

주제어: 러시아, 노년층, 사회경제적 박탈, 삶의 만족도, 러시아패널조사
Keywords: Russia Federation, Russian Seniors, Socioeconomic
Deprivation, Life Satisfaction, Russia Longitudinal Monitoring
Survey (RLMS-HSE)

투 고 일 : 2025. 05. 26
심 사 일 : 2025. 06. 02~2025. 06. 23
게재확정일 : 2025. 06. 23

Effect of Socioeconomic Deprivation on Life Satisfaction among Russian Seniors*

- RLMS-HSE Microdata -

Lee Jung Min**

Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Literature Review
- III. Methods
- IV. Results
- V. Conclusion

국문요약

이 연구는 러시아 노년층의 사회경제적 박탈이 삶의 만족도에 미치는 영향을 살펴보고자 했다. 러시아패널조사 32차 자료(2023년)를 활용하였으며 개인응답자 전체 17,011명 중 60세 이상을 대상으로 4,724명을 추출해 결측값을 제거한 후 3,877명을 분석했다. 기술통계 결과, 러시아 노년층의 삶의 만족도는 평균 3.21점으로 나타났다. 다중회귀분석 결과, 사회경제적 박탈에 해당하는 하위변수 모두 삶의 만족도에 부적(-) 영향을 미쳤으며 경제적박탈(31.9%), 건강박탈(18.5%), 기본생활박탈(13.2%), 사회적박탈(5.9%), 사회보장박탈(4.7%) 순으로 삶의 만족도에 영향을 미친 것으로 나타났다. 이는 러시아 노년층이 사회경제적 박탈을 경험할수록 삶의 만족도가 감소한다고 해석할 수 있다. 따라서 러시아 노년층의 삶의 만족을 향상할 수 있도록 사회경제적 박탈 유형을 반영

* This paper was presented at the 7th International Russia Longitudinal Monitoring Survey Conference on May 23-24, 2025, which was co-hosted by the National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), the Carolina Population Center, the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill, USA), etc.

** Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Graduate School of International and Area Studies (Doctor of Sociology).

한 사회복지정책과 서비스를 다각적으로 제공해야 할 것이다. 이 연구는 소득을 중심으로 빈곤을 결정하는 전통적인 빈곤개념에서 벗어나 러시아 노년층이 일상생활에서 경험하는 주관적 빈곤을 다차원적으로 분석했다는 점에 의의가 있다.

I. Introduction

As the population ages and life expectancy rises, the proportion of elderly citizens¹⁾ in Russia increases over time. According to the Russian Statistics Office's demographic forecasts for 2046, the old people ratio is predicted to reach 18.4% in 2024, known as "aging," and 23% in 2035—called "super-aging."²⁾ The Oxford Wellbeing Research Center published the World Happiness Report in 2024, ranking Russian seniors' happiness 66th (5.544 points) out of 143 countries from 2021 to 2023.³⁾ The older generation of Russians born during the Soviet era, in particular, has the features of having directly experienced the system transformation and being traumatized. As shown in survey results of a 2020 Levada Center survey, about 75% of older respondents stated they missed the Soviet period.⁴⁾

Generally, as people get older, their income and social participation tend to drop. In addition to the income drop, changes in roles and social connections may cause a decline in self-esteem, loneliness, or alienation.

1) In this study, the age of seniors in Russia is defined as 60 years old due to the retirement age of 60 for women and 65 for men under Federal Law (No. 350-FZ).

2) Lee, J. M. "Influential Factors and Features in the Russian Pension Reform Process during Putin Regime and After," PhD Dissertation, (Seoul of South Korea: Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, 2024), p. 121.

3) Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., DE Neve, J. E., Aknin, L. B., & Wang, S. *World Happiness Report* (Oxford of the UK: University of Oxford-Wellbeing Research Center, 2024), p. 27.

4) Левада-Центра. Структура и воспроизводство памяти о Советском Союзе в российском общественном мнении: По результатам инициативных репрезентативных общероссийских опросов населения (Moscow of Russia: Левада-ЦентраМарт 2020), с. 7.

As a result, there may be a deterioration in quality of life, as well as an increased risk of physical and mental illness. In this respect, loneliness, income, leisure activities, and health are aggravated for old people when their social obligations and status diminish, and it may produce social issues that go beyond seniors' own concerns.

Since 2010, Russia has been positively researching life satisfaction in a variety of disciplines. There were studies that employed panel surveys or interviews with a small sample size, and they focused on income and employment for elders in Russia on the basis of a conventional concept of poverty. To address these research shortcomings, it is necessary to examine Russian seniors' life satisfaction using the Russia Longitudinal Monitoring Survey (hereafter RLMS-HSE), which is conducted annually in the fields of welfare and health across Russia in order to obtain representation and apply a multifaceted understanding of poverty. This study is significant for analyzing the impact of socioeconomic deprivation on life satisfaction by using a multidimensional approach that goes beyond a conventional concept of poverty.

