Housing Precarity in Russia: Measurements in Regions and Federal Districtss

Denis B. Litvintsev
Novosibirsk State Technical University, Novosibirsk, Russia

ABSTRACT

Housing precarity has become an increasingly prominent issue over the past two decades, attracting sustained attention from researchers across multiple disciplines. While much of the existing work has focused on labor market precarization and the emergence of the precariat as a new social class, similar patterns are also evident in the housing sector, contributing to growing feelings of instability and uncertainty about the future. As a multidimensional phenomenon, housing precarity affects both renters and homeowners in various ways, depending on social and institutional contexts. This article draws on international experience with index-based assessments of housing precarity, particularly in Europe, the United States, and Australia, to develop a methodology for measuring housing precarity across regions of Russia. The preliminary findings of the correlational analysis reveal a strong relationship between housing precarity, quality of life, and net migration, since regional mobility is mostly driven by people's desire to secure better housing. Cluster analysis identifies four regional categories—low, moderate, advanced, and high levels of housing precarity—revealing substantial differences in living conditions across the country. The results also point to significant spatial disparities in the distribution of housing precarity among Russia's federal districts. The article concludes by outlining the limitations of the proposed method and suggesting directions for future research.

KEYWORDS

sociology of housing, housing precarity, precarious housing, Russian Federation, housing satisfaction, housing mobility, Regional Index of Housing Precarity, RIHP

Introduction

Although housing has long been one of the widely discussed topics in economics, sociology, and other disciplines, it remains far from exhausted. What keeps it relevant is that each study brings a fresh perspective—shaped not only by the researchers' interests but also by the institutional contexts of housing systems in different countries. Issues like affordability, living conditions, and residential mobility reflect different facets of the broader housing question. In recent years, however, a new focus has come to the forefront: precarity. This shift is driven, on the one hand, by the rise of housing sociology as an independent field, and on the other, by growing interest in labor precarity, which plays a key role in driving housing insecurity worldwide. While sociology has made significant progress in conceptualizing the precariat and studying labor precarization empirically, the concept of housing precarity remains largely unfamiliar in Russia. Meanwhile, in regions such as Europe, the United States, and Australia, housing precarity has become a central theme in contemporary research (Litvintsev, 2024c).

In contemporary Russia, housing precarity has gained increasing prominence as a critical issue, reflecting wider socioeconomic disparities across regions and federal districts. Even though housing precarity has a significant impact on individual well-being and social stability, its comprehensive assessments—especially systematic regional comparisons—are still scarce. This study aims to fill that gap by developing an index-based method to evaluate housing affordability, security, and quality. The main goal is to explore regional differences in housing precarity and examine how they are related to people's satisfaction with their living conditions and their plans to improve them. Using an interdisciplinary economic and sociological approach, this research offers a clear methodology for assessing housing vulnerabilities and sheds light on their wider socioeconomic consequences.

This study is based on international research on housing precarity, drawing from the theoretical frameworks of Bourdieu (1998) and Standing (2014). Their analyses of structural insecurity and labor precarity offer a foundation for understanding broader socioeconomic vulnerabilities, including those related to housing. At the same time, the research embraces the contemporary paradigm of housing sociology, which is consistent with the multiparadigmatic nature of sociology, thus viewing housing conditions as a fundamental determinant of social life (McCabe & Rosen, 2023). This perspective underscores how access to stable, secure, and adequate housing shapes individuals' opportunities, social mobility, and overall well-being, placing housing precarity at the center of the analysis of socioeconomic inequalities.

This article provides an interdisciplinary analysis of housing precarity in Russia. While focusing on objective indicators, the analysis takes into account the fact that housing decisions also involve economic, sociological, and psychological factors (Mulyadi & Ubaidillah, 2024). By highlighting the structural influences behind these decisions, the research offers empirical insights into the socioeconomic aspects of housing precarity, particularly housing safety as a key part of social security. Given the broader social impact of precarious housing, the findings contribute to understanding its role in social stability and processes of inclusion and exclusion.

Literature Review

Precarity is a complex phenomenon deeply rooted in legal and institutional frameworks (Litvintsev, 2024a). In contemporary society, it manifests not only in the labor sphere but also in social, cultural, financial, economic, and housing dimensions (Han et al., 2023). Housing precarity, which garners increasing attention in international research, refers to a condition of uncertainty that arises from the risk of experiencing adverse outcomes related to housing providers, dwelling quality, affordability, security, and access to essential services (Clair et al., 2016).

In several developed countries, homeownership rates have declined while unaffordable and unsafe private rental housing has become increasingly common (Waldron, 2023). This pattern is also observed in Russia, where policy focus is gradually shifting from encouraging responsible homeownership toward developing the rental market and its institutional frameworks. In this evolving context, housing precarity heightens anxiety not only about individuals' own living conditions but also about their relationships with cohabitants, neighbors, and the broader community (Owens & Green, 2020). Although housing precarity is often associated with rental housing, particularly in Western countries, it is not exclusive to it; homeowners can also experience precarious conditions. While renters in Europe tend to face more pronounced housing precarity, a significant portion of homeowners also encounter these challenges. Thus, across Europe, regardless of economic development or political regime, precarious housing affects a notable share of the population (Clair et al., 2016).

