and in the decrease in the amount of labor resources in the Oblast’s peripheral areas that have no urban settlements [12].

A team of scientists from the Ural Federal District study the differentiation of municipalities in the Sverdlovsk Oblast and consider the level of wages in the Oblast’s territorial entities to be the most important socio-economic indicator. I.D. Turgel’ and her associates point out that the level of wages has an impact on “the attractiveness of a territorial unit as a prospective place of residence, determines the orientation of migration flows, the capacity of the consumer market and, consequently, the growth rate and structure of

industries such as retail trade and services that support this market..." [7, pp. 31-32].

Small towns and rural areas have a high proportion of the poor – a social class that experiences deprivation because they cannot afford normal consumption. According to the results of research carried out by N.E. Tikhonova, and E.D. Slobodenyuk, poverty as a social phenomenon is concentrated in rural areas and small towns. In oblast centers, the share of people who experienced poverty is several times lower [9, p. 45].

Review of the scientific literature covering the influence of people's income levels on the amount of final consumption gives grounds to make a conclusion about the importance of taking into account the territorial aspect – the place of life activities in the definition of the subject area of the research devoted to this subject.

In one of the author's previously published articles, a research on the influence of income on the difference in the level of consumption of rural and urban population has already been conducted [14]. This work is fundamentally different from the above-mentioned article by the author and from research papers on this topic published by other scientists. The difference lies in the fact that the author carried out a multifactor analysis of the conditions under which the territories are developing, and of how these conditions affect the structure and level of incomes and consumer spending in the population living in administrative-territorial formations of Perm Krai. On this basis, the single-type administrative-territorial formations were selected, and the author proposed their classification based on the common regularities of formation of their

socio-economic potential and its influence on the stratification of the region's population living in different types of territorial entities.

It is known that people's money incomes consist of components such as wages, pensions, allowances and other social transfers. Besides, the structure of money income includes the income from entrepreneurial activity, interest from deposits, securities, etc. According to Permstat (Regional Office of the Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation in Perm Krai), in 2013, the total income of the population in Perm Krai reached 823,932.8 million rubles. The greatest share in the structure of incomes was represented by labor remuneration. It was equal to 273,192.1 million rubles, which accounted for 33.2%. The second place in the structure of incomes in 2013 was occupied by social payments (pensions, benefits) – 145,122.3 million rubles or 17.6%. Then, in decreasing order: income from entrepreneurial activity – 86,916.8 million rubles or 10.5%, and income from property – 34,278.2 million rubles or 4.2%. All other revenues accounted for the total of 34.5% of the aggregate volume of incomes in Perm Krai [8, p. 90].

Income from entrepreneurial activity and income from property occupy a minor place in the structure of incomes due to the fact that entrepreneurship as a phenomenon is currently still in the development stage, and property is in the stage of accumulation; besides, the mechanism of obtaining income from owning property is still in the process of formation. Moreover, in rural areas, due to the allocation of land shares, rural population can earn income from business activity connected with land exploitation or from the lease of the

land. But for the majority of rural residents, according to P.P. Velikii, and S.T. Zakirova, "... the cultivation of land using one's own efforts is a very challenging task taking into account one's own resources (excluding a relatively small group of constructive orientation)" [1, p. 14].

It should be noted that the rent that agricultural enterprises are willing to pay to land owners is negligible due to the excess of supply of farmland and the small demand for them. For example, the rent in Perm Krai is from 100 rubles a year per hectare of farmland plus the payment of land tax.

In order to assess the extent of territorial disparities of income and consumption of the perm Krai population that lives in different types of municipalities, the author developed the research algorithm, defined the indicators to be studied, and collected, structured and analyzed the relevant statistical data. The analysis and further aggregation of the data allowed the author to highlight nine types of municipal entities of Perm Krai that are differentiated by income level and, consequently, by purchasing power of the population, to analyze the impact of these factors on the level of people's consumption in the areas under consideration (*tab. 1*).

At the first stage of research, the author analyzed the influence of average monthly nominal accrued wage (because its share in the structure of income is the highest) on retail trade turnover per capita for the population living in nine types of territories of Perm Krai, taking into account the importance of the consumption indicator. The significance is due to the fact that household spending on food purchases, alcoholic beverages, and non-

food products in the structure of consumer spending is about 60%.