This paper comprises the following analyses: Chapter 2 reviews the literature on both life satisfaction and socioeconomic deprivation. In Chapter 3, research methods such as data sampling and variable processing are described. In Chapter 4, it employs a descriptive statistics, a correlation analysis, and a multiple linear regression analysis. Finally, Chapter 5 covers the conclusions.

II. Literature Review

Previous research has used a range of terminology to demonstrate life satisfaction, including quality of life, happiness, and well-being. There are several ways to determine someone's happiness, one of which is life

satisfaction. The term “life satisfaction” was originally used by Neugarten and his colleagues in 1961.⁵⁾ It refers to a perspective on one’s own life. Happiness is defined as the degree to which an individual is satisfied with his or her life. It was equivalent to “hedonic level,” “contentment,” and “enjoying something.”⁶⁾

Subjective well-being is defined as a person’s cognitive and affective evaluations of his or her life. These evaluations include emotional reactions to events as well as cognitive judgments of satisfaction and fulfillment. Thus, it is a broad concept that includes experiencing pleasant emotions, low negative moods, and high life satisfaction. Life satisfaction is the overall appreciation for one’s life; in other words, it is how much one enjoys the life one leads. In this way, it is a subjective and multidimensional concept, with no single consensus definition. On the other hand, it could be regarded as emphasizing the subjective side, since each individual has a different level of desire and expected value, as well as varying degrees of acceptance of their position. Accordingly, this study defines life satisfaction as the subjective satisfaction.

As mentioned earlier, as people age—especially after retirement—their income and social participation drop. It can lead to a loss of self-esteem, loneliness, or estrangement, as well as a decline in quality of life and an increased risk of medical and mental illnesses. It may produce social issues that go beyond seniors’ own concerns. The older generation of Russians has the features of having directly experienced the system transformation and being traumatized. As is shown in results of a 2020 Levada Center survey, approximately 75% of older respondents stated they missed the Soviet era. Therefore, this paper focuses on Russian seniors’ life satisfaction that persons aged 60 and up experience in their daily lives.

Since 2010, Russia has been actively researching the topic of life satisfaction. It has been studied in a variety of fields, including psychology,

5) Veenhoven, R. The concept of happiness (Berlin of Germany: Springer Dordrecht, 1984), p. 35.

6) Ibid., p. 89.

cognitive science, pedagogy, sociology, and health sciences. Based on previous studies, apathy and sadness have a detrimental effect on life satisfaction, whereas subjective vitality and subjective perception of happiness have a favorable impact.⁷⁾ However, self-esteem has no direct correlation with older adults' life satisfaction.⁸⁾

Shown in Table 1, some previous studies using social surveys and interviews with Russian elders had two limitations: a small sample size and a lack of representation.⁹⁾ Nonetheless, a few studies used the RLMS-HSE, which had strengths in ensuring representation but

7) Золотарева, А. А., Аверина, П. А., & Тимошина, А. Л. “Удовлетворенность жизнью в «третьем возрасте» и ее диагностика: адаптация русскоязычной версии LSITA-SF.” *Психологическая наука и образование*, Т. 27, №. 2 (2022), с. 19-28.

8) Николаева, И. А. “Взаимосвязь Удовлетворенности жизнью пожилых людей с их ценностными отношениями к себе и другим,” *Современные проблемы науки и образования*, №. 2 (2015), с. 8.

9) Никитина, Е. А. “Удовлетворенность жизнью женщин и мужчин старшего возраста,” *Вестник СПбГУ. Психология*, Т. 27, №. 2 (2024), с. 143-157.

Kurnosova, S. A., Trushina, I. A., Telitzyna, A. Y., Chestyunina, Y. V., & Zabelina, E. V. “Education as a factor of life satisfaction in retirement,” *Psychological Science and Education*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (2024), pp. 31-46.

Золотарева, А. А., et al. op. cit., с. 19-28.

Ауельбекова, Н. Ж., Ахтаева, Н. С., & Клепиков, Д. А. “Исследование самооценки, жизнестойкости и удовлетворенности жизнью пожилых людей,” *Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Психология*, Т. 66, №. 1 (2021), с. 143-157.

Кулагина, Н. В. “Удовлетворенность жителей малых российских городов качеством своей жизни (на примере Пермского края),” *Вестник Томского государственного университета*, №. 458 (2020), с. 110-115.