There is international evidence that housing precariousness is largely influenced by social institutions, state structures, and other factors (Dotsey & Ambrosini, 2023), such as the characteristics of the dwelling itself (physical factors) and rental or housing costs (economic factors) (Pendall et al., 2012). Furthermore, non-standard forms of employment are also associated with housing precariousness, constraining the ability of the precariat, as a newly emerging social class, to address housing issues effectively (Bobek et al., 2021). Additionally, a phenomenon termed "double precariousness" can occur when individuals face the simultaneous risk of losing both employment and housing, such as employer-provided accommodation (Bayurgil, 2022). Those without stable housing or in difficult socioeconomic circumstances are at greater risk of homelessness, which adversely affects their physical health and mental well-being (Bezgrebelna et al., 2021). Importantly, housing precariousness is not solely a consequence of poverty; it also reflects the erosion of safety nets traditionally offered by families and the state (Dietrich-Ragon, 2015). Additionally, factors such as marital status, housing location, and layout can intensify housing precariousness, especially among women who have recently relocated (Şeremet et al., 2024).

Challenges in accessing adequate housing may be closely tied to an individual's migration status, which limits housing options and exacerbates poor living conditions in environments that are unsafe and harmful to health (Barrera, 2023). This can lead to prolonged housing precariousness among migrants and the emergence of diverse survival strategies (Dotsey & Ambrosini, 2023). Contemporary household practices

and evolving notions of home contribute to a "culture of housing precariousness," often reflected in co-living arrangements (Bergan et al., 2021).

Housing precariousness is largely shaped and sustained by institutional frameworks, where the state plays a central role (Dotsey & Chiodelli, 2021). Poor policy choices can worsen housing conditions for vulnerable groups and alter societal perceptions of what constitutes a "good home" (Davey, 2020; Finnerty & O'Connell, 2017). For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, mandates to stay at home frequently clashed with realities of inaccessibility, exclusion, and instability in the housing sector (Sakali & Karyotis, 2022). In this context, scholars argue that policies addressing housing precariousness should be grounded in human rights rather than market logic or economic growth objectives (D'Adda, 2021).

Critics also note that current understandings of precarity primarily focused on unstable employment fail to adequately reflect housing-related vulnerabilities. There is a call to shift attention from employment insecurity to precarious living conditions (Banki, 2013). From this perspective, precarity can be examined not only at the level of individual housing units but also in relation to entire neighborhoods or territories (Bates et al., 2019), highlighting the value of a socio-spatial approach (Jaatsi & Kymäläinen, 2023).

Early studies on housing precarity often focused on the assessment of individual indicators, such as arrears in rent payments or the length of homeownership (Clair et al., 2016). However, contemporary scholars increasingly favor index-based methods for more comprehensive measurements (Litvintsev, 2024b). The index-based method can be considered a mixed approach, as it incorporates both absolute and relative dimensions of precarity. Absolute housing precarity is reflected in indicators that capture severe housing inadequacies, such as the lack of access to basic utilities, the presence of hazardous living conditions, or homelessness. Relative housing precarity is measured by indicators such as affordability, overcrowding, and tenure insecurity, assessed against societal norms and economic conditions. Index-based approaches that combine these elements offer a comprehensive view of housing precarity, capturing both structural shortcomings and socioeconomic inequalities.

This approach, however, does not preclude the analysis of sub-indices that cannot be reduced to a single composite measure. In 2021, a study was conducted across major cities in Europe and the United States, employing five distinct scales to measure housing precarity: housing affordability, security of tenure, housing satisfaction, neighborhood quality, and community cohesion (Debrunner et al., 2024). Clair et al. (2019) identify four categories of indicators to measure housing precariousness (Housing Precariousness Measure, HPM) in European countries: housing affordability (financial burden), housing security (risk of displacement), housing quality (access to utilities, overcrowding, etc.), and infrastructure availability (access to shops, public transport, and other amenities). Later, Waldron (2023) proposed a Housing Precarity Index (HPI) based on this model, which, instead of infrastructure indicators, incorporates measures of household financial capacity in Ireland.

Thus, housing precariousness encompasses a broad spectrum of insecurities within a single measure, capturing various dimensions of housing instability. Unlike housing deprivation, which primarily focuses on housing quality and specific

deficiencies such as dampness, inadequate lighting, or overcrowding, precariousness is typically assessed along a continuum rather than through binary classifications (e.g., adequate/inadequate conditions). This approach provides a more nuanced representation of individuals' housing experiences within the complexities of contemporary housing markets (Clair et al., 2019).

In 2021, a team of researchers from the Urban Displacement Project introduced the Housing Precarity Risk Model (HPRM) in the United States. This model takes into account the risk of eviction for individual households, the vulnerability of entire communities to displacement, unemployment rates and their changes compared to the previous year, as well as racial group segregation (Chapple et al., 2021). In the same year, the Healthy Housing Centre of Research Excellence developed the Neighborhood Employment and Housing Precarity (NEHP) Index in Australia. This index, designed to assess housing precarity and employment conditions during the pandemic, measures factors such as the ability to work from home, proximity to others in the workplace, access to emergency funds, and the precariousness of housing conditions (Mansour et al., 2021).

The Australian Urban Observatory developed and tested specialized housing indicators between 2022 and 2023, one of which is the Precarity Index for Neighborhood and City Housing (PINCH). This index primarily incorporates economic indicators that influence household mobility and social exclusion, including household income, rental and housing maintenance costs, and housing affordability (Davern, 2023). In 2022, researchers from the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute introduced the Index of Precarious Housing (IPH), which encompasses both indicators of housing precariousness—forced displacement, housing unaffordability, and overcrowding—as well as indicators of territorial precariousness, including neighborhood crime and social hostility (Ong ViforJ et al., 2022). Residents' perceived safety in their neighborhood may matter more than actual security reflected in objective data, even though this aspect is difficult to measure using available statistics.

