

Kamaljanova T.A.

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,
Kazakhstan, Astana, e-mail: Takhira.Kamaljanova@mail.ru

THE CONTRIBUTION OF SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS ANALYSIS TO UNDERSTANDING OF POVERTY IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD

The concept of Sustainable Livelihood (SL) is an attempt to go beyond the conventional definitions and approaches to poverty eradication. These had been found to be too narrow because they focused only on certain aspects or manifestations of poverty, such as low income, or did not consider other vital aspects of poverty such as vulnerability and social exclusion. According to the latest estimates, 10% of the world's population lives on less than 1.90 dollars per day. Below the poverty line are many countries in the African continent, India, Mexico and others. It is now recognized that more attention must be paid to the various factors and processes which either constrain or enhance poor people's ability to make a living in an economically, ecologically, and socially sustainable manner. The SL concept offers a more coherent and integrated approach to poverty. Based on the foregoing, the purpose of this study is to understand the concept of SL and its contribution to poverty eradication. The main objectives of the study are to study the multidimensional and dynamic understanding of poverty and the livelihood of poor people, and the analysis of approaches to SL and the dynamic aspirations of poor people. Also, it considers the relationship between SL and poverty reduction.

Key words: sustainable livelihoods, poverty, poverty reduction, rural areas of developing countries, vulnerability, poor people.

Камалджанова Т.А.¹

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті,
Қазақстан, Астана қ., e-mail: Takhira.Kamaljanova@mail.ru

Дамушы әлемде кедейлікті түсінуде өмір сүруге арналған тұрақты қаржы көздерін талдаудың үлесі

Тұрақты өмір сүру тұжырымдамасы (ӨСТ) – бұл кедейлікті жоюдың жалпы қабылданған анықтамалары мен тәсілдерінің шеңберінен шығу әрекеті. Аталмыш тәсілдердің аясы тым тар деп танылды, себебі кедейліктің белгілі бір аспектілері мен көріністеріне ғана (төмен табыс сияқты) назар аударылды; немесе кедейліктің осалдық және әлеуметтік оқшаулау сияқты басқа да өмірлік маңызды аспектілерін ескермеді. Соңғы есеп бойынша әлем халқының 10 пайызы күніне 1,90 доллардан аз көрсеткішке өмір сүреді. Кедейліктің шегінде Африка құрлығында, Үндістан, Мексика және басқа да көптеген елдер бар. Қазіргі уақытта кедей адамдардың экономикалық, экологиялық және әлеуметтік тұрақты түрде өмір сүру қабілетін шектейтін немесе арттыратын түрлі факторлар мен процестерге көбірек көңіл бөлу қажет деп танылды. Тұрақты өмір сүру тұжырымдамасы кедейлікке дәйекті және кешенді көзқарас ұсынады. Жоғарыда айтылғандарды ескере отырып, осы зерттеудің мақсаты тұрақты өмір сүру тұжырымдамасын және оның кедейшілікті жоюға қосқан үлесін түсіну болып табылады. Зерттеудің негізгі міндеттері – кедейшілік пен кедей адамдардың өмір сүруінің көп қырлы және динамикалық түсінігін зерттеу, тұрақты өмір сүру әдістерін және кедей адамдардың серпінді ұмтылысын талдау. Сондай-ақ, тұрақты өмір сүру мен кедейлік деңгейін төмендету арасындағы қатынастардың қажеттілігін қарастыру.

Түйін сөздер: өмір сүруге тұрақты құралдар, кедейшілік, кедейліктің қысқаруы, дамушы елдердің ауылдық аудандары, осалдық, кедей адамдар.

Камалджанова Т.А.¹

Евразийский Национальный Университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева,
Казахстан, г. Астана, e-mail: Takhira.Kamaljanova@mail.ru

Вклад анализа устойчивых источников средств к существованию в понимание бедности в развивающемся мире