The author points out the fact that the municipal districts in table 1 are arranged in such a way that the administrative-territorial formations in each group of territories take their places in the order of decreasing values of retail trade turnover per capita and, consequently, the rating values of this indicator in the whole region.

The data in table 1 show that in 2013 the average monthly salary in 13 administrative-territorial formations that top the ranking list was from 32,801.1 to 22,869.0 rubles, which corresponds to the first – sixteenth place in descending order. These municipal entities are among the five most successful groups of territories highlighted by the author. In 2013, all these areas characterized by high level of urbanization, including Permsky and Solikamsky districts that are considered to be rural areas, had the highest wages relative to other municipalities. The high ranking of Permsky district by level of wages is explained by the fact that its lands around the city of Perm, which is the regional center, contain large production facilities. A significant part of the Permsky district population is employed at these industrial enterprises that provide a high level of wages. The fact that Usolsky municipal district ranks first and Solikamsky municipal district ranks fifteenth is due to similar circumstances – a significant proportion of the working-age population living in these territories work at potassium salt deposits developed by JSC Uralkali, which pays its workers decently.

The sixth group of territorial entities includes municipal areas that are old industrial

Table 1. Influence of wages on retail trade turnover in different types of municipal entities of Perm Krai in 2013

Ranking position	Administrative-territorial formations	Average monthly nominal accrued wages, rubles	Ranking position	Retail trade turnover per capita, rubles per year	Ranking position	Disparity of values of the 4th and 6th columns, in points	Urban/rural population ratio, %
<i>1. Urban districts that consist of cities and towns which are industrial centers</i>							
1.	City of Perm	32,801.1	2	298,887	1	1	100/0
2.	City of Berezniki	29,005.4	4	151,582	3	1	100/0
3.	Town of Kungur	24,195.4	12	131,047	4	8	100/0
4.	Town of Solikamsk	25,301.1	8	121,077	7	1	100/0
5.	Town of Kudymkar	22,869.0	16	100,361	11	4	100/0
<i>2. Municipal districts and settlements included in the Perm agglomeration</i>							
6.	Krasnokamsky	25,209.9	10	156,282	2	8	80.7/19.3
7.	Dobryansky	30,337.0	3	107,441	10	7	81.6/18.4
<i>3. Municipal districts immediately adjacent to major cities that deployed industrial enterprises on the territory of these districts</i>							
8.	Permsky	25,236.6	9	83,971	13	4	0/100
9.	Usolsky	33,151.2	1	54,795	27	26	40.2/59.8
10.	Solikamsky	22,911.2	15	15,336	47	32	0/100
<i>4. Municipal districts with diversified industry</i>							
11.	Chaikovsky	26,556.3	6	116,280	9	3	79.8/20.2
<i>5. Municipal districts with a high share of enterprises specializing in oil production</i>							
12.	Chernushinsky	24,242.8	11	130,842	5	6	65.5/34.58
13.	Osinsky	26,879.0	5	68,916	18	13	71.7/28.3
<i>6. Municipal and urban districts – old industrial areas with a high proportion of the population that lives in single-industry settlements</i>							
14.	Lysvensky Urban District	20,139.9	29	116,586	8	21	84.4/15.6
15.	Chusovskoy	21,950.8	20	84,569	12	8	77.8/22.2
16.	Ochersky	22,152.2	18	78,694	14	4	76.2/23.8
17.	Kizelovsky	19,492.6	33	73,929	15	18	77.6/22.4
18.	Nytvensky	19,809.7	30	71,638	16	14	70.4/29.6
19.	Gubakhinsky Urban District	23,048.4	14	65,920	20	6	94.4/5.6
20.	Aleksandrovsy	20,645.2	25	63,868	21	4	88.2/11.8
21.	Gornozavodsky	23,586.0	13	51,707	30	17	94.5/5.5
22.	Krasnovishersky	19,783.8	31	50,932	31	-	72.7/17.3
23.	Gremyachinsky	22,079.9	19	47,135	37	18	81.4/18.6
<i>7. Municipal districts, the administrative centers of which are small towns, a significant part of the population of these districts lives in rural settlements</i>							
24.	Vereshchaginsky	20,248.7	28	121,852	6	22	53.7/46.3
25.	Suksunsky	18,251.4	38	59,598	23	15	39.9/60.1
26.	Ilyinsky	18,515.3	37	56,044	25	12	19.4/80.6
27.	Okhansky	16,306.9	44	51,891	28	16	44.2/65.8
28.	Oktyabrsky	20,292.9	27	49,425	35	8	50/50