An analysis of international index-based approaches to housing precarity reveals three key indicator domains: affordability, security, and quality (Table 1). Variations in indicator use stem from reliance on national statistics with country-specific metrics and from differing research focuses, e.g., studies conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic (Litvintsev, 2024b).

Table 1

Indicators of Housing Precarity in Various Indices

Index	Housing affordability	Housing security	Quality of housing	Other indicators
HPM	Financial burden	Immediate risk of housing mobility, with at least one housing change in the past five years	Leaks/dampness/ rot, lack of space/ overcrowding, availability of a private bathtub/shower and toilet, comfortable temperature (warm/ cold)	Access to essential services

Table 1 Continued

Index	Housing affordability	Housing security	Quality of housing	Other indicators
HPI	Housing expenses and the presence of debt, difficulty making ends meet, inability to afford unforeseen expenses	Crime, violence, or vandalism in the residential area	Leaks or dampness; insufficient lighting; pollution or environmental issues in the neighborhood; availability of central heating	—
HPRM	Vulnerability of low-income households to displacement, unemployment rate and its change compared to the previous year	Risk of eviction	—	—
PINCH	Housing affordability and housing maintenance costs, household income	—	Type of housing	—
NEHP	Access to emergency funds	—		Remote work feasibility and workplace density
IPH	The 30/40 rule is applied to measure housing unaffordability	Threat of eviction, residency in publicly owned housing, local crime prevalence, and neighborhood-level social tensions	Overcrowding	—

The variety of housing precarity indices reflects not only differences in national data availability but also in how the concept is theoretically understood. In academic discourse, housing precarity is explored through lenses such as social inequality, economic vulnerability, and spatial segregation—each shaping distinct methodologies. For example, the HPRM index highlights eviction risk and community vulnerability, while the NEHP links precarious employment with unstable housing. The PINCH index focuses on affordability, and the IPH emphasizes territorial insecurity. These methodological differences aim not to fragment the concept but to capture its complexity and adapt to local contexts. Overall, we can distinguish three main research traditions: (a) an economic approach centered on affordability; (b) a socio-

spatial perspective focused on exclusion and mobility; and (c) a comprehensive model combining housing and territorial risks.

Waldron (2023) rightly notes that the index he developed for Ireland likely does not capture all potential indicators of housing precarity. This assertion holds true for any composite indices developed in different national contexts. The omission or limitation of key socioeconomic indicators, the challenges inherent in measuring specific dimensions, and the insufficient coverage of diverse population groups may lead to an underestimation of the true extent of housing precarity (Münch & Siede, 2022). Thus, although existing indices provide valuable insights, their variations arise from differences in theoretical perspectives as well as limitations in available data, which means that measuring housing precarity requires a critical approach that carefully considers the specific context. For a detailed overview of international approaches and indices, see Litvintsev (2024a).

Materials and Methods

Today in Russia, most housing is privately owned—ranging from individual houses to apartments—reflecting the impact of large-scale privatization. This distinct feature of the Russian housing sector suggests that the main concerns about housing precarity differ from those in Western countries. While international methods often focus on risks like eviction or displacement, which are common in rental-heavy housing markets, Russia's primary issues revolve around housing affordability, quality, and security. These factors intensify overall housing challenges. Due to these unique features, a tailored approach is needed to measure housing precarity in Russia. Thus, the Regional Index of Housing Precarity (RIHP) is proposed, which captures both absolute and relative aspects of housing precarity. For 2022, standardized indicators of affordability, security, and quality were selected for Russia's constituent entities (Table 2).

It should be noted, however, that existing methods, including the RIHP, are designed for normal, peacetime conditions. They do not account for extraordinary situations like martial law or counterterrorism operations, which can cause forced evictions, housing destruction, and other severe impacts. To address such scenarios, complex mathematical or computer simulations would be required, which is a limitation that also applies to the RIHP.

Existing indices cannot be directly applied to Russia due to differences in data availability and measurement frameworks. Therefore, the study builds on Clair et al. (2019) by adapting both specific indicators and measurement methods to better reflect the Russian context. Many key indicators used abroad such as eviction risk or neighborhood segregation are often missing or inconsistently recorded in Russian statistics, making direct adaptation impractical. Furthermore, most international indices tend to focus on isolated aspects of housing precarity rather than offering a comprehensive assessment. In response, the proposed index captures housing precarity as a multidimensional phenomenon, encompassing affordability, security, and quality, while ensuring empirical applicability within Russia.

Thus, although the selection of housing precarity indicators for this study is primarily guided by international measurement practices (Table 1), it has been adapted to fit the specific data available from Russian governmental sources. These indicators have been modified to account for the particularities of the Russian housing sector. Data for this study were drawn from the Federal State Statistics Service (Rosstat, n.d.), Central Bank of the Russian Federation (Pokazateli rynka zhilishchnogo, 2025), Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation (Prestupnost' v regionakh, n.d.), and Ministry of the Russian Federation for Civil Defence, Emergencies and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters (Itogi deiatel'nosti MChS Rossii, n.d.).