Концепция устойчивого существования (УС) – это попытка выйти за рамки общепринятых определений и подходов к искоренению бедности. Они были признаны слишком узкими, поскольку фокусировались только на определенных аспектах и проявлениях бедности таких как низкий доход; или не учитывали другие жизненно важные аспекты бедности, как уязвимость и социальная изоляция. Согласно последним оценкам, 10 % населения мира живут менее чем на 1,90 долл. в день. За чертой бедности находятся многие страны Африканского континента, Индия, Мексика и другие. В настоящее время признано, что необходимо уделять больше внимания различным факторам и процессам, которые либо ограничивают, либо повышают способность бедных людей зарабатывать на жизнь экономически, экологически и социально-устойчивым образом. Концепция устойчивого существования предлагает более последовательный и комплексный подход к бедности. Исходя из вышеизложенного, цель данного исследования состоит в том, чтобы понять концепцию устойчивого жизнеобеспечения и ее вклад в искоренение бедности. Основными задачами исследования являются изучение многомерного и динамического понимания бедности и средств существования бедных людей; анализ подходов к устойчивому обеспечению средств к существованию и динамичные чаяния бедных людей. Также, необходимость рассмотрения взаимосвязей между устойчивыми средствами к существованию и сокращением бедности.

Ключевые слова: устойчивые средства к существованию, бедность, сокращение бедности, сельские районы развивающихся стран, уязвимость, бедные люди.

Introduction

Recently, the understanding of poverty and of ways in which people escape from or fall into poverty has become more holistic. This should improve the ability of policy analysts and others working in the field of poverty reduction (Doward, 2005). The role of livelihoods in terms of understanding poverty is significant. Livelihood is a means of earning money. It covers the capabilities of people, assets, income and activities necessary to meet life's needs. Livelihood is sustainable when it allows people to cope with shocks and stresses (such as natural disasters and economic or social upheavals), and improve their well-being and the well-being of future generations, without compromising the natural environment or resource base (eprints.soas.ac.uk). Sati and Vangchhia analysing livelihood strategy defines it as increased wellbeing, decreased vulnerability, enhanced food security and more sustainable use of natural resource base. But it generally depends on the availability of livelihood assets/capitals such as human capital, physical capital, natural capital and social capital. In other words, a sustainable livelihood is an area where all these stuff are controlled and they have an excellent opportunity to reach future livelihood sustainability (eprints.soas.ac.uk). While, livelihood sustainability is one of the elements in the way of poverty reduction

in developing countries in particular in Africa, India and China. The majority of people in these areas live below poverty line (Sati and Vangchhia, 2017). However, there are numbers of unused natural resources around the world. According to Sati and Vangchhia the optimum use these resources will destroy poverty and achieve food security. Thus, a contribution of livelihood in understanding poverty and poverty reduction is considerable (eprints.soas.ac.uk).

This essay aims to identify the contribution of livelihoods analysis to understanding of poverty in the developing countries. It describes a simple schema, which integrates multidimensional and dynamic understandings of poverty, of poor people's livelihoods. It considers sustainable livelihood approach and recognises the dynamic aspirations of poor people. It also brings together correlation between sustainable livelihood and poverty reduction.

Research methods

Research methods include literature review in terms of poverty and sustainable livelihood. It should be noted that a correlation between livelihood and poverty has been addressed by many scholars widely. The number of researchers such as Bhandari, White and Ellison, Krantz, Philip and

Rayhan, Panagariya in general, explain the level of poverty and how to reduce poverty in developed countries such as in Africa, India, Cambodia and Bangladesh, whereas, Slay et al., Alvaredo et al. consider the problem of vulnerability and inequality generally around the world and also regionally in Central Asian countries. Others such as Zoubets, Livshits, Sinitsina I. analyse the problem of poverty reduction and social inequality in case of Russia and CIS countries. According to them, currently, the population with incomes below the subsistence minimum has grown from 15.5 million people in 2013 to 19.8 million people in 2016. The inability of most of the poorest countries to break out of poverty on their own has made the problem of poverty global. There is a growing conviction in the world community that the gap between rich and poor countries and nations cannot be overcoming by relying on the natural course of events without coordinated efforts at all levels, from local to global (Panagariya, 2010). Therefore, some authors Adato and Ruth Meinzen, Serrat examines the sustainable livelihoods approach is as only one way of organizing the complex issues that surround poverty (Alvaredo, Chancel, 2018) and distinguish strengths and weaknesses of this livelihoods approaches (Zoubets, Novikov, 2017). While, Krantz notices that «the sustainable livelihoods idea was first introduced by the Brundtland Commission on Environment and Development, and the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development expanded the concept, advocating for the achievement of sustainable livelihoods as a broad goal for poverty eradication» (Bhandari, P.B., 2014: 1). Sati and Vangchhia state that sustainable livelihood could serve as «an integrating factor that allows policies to address development, sustainable resource management and poverty eradication simultaneously» (eprints.soas.ac.uk). The major discussion on sustainable livelihood so far focused on rural areas and situations where people are farmers or make a living from some kind of primary self-managed production.

