

**ПРЕДПОСТАВКИ ЗА ОБРЪЩАНЕ КЪМ ПРОБЛЕМА НА  
УПРАВЛЕНИЕТО ЗА ПОДОБРЯВАНЕ КАЧЕСТВОТО НА ЖИВОТА  
В НАСТОЯЩ ЕТАП В РАЗВИТИЕТО НА РУСИЯ**

Надежда Соколова, Лариса Шемятихина

**PREREQUISITES OF THE APPEAL TO THE PROBLEM OF  
MANAGEMENT OF IMPROVEMENT OF QUALITY OF LIFE AT THE  
PRESENT STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT OF RUSSIA**

Nadezhda Sokolova<sup>1</sup>, Larisa Shemyatikhina<sup>2</sup>

Received: 21.10.2018, Accepted: 25.10.2018

---

***Abstract***

*The authors states internal and external prerequisites of the appeal to a problem of management of improvement the quality of population's life at the present stage of Russia's and its territories social and economic development. The authors gives an overview of integral, objective and subjective indicators of quality and living standards of the population of Russia and its regions as well as other countries. Social and economic management is considered on the basis of the population's life quality as a natural strategy of state, regional and municipal development. The quality of population's life is a vector of a democratic society, according to which all reforms must be checked. From the authors's point of view, the idea of improving the quality of life should be seen as a national idea, the deficit of which is clearly felt. The proclamation of the quality of life with a national idea can significantly change the whole course of Russia's development in the 21st century.*

**Keywords:** *socio-economic management, socio-economic development of the territory, population's quality of life, indicators of the quality of population's life, national idea.*

**JEL Codes:** *O1, O35, O47*

---

---

<sup>1</sup> Doctor of Economics, associate professor, Professor of department «Management» Kalashnikov Izhevsk State Technical University, Izhevsk, Russia, [sokolova-ng@mail.ru](mailto:sokolova-ng@mail.ru)

<sup>2</sup> Candidate of pedagogical sciences, associate professor, associate professor of corporate economy and business management The Ural state economic university, Ekaterinburg, Russia, [lyshem@mail.ru](mailto:lyshem@mail.ru)

## **1. Introduction and methodology**

The concept of improving the quality of population's life of human life is focused on a harmonious combination of all society's aspects and the individual. It is, without a doubt, a symbol of progress. The steady improvement of the quality of life was determined as a shared goal for all mankind at the Earth Summit, held back in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. The Russian Federation, which, along with other countries, has signed Agenda 21, is now striving to translate this principle into practice. Quality of life and human development - these concepts constitute a content characteristic of modern approaches to the problems of economic growth and society's development. In recent years the idea of the need to improve the quality of population's life increasingly penetrates the public consciousness of power structures, politicians, the scientific community and the general public.

## **2. Problem statement and research objectives, key results**

We will consider prerequisites of the appeal to this problem (Sokolova, 2013), authors suggest to divide them on: internal and external.

It is offered to carry the following to internal prerequisites:

1. The fact that life as such is a priority for every human being and for society as a whole. People try to improve their lives, especially during the period of reforms and crisis. The quality of life includes both the objective parameters of existence, and the subjective aspects of human life. It is a holistic criterion of the country's socio-economic development. It allows you to compare countries, regions and social groups among themselves, rank them, identify unresolved problems and negative trends, as well as, to stimulate the search for ways and means to solve them.

2. At the same time, the quality of life is a regulator of social and economic transformation in the country. It is a source of sustainable socio-economic development and the restoration of Russia's role in the world community. Whether the changes that might worsen the living conditions of people take place, this immediately would cause social tension, create an intolerant reaction, which forces the authorities to adjust social and economic policies. Only decisions and actions of power institutions that lead to positive changes in specific characteristics of the quality of life have the right for implementation.

3. Use of indicators of quality of life as criteria for evaluation of effectiveness of activities of power structures for management of certain regions, subjects and territories of the Russian Federation and their heads, overall performance of regional and municipal departments is relevant. Quality of life - recognized integrated criterion for evaluation of effectiveness of practical activities.