Table 2

Indicators of Housing Precarity in RIHP

Domain	Indicator
Housing affordability	Share of household expenditure on housing services, water, electricity, gas and other fuels (Rosstat, n.d.)
	Household debt for housing, major repairs, and utilities, measured as the difference between accruals and actual payments per 10,000 people (Rosstat, n.d.)
	Debt on housing loans granted to resident individuals per 10,000 people (Pokazateli rynka zhilishchnogo, 2025)
	Number of citizens receiving social housing and utility payment support per 10,000 people (Rosstat, n.d.)
	Number of families receiving cash subsidies for housing and utilities in the reporting period per 10,000 people (Rosstat, n.d.)
	Unemployment rate of population aged 15 years and over (Rosstat, n.d.)
Housing security	Number of registered crimes, per 10,000 permanent population on average per year (Prestupnost' v regionakh, n.d.)
	Number of flooded residential buildings per 1,000 square meters of living space (Itogi deiatel'nosti MChS Rossii, n.d.)
	Number of fires in the residential sector (per 1,000 square meters of living space) (Itogi deiatel'nosti MChS Rossii, n.d.)
Quality of housing	Proportion of residential premises equipped with water, sewerage, heating, hot water, gas, or electric stoves (Rosstat, n.d.)
	Total area of residential premises per inhabitant on average (Rosstat, n.d.)
	Percentage of residential premises with over 65% wear and tear per 1,000 square meters of total area of residential premises) (Rosstat, n.d.)
	Share of families provided with housing out of those registered as eligible (Rosstat, n.d.)

Housing affordability is operationalized through six key indicators. First, the share of household expenditures on housing services, water, electricity, gas, and other fuels is a critical indicator of housing precarity, reflecting the financial burden on households.

A high proportion of these costs can increase the risk of arrears and housing loss for renters, while for homeowners, it may constrain their ability to repay mortgages and maintain housing conditions. This financial strain can ultimately contribute to housing deterioration and broader social instability.

Second, household debt for housing, major repairs, and utilities serves as an indicator of housing precarity by reflecting financial strain and the ability to meet recurring obligations. While subject to seasonal fluctuations, a high level of arrears signals financial difficulties for both homeowners and renters, increasing institutional pressures through legal enforcement and potential service restrictions. This highlights the precarious housing situation of households unable to make timely utility payments.

Third, household mortgage debt is a key indicator of housing precarity, reflecting financial obligations primarily tied to home loans. This metric captures regional disparities in debt burdens and highlights financial instability that may threaten both homeowners and renters. When considered alongside utility arrears, it provides a more comprehensive assessment of household financial resilience and housing-related risks.

Fourth, the number of citizens receiving social housing and utility payment support reflects state efforts to reduce housing precarity by aiding vulnerable populations. While high support levels show active government intervention, they may also reveal underlying structural problems in the regional housing system.

Fifth, the number of families receiving monetary subsidies for housing and utility payments indicates state support for those facing financial difficulties. While a high number reflects efforts to ease housing costs, it may also highlight broader social issues needing policy attention.

Finally, the unemployment rate is a key indicator of housing precarity, reflecting the economic stability of households. High unemployment reduces renters' ability to pay rent and increases the risk of housing loss, while for homeowners, it can lead to difficulties in meeting mortgage and housing expenses. In regions with high unemployment, housing quality may deteriorate due to limited financial resources for maintenance, exacerbating social instability.

Housing security can be understood through three primary indicators. First, the number of registered crimes is an important indicator of housing precarity, as it directly impacts the level of instability within a region. An increase in crime rates creates an atmosphere of uncertainty, prompting residents to relocate within or outside the region, particularly in border areas. High crime rates can also reduce property values and deter investment in the housing sector, exacerbating issues of housing accessibility and stability. Additionally, the constant stress and anxiety associated with high crime rates can negatively affect residents' mental well-being and their sense of security in their homes.

Second, the number of flooded residential buildings is a significant indicator of housing precarity, reflecting the ongoing issue of floods in certain regions. Frequent flooding causes substantial damage to residential structures, reducing housing quality and, in some cases, rendering homes uninhabitable, which, in turn, creates a risk of forced relocation and worsens living conditions. Additionally, the need for repairs and rebuilding increases financial burdens on households, further exacerbating economic instability.

Third, the number of fires in residential areas is a key indicator of housing precarity, as fires threaten residents' safety and cause property damage. High fire risk worsens housing insecurity and living conditions, increasing financial hardship for affected households.

The quality of housing encompasses four key indicators. First, the share of residential space equipped with plumbing, sewage, heating, hot water supply, gas, or electric stoves is a significant indicator of housing precarity. Access to modern engineering systems and essential utilities reduces housing insecurity and improves living conditions, especially in urban areas. These amenities enhance safety, comfort, and residents' overall well-being.

Second, the average residential space per person is a considerable indicator of housing precarity and overcrowding. A higher value indicates fewer households in need of better living conditions, lowering housing instability risk. This measure reflects both physical housing quality and social factors like comfort and well-being. Even small changes can highlight regional issues in housing accessibility, quality, and economic conditions.

Third, the percentage of residential buildings with more than 65% wear and tear is an essential indicator of housing precarity. Aging housing stock raises the share of unsafe homes, threatening residents' health and safety. While deteriorated buildings may be renovated, such processes often require resident relocation, increasing housing insecurity in the region.

The fourth key indicator of housing precarity is the share of families provided with housing out of those registered as eligible. This metric shows how housing improvements reduce insecurity and benefit individual households. It reflects the effectiveness of housing programs and access for vulnerable groups, supporting regional social stability and well-being.

Certain indicators were grouped according to their thematic relevance: incidents in the residential sector (e.g., floods and fires), debt (housing and communal services, mortgage loans), and state support including social assistance and subsidies for housing and utility payments. To address the issue of multicollinearity, a correlation matrix was constructed, revealing no strong relationships between variables (correlation coefficients did not exceed 0.7). To standardize scales, all absolute indicator values were recalculated per 10,000 residents of the region or per 10,000 square meters of living space, as presented in Table 2. For a detailed discussion of these indicators and the methodology, see (Litvintsev, 2025).

