



SCIENTIFIC REVIEW

DOI: 10.18287/2782-2966-2024-4-4-74-88

Submitted: 06.10.2024

Revised: 22.11.2024

Accepted: 16.12.2024

V.Yu. Bocharov

Samara National Research University,

Samara, Russian Federation

E-mail: bocharov.vyu@ssau.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3915-2189>**Transformation of the subject field of Russian sociology of labor:
from a system of labor relations to the constructivist perspective**

Abstract: the article is devoted to the processes of transformation of the content and boundaries of the subject field of Russian sociology of labor, which occurred from the late 1980s to the present. To achieve this goal, the tasks are solved, consisting in the analysis of scientific and educational literature on the subject of labor sociology; the description of the main methodological approaches to the study of labor relations; the construction of the content of the subject field of labor sociology from the standpoint of the latest concepts of the sociology of life and the existing experience of the Samara School of Sociology of Labor. It is emphasized that in Russian literature there are at least six approaches to the consideration of the subject of sociology of labor, which are mainly based on the systemic approach that prevailed back in Soviet times. In terms of content, one or another aspect of social interaction in the field of work is most often declared the subject of labor sociology: 1) the attitude of society to work (work as a social phenomenon), 2) relations between participants in the labor process (labor relations), 3) the attitude of participants in the labor process to their work. The methodical and methodological difficulties of analyzing labor relations are associated with the existence of many overlapping and contradictory approaches within the directions of sociological realism, nominalism and constructivism, which interpret both their content and the factors influencing them in different ways. The most promising direction of modern analysis of labor relations is the application of the constructivist concept of the sociology of life, in which labor relations can be considered as a synthesizing (unifying) concept in relation to the key components of the employee's life world (labor consciousness, labor behavior and the work environment), which in turn consist of a number of elementary concepts (labor motivation, social well-being, social tension, involvement in labor activity) in the space of the social and labor sphere of society (a structure-forming concept). Based on the experience of empirical research accumulated during the post-Soviet period and using new theoretical foundations, the main directions of modern research in the subject field of Russian sociology of labor are: 1) study of the behavior and life world of subjects of labor relations in conditions of precarious employment, 2) analysis of the content and composition of participants (subjects) of labor relations, 3) problems of inequality and social justice in conditions of everyday labor interactions.

Key words: subject of sociology of labor; Samara School of Labor Sociology; labor relations; sociological realism; sociological nominalism; sociological constructivism; sociology of life.

Citation: Bocharov, V.Yu. (2024), Transformation of the subject field of Russian sociology of labor: from a system of labor relations to the constructivist perspective, *Semioticheskie issledovaniya. Semiotic studies*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 74–88, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.18287/2782-2966-2024-4-4-74-88>.

Acknowledgments: the review was carried out with the support of the Institute of Social Sciences and Humanities of Samara University.

Information about conflict of interests: the author declares no conflict of interests.

© Bocharov V.Yu., 2024

Vladislav Yu. Bocharov – candidate of sociological sciences, associate professor, Department of Sociology and Cultural Studies, Samara National Research University, 34, Moskovskoe Shosse, Samara, 443086, Russian Federation; research associate, Sociological Institute of the RAS – FCTAS RAS branch, 25/14, office 524, 7th Krasnoarmeyskaya str., St.-Petersburg, 190005, Russian Federation.

НАУЧНЫЙ ОБЗОР

УДК 316.334.22

В.Ю. Бочаров

Самарский национальный исследовательский университет имени академика С.П. Королева, г. Самара, Российская Федерация

E-mail: bocharov.vyu@ssau.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3915-2189>

Трансформация предметного поля российской социологии труда: от системы трудовых отношений до конструктивистской перспективы

Аннотация: статья посвящена рассмотрению процессов трансформации содержания и границ предметного поля российской социологии труда, происходящей с конца 1980-х по настоящее время. Для достижения этой цели решаются задачи, состоящие в анализе научной и учебной литературы о предмете социологии труда; описании основных методологических подходов к изучению трудовых отношений; конструировании содержания предметного поля социологии труда с позиций новейших концепций социологии жизни и имеющегося опыта Самарской школы социологии труда. Подчеркивается, что в российской литературе есть по крайней мере шесть подходов к рассмотрению предмета социологии труда, которые в основном опираются на доминировавший еще в советское время системный подход. В содержательном плане предметом социологии труда чаще всего объявляется тот или иной из аспектов социального взаимодействия в сфере труда: 1) отношение общества к труду (труд как общественное явление), 2) отношения между участниками трудового процесса (трудовые отношения), 3) отношение участников трудового процесса к своему труду. Методические и методологические трудности анализа трудовых отношений связаны с существованием множества взаимопересекающихся и противоречащих друг другу подходов внутри направлений социологического реализма, номинализма и конструктивизма, по-разному трактующих как их содержание, так и факторы на них влияющие. Наиболее перспективным направлением современного анализа трудовых отношений является применение конструктивистской концепции социологии жизни, в рамках которой трудовые отношения могут рассматриваться в качестве синтезирующего (объединяющего) понятия по отношению к ключевым компонентам жизненного мира работника (трудовое сознание, трудовое поведение и трудовая среда), состоящих, в свою очередь, из ряда элементарных понятий (трудовая мотивация, социальное самочувствие, социальная напряжённость, включённость в трудовую деятельность) в пространстве социально-трудовой сферы общества (структурообразующее понятие). На основе накопленного за постсоветский период опыта эмпирических исследований и с использованием новых теоретических оснований главными направлениями современных исследований предметного поля российской социологии труда являются: 1) изучение поведения и жизненного мира субъектов трудовых отношений в условиях precarious занятости, 2) анализ содержания и состава участников (субъектов) трудовых отношений, 3) проблемы неравенства и социальной справедливости в условиях повседневных трудовых взаимодействий.