End of the table 1

<i>8. Rural municipal districts specializing in agricultural production</i>							
29.	Berezovsky	21,599.7	22	71,328	17	5	0/100
30.	Kuyedinsky	17,408.2	41	66,088	19	22	0/100
31.	Bolshesosnovsky	18,661.4	36	60,382	22	14	0/100
32.	Sivinsky	16,199.9	45	57,437	24	21	0/100
33.	Chastinsky	21,132.3	23	56,032	26	3	0/100
34.	Yelovsky	18,960.9	35	51,738	29	6	0/100
35.	Karagaysky	19,287.5	34	50,671	32	2	0/100
36.	Kochevsky	25,373.4	7	50,079	33	26	0/100
37.	Uinsky	18,050.4	39	49,702	34	5	0/100
38.	Cherdynsky	20,415.1	26	48,424	36	10	0/100
39.	Bardymsky	21,610.1	21	46,596	38	17	0/100
40.	Yusvinsky	15,059.9	46	41,944	39	7	0/100
41.	Ordinsky	19,751.8	32	41,666	40	8	0/100
42.	Gaynsky	22,680.0	17	40,342	41	24	0/100
43.	Yurlinsky	17,161.3	42	39,315	42	-	0/100
44.	Kosinsky	20,986.5	24	38,339	43	19	0/100
45.	Kishertsky	17,772.1	40	37,767	44	4	0/100
<i>9. Rural municipal districts without industry, geographically covering the urban districts that are economically independent from them</i>							
46.	Kudymkarsky	14,462.2	47	32,792	45	2	0/100
47.	Kungursky	17,023.5	43	28,490	46	3	0/100

Note. The data was collected, structured and the calculations made by the author with the use of reference source 8.

territories. They have a significant proportion of urban population. But this population lives in single-industry towns, the problem of which, according to V.V. Gusev, “is a kind of white spot, archaism of modern economy, since single-industry towns are currently... centers of stagnation, spatially and economically remote, largely incapable of independent economic development and not fitting in the current social and urban standards” [2, p. 23].

Average monthly wage in the municipalities belonging to the sixth group of territories ranges from 23,586.0 to 19,492.6 rubles. In all the 11 municipalities belonging to this group of territories, average wages are much lower than in the five groups of territories that are higher on the list under consideration.

The relatively high level of wages in the leaders of the list among the municipalities arranged in this group can be explained by several circumstances. On the territory of Gornozavodskoy District there operates a large plant for cement production, enjoying strong demand in the construction materials market. A machine building plant is located in Ochersky District, it supplies its products to oil-producing companies. In the town of Gubakha, a significant contribution to the increase in average wages of the population is made by JSC Metafrax – the leading chemical industrial enterprise in this district.

Kizelovsky Municipal District is the last in the group in terms of wages; Kizel coal basin that was closed in the 1990s is located there.

A.I. Treivish writes: "As a result of the sudden and manmade death of the basin, which was followed by the decline of coal production and decrease in wages, all other industries have also collapsed in this depressed territory without making any attempt to turn from auxiliary into town-forming branches... People have found themselves trapped in a depressing "rusty bowl" [11, pp. 271-272].

The situation is even worse concerning the wages in the majority of municipalities, the administrative centers of which are small towns and in which a significant share of the population lives in rural settlements (7th group) and completely rural municipal districts (8th group). The exception is Kochevsky Municipal District that occupies the seventh place in the ranking in terms of wages. This is because it is located in the forest zone in the north of Perm Krai and it has 17 enterprises for timber harvesting and processing, the level of wages at these enterprises is rather high. This district almost completely lacks the agricultural component. The ninth group includes rural municipal districts that contain the towns of Kudymkar and Kungur – independent municipal formations – urban districts that are economically artificially cut off from their surrounding districts. Therefore, the replenishment of budgets in Kungur and Kudymkar districts is low, and the majority of the population is engaged in low-wage rural labor. This leads to the aggravation of the issue of territorial differentiation of wages that differ significantly in these territories compared to the regional center. In Kudymkarsky Municipal District, which occupies the last place in the ranking, the wage level in 2013 was only 44% relative to that in the city of Perm.