The index was constructed using min–max normalization to derive an arithmetic mean on a scale from 0 = *No housing precarity* to 1 = *Maximum housing precarity*. For indicators that contribute to housing precarity, a standard normalization formula was applied, while for those mitigating precarity, an inverse formula was used. To classify Russian regions, cluster analysis was conducted using the *k*-means method. Pearson correlation analysis was employed to examine relationships between housing precarity and other variables, with statistical significance assessed using Student's *t*-test. Regression analysis was applied to evaluate the impact of one variable (RIHP) on another (migration, quality of life).

For the purposes of correlation analysis, the study employs data from a monitoring survey on housing conditions in Russia, conducted by the Russian Public Opinion Research Center (VCIOM) in 2022 (Svoia krysha nad golovoi, 2023). The survey used a stratified random sampling method, drawing from a comprehensive database of mobile phone numbers registered in the Russian Federation. A total of 1,600 respondents aged 18 and older participated in telephone interviews. The dataset was weighted according to key socio-demographic parameters to ensure representativeness. The sampling error does not exceed 2.5% at a 95% confidence level.

Additionally, the analysis utilized data from the Comprehensive Monitoring of Living Conditions in Russia, conducted by the Federal State Statistics Service in 2022 (Rosstat, 2022). This large-scale survey employed a stratified random sampling method to assess living conditions across all Russian regions, encompassing a representative sample of 60,000 households. The household selection process adhered to principles of randomization in each region to ensure statistical validity. Data collection was carried out through face-to-face interviews with respondents at their place of residence.

Furthermore, the analysis incorporated data on regional quality of life assessments in Russia, as reported by RIA Rating (part of the Rossiya Segodnya International Media Group) in 2022 (Reiting regionov, 2023). This 1-to-100 ranking is based on a comprehensive evaluation of 67 indicators across 11 categories, reflecting living conditions and the socio-economic environment in Russia's regions.

Results

Until October 2022, Russia consisted of 85 constituent entities. As a result of the cluster analysis, four groups of regions with low, moderate, medium, and high housing precarity were identified (Table 3). The best values of the RIHP are demonstrated by Kursk (0.303) and Belgorod (0.319) Oblasts, as well as the federal cities of St. Petersburg (0.349) and Moscow (0.36). The regions with the worst values are the Republic of Tuva (0.711), the Republic of Altai (0.69) and Trans-Baikal Territory (0.678). The difference between the best and worst RIHP score is 0.408. Most Russian regions exhibit moderate levels of housing precarity (Litvintsev, 2025). This study did not calculate regional sub-indices for affordability, security, and quality, which could be a focus for future research.

Table 3

Results of Custering of Russian Regions by RIHP

Cluster	Cluster center	Number of cases	Regions
Low Precarity	0.378	20	Kursk Oblast, Belgorod Oblast, Saint Petersburg, Moscow, Penza Oblast, Republic of Tatarstan, Lipetsk Oblast, Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug, Republic of North Ossetia–Alania, Kostroma Oblast, Ryazan Oblast, Republic of Bashkortostan, Bryansk Oblast, Stavropol Krai, Moscow Oblast, Ulyanovsk Oblast, Kaluga Oblast, Kaliningrad Oblast, Voronezh Oblast, Tambov Oblast

Cluster	Cluster center	Number of cases	Regions
Moderate Precarity	0.437	33	Republic of Mari El, Republic of Adygea, Vladimir Oblast, Chuvash Republic, Oryol Oblast, Samara Oblast, Orenburg Oblast, Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug—Yugra, Rostov Oblast, Saratov Oblast, Tver Oblast, Volgograd Oblast, Nizhny Novgorod Oblast, Astrakhan Oblast, Chelyabinsk Oblast, Sverdlovsk Oblast, Krasnodar Krai, Kabardino-Balkarian Republic, Republic of Mordovia, Tula Oblast, Republic of Kalmykia, Sevastopol, Yaroslavl Oblast, Vologda Oblast, Republic of Khakassia, Ivanovo Oblast, Murmansk Oblast, Sakhalin Oblast, Karachay-Cherkess Republic, Kemerovo Oblast, Kamchatka Krai, Chechen Republic, Kirov Oblast
Average Precarity	0.514	26	Udmurt Republic, Tyumen Oblast, Arkhangelsk Oblast, Omsk Oblast, Republic of Dagestan, Leningrad Oblast, Smolensk Oblast, Khabarovsk Krai, Irkutsk Oblast, Novosibirsk Oblast, Pskov Oblast, Republic of Ingushetia, Krasnoyarsk Krai, Perm Krai, Tomsk Oblast, Chukotka Autonomous Okrug, Republic of Crimea, Altai Krai, Novgorod Oblast, Nenets Autonomous Okrug, Primorsky Krai, Amur Oblast, Komi Republic, Republic of Karelia, Kurgan Oblast, Magadan Oblast
High Precarity	0.654	6	Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), Jewish Autonomous Oblast, Republic of Buryatia, Zabaykalsky Krai, Altai Republic, Tuva Republic

Correlational analysis revealed a significant positive relationship ($r = .55$; $p < .001$) between housing precarity and households' intentions to improve their housing conditions, based on the Comprehensive Monitoring of Living Conditions at the regional level. In other words, the higher the level of housing precarity, the stronger people's intention to improve their living conditions.

