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**The object** **of this study** is various socio-economic and demographic groups of the population and households in modern Russia; **the subject** is their adaptation to the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic in the context of new social policy measures.

**Aim of the research:** to analyze the models of adaptation of various socio-economic and demographic groups of the population to the consequences of the pandemic in the context of new social policy measures.

**Methodology:** desk research, theoretical-methodological methods, methods of typologies and comparative cross-country analysis, methods of descriptive statistics, multivariate statistical and econometric methods (factor, cluster analysis, regression modeling), methodology of construction of composite indicators, microsimulation modeling (based on SOUTHMOD and EUROMOD models), methods of analysis of qualitative sociological data. Statistical and econometric analysis was conducted in statistical packages SPSS, Stata, R.

**The empirical base of research:** statistical indicators of the Federal State Statistics Service, international statistics, microdata of different waves of the Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey – HSE (RLMS-HSE), Comprehensive Observation of Living Conditions of Population of the Federal State Statistics Service for 2020, the four waves of the “Willingness to Change” survey (2016, 2018, 2020, and 2021), the 12th wave of the monitoring All-Russian Representative Survey conducted by the Institute of Sociology of the FCTAS RAS in March-April 2021, the survey of representatives of small and medium-sized businesses and individual entrepreneurs, conducted jointly with the “Institute of Social Marketing” in June-July 2020 in Moscow, the international European Social Survey (ESS) for 2008 and 2016, the results of qualitative studies of migrants, the database of the richest businessmen in Russia.

**Results of research:**

During the economic crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, even more heavily than in 2008, states relied on employment and social protection programs as elements of countercyclical macroeconomic policy. They relied on measures that proved their efficiency during the 2008 crisis, including job subsidies and part-time work subsidies to employers who suffered from the lockdowns. At the same time, countries were more active in using unemployment benefits and expanding vocational training and retraining programs in 2020 than in 2008. Direct support measures as part of social assistance programs and measures to postpone utility payments and moratoriums on their suspension were much more widespread. The duration of the pandemic and the uncertain timing of leveling the negative impact of the virus create structural problems for policy, more pronounced in developing countries. It raises the question of adjusting the measures introduced in 2020 as an emergency, considering changing budgetary constraints.

The results of the analysis of the dynamics of the population’s requests for social policy in Russia convincingly confirm the hypothesis of expanding support for the state’s responsibility for improving people’s well-being during the crisis. At the same time, despite the decline in income during the COVID-19 pandemic, the willingness of people to pay additional taxes to certain social benefits and services has increased. In the context of the crisis and increased economic risks, the Russian population supports the social protection model, maximizing benefits to selective groups most affected by the crisis. In the respondents’ opinion, healthcare, pensions, social benefits to vulnerable groups, and school education expenses are priorities for increasing public spending. Contrary to expectations, there was no stable and significant evidence of increasing socio-economic convergence in the public attitudes toward welfare state policies. Respondents are guided primarily by the logic of self-interest rather than by ideas of social solidarity.

The research did not detect an apparent deterioration in the health of the Russian population in 2020, which can be explained by slower, compared to developed Western countries, the spread of coronavirus in Russia, and simultaneously a shorter and less stringent period of mass restrictions (lockdown). When considering the dynamics of possible health change factors during the COVID-19 pandemic, we should mention a decrease in inpatient and emergency medical care availability and a slight increase in the proportion of citizens engaging in sports. In the first year of the pandemic, citizens’ overall well-being depended on changes not directly related to health. The chances of improving well-being appeared in citizens with increased job satisfaction, the contribution of general life satisfaction to changes in self-assessment of health increased. In 2020, the pandemic’s positive effects were associated with reduced workload and stress and more free time. But the decline in the availability of inpatient care has created the chances of improvement dependent on getting to the hospital and undergoing surgery.

In general, Russians perceive the consequences of the crisis caused by the coronavirus as quite severe both for the country and for themselves personally or their close ones. Still, they perceive the damage caused by the pandemic to the country more dramatically than the damage to themselves or their family members from it. Working Russians, unlike non-working, were primarily influenced by factors related to employment to form their perception of the severe damage the crisis caused. The economic crisis caused by the pandemic had a noticeable impact on the level of social protection of various groups of workers and the observance of their labor rights by employers.

A comparative analysis of the effects of the first and second waves of the pandemic on employment shows a decrease in the seriousness of the problem of job loss (although the problem is still highly acute), as well as a reduction in the incidence of business plan disruptions and forced unpaid leave of absence. At the same time, the problems of increased workloads and intensity of work, and wage arrears have become more acute. For different occupational groups, the harmful effects of the pandemic on employment not only manifested themselves differently but were also offset to varying degrees by their wage dynamics. In terms of the integral assessment of their social protection and the impact of the pandemic on it, professionals and managers fared best, while sales workers and blue-collar workers were the least advantaged. Semiprofessionals and office clerks represent an intermediate group between these two mass poles of Russian society. High-skilled workers are more likely to belong to the well-off working population regarding their wages and the degree to which their labor rights are respected. Still, they are closer to the rest of the workers regarding the COVID-19 consequences and the resource of their social networks. The Government’s targeted activities have been quite successful in alleviating some of the problems associated with social insecurity. At the same time, the state’s long-standing neglect of other aspects of workers’ social security has led to a significant deterioration of the situation in the relevant areas.

Based on the calculated index of adaptation potential, we have found that the main contribution to adaptation potential comes from the availability of property, transportation, and personal subsidiary plots (LPH). At the same time, financial practices or institutional support are not available to everyone. In general, the average values of the index are shifted toward the lower end of the range, indicating that the resources that can be used to adapt to changing conditions are not numerous or are not available to all segments of the population. At the same time, comparing the two periods - 2019 and 2020 - it can be argued that there has not been a significant waste of available resources - the overall indicators of the measured index have changed insignificantly.

The overall index of adaptation potential is higher in families with children, adults with higher education, working-age people, and pensioners. The adaptation index of the middle class is higher, and the main benefits are formed by the property, transportation, and financial practices, which is an indicator of the quality and lifestyle of this stratum. And if there are working-age adults without work in the family, it is expected to lower the adaptation potential. Partially, higher adaptation potential is associated with higher household incomes. At the same time, the 1st quintile indicators are higher than those in the 2nd-4th quintiles due to high personal subsidiary plot (LPH) domain indicators. In this regard, it can be assumed that social support measures aimed at assistance through the development of private subsidiary plots, especially in rural areas or agrarian regions, may be successful for individuals with low incomes. Moreover, the partial index of institutional support indicates the insufficiency of social policy measures for the poorest group.

**Level of implementation, recommendations on implementation, or outcomes of the implementation of the results:** The results of the research were presented at scientific and scientific-practical events, including international - in Russia, France, Poland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Brazil. Based on the research results, 22 scientific publications were prepared, including 13 articles in journals indexed in WoS and Scopus. Some study results were used to prepare analytical notes and expert opinions sent to the Russian Government and federal executive authorities in 2021.

**Level of implementation:** The results of this research can be used for consultation of public authorities and improving existing or developing legislation in the fields of social, tax, and economics policies and evaluation of their effectiveness, particularly in the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Russian Federation, the Ministry of Economic Development of Russian Federation, the Ministry of Finance of Russian Federation, the Ministry of Health of Russian Federation, the Accounts Chamber of Russian Federation and the Federal State Statistics Service of Russian Federation.