The analysis of the influence of the average level of wages in the municipality on retail trade turnover per capita of the population living in its territory to a certain extent confirms the dependence between these indicators. The data in table 1 show that all the administrative-territorial units referred to the first five groups, except for Usolsky and Solikamsky municipal districts, occupy high positions in the ranking by level of consumption. The fact that these territories occupy low positions in the rating list by level of retail trade turnover is explained by the small size of these areas so that their residents make the bulk of their purchases in the nearby larger settlements – the city of Berezniki and the town of Solikamsk.

In comparison to the above five groups of territories, the rating values of the indicator of retail trade turnover per capita are lower in almost all the territorial units that belong to the group of old industrial territories, in municipal districts, the administrative centers of which are small towns, and in rural municipal districts. The exceptions are Lysvensky Urban District and Vereshchaginsky Municipal District, their administrative centers – the towns of Lysva and Vereshchagino – are located at the intersection of transport railroads and motor roads; these towns are local logistic centers with well-developed trade and the services sector.

The data in table 1 show there is a huge gap in the level of consumption of food and non-food goods between the Perm Krai areas under consideration. In the majority of municipalities dominated by rural population, retail trade turnover per capita is five and more times lower than that in the city of Perm. In the 12 regions that are outsiders in terms of retail

trade turnover per capita, the values of this indicator in 2013 were below 50 thousand rubles – almost six times lower than in the regional center. Even considering the fact that the residents of peripheral areas make some of their purchases in the regional center and nearby towns, we can say with confidence that there exists an inter-municipal stratification of the Perm Krai population by level of consumption.

The mismatch between the values of the fourth and sixth columns for 27 municipalities out of 47 does not exceed 10 points. A greater mismatch for other territories is explained by the fact that the territories differ in the proportion of pensioners and the unemployed – the social groups with lower incomes.

The author points out the fact that currently, in Russia and most of its regions, the number of pensioners per worker increases due to the demographic issues associated with low birth rates that linger from the late 1980s. In rural areas, depressed areas, in the settlements that have enterprises with a high share of workplaces characterized by harmful working conditions (mining, chemical industry, etc.), the percentage ratio of pensioners to working population is even higher. This is due, first, to the migration outflow of able-bodied population from the depressed territorial entities, and second, to the fact that according to the labor legislation of the Russian Federation, employees of enterprises with harmful working conditions retire earlier by five or ten years according to the list of occupations that grant the right to earlier retirement. Therefore, the average income and consumption per capita within the borders of

such territories where a significant part of the population lives on pensions are lower than in other municipalities.

A high proportion of the unemployed is one more factor influencing the decline in per capita incomes and consumption in the territory, because the unemployed live on unemployment benefits, in case of their successful registration at the employment service. If the registration procedure of the individual as the unemployed was not completed, or if those who had no job and applied to the employment service did not receive the status of the unemployed, they actually live on odd jobs, gain income from private subsidiary plots and sometimes from the gathering. Perm Krai has a pronounced territorial heterogeneity in the distribution of the number of pensioners per 1,000 population and the unemployed in the nine groups under consideration (*tab. 2*).

The data in table 2 show that, according to the statistics, with rare exceptions, the smallest number of pensioners per 1,000 population and the registered unemployed is observed in the types of Perm Krai territories that are formed by large and medium-sized cities and towns, municipal districts that are suburban areas of these cities and towns and in Chaikovsky Municipal District, which has a diversified production facilities. A small amount of the population with low income has a positive effect on the formation of consumer demand, and, accordingly, on the level of retail trade turnover in these territories. Let us consider an opposite example. Osinsky Municipal District is a center of oil production in Perm Krai. It ranks fifth by wage level, but a

Table 2. Comparative table of rating values of the proportion of pensioners and the unemployed and the level of consumption in different types of territories in Perm Krai in 2013

