

The problem of citizens' awareness of their own financial situation has begun to become the cause of researchers' interest in the latest decades due to several reasons: first, the role of material positioning in the society has been started to realize as important as other economic and political aspects that can be regulated; second, due to the development of quantitative and qualitative research in political science, social sciences and economics. Initially, researchers justified the psychological attitude of citizens only by economic factors, such as a respondent's income, which obviously deprived the study of a significant share of objectivity [Milanovic 2005; Bartels 2008; Kaltenhaler 2008]. Special attention was given to the psychological estimation by the respondent of social and property inequality within the state without the correspondence with the estimation of their own situation compared to others [Loveless, Whitefield 2011]. It is also worth noting that the vast majority of studies did not relate to the situation in Russia either because of a lack of data, or because of a lack of much interest towards this problem. The study of Binelli and Lovelace, whose theoretical model is used as a basis in this current work, for the first time has indicated the place of a respondent's residence as the key determinant in their perceptions of their own financial situation. As for the qualitative research on this topic, they have not yet been carried out, which makes the need for an integrated approach to this problem especially relevant.

The implementation of the qualitative comparative method QCA has spread among researchers in historical and political studies since 1980s and was mostly used for analyzing the causal relations between events and factors as well as the combination of factors delivering certain results [Ragin, Charles 1987]. Moreover, recently this combinatorial method began to be used not only in political studies, but it has also started to bear a socio-economic nature. Despite the fact that there is a number of drawbacks of such analysis, including the impossibility to estimate the importance of a certain factor compared to others as well as difficulties in economic studies with analyzing the causality without the implementation of regressions, QCA still proves its effectiveness in the studies with small and medium number of cases and, therefore, draws our attention in the current study [Jordan, Gross, et.al. 2011].

Thus, the basis for the study was, firstly, the insufficient coverage of previous Russian studies in determining the respondents' own financial situation, as well as the lack of integrated approaches to the analysis of this research problem. The study presented in this research paper is based on the use of elements of a Binelli and Lovelace's econometric model, but the current model is specified for Russia and with the use of Russian empirical data - Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey – HSE (RLMS HSE). Moreover, the authors of this work included a number of additional indicators and variables into the initial model. The main purpose of the study was to analyze factors that influence the subjective perception of property inequality in Russia from the state of view of Russian citizens. The analysis presented in this paper is relevant for a number of reasons: first of all, it helps to establish more accurate connections between the social environment in which the individual is located and subjective perception of his or her material wealth, the research also contributes to a more accurate further forecasting of public sentiments in Russia and abroad. This study is the analysis using quantitative data analysis methods, as well as the combinatorial QCA (Qualitative Comparative Analysis) method.

The authors of the article, Binelli and Lovelace, suggest the following economic model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{income}_i + \beta_2 \text{urb_rural}_i + \beta_3 (\text{income}_i * \text{urban}_i) + X_i' \gamma + \varepsilon_i$$

In this model, y_i is a dependent variable, that reflects the subjective representation by the interviewed individual of the degree of social or material inequality, income_i is an indicator of household income, urb_rural_i is a dummy variable, where 1 is contributed to the to the individuals living in the cities, and 0 to the individuals living in the rural areas. Indicator X_i , that was developed in the article of Lovelace and Whitefield in 2011, is a set of variables representing individual characteristics divided into 4 subgroups (normative contribution to the economic market and democratic political institutions, individual characteristics of the respondent, economic and political experience with the market and democratic institutions and individuals representing social progress) [Loveless, Whitefield 2011].

Applying this model to the data of the Russian Federation, the authors of this work optimized model so that it could answer its purpose in a more correct way. In order to optimize the model, it was necessary to select factors in addition to the income and *urb_rural* indicators indicated by Binelli and Lovelace that influence the respondent's characteristics of his or her financial situation.

As a result, we formulated the following research hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: The individuals from rural areas tend to rate their material and social status higher than urban residents of the same income group.

Hypothesis 2: A respondent's feeling about material and social status are directly linked to his or her income.

The problem of choosing the factors determining the indicator y in econometric analysis was solved through the analysis using combinatorial methods. To conduct the study, a standard analysis of "boolean" sets of csQCA (crisp-set QCA) was implemented by reducing the data to a dichotomized form by encoding them as (1) and (0).

Based on the results, we came to the following conclusions:

1. The results of the qualitative part of the study show that the main determinants of the respondents' assessment of their own financial situation are age, income satisfaction, size of income, higher education, family, job availability and gender of the respondent.

$$y = 1,65 + 0,026 * \text{total}_{income} - 0,03 * \text{urban}_{rural} - 0,02 * \text{age} + 0,04 * \text{diplom} + 0,07 * \text{family} + 0,028 * \text{work} * 0,15 * \text{income_satisfaction} + 0,1 * \text{credit}$$

2. The hypothesis that villagers tend to rate their material and social situation higher than urban residents was proved fully. The magnitude of the difference in subjective perception between the city and the village was 10.3%.
3. The hypothesis about the direct impact of respondent's income on material and social self-feeling status was partially confirmed. There are 2 trends in the data – the first one is a downward trend in the assessment of one's own property welfare with wage growth in the range up to 40 thousand rubles, and there is also the opposite tendency of increase in the assessment of own material and social well-being after a further increase in income above 40 thousand rubles.
4. The accuracy of the econometric model was improved by adding indicators that indirectly affect the standard of living and well-being, as well as the self-attitude of citizens regarding both the working sphere and personal life.
5. Due to the fact that the final model has been tested and its accuracy and reliability have been proved, there is reason to claim that it can be used as a base in further studies on another database, in particular for making forecasts, etc.

References:

- 1) Bartels, L. (2008). *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 2) Binelli, C., Loveless, M. (2016) The urban-rural divide: Perceptions of income and social inequality in Central and Eastern Europe. *Economics of Transition*, 24 (2), 211-231. (doi:10.1111/ecot.12087).
- 3) Jordan E., Gross, M., Javernick-Will A.N & Garvin M.J (2011) Use and misuse of qualitative comparative analysis, *Construction Management and Economics*, 29:11, 1159-1173.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2011.640339>.
- 4) Kaltenhaler, K., Ceccoli, S. and Gelleny, R. (2008). Attitudes toward eliminating income inequality in Europe, *European Union Politics*, 9(2), pp. 217–241.
- 5) Loveless, M. and Whitefield, S. (2011). ‘Being unequal and seeing inequality: Explaining the political significance of social inequality in new market democracies’, *European Journal of Political Research*, 50, pp. 239–266.
- 6) Milanovic, B. (2005). *Worlds Apart. Measuring International and Global Inequality*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 7) Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method. Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.