To external prerequisites, from the point of view of authors, defining relevance of the appeal to a problem of quality of life, belong:

1. Reality of economic and social conditions of Russian society. At the beginning of the 21st century, almost all the most important life-support indicators of the Russian population are at an extremely low and sometimes critical level (see tables 1-4). For instance, the value of the Gini coefficient in Russia, according to official statistics, reached a value of about 15.6 in 2006 (comparing to 5-10 for industrialized countries). By the size of the human development index - a kind of analogue of the quality of life indicator - Russia, until recently, occupied only 65th (in 2004) and 67th place among the 177 countries evaluated in 2005; 66th in the list of 187 countries in 2011; 50th among 188 countries in 2015. The worst 71st position was registered in 1999 (Sokolova, 2013). There was 31st place in 1993. The problem is not about how to accelerate the growth and development but rather about self-preservation. The importance of improving life's quality in Russia is also growing due to the fact of actively aging processes and depopulation. People become the scarcest resource.

2. Interest is caused by the process of globalization, which dictates for the modernizing states the need to create decent living conditions, not only for those who live today, but also for future generations. World studies and forums for example, on children, the environment, human rights, social development, the status of women, the settled population, food security, migration, poverty and aging which conducted under auspices of the United Nations play a major role in understanding global problems related to the main directions for improving the quality of life (Regions of Russia, 2017).

3. Of no less importance is the fact that a new stage of development has begun in the world civilization - the advancement of man to the "quality epoch". Its meaning lies in the fact that quality in all its aspects - economic, social, political, and technological - is regarded as a necessary condition for ensuring sustainable development of civilization, improving the environment, improving the person himself.

Management of economy by criterion of quality becomes the key sphere of attention of modern management. The quantitative increase in individual indicators of the standard of living does not solve the problem today. We need criteria that would take into account the full range of needs, interests and value orientations of citizens. This is the criterion of quality of life. Quality-based management is seen as an element of the strategy of state, regional and municipal development. The quality of a person's life becomes the main vector of a democratic society, according to which all directions of ongoing reforms must be checked.

The idea of managements of improvement the quality of life should be seen as a national idea, the deficit of which is clearly felt. The proclamation of improving and growing the quality of life in the form of a nationwide idea should restore the social meaning of the reforms, justify the costs of the previous period, besides this might restore people's confidence in the authorities. The quality of life proclamation as a nationwide

idea can significantly change the whole course of Russia's development in the coming twenty-first century. It becomes evident that the quality of life policy is a priority process for regional and local authorities. The status and conditions for the development of territories have changed qualitatively. It is they who, on the basis of mechanisms of motivating management of socio-economic development, can create the most favorable conditions for human development towards an adequate global strategy of Russian society "ensuring a decent life and free development of a person", as defined in the Constitution of the Russian Federation.

Internal and external prerequisites for addressing the issue managements of improvement of quality of life explain why this problem is increasingly considered as one of the key for the modern development of Russia, its regions and territories. At first glance, its formulation looks premature, since for a large part of the population of Russia the question is, rather not about the quality of life, but about ensuring an elementary survival. There are often opinions that talking about the quality of life is another type of political speculation, attempts by a number of leaders to maintain their image.

Table no 1 – Russia in the ranking of countries by combined quality-of-life indicator