Ranking position	Territorial units	Number of pensioners per 1,000 population	Ranking position	Unemployment level, %	Ranking position	Position in the ranking in terms of wages*	Mean value in the ranking for the three values	Place in the ranking by retail trade turnover per capita, rubles per year
<i>1. Urban districts that consist of cities and towns which are industrial centers</i>								
1.	City of Perm	275	5	0.50	2	2	3	1
2.	City of Berezniki	329	33	0.46	1	4	13	3
3.	Town of Kungur	286	11	1.27	6	12	10	4
4.	Town of Solikamsk	282	8	1.43	12	8	10	7
5.	Town of Kudymkar	278	6	2.39	19	16	14	11
<i>2. Municipal districts and settlements included in the Perm agglomeration</i>								
6.	Krasnokamsky	288	13	1.19	8	10	10	2
7.	Dobryansky	296	16	1.86	16	3	12	10
<i>3. Municipal districts immediately adjacent to major cities that deployed industrial enterprises on the territory of these districts</i>								
8.	Permsky	236	1	0.84	4	9	5	13
9.	Usolsky	258	2	1.48	14	1	6	27
10.	Solikamsky	286	12	1.46	13	15	13	47
<i>4. Municipal districts with diversified industry</i>								
11.	Chaikovsky	289	14	0.92	5	6	8	9
<i>5. Municipal districts with a high share of enterprises specializing in oil production</i>								
12.	Chernushinsky	272	4	0.78	3	11	6	5
13.	Osinsky	309	20	3.21	31	5	19	18
<i>6. Municipal and urban districts – old industrial areas with a high proportion of the population that lives in single-industry settlements</i>								
14.	Lysvensky Urban District	349	39	1.36	9	29	26	8
15.	Chusovskoy	313	27	1.64	15	20	21	12
16.	Ochersky	310	22	3.80	36	18	25	14
17.	Kizelovsky	466	46	3.18	29	33	36	15
18.	Nytvensky	318	28	2.92	24	30	27	16
19.	Gubakhinsky Urban District	373	43	1.05	7	14	21	20
20.	Aleksandrovsky	346	37	2.33	18	25	27	21
21.	Gornozavodsky	347	35	1.96	17	13	22	30
22.	Krasnovishersky	350	40	8.25	47	31	39	31
23.	Gremyachinsky	502	47	3.71	35	19	34	37
<i>7. Municipal districts, the administrative centers of which are small towns, a significant part of the population of these districts lives in rural settlements</i>								
24.	Vereshchaginsky	266	3	0.99	6	28	12	6
25.	Suksunsky	316	30	3.05	26	38	31	23
26.	Ilyinsky	316	31	3.17	28	37	32	25
27.	Okhansky	297	17	2.70	22	44	28	28
28.	Oktyabrsky	312	24	3.38	32	27	28	35

End of the table 2

<i>8. Rural municipal districts specializing in agricultural production</i>								
29.	Berezovsky	314	21	3.94	37	22	27	17
30.	Kuyedinsky	303	19	2.56	21	41	27	19
31.	Bolshesosnovsky	312	23	4.99	42	36	34	22
32.	Sivinsky	290	15	3.00	25	45	28	24
33.	Chastinsky	280	7	3.21	30	23	20	26
34.	Yelovsky	372	42	4.78	39	35	38	29
35.	Karagaysky	297	18	2.74	23	34	25	32
36.	Kochevsky	333	34	6.10	43	7	28	33
37.	Uinsky	390	38	3.15	27	39	35	34
38.	Cherdynsky	285	10	4.87	41	36	29	36
39.	Bardymy	316	32	3.48	33	21	29	38
40.	Yusvinsky	342	36	5.18	43	46	42	39
41.	Ordinsky	319	29	4.29	38	32	33	40
42.	Gaynysky	376	44	5.19	44	17	35	41
43.	Yurlinsky	319	26	4.79	40	42	36	42
44.	Kosinsky	407	45	6.24	46	24	38	43
45.	Kishertsky	365	41	3.64	34	40	38	44
<i>9. Rural municipal districts without industry, geographically covering the urban districts that are economically independent from them</i>								
46.	Kudymkarsky	309	21	2.46	20	47	29	45
47.	Kungursky	284	9	1.39	11	43	21	46

Note. The data was collected, structured and the calculations made by the author with the use of reference source 8.
* Position in the ranking by indicator "average monthly nominal accrued wages" was transferred from table 1.

significant number of low-income population groups live there. The District ranks 21st in terms of the number of pensioners per 1,000 population, and 33rd – by level of unemployment in Perm Krai. Accordingly, taking into account the influence of these factors, Osinsky District occupies a rather low fifteenth position in the ranking in terms of retail trade turnover per capita per year.