At the federal district level, a significant correlation was also found between housing precarity and migration growth (Rosstat, n.d.), as well as the desire to improve housing conditions (Svoia krysha nad golovoi, 2023).

Higher levels of housing precarity are associated with stronger migration outflows, as shown by the negative correlation between the RIHP and net migration ($r = -.72$; $p < .05$), and the positive correlation with intentions to improve housing conditions ($r = .75$; $p < .05$). This relationship is even stronger when migration growth per 10,000 residents is considered ($r = -.90$; $p < .01$). Although a high degree of housing precarity also correlates with lower satisfaction with housing ($r = -.49$), this finding is not statistically significant ($p = .15$).

The Central Federal District shows the most favorable RIHP score (0.24), along with a net migration gain of 140,131 people in 2022 (Table 4). At the opposite end, the

Far Eastern Federal District had the highest housing precarity (RIHP = 0.67) and a net loss of 37,513 people. Other districts fall in between: Volga (RIHP = 0.33), Northwestern (0.36), Ural and Southern (0.4), Siberian (0.56), and North Caucasian (0.5). Notably, the Volga Federal District shows a net migration loss of 31,620 despite its relatively low RIHP, suggesting the need for further analysis. Polynomial regression results confirm a strong relationship between housing precarity and spatial mobility (R^2 = .73).

Table 4

RIHP Values and Migration in the Federal Districts of Russia

Federal districts	RIHP value	Net migration increase/ decrease
Central Federal District	0.24	140,131
Volga Federal District	0.33	−31,620
Northwestern Federal District	0.36	30,066
Ural Federal District	0.40	1,563
Southern Federal District	0.40	11,367
Siberian Federal District	0.56	−33,352
North Caucasian Federal District	0.50	−18,725
Far Eastern Federal District	0.67	−37,513

Ong ViforJ et al. (2022) explored the relationship between housing precarity and population well-being in Australia, noting a decline in the latter due to forced relocations, housing inaccessibility, and related factors. To assess the link between housing precarity and quality of life in Russia, a correlational analysis was conducted, revealing a significant negative correlation between the RIHP and the Quality of Life Index for 2022, according to RIA Rating (r = −.68; p < .01). The analysis of the linear regression model suggests that in nearly half of the cases, variations in regional quality of life in Russia may be associated with housing precarization (R^2 = .47). The research findings and their limitations are discussed in more detail in (Litvintsev, 2025).

Discussion

Housing precarity is closely tied to unstable employment and shaped by both housing conditions (e.g., building age, access to utilities) and broader institutional and sectoral issues. Market-driven transformations, economic crises, and state policies that enable eviction and displacement have all fueled its rise. Both rental and owner-occupied housing can be precarious, though ownership tends to offer more stability. In Europe, housing precarity affects countries regardless of their development level and disproportionately impacts vulnerable groups, such as migrants. Its uneven spatial distribution, seen in countries like the U.S. and Australia, underscores the importance of addressing this problem on the regional level, with more attention being paid to housing mobility.

The RIHP, as an integral assessment of the housing situation, differs from other approaches by offering a comprehensive measurement not only of housing characteristics (e.g., housing quality) but also of related indicators (housing affordability and security), which collectively influence spatial mobility, housing satisfaction, and intentions to improve housing conditions. The results of RIHP measurements across Russian regions revealed a significant difference, with Kursk Oblast showing the best indicator and the Republic of Tuva demonstrating the worst. Most regions of Russia exhibit moderate to average levels of housing precarity, and the intention to improve housing conditions is more prevalent in areas with higher levels of housing precarity.

The results of cluster analysis reveal significant disparities in the accessibility, security, and quality of housing, as measured by the RIHP, with a clear segmentation into groups with low, moderate, medium, and high levels of precarity. Leading regions exhibit superior RIHP outcomes, while residents of lagging regions face more acute housing challenges. The prevalence of moderate and medium housing precarity in most regions underscores the need for the development of targeted institutional measures for state support. The substantial differences in indicators call for further analysis of specific aspects of housing precarity to inform recommendations for improving housing conditions nationwide.

Housing precarity is a key factor affecting regional quality of life and it has direct and indirect effects on migration patterns. While economic conditions such as employment and wages are major drivers of mobility, the availability of adequate, secure housing is also crucial. For instance, the Far Eastern Federal District, which showed high housing precarity, experienced a net migration loss in 2022, whereas the Central Federal District—with the lowest precarity—saw a significant influx.

Although the RIHP offers useful insights, its reliance on aggregated regional data may obscure local variation, which reflects ongoing debates around applying a relatively new conceptual framework and adapting international measurement approaches to the Russian context. Still, the index can be refined by incorporating alternative data sources, comparing results, or combining methods to improve precision. Despite limitations, such as the lack of data on infrastructure access and the inability to distinguish between urban and rural areas, the RIHP draws on global best practices and reflects the distinct features of Russia's housing sector. As such, it provides a valuable foundation for further research and evidence-based housing policy development.

Conclusion

This study highlights the multidimensional nature of housing precarity, shaped by both structural and institutional factors. The RIHP provides a comprehensive measurement approach that reflects regional disparities in housing accessibility, security, and quality. The findings underscore the need for targeted policy interventions, particularly in regions with high housing precarity, where precarious living conditions intersect with migration trends and economic challenges. Given the pronounced regional

disparities, future housing policies should adopt differentiated approaches to account for specific territorial contexts.