Ключевые слова: предмет социологии труда; самарская школа социологии труда; трудовые отношения; социологический реализм; социологический номинализм; социологический конструктивизм; социология жизни.

Цитирование: Бочаров В.Ю. Трансформация предметного поля российской социологии труда: от системы трудовых отношений до конструктивистской перспективы // Семиотические исследования. Semiotic studies. 2024. Т. 4, № 4. С. 74–88. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.18287/2782-2966-2024-4-4-74-88>.

Благодарности: обзор выполнен при поддержке социально-гуманитарного института Самарского университета.

Информация о конфликте интересов: автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

© Бочаров В.Ю., 2024

Владислав Юрьевич Бочаров – кандидат социологических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры социологии и культурологии, Самарский национальный исследовательский университет имени академика С.П. Королева, 443086, Российская Федерация, г. Самара, Московское шоссе, 34; ассоциированный научный сотрудник, Социологический институт РАН – филиал ФНИСЦ РАН, 190005, Российская Федерация, г. Санкт-Петербург, 7-я Красноармейская ул., д. 25/14.

Introduction

"Sociology of Labor" is one of the most developed branches of sociological knowledge. On a global scale, it is customary to talk about a number of scientific schools of labor sociology that have studied the problems of social interaction in the field of work (relationships, interactions, communication) in different years. The largest schools were: Scientific Management School (F. Taylor, A. Fayol, H. Emerson, J. Galbraith, etc.), Chicago School (A. Small,

J. Vincent, C. Henderson, W. Thomas), Frankfurt School (M. Horkheimer, T. Adorno, E. Fromm, G. Marcuse, Yu. Habermas), French School (M. Crozier, A. Touraine, M.D. Renaud, J. Friedman), as well as the Soviet School of Scientific Labor Organization (A.K. Gastev, P.M. Kerzhentsev, O.A. Ermansky, I.M. Burdyansky, M.P. Rudakov, etc.), which existed on the basis of the Central Institute of Labor (CIT) in the 1920s-30s. However, due to political reasons, the

sociology of labor developed in the USSR as a separate sociological discipline only by the second half of the 1960s. And even at that time, it was not yet an academic university science, but was, in fact, one of the central areas of empirical analysis of problems of social labor and labor relations (*"factory sociology"*) (Kravchenko, Shcherbina 1998; Tokarskaya, Karpikova 2006). This largely explains the lack of a clear understanding of the boundaries of the subject field of sociology of labor as a discipline among Soviet scientists of that time. At the same time, empirical studies of the problems of social labor covered, in addition to the actual labor, the economic, managerial and psychological aspects of the labor activity of Soviet workers. Analyzing these studies, it is customary to talk about at least 3 directions (schools) of the Soviet sociology of labor in the 1960s and 70s: 1) the Leningrad school (V.A. Yadov, A.N. Alekseev, V.S. Magun, A.G. Zdravomyslov, V.V. Vozzinskaya, L.D. Doktorova, G.I. Saganenko, A.A. Kissel 2) the Moscow school (G.V. Osipov, V.G. Podmarkov, M.N. Rutkevich, Zh.T. Toschenko, N.F. Naumova, L.A. Gordon, I.I. Changli, A.I. Prigozhin, V.N. Shubkin, etc.); 3) the Novosibirsk school (T.I. Zaslavskaya, R.V. Ryvkina, V.I. Gerchikov, F.M. Borodkin, etc.). Somewhat later, the Samara school of Labor Sociology was formed largely under the influence of the Leningrad school (B.G. Tukumtsev, E.F. Molevich, A.S. Gotlib, O.K. Samartseva, I.E. Stolyarova, A.F. Bokovenko, L.M. Polyantseva, etc.) (Avdoshina, Bocharov, Vaskina 2024). Representatives of each of these schools had their own ideas not only about the boundaries of the subject field, but also about the content of labor sociology. Perhaps the only thing that united the research of Soviet sociologists was the reliance on Marxist methodology, which was actually a prerequisite for conducting research and further publishing their results, as well as a systematic approach to the analysis of the social and labor sphere.