The data in table 2 also shows that in all municipalities that are old industrial areas with a high proportion of urban population living in single-industry settlements and in most rural areas of the region, the share of pensioners and the unemployed in the total population

is much larger than in the first five groups of territories. As for the extent of differentiation, it can be judged by the variation of values of the factors under consideration. In the nine municipal districts – the outsiders of the rating – the number of persons who receive pensions per 1,000 population living in these territories exceeds 350, which is 1.5 times more than in Permsky Municipal District. Due to the fact that the local city-forming enterprise – pulp and paper mill – was shut down, the unemployment rate in Krasnovishersky District is 16.5 times higher than in the center of Perm Krai. If we compare the mean value of the rating positions of municipal entities

of Perm Krai in terms of the three examined indicators and their place in the ranking in terms of retail trade turnover per capita, we can see that in 38 cases out of 47 (in bold), the discrepancy between these values does not exceed 10 points. In other cases, a greater interval between the values under comparison is caused by the presence of additional factors that influence the specifics of spending of the population in some municipalities. For example, a developed transport infrastructure allows the residents of some rural municipal districts to shop in nearby towns, this fact contributes to the decline in turnover in these regions, but increases it in towns (Kungursky and Kudymkarsky municipal districts and the towns of Kungur and Kudymkar, respectively).

It is possible to draw a number of conclusions and proposals based on the above material.

The combination of all three total sources of income (wages, pensions and unemployment benefits) differentiated by their amount and forming in the aggregate the amount of disposable money income of the population of the administrative-territorial unit forms the potential of its costs, including the potential of retail trade turnover in the territory.

Taking into account the specifics of Perm Krai, the groups of territories arranged in descending order of their socio-economic potential and the consequent reduction in income, purchasing power and consumption level are as follows:

1. Urban districts that consist of cities and towns which are industrial centers.
2. Municipal districts and settlements included in the Perm agglomeration.

3. Municipal districts immediately adjacent to major cities, the industrial area of which is partially located on the territory of these districts.

4. Tchaikovsky Municipal District that has a diversified industrial structure.

5. Municipal districts with a high share of companies specializing in oil production.

6. Municipal districts – old industrial areas with a high proportion of the population that lives in single-industry settlements.

7. Municipal districts, the administrative centers of which are small towns, a significant part of the population of these districts lives in rural settlements.

8. Rural municipal districts specializing in agricultural production with the rural settlement as their administrative center.

9. Rural municipal districts without industry that geographically cover the urban districts that are economically independent from them.

The last five groups of territories are the most “problematic” from the viewpoint of social justice concerning incomes and consumer spending. The Perm Krai authorities are taking measures to reduce the degree of differentiation between incomes and consumer spending of the population of the Krai. For this purpose, Perm Krai is working out programs for development of “problematic” territories such as single-industry towns, rural areas, depressed areas of Kizel coal basin; besides, steps are being undertaken to implement these programs aimed at strengthening the security of employment, creation of jobs, increase in wages in the budgetary sphere, etc. Despite this, the situation concerning the stratification

of the population living in the territories that differ in the levels of socio-economic development, income and consumption remains grave, especially in rural municipal districts. Stratification of the residents by level of income and consumption leads to their outflow from urban depressed areas and rural municipalities, and it is, first of all, the working age population that leaves these territories. As a consequence, these areas experience progressive decline characterized by the reduction of production, loss of production capacities at the areas that are peripheral in relation to major cities and towns. For example, the fact that rural areas of Perm Krai are in a state of decline can be substantiated by a single generalized fact. In 1990–2013, cultivated area in Perm Krai decreased from 1850.3 to 736.0 thousand hectares, or by 60%. Due to the fact that agricultural lands in Perm Krai are located in natural forest area and are characterized by small outlines of the fields, the lands that were no longer

used for agricultural purposes have quickly returned to forest. Given the impossibility of melioration on the former fields, we can point out that 60% of agricultural land – the main means of agricultural production – was lost. This influenced the reduction of the region's potential in general, and led to the increase in intra-regional development contradictions.