Results Discussion

There are many definitions and meanings in understanding the approach to sustainable livelihoods. But undoubtedly, the main goal of sustainable livelihoods is to improve understanding of livelihoods, especially the livelihoods of poor people (Mizoram, 2017). Initially, sustainable livelihoods emerged as a means to improve the effectiveness of poverty alleviation through

understanding poverty in poverty (Sinitsina, 2006). The same point of view has Rumina. She notices that for a long time in the countries of Asia and Africa, the foundation for sustainable development was the fight against poverty (ECOVEST, 2006). Kollmair and Gamper distinguish two steps to investigate SLA: «a complex investigation of the living conditions of the target population is the starting point of a development project based on the sustainable livelihood approach and reveal limiting factors which hinder the adaptation of sustainable livelihood strategies on the one hand and recognise the factors that reduce vulnerability on the other» (World inequality LAB, 2018,). The sustainable livelihoods approaches can serve as an analytical tool for identifying development priorities and new activities before and during development. Therefore, livelihood analysis applies a wide range of traditional methods and tools, for example, from a population-based poverty assessment (PPA), rural population assessment (PRA), and methods for evaluating good governance (eprints.soas.ac.uk). Department for International Development (DFID) suggests that sustainable livelihoods is «the capability of people to make a living and improve their quality of life without jeopardizing the livelihood options of others, either now or in the future» (Ivanov, 2005). According to Haan DFID explicitly aimed at «a refocus on assistance to the poor» (Adato, 2007: 346). Researchers Rakodi and Lloyd-Jones share this point of view and adds that the SL approaches as a means of analysing development issues and informing the design of policies and programmes intended to meet overarching goal of poverty reduction. Until recently, this approach has been developed largely in a rural development context (Serrat, 2010). DFID considers the sustainable livelihoods approach as strategies of poverty based on the options for utilising assets and reducing vulnerability (Ivanov, 2005). The aim of these strategies is to achieve livelihood outcomes such as «more income, increased well-being, reduced vulnerability, improved food security, more sustainable use of the natural resource base» (Alvaredo, 2018). Thus, as we see, the sustainable livelihood directly interacts with poverty, in particular poverty reduction.

However, there was a serious problem in approaching livelihoods, that is, how to overcome its bias towards the local population. In the 1990s and early 2000s, many studies of livelihoods concerned only the local context for the poor (Adato, 2007). At present, it is generally accepted that local displacement can best be overcome by including global-local interactions in the analysis.

But, as a rule, this is realized by focusing on how it is globally challenged and formed at the local level and how local communities create local settlements, developing contested and agreed spaces. However, the reverse is often ignored, that is, how locations form a global space, the impact of local livelihoods on global politics or how local livelihoods form global well-being and global well-being. This is what De Haan and Kamanzi tried to achieve in the above-mentioned study on measures for the development of the Netherlands in Tanzania. Expanding their energy analysis beyond the local political arena with a similar analysis of power at the regional, national and international levels, they not only do the trick to derive conclusions from research on livelihoods, conclusions that surpass the local level and are aimed at generalization (Adato, 2007).

Taking into account the above, there is a mention of the development/historical aspect of the concept of SL. The concept of SL appeared in the report of Brundtland (our common future) of the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987 (Serrat, 2010). Since then, the terminology SL has been changed widely. In the context of «the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), it is often represented mainly in terms of the impact of people's livelihoods on the environment» (Serrat, 2010: 15). However, in the rural livelihoods of the late 1980s and early 1990s, despite the fact that environmental sustainability has remained central, attention to the problem of poverty has strengthened. It should be noted that poverty concerns not only money incomes, but also links to health and education, as well as, perhaps, less tangible subjects, such as a sense of «powerlessness» (Bhandari, 2014). Thus, poverty is multifaceted, although development history suggests that the project should focus only on addressing one aspect (for example, income) and ignore all others (Smith, 2015). In this respect, we can give an example in case of Africa. For instance, macro data shows that in sub-Saharan Africa, living standards improved after independence (in 1960) and in the 1970s. Subsequently, the 1980s and 1990s witnessed a catastrophic decline. Only in the late 1990s did the recovery begin, as a result of which the current standards of life were often better than in the 1970s (Adato, 2007). But this long-term trend of progress, deterioration, rebound and new progress is not very clearly reflected in research on livelihoods in Africa. This may be due to the fact that a large number of specific means of livelihood can be hidden behind the average indicators. Indeed, macroeconomic research has led to a reduction in poverty in Africa,