HumanDevelopmentIndex (HDI), 2011, 2015 г. [1]					Quality-of-Life Index (Economist Intelligence Unit), 2005 / 2013 [2]					Happy Planet IndexHPI (New Economics Foundation ), 2006, 2009, 2012, Satisfaction with Life 2012 [3]							
Rank		Country	Value		Rank		Country	Score out of 10		Rank			Country	HPI Value			Satisfacti on with life value, 2012
2011	2015	2011	2015	2005	2013	2005		2013	2006	2009	2012	2006		2009	2012		
Very high human development					1	12	Ireland	8,33	7,74	3	1	1	Costa Rica	66,0	76,1	64,0	7,3
1	1	Norway	0,943	0,944	2	1	Switzerland	8,07	8,22	-	-	2	Vietnam	-	-	60,4	5,8
2	2	Australia	0,929	0,935	3	3	Norway	8,05	8,09	2	-	3	Columbia	67,2	-	59,8	6,4
-	3	Switzerland	-	0,930	5	4	Sweden	7,94	8,02	-	3	6	Jamaica	-	70,1	58,5	6,2
3	5	Netherlands	0,910	0,922	6	2	Australia	7,92	8,18	6	7	12	Cuba	61,9	65,7	56,2	5,4
4	8	USA	0,910	0,915	13	17	USA	7,61	7,38	1	-	-	Vanuatu	68,2	-	-	-
5	9	New Zealand	0,908	0,913	17	25	Japan	7,39	7,08	115	88	29	Norway	39,2	40,4	51,4	7,6
-	25	Slovenia	-	0,880	26	16	Germany	7,05	7,38	-	2	33	Dominican Republic	-	71,8	50,7	4,7
-	28	Czech Republic	-	0,870	29	27	Great Britain	6,92	7,01								
-	35	Slovakia	-	0,844						90	35	32	India	42,5	53,0	50,9	5,0
High human development					25	26	France	7,08	7,04	65	52	34	Switzerland	48,3	48,1	50,3	7,5
48	52	Uruguay	0,755	0,793	27	32	Slovenia	6,99	6,77	19	61	38	Kyrgyz Republic	59,1	47,1	49,1	5,0
...					34	28	Czech Republic	6,63	6,96	147	32	40	Moldova	31,1	54,1	48,0	5,6
65	50	Belarus	0,756	0,798	45	35	Slovakia	6,38	6,64	79	66	-	Slovenia	44,0	44,5	-	-
66	50	Russia	0,755	0,798	42	50	Thailand	6,42	5,96	132	73	-	Slovakia	35,8	43,5	-	-
...					60	14	China	6,08	7,67	108	74	41	Great Britain	40,3	43,3	47,9	7,0
Medium Human Development					69	18	UAE	5,90	7,33	95	75	45	Japan	41,7	43,3	47,5	6,1
95	80	Jordan	0,698	0,748	72	38	Saudi Arabia	5,77	6,49	81	51	46	Germany	43,8	48,1	47,2	6,7
-	106	Botswana	-	0,698						61	57	48	Austria	48,8	47,7	47,1	7,3
...					98	78	Ukraine	5,03	4,98	129	71	50	France	36,4	43,9	46,5	6,8
Low Human Development					105	72	Russia	4,79	5,31	128	92	-	Czech Republic	36,5	38,3	-	-
142	156	Solomon Islands	0,510	0,506	73	66	India	5,76	5,67	172	108	-	Russia	22,8	34,5	-	-
					75	69	Jordan	5,68	5,63	150	114	-	USA	28,8	30,7	-	-
187	136	Congo	0,286	0,591	96	74	Kazakhstan	5,08	5,20	74	122	-	Luxemburg	45,6	28,5	-	-
-	188	Niger	-	0,348	108	80	Nigeria	4,51	4,74	178	143	-	Zimbabwe	16,6	16,6	-	-

Table no 2 - List of federal subjects of Russia by Human Development Index (Volga Federal District), 2008, 2015.[4]

Rank		Federal subject	Value		Rank		Federal subject	Value		Rank		Federal subject	Value	
2008	2015		2008	2015	2008	2015		2008	2015	2008	2015		2008	2015
Very High Human Development					14	41	Bashkortostan	0,815	0,852	Satisfactory Human Development				
1	1	Moscow	0,929	0,949	28	41	Nizhny Novgorod Oblast	0,801	0,851					
3	2	Saint-Petersburg	0,877	0,922	27	45	Saratov Oblast	0,801	0,850	78	83	Jewish Autonomous Oblast	0,748	0,794
2	3	Tyumen Oblast	0,878	0,904	38	45	Mordovia	0,794	0,850	80	85	Tuva	0,717	0,776
-	4	Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug	-	0,902	45	48	Penza Oblast	0,786	0,848					
High Human Development					63	53	Kirov Oblast	0,774	0,842	0,900-1,000	Very High Development (USA, Canada, West Europe, Japan, South Korea etc.)			
-	-	Russia (on average)	0,825	0,875	46	54	Ulyanovsk Oblast	0,786	0,841	0,800-0,899	High Development (East Europe, Russia etc.)			
4	5	Tatarstan	0,848	0,896	36	56	Chuvashia	0,797	0,839					
8	20	Samara Oblast	0,817	0,867	69	59	Mari El	0,769	0,838					
18	24	Orenburg Oblast	0,813	0,865	...	...	...	...	...	0,700-0,799	Satisfactory Development (Brazil, China, Kazakhstan, Ukraine etc.)			
25	26	Udmurtia	0,805	0,864	77	77	Pskov Oblast	0,751	0,813	0,600-0,699	Medium Development (Vietnam, South Africa, Indonesia, Uzbekistan etc.)			
26	30	Perm Krai	0,802	0,860	79	79	Altai Republic	0,748	0,812	0,500-0,599	Unsatisfactory Development (India, Pakistan etc.)			

