
1. « », -

, , ,

[7].

-

[9] , (

), , ,

,

,

-

,

100 . .

,

,

,

(50%),

(31%),

(14%) [8].

1C : -

// -

. - 2016. - 4. - . 62-85.

35

60%

– 52%.

(3 . .)

35-


49,9%

18

– 53,2% (. 1).

53,4%

56,4%.



. I.


(/), %

-2015

, 2 . . , -
 18 44 , -
 , -
 , .
 -2015, 60% -
 , 63% 53% -
 - 62, 64 52% -
 ,
 1-2 . . , ó .
 , -
 ? ? -
 45 -
 -
 , -2015, -
 15- . -
 21% , 12% -
 . - (75%
),
 (-
).
 « » -
 ? -
 : - , -


4. -
 (44) (45) : 71%
 : 26%
 17%
 15- : , ,
 5. 30,7%
 23,6%,
 (21%)
 2,6% ,
 7,2% -

4 : . //
 5 . - 2015. - 3. - C. 109-138.
 : 67,4% , ,
 (27,6%) , ,
 -2015, 50% 18 , 67%
 15- , ,
 - ,
 (-),
 .



. 2. 18 44 , % -
: -2013

(. 2).
(3 24%). (9 27%) - -
18-44 . 51% -
25% , 18 44 ,
(30,6%).
4,5% ,
0,6% ,
- :
26% (. 3). : 40%
9% : 7%



. 3.

18-44

, %

-2013

20%

(9%) –

18-44-

»

«

6.

)

6

С

15 7,

(.1)

().

», :

10 20%

18-44-

8:

+4%.

+24%),

7

8

C

,

		-	- -	
1 ()	- , - - , -	- , - - , -	- - -	
2	-	-	- -	- -
3	-		, - -	- -
4 ()	- - -	- - -	- , - .	, - , - .
5 ()	- - - -	- - -	- - -	, - - -

(-31%),

« »

?

,
,

, , -

« »
 - .
 , -
 51% (.2). -
 2

	, %
: , -	13,3
:	19,7
: ,	51,3
:	15,7
:	50,8
:	49,2
: 18 29	41,1
: 30 44	58,9
()	10,1
()	7,7
()	12,1
() ,	24,7
, ,	32,8
	5,7
,	5,7

: -2013.

, %

	23,3	48,4	28,4
	34,9	35,1	29,9
	23,5	41,2	35,2
	28,9	42,7	28,4

: -2013.

18 29 (41%)) 30 44 (59%).

- 18 44 ,
15- 9.

35-48% , 23-35%

, 28-35% -

(. 3). -

-1 +1, - 0,04, -

-0,51. -

, -

R- 0,2, -

(. 4). , -

, -

:

0,25


9

(,). , -

	R	R-	R-	
	0,441	0,194	0,192	0,644
	0,329	0,108	0,105	0,760
	0,323	0,105	0,102	0,718
	0,081	0,007	0,004	0,756
	0,302	0,091	0,088	0,488

: -2013.

.4 .5. -
« » -
- -
- , « -
» . -
-
, , -
, . 29 -
30-44 , . -
- , -
, -
, -
. . -



. 4.

()	-				
	-	-	-	-	-
	0,390	0,178	0,098		0,136
:	-0,204	-0,269	0,098		
: 18-29	-0,168	-0,136			-0,045
-			0,268		0,145
				-0,086	-0,063
	0,216	0,196			0,077
	-0,136			-0,096	-0,087
, -	-0,591				-0,173
		-0,885			
,			-0,972		-0,474

:
5%.
:
-2013.

()

(.4),

3. SPERO. – 2009. – 10. – 181–200.

4. // SPERO. – 2007. – 7. – 163–190.

5. // – 2009. – 1-2. – 161–174.

6. // : – 2014. – 3 (83). – 75–93.

7. : / . ; . – 2018. – 536 .

8. // – 2016. – 4. – 103–123.

9. Ayhan S.H., Gatskova K., Lehmann H. The Impact of Non-Cognitive Skills and Risk Preferences on Rural-to-Urban Migration: Evidence from Ukraine. Working paper WP3/2017/04. National Research University «Higher School of Economics». Moscow, 2017. – 41 p.

(,)–

,

(119034,

., 11, e-mail: maleva-tm@rane.ru).

(,)–

–

(119034,

., 11, e-mail: aleksandra.burdyak@gmail.com).