but early warning that certain regions (peripheral areas, areas with high precipitation variability) and special social groups (poorly educated, with little access to land with an increased risk to health in particular with women) may lag behind. Haan pointed to the same phenomenon in Latin America. Regional differences are enormous. Moreover, «economically, socially and politically, poor people, especially in rural areas, do not have the opportunity to improve their living conditions» (Adato, 2007: 352)

In the world, roughly 70% poor people live in rural areas of developing countries. Although urban poverty is increasing, «the correlation between poverty and remoteness from urban centres in most countries is strong and it is expected to remain so until at least the second decade of the next century» (eprints.soas.ac.uk) «The International Development Target of having the number of people leaving in extremely poverty by 2015 will be achievable if the problem of rural poverty is confronted head on» (eprints.soas.ac.uk). According to Carney food security remains the main problem. More than 850 million people around the world are undernourished. That's why, it is important to ensure that the new approaches contribute to improved agricultural productivity and that they help increase the poor people's access to food (Carney, 2002). Scarcities of resources is serious issues in rural areas. Sati and Vangchhia believe that sustainable rural livelihoods can only be achieved if natural resources are themselves used in sustainable ways. Maintaining objectivity in deciding what constitutes sustainable use is likely to be a huge challenge, especially in areas where people are already extremely vulnerable and have few opportunities, other than a wider use of resources (eprints.soas.ac.uk). According to Carney sustainable livelihood thinking focused on «people and their livelihoods and provided an effective framework for planning research». It is important to note that this gave «new insights into livelihoods for the poor and stressed the importance of working alongside the poor and supporting them in reducing poverty» (Carney, 2002)

These different interpretations and elaborations of the SL concept somehow led a number of development agencies to apply what is now called the SL approach to poverty reduction. This has emerged in response to the negative experience associated with traditional approaches to poverty reduction, as well as from recent findings on the nature and understanding of poverty (Krantz, 2001: 9). In this case, Krantz distinguishes three reasons why the sustainable livelihood approach has been

applied to poverty reduction. First, the realization that while economic growth may be significant for reducing poverty, there is no automatic relationship between them, but all depends on the ability of the poor to take advantage of economic opportunities. Secondly, the realization that poverty, as the poor themselves understand, is not just a matter of low income, but also includes other aspects such as «ill health, illiteracy, lack of social services and a state of vulnerability and feelings of powerlessness in general» (Krantz, 2001: 10). Furthermore, it is now recognized that there are important links between the various aspects of poverty, so that the improvement of one has a positive effect on the other. Raising the level of education of people can have a positive impact on their health standards, which, in turn, can improve their production capabilities. Finally, it is now recognized that the poor themselves often know their situation and they need the best results, and therefore they must participate in the development of policies and projects aimed at improving their lot. Taking into account the opinion of developers, they are usually more committed to implementation. Thus, the participation of the poor improves the results of the project. At present, certain international development agencies apply this «livelihood approach» in their practical development activities (Krantz, 2001)

Sustainable livelihood thinking informs about a wide range of research projects, especially those funded by the Natural Resources Policy Research Programme of DFID's rural livelihoods Department. The majority of these research projects are aimed at improving livelihoods by contributing to policy change.