Current conditions make it necessary to increase the implementation efficiency of programs for social development in Perm Krai, to work out additional management decisions aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of regulation of territorial differentiation. In view of the above, there emerged the necessity to address this issue by combining the efforts of Perm Krai administration and municipal authorities; it is also necessary to develop relevant management programs that would take into account the specifics of each municipality on the basis of application of social management methods.

Information about the Author

Vladislav Yakovlevich Fokin – Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor, Federal State-Financed Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education “Perm National Research Polytechnic University”, Chaykovsky Branch (73, Lenin Street, Chaykovsky, Perm Krai, 617760, Russian Federation, vlad-f62@yandex.ru)

References

1. Velikii P.P., Dakirova S.T. Sotsial'nyi potentsial postsovetsoi derevni [Social Potential of the Post-Soviet Village]. *Izvestiya Saratovskogo universiteta. Novaya seriya. Seriya: Sotsiologiya. Politologiya* [Herald of Saratov University. New Series. Series: Sociology. Political Science], 2012, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 13-17.
2. Gusev V.V. Rossiiskie monogoroda: proekty budushchego ili arkhainoe nasledie proshlogo? [Russia's Single-Industry Towns: the Projects of the Future, or Archaic Legacy of the Past?]. *Vlast'* [Power], 2012, no. 10, pp. 23-27.
3. Il'ina I.Yu. *Sotsial'no-demograficheskaya differentsiatsiya potrebleniya naseleniya: avtoref. dis. ... d.e.n.* [Socio-Demographic Differentiation of People's Consumption: Doctor of Economics Dissertation Abstract]. Moscow, 2009. 53 p.

4. Kalugina Z.I. Sotsial'nye riski modernizatsii rossiiskoi agrarnoi ekonomiki [Social Risks in the Modernization of Russia's Agrarian Economy]. *Otechestvennye zapiski* [Domestic Notes], 2012, no. 6, pp. 117-129.
5. Kostyleva L.V. Prostranstvennye aspekty sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi differentsiatsii naseleniya regiona [Spatial Aspects of the Region's of Population Socio-Economic Differentiation]. *Ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz* [Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast], 2009, no. 3, pp. 82-92.
6. Ovsyannikov A.A. Obshchestvo potrebleniya v Rossii: sistemnost' i total'nost' krizisa [Consumer Society in Russia: Consistency and Totality of the Crisis]. *Vestnik MGIMO* [MGIMO Herald], 2011, no. 3, pp. 222-235.
7. Turgel' I.D., Pobedin A.A., Trofimova O.M., Ruchkin A.V., Shemetova N.K. *Otsenka potentsiala samorazvitiya munitsipal'nykh obrazovaniy: teoriya i praktika: monografiya* [Assessment of Potential for Self-Development of Municipal Formations: Theory and Practice: Monograph]. Yekaterinburg: UrI RANKHiGS, 2012. 212 p.
8. Statisticheskii ezhegodnik Permskogo kraia – 2014: stat. sb. [Statistical Yearbook of Perm Krai – 2014: Statistics Collection]. *Territorial'nyi organ Federal'noi sluzhby gosudarstvennoi statistiki po Permskomu krayu (Perm'stat)* [Regional Office of the Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation in Perm Krai (Permstat)]. Perm, 2014. 444 p.
9. Tikhonova N.E., Slobodenyuk E.D. Geterogenost' rossiiskoi bednosti cherez prizmu deprivatsionnogo i absolyutnogo podkhodov [Heterogeneity of Poverty in Russia Through the Prism of Deprivation and Absolute Approaches]. *Obshchestvo i sovremennost'* [Society and Modernity], 2014, no. 1, pp. 36-49.
10. Tokarskiy B.V. Vozdeistvie demograficheskoi politiki na formirovanie kachestva zhizni naseleniya v usloviyakh rynka [Influence of Population Policy on Formation of Life Quality in Market Conditions]. *Izvestiya EGEA* [Izvestiya of Irkutsk State Economic Academy], 2012, no. 3, pp. 158-162.
11. Treivish A.I. Paradoksy depressivnykh territorii Rossii na primere Kizela i Ivanovskoi oblasti [Paradoxes of Depressed Territories of Russia on the Example of the Town of Kizel and the Ivanovo Oblast]. *Mestnoe samoupravlenie v sovremennoi Rossii* [Local Government in Modern Russia]. Moscow: ISRMO "Malye goroda", Vladimir, 2007. Pp. 269-286.
12. Uskova T.V. Aktual'nye problemy prostranstvennogo razvitiya [Actual Problems of Spatial Development]. *Ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz* [Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast], 2011, no. 5, pp. 170-174.
13. Shamlikashvili V.A. Sotsial'nyi potentsial elitnogo potrebleniya [Social Potential of Elite Consumption]. *Izvestiya Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta ekonomiki i finansov* [Herald of Saint-Petersburg State University of Economics], 2010, no. 1, pp. 45-53.
14. Fokin V.Ya. Territorial'naya differentsiatsiya dokhodov kak faktor stratifikatsii naseleniya po urovnyu potrebleniya [Territorial Differentiation of Incomes as a Factor in Population Stratification by Level of Consumption]. *Diskussiya* [Discussion], 2014, no. 5, pp. 76-82.