Сергеева, Т. Б., & Борисов, Г. И. “Взаимосвязь удовлетворённости качеством жизни и индивидуальных свойств работающих и неработающих пенсионеров,” *Проблемы образования, науки и культуры*, Т. 26, №. 1 (2020), с. 158-169.

Ермакова, Н. Г., Денисова, К. Э., & Виттен, А. А. “Смысложизненные ориентации и удовлетворенность жизнью лиц пожилого,” *Герценовские чтения: психологические исследования в образовании*, №. 3 (2020), с. 193-198.

Belovol, E. V., Boyko, Z. V., & Shurupova, E. Y. “Cognitive factors of life satisfaction among the Russian elderly,” *Journal of Psychology and Pedagogics*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (2020), pp. 671-684.

Фролова, Е. А., & Маланина, В. А. “Анализ факторов формирования ожиданий относительно будущего и удовлетворенности жизнью пожилых людей в России,” *Вестник Томского государственного университета*, №. 447 (2019), с. 105-115.

Нестерова, А. А., & Жучкова, С. М. “Факторная структура удовлетворённости жизнью в пожилом и старческом возрасте: социально-психологический подход,” *Вестник Государственного университета просвещения, Серия: Психологические науки*, №. 1 (2018), с. 60-72.

Бурко, В. А., & Волкова, Ж. В. “Социальное самочувствие пожилых людей в современном российском обществе (сравнительный анализ),” *Вестник Пермского национального исследовательского политехнического университета. Социально-экономические науки*, №. 1 (2017), с. 43-62.

Николаева, И. А. op. cit., с. 689–690.

[Table 1] Literature Review

Variable	Researcher	Target (N)	Region	Data	Limitation
Life Satisfaction	Fokina et al (2020)	Middle, Senior (8,436)	Across Russia	RLMS-HSE	focusing on employment
	Voronin et al (2018)	-	Across Russia	RLMS-HSE	
	Nikitina (2024)	Senior (72)	Moscow & Moscow oblast	visiting survey	a lack of representation
	Kurnosova et al (2024)	Senior (291)	Chelyabinsk oblast	online survey (SNS)	
	Zolotareva et al (2022)	Middle, Senior (203)	Moscow	visiting survey	
	Auyelbekova et al (2021)	Senior (80)	Social welfare center	visiting survey	
	Kulagina et al (2020)	Youth, Middle, Senior (600)	Verkhnekamye cities	group survey	
	Cepreeva et al (2020)	Middle, Senior (200)	Yekaterinburg Sverdlovsk oblast	-	
	Ermakove et al (2020)	Senior (93)	Saint day care center	-	
	Belovo et al (2020)	Senior (97)	-	visiting survey	
	Frolova et al (2019)	Middle, Senior (854)	-	social survey 2012	
	Nesterova et al (2018)	Senior (450)	Moscow & Moscow oblast	-	
	Burko et al (2017)	Senior (110)	Perm	social survey 2015 and 2016	
	Nkolayeva et al (2015)	Middle, Senior (80)	-	-	
Socio-economic Deprivation	Frolova et al (2020)	Senior (-)	-	Three types of surveys	focusing on employment
	Kosarnar et al (2019)	low income population (526)	Penza	visiting survey (interview)	a lack of representation
	Kosarnar et al (2019)	Senior (1,120)	Penza Saratov Tatarstan	visiting survey (interview)	

shortcomings in emphasizing older adults' income and employment status as critical determinants of life satisfaction based on a narrow definition of poverty.¹⁰⁾ Russia divides poverty into objective (monetary) and subjective poverty using a conventional idea.¹¹⁾ Some studies on socioeconomic deprivation in Russia have begun beyond the narrow concept of poverty, but they have been limited to the labor sector, with an emphasis on income in the Penza and Saratov regions and the Tatarstan Republic.¹²⁾ To summarize, prior studies appeared to have research limitations, such as a lack of representation—a small sample size—or applying a traditional perspective on poverty.

The term “socioeconomic deprivation,” which incorporates the multifaceted deprivation encountered in life and transcends the limited definition of poverty, has appeared. It encompasses the multifaceted deprivation and transcends the narrow concept of poverty. Rather than focusing on income, it can evaluate deprivation and real-world experiences, allowing it to accurately reflect the quality of life. In Russia, some scholars are attempting to address multiple facets of socioeconomic deprivation. More precisely, In Russia, some scholars are attempting to address multiple facets of socioeconomic deprivation. More precisely, Frolova and colleagues (2020) examined education, work experience, household size, marital status, and place of residence. Kosarnar and colleagues (2019) analyzed only

10) Fokina, V. V., Tsikaridze, B. I., & Dudareva, A. D. “Analysis of life satisfaction of the older population in Russia based on the RLMS-HSE microdata,” *Population and Economics*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (2020), pp. 57-74.