Table 3 Regions of Russia – key socio-economic indicators in 2010 (ranking of the federal subjects according to the key socio-economic indicators) [5]

	Average per capita income (per month), rub.		Rank by average per capita income, 2010		Average monthly nominal wage, rub.		Rank by average monthly nominal wage, 2010 r.	Real income of the population (% in the comparison to the previous year)	
	2010	2016	2010	2016	2010	2016		2010	2016
Russian Federation	18881	30744	-	-	20952,2	36709,0	-	105,4	94,4
Bashkortostan	17677	28125	22	28	16377,7	28108	42	101,0	95,7
Mari El	10195	18671	79	77	12650,6	23305	74	103,6	94,2
Mordovia	11055	17695	74	81	11883,1	23229	78	110,0	94,1
Tatarstan	18158	32609	20	16	17350,1	30224	37	109,0	96,5
Udmurtia	12423	23878	70	52	14291,1	26693	60	108,1	93,6
Chuvashia	10885	17872	77	79	13004,4	22908	71	107,5	92,4
Perm Krai	19422	28400	18	26	17438,3	30651	35	102,4	82,3
Kirov Oblast	13385	21301	59	70	13292,6	23404	67	109,3	90,2
Nizhny Novgorod Oblast	16358	30598	27	20	16327,6	28399	44	105,9	93,4
Orenburg Oblast	13398	22028	58	67	15199,6	26209	52	105,6	91,6
Penza Oblast	12700	21825	66	68	14423,6	25337	58	105,1	94,2
Samara Oblast	20279	26795	17	36	16479,4	28295	41	105,8	90,5
Saratov Oblast	11961	19406	72	76	14554,0	23548	54	108,2	91,4
Ulyanovsk Oblast	12905	22481	64	62	13339,0	24334	66	112,8	92,7

Table 4 The distribution of total monetary income among population quintiles and by average per capita money income. The distribution of the population by average per capita money income in 2016. The numbers of persons with money incomes below the subsistence level. [6]

	The proportion of total monetary income among population quintiles, %					Assets Ratio	Gini coefficient	Average per capita money income, rubles per month								The numbers of persons with money incomes below the subsistence level, %	
	first	second	third	fourth	fifth			Up to 7000,0	Between 7000,1 and 10000,0	Between 10000,1 and 14000,0	Between 14000,1 and 19000,0	Between 19000,1 and 27000,0	Between 27000,1 and 45000,0	Between 45000,1 and 60000,0	Above 60000,0	2010	2016
Russian Federation	5,3	10,0	15,0	22,6	47,1	0,412	15,6	6,0	7,9	12,0	14,3	18,2	22,7	8,5	10,4	12,6	13,4
Bashkortostan	5,3	9,9	14,9	22,6	47,3	0,416	16,0	7,9	9,2	13,2	14,9	17,9	20,9	7,4	8,6	12,0	12,5
Mari El	6,3	11,1	16,0	22,9	43,7	0,371	11,6	13,5	14,7	18,5	17,6	16,8	13,8	3,1	2,0	24,6	22,5
Mordovia	6,5	11,3	16,1	23,0	43,1	0,364	11,0	14,4	15,5	19,3	17,8	16,4	12,5	2,6	1,5	19,0	18,8
Tatarstan	5,3	10,0	15,0	22,6	47,1	0,413	15,7	5,2	7,1	11,2	13,8	18,1	23,5	9,2	11,9	8,0	7,5
Udmurtia	6,2	11,1	15,9	22,9	43,9	0,374	11,8	7,4	10,3	15,5	17,2	19,5	19,8	5,7	4,6	14,6	12,3
Chuvashia	6,9	11,8	16,5	23,1	41,7	0,345	9,7	11,9	15,1	19,9	19,0	17,5	12,9	2,5	1,2	18,7	18,6
Perm Krai	5,3	10,1	15,0	22,6	47,0	0,412	15,5	7,3	8,9	13,1	14,9	18,1	21,4	7,6	8,7	13,8	14,9
Kirov Oblast	6,9	11,8	16,4	23,1	41,8	0,348	9,8	7,4	11,5	17,5	19,0	20,1	17,8	4,2	2,5	14,1	15,9
Nizhny Novgorod Oblast	5,5	10,3	15,2	22,7	46,3	0,403	14,6	5,4	7,6	12,0	14,5	18,6	23,2	8,6	10,1	12,5	9,6
Orenburg Oblast	6,1	10,9	15,8	22,9	44,3	0,379	12,2	9,6	11,9	16,5	17,3	18,5	17,7	4,8	3,7	14,2	14,8
Penza Oblast	6,3	11,1	16,0	22,9	43,7	0,371	11,6	9,2	11,8	16,7	17,7	18,9	17,7	4,6	3,4	15,5	14,5
Samara Oblast	6,0	10,8	15,7	22,9	44,6	0,383	12,6	6,0	8,8	13,7	16,1	19,6	22,0	7,1	6,7	15,1	13,8
Saratov Oblast	6,4	11,3	16,0	23,0	43,3	0,367	11,2	11,8	13,9	18,3	17,9	17,7	14,8	3,4	2,2	16,9	17,6
Ulyanovsk Oblast	6,4	11,2	16,0	23,0	43,4	0,367	11,3	8,1	11,1	16,4	17,8	19,5	18,6	4,9	3,6	17,0	14,9