Cited Works

1. Velikii P.P., Dakirova S.T. Social Potential of the Post-Soviet Village. *Herald of Saratov University. New Series. Series: Sociology. Political Science*, 2012, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 13-17.
2. Gusev V.V. Russia's Single-Industry Towns: the Projects of the Future, or Archaic Legacy of the Past?. *Power*, 2012, no. 10, pp. 23-27.
3. Il'ina I.Yu. *Socio-Demographic Differentiation of People's Consumption: Doctor of Economics Dissertation Abstract*. Moscow, 2009. 53 p.
4. Kalugina Z.I. Social Risks in the Modernization of Russia's Agrarian Economy. *Domestic Notes*, 2012, no. 6, pp. 117-129.
5. Kostyleva L.V. Spatial Aspects of the Region's of Population Socio-Economic Differentiation. *Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast*, 2009, no. 3, pp. 82-92.

6. Ovsyannikov A.A. Consumer Society in Russia: Consistency and Totality of the Crisis. *MGIMO Herald*, 2011, no. 3, pp. 222-235.
7. Turgel' I.D., Pobedin A.A., Trofimova O.M., Ruchkin A.V., Shemetova N.K. *Assessment of Potential for Self-Development of Municipal Formations: Theory and Practice: Monograph*. Yekaterinburg: UrI RANKhiGS, 2012. 212 p.
8. Statistical Yearbook of Perm Krai – 2014: Statistics Collection. *Regional Office of the Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation in Perm Krai (Permstat)*. Perm, 2014. 444 p.
9. Tikhonova N.E., Slobodenyuk E.D. Heterogeneity of Poverty in Russia Through the Prism of Deprivation and Absolute Approaches. *Society and Modernity*, 2014, no. 1, pp. 36-49.
10. Tokarskiy B.V. Influence of Population Policy on Formation of Life Quality in Market Conditions. *Izvestiya of Irkutsk State Economic Academy*, 2012, no. 3, pp. 158-162.
11. Treivish A.I. Paradoxes of Depressed Territories of Russia on the Example of the Town of Kizel and the Ivanovo Oblast. *Local Government in Modern Russia*. Moscow: ISRMO “Malye goroda”, Vladimir, 2007. Pp. 269-286.
12. Uskova T.V. Actual Problems of Spatial Development. *Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast*, 2011, no. 5, pp. 170-174.
13. Shamlikashvili V.A. Social Potential of Elite Consumption. *Herald of Saint-Petersburg State University of Economics*, 2010, no. 1, pp. 45-53.
14. Fokin V.Ya. Territorial Differentiation of Incomes as a Factor in Population Stratification by Level of Consumption. *Discussion*, 2014, no. 5, pp. 76-82.