Воронин, Г. Л., Захаров, В. Я., & Козырева, П. М. “Одинокие пожилые: доживают или активно живут?” *Социологический журнал*, Т. 24, №. 3 (2018), с. 32–55.

11) Курьшова, Л. Н., & Курмышкина, О. Н. “Структура бедности регионального социума (на примере Республики Мордовия),” *Уровень жизни населения регионов России*, Т. 19, №. 3 (2023), с. 421-431.

12) Фролова, Е. А., Маланина, В. А., & Шавлохова, А. А. “Региональный аспект бедности пожилых людей в России,” *Векторы благополучия: экономика и социум*, №. 4 (2020), с. 138-147.

Кошарная, Г. Б., & Щанина, Е. В. “Факторы депривации пожилых людей в социально-трудовой сфере: региональный аспект,” *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Социология*, Т. 19, №. 3 (2019), с. 481-493.

Кошарная, Г. Б., Каримова, Л. Ф., & Корж, Н. В. “Социально-экономические индикаторы депривации малообеспеченного населения в российском регионе (на примере Пензенской области),” *Регионология*, Т. 27, №. 3 (2019), с. 555-571.

income in the Penza region. In the same year, Kosarnar and colleagues (2019) expanded their research areas and indicators by measuring six indicators of socioeconomic deprivation: deprivation of leisure opportunities, deprivation of the labor market, deprivation of access to education, housing deprivation, medical services deprivation, and financial (income) deprivation in the Penza and Saratov regions as well as the Tatarstan Republic. Particularly, since the variable ranges did not match and the super-variables and sub-variables were combined, Kosarnar and colleagues (2019) encountered shortcomings in the systematic analysis.

Consequently, this study employs Kim's indicators, which are meticulously reorganized and consistent across variables of socioeconomic deprivation on the basis of the characteristics of the aged: necessities deprivation, social protection deprivation, social deprivation, health deprivation, and financial deprivation.¹³⁾ Plus, to ensure representation, data from the RLMS-HSE is utilized to validate how socioeconomic factors affect life satisfaction in individuals over 60.

III. Methods

1. Data Sampling

The RLMS-HSE microdata is designed to monitor and analyze how society is evolving in correspondence to the Russian government reform; it is a welfare and health panel survey that is intended for both households and individuals. It could be representative of the population.

In this study, 4,274 out of 17,011 respondents aged 60 and older were retrieved from the 32-wave survey (2023), and finally 3,877 samples were

13) Kim, H. C. "Depression as a Mediator in the relation between the Socioeconomic Deprivation Life Satisfaction in Older Adults." *Journal of the Korea Contents Association*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (2019), pp. 237-238.

analyzed after removing missing values. It used SPSS to perform various analyses, such as a descriptive statistics, a correlation analysis, and a multiple linear regression analysis. First, the descriptive statistics was used to identify demographic variables, socioeconomic deprivation experiences, and life satisfaction characteristics. Second, the Pearson correlation analysis was performed to verify the correlation between demographic variables, socioeconomic deprivation, and life satisfaction. Lastly, the multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the influence of socioeconomic deprivation on life satisfaction. The research hypothesis is that the socioeconomic deprivation of older Russians will have an impact on their life satisfaction.

2. Variable processing

All variables proceeded as shown in Table 2. The case of the dependent variable, life satisfaction among Russian seniors, was estimated as follows. Using a 5-point Likert scale, respondents to the RLMS-HSE were asked how satisfied they were with their life overall. Conversely, since it was coded in reverse, older persons who scored higher represented that they were more satisfied with their lives.

[Table 2] Variables Description

Variable	Categories		Value
Controlled Variable	Gender	Male, Female	-
	Age	60 years older	
	Educational level	0-6 grades of comprehensive school : Higher education diploma and more	
	Residential area	Oblast center*, Town, PGT**, Rural	
Dependent Variable	Life Satisfaction	Satisfied with life at present	

Variable	Categories		Value
Independent Variable	Necessities Deprivation	Concerned about necessities***	No deprivation experience=0
	Social Protection Deprivation	Received pension payments****	
	Health Deprivation	Satisfied with health	Deprivation experience=1
	Social Deprivation	Were a polite person to others	
		Treated mean/not nice to you	
	Financial Deprivation	Satisfied with economic conditions	
		Economic rank nine-step ladder	

Note. * Oblast is a province or region, and Russia has 46 of them. The Oblast center refers to the provincial center as an administrative and economic hub.