While the RIHP has some methodological constraints, it remains a valuable tool for assessing housing precarity and informing policy decisions in Russia. By integrating an interdisciplinary economic-sociological framework, this research contributes to a broader understanding of housing-related vulnerabilities as a dimension of socioeconomic inequality. Future studies should refine this approach by incorporating additional indicators, such as infrastructure accessibility and urban–rural differences, to enhance the accuracy of housing precarity assessments. Further comparative analyses with international indices may also strengthen methodological approaches and deepen insights into the mechanisms through which housing precarity shapes social inclusion and exclusion in different socioeconomic contexts.

By addressing the lack of systematic regional comparisons in Russia, this study advances the discourse on housing precarity and provides an empirical foundation for evidence-based housing policy. The results highlight the structural determinants of precarious housing conditions and their broader implications for social stability, reinforcing the need for continued interdisciplinary research in this field.

References

Banki, S. (2013). Precarity of place: A complement to the growing precariat literature. *Global Discourse*, *3*(3–4), 450–463. https://doi.org/10.1080/23269995.2014.881139

Bates, L., Wiles, J., Kearns, R., & Coleman, T. (2019). Precariously placed: Home, housing and wellbeing for older renters. *Health & Place*, *58*, Article 102152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2019.102152

Barrera, S. L. (2023). The architectural typologies of Latinx housing precarity. In *111th ACSA Annual Meeting Proceedings: In Commons* (pp. 473–479). ACSA. https://doi.org/10.35483/ACSA.AM.111.62

Bayurgil, L. (2022). Fired and evicted: Istanbul doorkeepers' strategies of navigating employment and housing precarity. *Social Problems*, *69*(4), 1092–1108. https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spab013

Bergan, T. L., Gorman-Murray, A., & Power, E. R. (2021). Coliving housing: Home cultures of precarity for the new creative class. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *22*(9), 1204–1222. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2020.1734230

Bezgrebelna, M., McKenzie, K., Wells, S., Ravindran, A., Kral, M., Christensen, J., Stergiopoulos, S. Gaetz, S., & Kidd, S. A. (2021). Climate change, weather, housing precarity, and homelessness: A systematic review of reviews. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(11), Article 5812. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18115812

Bobek, A., Pembroke, S., & Wickham, J. (2021). Living in precarious housing: Non-standard employment and housing careers of young professionals in Ireland. *Housing Studies*, *36*(9), 1364–1387. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2020.1769037

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Acts of resistance: Against the new myths of our time*. Polity Press.

Chapple, K., Thomas, T., & Zuk, M. (2021). *Housing precarity risk model*. Urban Displacement Project. https://www.urbandisplacement.org/maps/housing-precarity-risk-model/

Clair, A., Reeves, A., McKee, M., & Stuckler, D. (2016). Housing precariousness: Its measurement and impact on health before and after the Great Recession. *European Journal of Public Health*, *26*(Suppl. 1), Article ckw171.014. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckw171.014

Clair, A., Reeves, A., McKee, M., & Stuckler, D. (2019). Constructing a housing precariousness measure for Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *29*(1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928718768334

D'Adda, G. (2021). Urban mobilizations and municipal policies to un-make housing precarity: The Barcelona experiments. *City*, *25*(5–6), 740–763. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2021.1981696

Davern, M. (2023). *AUO Specialist Housing Indicators project* (Report). RMIT University. https://doi.org/10.25439/rmt.23300537.v1

Davey, R. (2020). Snakes and ladders: Legal coercion, housing precarity, and home-making aspirations in southern England. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, *26*(1), 12–29. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.13175

Debrunner, G., Hofer, K., Wicki, M., Kauer, F., & Kaufmann, D. (2024). Housing precarity in six European and North American cities: Threatened by the loss of a safe, stable, and affordable home. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *90*(4), 610–626. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2023.2291148

Dietrich-Ragon, P. (2015). Relational networks of persons in a situation of housing insecurity in France: Homelessness and strength or weakness of social ties. *Revue Française De Sociologie*, *56*(2), 301–330. https://doi.org/10.3917/rfs.562.0301

Dotsey, S., & Ambrosini, M. (2023). Migration, (il)legal status and housing precarity: Difficulties and coping strategies. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, *47*(4), 1328–1347. https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2023.2224021

Dotsey, S., & Chiodelli, F. (2021). Housing precarity: A fourfold epistemological lancet for dissecting the housing conditions of migrants. *City*, *25*(5–6), 720–739. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2021.1979802

Finnerty, J., & O'Connell, C. (2017). Changing precarities in the Irish housing system: Supplier-generated changes in security of tenure for domiciled households. *Global Discourse*, *7*(4), 473–488. https://doi.org/10.1080/23269995.2017.1399708

Han, S. H., Kim, J., & Park, N. (2023). Generation rent on the housing treadmill: A study on South Korea's housing allowance programmes and recurring precarity. *Social Policy & Administration*, *57*(3), 382–398. https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12869

Itogi deiatel'nosti MChS Rossii [Results of the activities of the EMERCOM of Russia]. (n.d.). EMERCOM of Russia. The Ministry of the Russian Federation for Civil Defence, Emergencies and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters. https://mchs.gov.ru/deyatelnost/itogi-deyatelnosti-mchs-rossii

Jaatsi, M., & Kymäläinen, P (2023). Navigating precarity in everyday (sub) urban space in Helsinki, Finland. *City & Society*, *35*(2), 77–88. https://doi.org/10.1111/ciso.12461

Litvintsev, D. B. (2024a) Vozmozhnosti indeksnogo metoda v izmerenii zhilishchnoi prekarnosti: Sravnitel'nyi analiz zarubezhnykh podkhodov [Possibilities of the index method in measuring housing precarity: A comparative analysis of foreign approaches]. *Tomsk State University Journal*, *509*, 102–112.