T.M. Maleva, A.Ya. Burdyak

TERRITORIAL MOBILITY OF THE RUSSIAN POPULATION WITHIN SOCIAL DYNAMICS

The article views working-age citizens moving to other localities with a perspective on social mobility, by which we mean raising educational attainment, improving economic well-being or advancing in careers compared to the relevant characteristics of the generation before them. Migration is a powerful social elevator: seeking to improve their economic and social status, people are motivated to change place of residence. This study's objective is to estimate the impact of relocation on social dynamics by basing on the regular all-Russian sociological survey «Person, Family, Society». An analysis of the territorial mobility of strata based on three equilibrium criteria – material, socio-professional and subjective – showed that the middle class is the least mobile one. Members of the lower class exhibited the most intensive territorial mobility. People most often relocate for family reasons, and this migration is most typical of the lower class. A hypothesis that any territorial mobility has a positive impact on socio-economic growth relative to the previous generation is not confirmed. However, moving to study does accompany intergenerational education and employment mobility, whereas relocating for family reasons, other things being equal, reduces a person's chances of surpassing their parents in economic well-being and educational attainment.

Keywords: middle class; migration; social mobility; stratification; generations analysis

References

1. *Bogomolova, T.Yu. & T.Yu. Cherkashina.* (2015). Regionalno-poselencheskie aspekty struktury nefinansovogo bogatstva rossiyskikh domokhozyaystv [Regional and settlement aspects of the structure of Russian household non-financial wealth]. *Region: ekonomika i sotsiologiya* [Region: Economics and Sociology], 1 (85), 79–107.
2. *Bourdieu, P.* (2007). *Sotsiologiya sotsialnogo prostranstva* [La Sociologie de l'Espace Social]. Transl. from French and edited by N.A. Shmatko. Moscow, Institute of Experimental Sociology. Saint-Petersburg, Aletheia Publ.

3. *Goldthorpe, J. & M. Jackson.* (2009). Mezhpokolencheskaya klassovaya mobilnost v sovremennoy Velikobritanii: politicheskie aspekty i rezultaty issledovaniy [Intergenerational class mobility in contemporary Britain: political concerns and empirical findings]. SPERO. Sotsialnaya politika: ekspertiza, rekomendatsii, obzory [SPERO. Social Policy: Expertise, Recommendations, Overview], 10, 181–200.

4. *Gordon, D., R. Levitas, C. Pantazis et al.* (2007). Bednost i sotsialnaya isklyuchennost v Velikobritanii [Poverty and social exclusion in Britain]. SPERO. Sotsialnaya politika: ekspertiza, rekomendatsii, obzory [SPERO. Social Policy: Expertise, Recommendations, Overview], 7, 163–190.

5. *Zubarevich, N.V.* (2009). Regionalnoe razvitiye i regionalnaya politika za desyatiletie ekonomicheskogo rosta [Regional development and regional policy in Russia during ten years of economic growth]. Zhurnal NEA [Journal of New Economic Association], 1-2, 161–174.

6. *Kolomak, E.A.* (2014). Evolyutsiya prostranstvennogo raspredeleniya ekonomicheskoy aktivnosti v Rossii [Evolution of the spatial distribution of economic activities in Russia]. Region: ekonomika i sotsiologiya [Region: Economics and Sociology], 3 (83), 75–93.

7. *Clark, G.* (2018). Ottsy i deti. Familii i istoriya sotsialnoy mobilnosti [The Son Also Rises: Surnames and the History of Social Mobility]. Transl. from English by N. Edelman and ed. by A. Volodin. Moscow, Gaidar Institute Publ., 536.

8. *Mkrtychyan, N.V. & Yu.F. Florinskaya.* (2016). Sotsialno-ekonomicheskie efekty trudovoy migratsii iz malykh gorodov Rossii [Socio-economic effects of labor migration from small towns of Russia]. Voprosy ekonomiki [Problems of Economics], 4, 103–123.

9. *Ayhan, S.H., K. Gatskova & H. Lehmann.* (2017). The impact of non-cognitive skills and risk preferences on rural-to-urban migration: Evidence from Ukraine. Working paper WP3/2017/04. National Research University «Higher School of Economics». Moscow, 41.

Information about the authors

Maleva, Tatyana Mikhaylovna (Moscow, Russia) – Candidate of Sciences (Economics), Director of the Institute for Social Analysis and Forecasting, RANEPA (11, Prechistsenskaya Embankment, Moscow, 119034, Russia, e-mail: maleva-tm@rane.ru).

Burdyak, Aleksandra Yaroslavovna (Moscow, Russia) – Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Analysis and Forecasting, RANEPA (11, Prechistsenskaya Embankment, Moscow, 119034, Russia, e-mail: aleksandra.burdyak@gmail.com).

15.03.2018 .

© 2018