In this regard, Carney cites several examples of sustainable livelihood research projects. The first one is the LADDER project («Livelihoods and diversification of research areas») is carried out by the Overseas Development Group (ODG) of the University of East Anglia in Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi and Kenya. The LADDER distinguishes the living conditions of the poor from the better-off segments of the population, examines the factors that contribute to and impede development in the institutional environment facing the household, and links PRSPs with politicians at the macro level. In the framework of the project, a quantitative survey of nearly 4,000 households in 37 villages in four countries was carried out with qualitative research and analysis of seed policy (Carney, 2001). Secondly, the Institute for the Study of Sustainable Livelihoods Development in the South African Project focuses on how policies and institutions

affect the access of the poor to natural resources (land, water and wildlife). Based on qualitative research approaches, he pays special attention to politicians and institutions that provide livelihoods, as well as how the interests of the poor are reflected (or not reflected) in the political process. In this project, a less detailed analysis of the portfolios of livelihoods.

These two projects differ from each other in case studies and methodologies. The SL approach and structural elements are clearly visible in the questionnaire project in East Africa and the mapping phase in South Africa. Accordingly, the SL approach was used most explicitly during the analysis in LADDER. For example, the results of the study included an analysis of how the «pentagon» of assets between the quartiles of income is changing and how assets, activities, results, policies and institution (PIPS) are closely related (Carney, 2001). The value of this approach has already been proven in Uganda where the LADDER project has been able to contribute new and useful insights to policy-makers.

Conclusion

In conclusion, as we have seen above, the contribution of livelihood to understanding of poverty is considerable. According to Carney SL is a way of thinking and an approach to development, not a clear-cut recipe for how we should proceed in our poverty efforts. The multiple version of SL referenced in this volume are clear testament to this fact. SL not solving every single problem but it can definitely contribute to our understanding of poverty and its reduction (Carney, 2001). Poverty is extremely dynamic, and the poor often have to quickly adapt their life support strategies to changing circumstances. Therefore, poverty analysis often deals with a «moving target» (Carloni, 2002). Moreover, Carloni et al. believe that poverty is quite complex and can depend on such a wide range of variables that it can be almost impossible to fully identify and understand the target group in a short-term study. Precisely because poverty is often associated with marginalization from the mainstream of the social and economic life of the community, it is often difficult for the poor to identify and interact with them. To gain their trust and find a common basis for effective work with them, it takes time and effort (Carloni, 2002). Furthermore, from the report of the Director General of the International Labour Office: in order to satisfy needs of poor and

mostly vulnerable group of people, there is a need to mobilise funds for creating global partnerships, where will be participated all countries and all interested people. As well as, all efforts should be based on the principle of national ownership and responsibility, coordinated strategies for sustainable development, supported by integrated national financing mechanisms (General of the

International Labour Office, 2016). Finally, actions of International organizations are another important element in fighting poverty. Organizations such as United Nations, United Nations Development Program (UNDP), U.S. Agency for International Development, World Bank (Ismuratova, 2015) and others make huge contributions to poverty alleviation in developing countries.