** PGT refers to an urban type settlement developed during the Soviet period.

*** Necessities are fundamental requirements for survival, such as food, clothing, and shelter, known as bare necessities.

**** Since the income replacement rate of the Russian pension system—26% in 2023— is lower than the ILO-recommended standard of 40%, relative poverty is defined as 60% of median income or less. As is evidenced in data released by the Russian government, the median income in 2023 was 40,121 rubles.

Following that, the independent variables were covered. Based on Kim’s classification, it consisted of five categories and seven items. Housing deprivation was omitted because it did not respond. In addition, since this study focuses on subjective poverty, the social protection deprivation variable was assessed as relative poverty by pension payments. It was measured at less than 60% of the median income (40,121 rubles) announced by the Russian government in 2023. This is because the income replacement rate of Russian pensions is lower than the ILO-recommended standard of 40%. The value was coded so that if they had not experienced it, it was “no deprivation experience = 0,” and if they had experienced it, it was “yes deprivation experience = 1.” The highest value was regarded as 1, and it was calculated by combining the maximum values of seven items. Demographic variables were used as dummy variables. The raw data was statistically analyzed using dummy variables, reverse coding, and scale conversion.

IV. Results

1. Descriptive statistics

Table 3 displays demographic characteristics. Of the 3,877 people, 2,669

[Table 3] Descriptive statistics_1

N=3,877

Variable	Categories	n (%)
Gender	Male	1,208 (31.2)
	Female	2,669 (68.8)
Age group	60-69	2,070 (53.4)
	70-79	1,222 (31.5)
	80-89	531 (13.7)
	90 years older	54 (1.4)
Educational level	0-6 grades of comprehensive school	61 (1.6)
	Unfinished secondary education	272 (7.0)
	Unfinished secondary education+others	185 (4.8)
	Secondary school diploma	1,244 (32.1)
	Vocational secondary education diploma or more	1,146 (29.6)
	Higher education diploma or more	969 (25.0)
Residential area	Oblast center	1,673 (43.2)
	Town	1,060 (27.3)
	PGT	276 (7.1)
	Rural	868 (22.4)
Life satisfaction	Fully satisfied	227 (5.9)
	Rather satisfied	1,626 (41.9)
	Both yes and no	1,028 (26.5)
	Not very satisfied	736 (19.0)
	Not at all satisfied	260 (6.7)
Necessities Deprivation	No deprivation	1,508 (38.9)
	Yes deprivation	2,369 (61.1)
Social Protection Deprivation	No deprivation	1,210 (31.2)
	Yes deprivation	2,667 (68.8)
Health Deprivation	No deprivation	2,825 (72.9)
	Yes deprivation	1,052 (27.1)
Social Deprivation	No deprivation	3,257 (84.0)
	Yes deprivation	620 (16.0)
Financial Deprivation	No deprivation	1,410 (36.4)
	Yes deprivation	2,467 (63.6)

(68.8%) were female and 1,208 (31.2%) were male, with females being more prevalent. The average age was 70.5 years old, with 2,070 people in their 60s (53.4%), 1,222 people in their 70s (31.5%), 531 people in their 80s (13.7%), and 54 people in their 90s (1.4%), with the 60s being the largest age group. The highest educational level was a secondary school diploma. There were 61 individuals (1.6%) with 0–6 comprehensive school grades, 272 individuals (7.0%) with an unfinished secondary education, 185 individuals (4.8%) with an unfinished secondary education and something else, 1,244 individuals (32.1%) with a secondary school diploma, 1,146 individuals (29.6%) with a vocational secondary education diploma, and 969 individuals (25.0%) with a higher education diploma and more. The largest proportion of seniors resided in the oblast center, where there were 1,673 old people (43.2%), 1,060 old people (27.3%) in town, 276 old people (7.1%) in PGT, and 868 old people (22.4%) in the rural area.

Table 4 presents descriptive statistics on socioeconomic deprivation as well as life satisfaction. The average point for socioeconomic deprivation was 2.366, with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 5. To be more specific, the averages for each subvariable were necessities deprivation = 0.611, social protection deprivation = 0.688, health deprivation = 0.271, social deprivation = 0.160, and financial deprivation = 0.636. It had a value ranging

[Table 4] Descriptive statistics_2

N=3,877

Variable		Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Minimum	Maximum
Socioeconomic Deprivation	Necessities Deprivation	.611	.488	0	1
	Social Protection Deprivation	.688	.463	0	1
	Health Deprivation	.271	.445	0	1
	Social Deprivation	.160	.367	0	1
	Financial Deprivation	.636	.481	0	1
	Total (Five variables)	2.366		0	5
	Life Satisfaction	3.213	1.033	0	5

from 0 to 1. The average point for life satisfaction was 3.213, with a range of 1 to 5.