Litvintsev, D. B. (2024b). Zhilishchnaia prekarnost': Faktory, diskursy i zarubezhnyi opyt izmereniia [Housing precarity: Factors, discourses and foreign measurement experiences]. *The Journal of Social Policy Studies*, *22*(3), 553–566. https://doi.org/10.17323/727-0634-2024-22-3-553-566

Litvintsev, D. B. (2024c). Zhilishchnaia prekarnost' v razvitykh stranakh: Obzor issledovanii i otsenka ikh znachimosti dlia Rossii [Housing precarity in developed countries: A review of research and an assessment of their significance for Russia]. *Social Novelties and Social Sciences*, *3*, 55–65. https://doi.org/10.31249/snsn/2024.03.04

Litvintsev, D. B. (2025). Zhilishchnaia prekarnost' v regionakh Rossii i ee sviaz' s udovletvorennost'iu zhil'em i namereniiami uluchshit' zhilishchnye usloviia [Housing precarity in Russia's regions and its connection with housing satisfaction and intentions to improve housing conditions]. *Terra Economicus*, *23*(1), 37–50. https://doi.org/10.18522/2073-6606-2025-23-1-37-50

Mansour, A., Martino, E., & Bentley, R. (2021). *Neighbourhood Employment and Housing Precarity (NEHP) Index* [Interactive map]. Healthy Housing Centre of Research Excellence. https://www.healthyhousing-cre.org/nehp-index

McCabe, B. J., & Rosen, E. (Eds.). (2023). *The sociology of housing: How homes shape our social lives*. The University of Chicago Press.

Mulyadi, M., & Ubaidillah, N. Z. (2024). Unearthing the role of cultural perception in homeownership behavior: A conceptual exploration. *Changing Societies & Personalities*, *8*(1), 202–221. https://doi.org/10.15826/csp.2024.8.1.271

Münch, S., & Siede, A. (Eds.). (2022). *Precarious housing in Europe: A critical guide*. Edition Donau-Universität Krems. https://doi.org/10.48341/n0qk-fd13

Ong ViforJ, R., Singh, R., Baker, E., Bentley, R., & Hewton, J. (2022). *Precarious housing and wellbeing: A multi-dimensional investigation* (AHURI Final Report No. 373). Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute Limited. https://doi.org/10.18408/ahuri8123801

Owens, K., & Green, C. (2020). Performing millennial housing precarity: How (not) to live together. *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, *40*(1), 44–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/14682761.2019.1689738

Pendall, R., Theodos, B., & Franks, K. (2012). Vulnerable people, precarious housing, and regional resilience: An exploratory analysis. *Housing Policy Debate*, *22*(2), 271–296. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2011.648208

Pokazateli rynka zhilishchnogo (ipotechnogo zhilishchnogo) kreditovaniia [Housing (mortgage) loan market]. (2025, May 30). Bank of Russia. https://www.cbr.ru/statistics/bank_sector/mortgage/

Prestupnost' v regionakh [Crime rates in the regions]. (n.d.). Legal Statistics Portal of the Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation. http://crimestat.ru/regions_table_total

Reiting regionov po kachestvu zhizni—2022 [Ranking of regions by quality of life—2022]. (2023, February 13). RIA Rating. https://riarating.ru/infografika/20230213/630236602.html

Rosstat [Federal State Statistics Service]. (n.d.). *Ofitsial'ania statistika* [Official statistics]. https://rosstat.gov.ru/folder/10705

Rosstat [Federal State Statistics Service]. (2022). *Kompleksnoe nabliudenie uslovii zhizni naseleniia* [Comprehensive monitoring of living conditions of the population]. https://rosstat.gov.ru/free_doc/new_site/GKS_KOUZH_2022/index.html

Sakali, C., & Karyotis, T. (2022). Can't #StayAtHome without a home: Politics of housing precarity in Greece in the time of pandemic. In C. Petropoulou, J. Holloway, F. Matamoros Ponce, E. González Cruz, P. Doulos, M. A. Melgarejo Pérez, D. Tzanetatos, K. Zafeiris, & C. Tsavdaroglou (Eds.), *Luchas invisibles en tiempos de pandemia. Vol 2. Territorialidades en movimiento: Resistencias y creatividades en geografías urbanas-regionales durante la pandemia* [Invisible struggles in times of pandemic. Vol. 2. Territorialities in motion: Resistance and creativity in urban-regional geographies during the pandemic] (pp. 339–366). University of the Aegean; Universidad Autónoma De Puebla. https://doi.org/10.26215/heal.j2hq-jv15

Şeremet, M., Phua, V. C., Cihangir, E., Bayram-Öz, E., Okudum, R., & Alaeddinoğlu, F. (2024). Precarity and patriarchal bargain: Women's experiences in post-disaster recovery housing after the 2011 Van earthquake. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *31*(7), 954–978. https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2023.2229063

Standing, G. (2014). The Precariat: The new dangerous class (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Svoia krysha nad golovoi, ili zhil'e dlia rossiian [Your own roof over your head, or housing for Russians]. (2023, October 3). VCIOM (Russian Public Opinion Research Center). https://wciom.ru/analytical-reviews/analiticheskii-obzor/svoja-krysha-nad-golovoi-ili-zhile-dlja-rossijan

Waldron, R. (2023). Generation Rent and housing precarity in *'post crisis'* Ireland. *Housing Studies*, *38*(2), 181–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2021.1879998