References

- Adato, M., Ruth Meinzen (2007) *D.Agricultural research, livelihoods and poverty. Studies of Economic and Social impacts in six countries.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Alvaredo F., Chancel L., Piketty Th., Saez E., Zucman (2018) *G. Report on Inequality in the world. Key points.* Russian version. – Berlin: World inequality LAB: 21 p
- Bhandari, P.B. (2014) *Rural livelihood change? Household capital, community resources and livelihood transition.* HHS Public access //Author manuscript. – pp. 126-136.
- Carloni A., Townsley Ph. (2002) *Sambrook C.Guidelines Poverty and Livelihoods Analysis for Targeting in IFAD-supported Projects.* – UK.
- Carney, D. (2002) *Sustainable livelihoods approaches: progress and possibilities for change.* Department for International Development (DFID). Canada, Toronto.
- De Haan L., Kamanzi, A. (2009) *Who gets drunk at the bottom of the pyramid when a bottle of whiskey is dropped from the top? Development cooperation as a chain of political arenas.* In: HoeBinK, P. (ed.): *The Netherlands Yearbook on International Cooperation* – pp. 119–140.
- Department for International Development (DFID) (2001) *Literature review. Addressing poverty through city Development Strategy.* Research Project for the Department for International Development. – UK.
- Dorward, A., Anderson S., Nava, Y., Pattison, J., Paz, R., Rushton, J., Sanchez V.E., (2005). *Hanging in, Stepping up and Stepping Out: Livelihood Aspirations and Strategies of the Poor.* Retrieved from <https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/6163/1/HangingInDIP.pdf>
- FAO Corporate Document Repository (2005) *Do Sustainable livelihoods approaches have a positive impact on the rural poor?* Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/008/j5129e/j5129e01.htm>
- Haan, L.J.D. (2012) *The livelihood approach: a critical exploration //Erdkunde Journal.* – Vol.66. – N4. – pp. 345-357
- Ishmuratova V.G. (2015) *Role of International organizations in fighting poverty in modern Russia //Vestnik of Bashkir University.* – T.2. №2. – pp. 507-510
- Ivanov N., Goffe N., Monusova G. (2010) *Globalization and poverty //World economy and International Relations.* - N 9.- pp. 29-42
- Jensen J. (2009) *Understanding the link between water, livelihoods and poverty in the Nyando river Basin.* – Kenya: University of Florida.
- Kollmair, M., Gamper, St. (2002) *The sustainable livelihoods approach.* Switzerland, Zurich: Development Study Group.
- Krantz L. (2001) *The Sustainable Livelihood Approach to Poverty Reduction.* Division for Policy and Socio-Economic Analysis. – Swedish: International cooperation agency. – pp. 27
- Livshits V.N. (2017) *Poverty and income inequality in Russia and abroad.* – Moscow: Institute of Economics, Russian Academy of Sciences. – 52 p.
- Morse S., McNamara N. (2013) *Sustainable Livelihood Approach.* Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht.
- Nekrasova N.L. (2004) *A Handbook — A World Bank Guide.* Edited by Kirsanova. – T.V. Moscow: The whole world- 280 p.
- Panagariya A. (2010) *Overcoming poverty due to economic growth. Economic development reduces poverty by creating job opportunities and financing anti-poverty programs // Finance and Development.* – September – pp. 22-23
- Philip D., Rayhan, I. (2004) *Vulnerability and Poverty: What are the causes and how are they related? Term paper for Interdisciplinary Course.* International Doctoral Studies Program at ZEF. University Bonn.
- Rakodi C., Lloyd-Jones T. (2002) *Urban livelihoods. A people-centred approach to reducing poverty.* – USA, New York – 299 p.
- Report of the Director General of the International Labor Office (2016). *Poverty Eradication Initiative Motte and Agenda 2030 //International Labor Conference. 105th Session. Report I (B).* 21 p.
- Rumina E.V. (2005) *Problems of Sustainable Development //Proceedings of the VI International Russian-Chinese Symposium «State and Market».* Section III. – Ekaterinburg. – p. 207-210.
- Sati, V.P., Vangchhia, L. A (2017) *Sustainable Livelihood Approach to Poverty Reduction: An Empirical analysis of Mizoram, the Eastern extension of the Himalaya.* – India, Mizoram: Mizoram University.
- Scherr S.J., Buck L., Meinzen-Dick R., Jackson L.A. (1995) *Designing Policy Research on Local organizations in Natural Resource Management.* USA-Indonesia: Centre for International Forestry Research-UK: Overseas Development Institute. – 126 p.
- Serrat, O. (2010) *The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach.* Asian Development Bank. Cornell University ILR.

- Sinitsina I. (2006) Poverty and ways to overcome it in the CIS countries. Institute of privatization and management ECOVEST. – N 5-2. – pp. 135-170
- Slay B., Danilova-Kross T., Papa Ya., Pelyakh V., Marni Sh., Khenrikh K. (n.d.) Poverty, inequality and vulnerability in Europe and Central Asia with transition and developing economies.
- Smith, D., Lyer, D. (2015) Guidance note on integrating environment linked poverty concern into planning, budgeting and monitoring processes. UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative – 26 p.
- UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS; UNDP Bureau for Policy and Program Support. United Nations Development Program. (2014, October) – 61 p.
- White S., Ellison M. (2006) Wellbeing, livelihood and resources in social practice. ESRC research group on wellbeing in developing countries. – UK, Bath.
- Zoubets A.N., Novikov a.V., Oborsky A.V. (2017) The problems of poverty reduction and socio-economic inequality in Russia. Sociological analysis //Vestnik of Academy of Finance. Humanitarian Sciences, Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/problemy-sokrascheniya-bednosti-i-sotsialno-ekonomicheskogo-neravenstva-v-rossii-sotsiologicheskii-analiz>