2. Correlation Analysis

The results of the correlation analysis between the primary variables are shown in Table 5, where all independent variables have a significant association with the dependent variable. Moreover, no variable had a correlation coefficient higher than 0.8 ($r = 0.8$ or higher), indicating that the control and independent variables' correlation coefficients were unrelated to one another. No multicollinearity—no comparable independent variables—was indicated by the tolerance of 0.903-0.993 > 0.1 and the variance inflation factor (VIF) of 1.007-1.108 < 10 . They can therefore adequately explain the dependent variable.

[Table 5] Correlation analysis

N=3,877

Variable		Life Satisfaction	Socioeconomic Deprivation					
			1	2	3	4	5	
Life Satisfaction		1						
Socio-economic Deprivation	1. Necessities Deprivation	r	-.223***	1				
		p-value	.000					
	2. Social Protection Deprivation	r	-.114***	.153***	1			
		p-value	.000	.000				
	3. Health Deprivation	r	-.212***	.016	-.100***	1		
		p-value	.000	.329	.000			
	4. Social Deprivation	r	-.090***	.045**	.058***	.014	1	
		p-value	.000	.005	.000	.388		
	5. Financial Deprivation	r	-.381***	.245***	.193***	.091***	.062***	1
		p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

Note. * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$ (*Significant at a 5% level, **Significant at a 1% level, ***Significant at a 0.1% level)

3. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Initially, the regression model proved sufficient performance, as shown in Table 6, with an ANOVA F-test of 194.885 and a p-value of .000 <

[Table 6] Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

N=3,877

Variable		Dependent Variable → Independent Variable				
		B(SE)	β	T	p-value	
Controlled Variable	Gender		.047 (.036)	.021	1.318	.188
	Age group	60s	3.237 (.023)		143.104	.000
		70s	-.134 (.037)	-.060***	-3.599	.000
		80s	.087 (.050)	.029	1.742	.082
		90s	.430 (.142)	.049**	3.031	.002
	Educational level	Higher education diploma or more	3.368 (.033)		101.917	.000
		0-6 grades school	-.418 (.136)	-.050**	-3.075	.002
		Unfinished secondary school	-.225 (.071)	-.056***	-3.188	.001
		Unfinished secondary school+others	-.314 (.083)	-.065***	-3.808	.000
		Secondary school diploma	-.208 (.044)	-.094***	-4.711	.000
		Vocational secondary diploma	-.176 (.045)	-.078***	-3.910	.000
	Residential area	Oblast center	3.311 (.025)		131.563	.000
		Town	-.176 (.040)	-.076***	-4.344	.000
		PGT	-.116 (.067)	-.029	-1.731	.084
		Rural	-.190 (.043)	-.077***	-4.422	.000
	Independent Variable	Financial Deprivation		-.686 (.032)	-.319***	-21.121
Health Deprivation		-.429 (.034)	-.185***	-12.711	.000	
Necessities Deprivation		-.280 (.032)	-.132***	-8.865	.000	
Social Deprivation		-.167 (.041)	-.059***	-4.120	.000	
Social Protection Deprivation		-.104 (.033)	-.047**	-3.138	.002	
Constant		4.035 (.035)		116.168	.000	
Adj R ²		.200				
F (sig)		194.885				

Note. *p≤.05, **p≤.01, ***p≤.001 (*Significant at a 5% level, **Significant at a 1% level, ***Significant at a 0.1% level)

.001. To ascertain whether the independent variable, the experience of socioeconomic deprivation, affects the dependent variable, life satisfaction, the explanatory power was 20.0%. All five socioeconomic deprivations affected the life satisfaction of senior citizens in Russia. The p-value was lower than 0.5.

It was determined which socioeconomic deprivation had the greatest impact on life satisfaction after controlling for demographic variables. Financial deprivation ($\beta=-.319$, $p<.001$), health deprivation ($\beta=-.185$, $p<.001$), necessities deprivation ($\beta=-.132$, $p<.001$), social deprivation ($\beta=-.059$, $p<.001$), and social protection deprivation ($\beta=-.047$, $p<.01$) were the outcomes. Accordingly, financial deprivation (31.9%) had the greatest effect on the old's life satisfaction, followed by health deprivation (18.5%), necessities deprivation (13.2%), social deprivation (5.9%), and social protection deprivation (4.7%).