There is a serious danger that discussion of a problem of quality of life won't go beyond a political and ideological action and won't be transferred to the implementation plane, it is connected with influence of a number of the factors characteristic of modern process of territorial department. This is due to the effect of a number of factors that are characteristic of the current process of territorial management: the task of managing the quality of life is of a long-term nature, while the territorial authorities and administrations in recent years are most often oriented to the medium and short term; there is an opinion that the solution of this task requires the expenditure of considerable resources, which are not available especially to the municipal authorities; When implementing plans to improve the quality of life, the degree of risk is extremely high; their failure casts doubt on the prospect of retaining the power of the team that initiated the quality improvement program.

Nevertheless, the formulation of a task of management of improvement of quality of life is necessary and appropriate, at minimization of risks and resources, definiteness of reference points of development and finding of mutual understanding, balance of interests of the subjects participating in process of improvement of quality of life and the population.

### 3. Conclusion

Management of improvement of quality of life as the directions of strategy of social and economic development of the country is staticized in the context of realization of reform of pension system (increase in a retirement age) when the population of "the third age" for maintenance of own activity and working capacity has to have access to qualitative resources of maintenance of activity and health (health care, education, family policy, legislative rules of protection and social guarantees).

The concept of management of improvement of quality of life demands new and modern tools at the level of the public, regional and municipal administration, selection of economic techniques for justification of the made decisions, transformation in understanding of mechanisms of management of improvement, understanding by modern managers of opportunities of increase in resource potential of the population [9] from the incurred expenses in improvement of quality of life. The stated perspective is relevant therefore we hope will lead to activization in carrying out cross-disciplinary scientific and applied researches on consideration of economic category "management of improvement of quality of life" and its influence on processes of social and economic development.

### REFERENCES

- Sokolova N.G. (2013) The analysis of the reasons of the appeal to a problem of improvement of quality of life at the present stage of social and economic development of Russia//the Messenger of IzhGTU of M.T. Kalashnikov, 2, 53-57.
- United Nations Development Program: The Index of Human Development in the World in 2015, Center for Humanitarian, Web site: <http://gtmarket.ru/news/2015/12/16/7285>
- Where-to-be-born index (previously called the quality-of-life index, abbreviated QLI) Web site: [https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/индекс\\_качества\\_жизни](https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/индекс_качества_жизни)
- Happy Planet Index (HPI) Web site: [https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/международный\\_индекс\\_счастья](https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/международный_индекс_счастья)
- List of federal subjects of Russia by Human Development Index Web site: [https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/ирчп\\_субъектов\\_российской\\_федерации](https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/ирчп_субъектов_российской_федерации)
- Russian Statistical Yearbook (2017): Stat .book. Rosstat - R76, 142.
- Regions of Russia. Socio-Economic Indicators (2017): Stat. book. Rosstat, 272-281.
- Global Issues Overview, The United Nations Web site: <http://www.un.org/ru/sections/issues-depth/global-issues-overview/index.html>
- Shemyatikhina L.Y. (2015) Resource potential of the senior generation // *Basic researches*, 8-3, 629-632 // <https://www.fundamental-research.ru/ru/article/view?id=38954>