It was also estimated how controlled variables, which added dummy variables, affected the dependent variable, life satisfaction. The finding indicated that gender was unrelated. In terms of age, individuals in their nineties had the greatest influence on life satisfaction. It may be argued that as people age, their level of life satisfaction increases. Additionally, a higher educational diploma and the oblast center had a greater effect than other variables. To conclude, Russian seniors in their nineties who reside in megacities and have a higher educational level are more satisfied with their lives. In Russia, as in other countries, highly educated elderly people are likely to have worked in high-paying jobs, which leads to higher pension payments after retirement. In other words, they can be seen as enjoying economic stability. In addition, cities provide easy access to various cultural facilities, medical care, and the possibility of participating in social activities, so they can be seen as enjoying psychological stability.

V. Conclusion

This study found that the life satisfaction of Russian older persons was impacted by socioeconomic deprivation. It highlights the principal findings of the study before suggesting policy changes to improve the quality of life for older people in Russia.

According to the study's findings, Russian seniors had a higher life satisfaction score of 3.21 points. It is higher than the previous study (2.85 points), which utilized the same data (RLMS-HSE) and focused on both income and employment. Although the old people represented high levels of life satisfaction, social welfare policies and social services for those who scored lower than average should be revised.

Nevertheless, to strengthen social welfare policies and services for seniors with low life satisfaction, the Russian government has to consider multiple dimensions that extend beyond a narrow idea of poverty. As is evidenced in the findings released by this study, five socioeconomic deprivations had a negative (-) effect on life satisfaction among Russian elders: financial deprivation ($\beta=-.319$, $p<.001$), health deprivation ($\beta=-.185$, $p<.001$), necessities deprivation ($\beta=-.132$, $p<.001$), social deprivation ($\beta=-.059$, $p<.001$), and social protection deprivation ($\beta=-.047$, $p<.01$). This means that the more socioeconomic deprivation they experience, the lower their life satisfaction. The findings are consistent with prior research showing that socioeconomic deprivation has a detrimental effect on life satisfaction. Additionally, it affects how satisfied Russian seniors are with their lives. Specifically, financial deprivation, health deprivation, necessities deprivation, social deprivation, and social protection deprivation were followed in that sequence.

This paper has implications for improving the quality of life for older persons. Therefore, this might be emphasized in improving the quality of life for senior citizens in Russia in terms of social welfare policies and

social services. Most crucially, the pension income replacement needs to be raised to the 40% ILO-recommended level in order to prevent financial, necessities, and social protection deprivation and to promote retirees' consumption. Furthermore, in order to allow older users to enjoy their free time and build social networks related to overcoming social deprivation, it is fundamental to provide customized welfare that takes into consideration regional variations as their needs change. Actively gathering feedback from senior users, creating a variety of programs, and enhancing collaboration with relevant organizations are all essential. Assessing elders' needs and concerns in a range of areas that go beyond income and work, with an emphasis on socioeconomic deprivation, is crucial to providing them with multifaceted social welfare policies and social services. For precise measurement, a standardized socioeconomic deprivation index is required. In addition, from a life course viewpoint, research is required to compare and analyze life satisfaction in Russia by age group in order to determine the types and examine the effects on each age group using the RLMS-HSE microdata.

References

- Belovol, E. V., Boyko, Z. V., & Shurupova, E. Y. "Cognitive factors of life satisfaction among the Russian elderly," *Journal of Pshychology and Pedagogics*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (2020).
- Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. *Subjective Well-Being: The Science of Happiness and Life Satisfaction*. in Lopez, S. J & Snyder, C. R (Eds.). Oxford handbook of positivie psychology (Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Fokina, V. V., Tsikaridze, B. I., & Dudareva, A. D. "Analysis of life satisfaction of the older populaton in Russia based on the RLMS-HSE microdata," *Population and Economics*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (2020).
- Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., DE Neve, J. E., Aknin, L. B., & Wang, S. *World Happiness Report* (Oxford of the UK: University of Oxford-Wellbeing Research Center, 2024).
- Kim, H. C. "Depression as a Mediator in the relation between the Socioeconomic Deprivation Life Satisfaction in Older Adults." *Journal of the Korea Contents Association*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (2019).
- Kurnosova, S. A., Trushina, I. A., Telitzyna, A. Y., Chestyunina, Y. V., & Zabelina, E. V. "Education as a factor of life satisfaction in retirement," *Psychological Science and Education*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (2024).
- Lee, J. M. "Influent factors and features in the Russian pension reform process during Putin regime and after," PhD Dissertation, Seoul of South Korea: Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, 2024.
- Sameer, Y., Eid, Y., & Veenhoven, R. "Perceived meaning of life and satisfaction with life: A research synthesis using an online finding archive." *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 13 (2023).
- Veenhoven, R. *The concept of happiness*, (Berlin of Germany: Springer Dordrecht, 1984).
- Ауельбекова, Н. Ж., Ахтаева, Н. С., & Клепиков, Д. А. "Исследование самооценки, жизнестойкости и удовлетворенности жизнью пожил

- ых людей,” *Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Психология*, Т. 66, №. 1 (2021).
- Бурко, В. А., & Волкова, Ж. В. “Социальное самочувствие пожилых людей в современном российском обществе (сравнительный анализ),” *Вестник Пермского национального исследовательского политехнического университета. Социально-экономические науки*, №. 1 (2017).
- Воронин, Г. Л., Захаров, В. Я., & Козырева, П. М. “Одинокие пожилые: доживают или активно живут?” *Социологический журнал*, Т. 24, №. 3 (2018).
- Ермакова, Н. Г., Денисова, К. Э., & Виттен, А. А. “Смысло-жизненные ориентации и удовлетворенность жизнью лиц пожилого,” *Герценовские чтения: психологические исследования в образовании*, №. 3 (2020).
- Золотарева, А. А., Аверина, П. А., & Тимошина, А. Л. “Удовлетворенность жизнью в «третьем возрасте» и ее диагностика: адаптация русской версии LSITA-SF.” *Психологическая наука и образование*, Т. 27, №. 2 (2022).
- Кошарная, Г. Б., & Щанина, Е. В. “Факторы депривации пожилых людей в социально-трудовой сфере: региональный аспект,” *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Социология*, Т. 19, №. 3 (2019).
- Кошарная, Г. Б., Каримова, Л. Ф., & Корж, Н. В. “Социально-экономические индикаторы депривации малообеспеченного населения в российском регионе (на примере Пензенской области),” *Регионология*, Т. 27, №. 3 (2019).
- Кулагина, Н. В. “Удовлетворенность жителей малых российских городов качеством своей жизни (на примере Пермского края),” *Вестник Томского государственного университета*, №. 458 (2020).
- Курьшова, Л. Н., & Курмышкина, О. Н. “Структура бедности регионально о социума (на примере Республики Мордовия),” *Уровень жизни населения регионов России*, Т. 19, №. 3 (2023).
- Левада-Центра, Структура и воспроизводство памяти о Советском Союзе

- в российском общественном мнении: По результатам инициативных репрезентативных общероссийских опросов населения (2020).
- Нестерова, А. А., & Жучкова, С. М. “Факторная структура удовлетворённости жизнью в пожилом и старческом возрасте: социально-психологический подход,” *Вестник Государственного университета просвещения, Серия: Психологические науки*, №. 1 (2018).
- Никитина, Е. А. “Удовлетворенность жизнью женщин и мужчин старшего возраста,” *Вестник СПбГУ. Психология*, Т. 27, №. 2 (2024).
- Николаева, И. А. “Взаимосвязь удовлетворенности жизнью пожилых людей с их ценностными отношениями к себе и другим,” *Современные проблемы науки и образования*, №. 2 (2015).
- Сергеева, Т. Б., & Борисов, Г. И. “Взаимосвязь удовлетворенности качеством жизни и индивидуальных свойств работающих и неработающих пенсионеров,” *Проблемы образования, науки и культуры*, Т. 26, №. 1 (2020).
- Фролова, Е. А., & Маланина, В. А. “Анализ факторов формирования ожиданий относительно будущего и удовлетворенности жизнью пожилых людей в России,” *Вестник Томского государственного университета*, №. 447 (2019).
- Фролова, Е. А., Маланина, В. А., & Шавлохова, А. А. “Региональный аспект бедности пожилых людей в России,” *Векторы благополучия: экономика и социум*, №. 4 (2020).

Abstract

러시아 노년층의 사회경제적 박탈이
삶의 만족도에 미친 영향
- RLMS-HSE Microdata -

이정민

This study examined the effect of socioeconomic deprivation on Russian seniors' life satisfaction. It employed a 32-wave survey from the Russia Longitudinal Monitoring Survey-HSE Microdata. 4,724 out of the 17,011 respondents were aged 60 years or older, and 3,877 samples were selected after removing missing values. A descriptive statistics found that the average level of life satisfaction among Russian seniors was 3.21 points. A multiple linear regression analysis revealed that all five socioeconomic deprivations had a negative (-) impact on life satisfaction. Specifically, the greatest influence on life satisfaction was financial deprivation (31.9%), followed by health deprivation (18.5%), necessities deprivation (13.2%), social deprivation (5.9%), and social protection deprivation (4.7%) in that sequence. This means that the more socioeconomic deprivation they experience, the lower their life satisfaction. Consequently, social welfare policies and services have to be developed to improve the quality of life for seniors. The study is significant in that it utilized a multidimensional approach to the deprived daily lives of old Russian persons.