It was only since the 1980s that the situation began to change. Objectively, this was due to the need, in the context of the growing crisis of the Soviet system, to have real empirical data on the problems and state of labor relations at Soviet enterprises. And in many ways, therefore, within the framework of the Soviet Sociological Association (SSA), the Scientific Research Committee (SRC) "Sociology of Labor" was established to coordinate the scientific potential of research in the field of labor. Among its members in different years it can be noted: B.V. Rakitskiy, B.G. Tukumtsev, Zh.T. Toschenko, S.G. Klimova, Z.H.-M. Saraliev, Ya.L. Eidelman, A.A. Rusalina, M.A. Slyusaryansky, P.V. Romanov, I.M. Kozina, B.I. Maksimov, N.I. Shatalova, I.L. Sizova and many others, whose works influenced the development of modern Russian sociology of labor and are widely known. In addition, in the second half of the 1980s, during the period of restructuring of the entire Soviet

society, the processes of gradual institutionalization of labor sociology as a university discipline began, a number of major all-Union conferences were held, scientific monographs (Toshchenko 1989) and collections of articles (The key issue... 1988) were published, which dealt with changes in the problems and content of labor sociology. Finally, on July 7, 1988, the Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR No. 256 "On increasing the role of Marxist-Leninist sociology in solving the nodal social problems of Soviet society" was issued, which actually opened the way for university sociology, including sociology of labor. It should be noted that in addition to the capital's universities, the training of sociological personnel began at Samara State University (Tukumtsev 2000).

It was at the crucial time of the late 1980s that the conceptual understanding of the practical developments of Soviet labor sociology and the discussion of the subject field of this discipline began. And since the early 1990s, attempts began to redefine the subject of labor sociology in a market system, the revival of private property and related problems of social tension and competition in labor relations (Lapin 1990; Motivation and Behavior... 1990; Sociology of Labor... 1993; Democratization of management... 1993). At the same time, the subject field of labor sociology narrowed due to the emergence of a number of independent middle-level sociological disciplines (sociology of management, sociology of organizations, economic sociology, etc.) (Kravchenko 1994; Yadov 2006). In addition, the methodology of Russian sociological research was changing – the only Marxist paradigm (which did not completely disappear, but ceased to be mainstream in post-Soviet studies) was being replaced by a number of others that consistently dominated and set trends in labor and labor relations research (Bocharov 2022).

The purpose of this review is to analyze the processes of transformation of the subject field of Russian sociology of labor that occurred in the post-Soviet period. To achieve this goal, a number of tasks are consistently solved: 1) to explore the available scientific and educational literature, defining the content and boundaries of the subject field of labor sociology; 2) to consider the main methodological approaches to the analysis of labor relations as the central concept of the subject field of labor sociology; 3) to define and describe the content of the subject field of labor sociology from the standpoint of the latest concepts based on the methodology of sociological constructivism and the existing experience of the Samara School of Labor Sociology.

Methods and criteria for the selection of literary sources

Modern sociology is dominated by a paradigm that assumes that the main criterion for the scientific

character of existing theoretical and methodological approaches is their discourse in the scientific community (Yadov 2009, p.16). The author of this review is the current chairman of the SRC "Sociology of Labor" of the Russian Society of Sociologists (RSS) and in this regard has been working for almost 20 years, holding scientific conferences, compiling collections of scientific articles based on their results, reviewing educational, methodological and scientific literature for highly rated scientific journals publishing texts on the sociology of labor (including "Sociological Studies", "Sociological Journal", "Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology", etc.), as well as conducting empirical studies of the social and labor sphere of Russian organizations, based on the results of which scientific articles and monographs have been written. For example, the monograph "The Social Institute of wage Labor in modern Russia" contains a bibliographic list consisting of 423 Russian and English-language sources (Bocharov 2010). In addition, the author of the review is an associate researcher at the Sociological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences (St. Petersburg), being a member of the Center for Research in the Social and Labor sphere which bears the name of B.G. Tukumtsev since 2021. Such associate membership provides ample opportunities for scientific communication not only with Russian sociologists, but also sociologists from friendly countries dealing with the problems of labor sociology. The presence of such experience is associated with a constant discussion of the problems of labor sociology, as on the pages of scientific journals (Bocharov, Klimova 2022; Bocharov, Klimova, Sizova 2023; Baymurzina, Bessokirnaya, Bocharov et al. 2024), so in the framework of direct communication with scientists, including those who are leading members of the SRC "Sociology of Labor" RSS (G.R. Baymurzina, G.P. Bessokirnaya, T.V. Gavriluk, G.V. Eremicheva, S.G. Klimova, I.P. Popova, Z.H.-M. Saralieva, I.L. Sizova, A.L. Temnitsky, Zh.T. Toshchenko, etc.). All this allows us to assume that the author is "inside the discourse" and has the necessary competencies and information to select, systematize and analyze scientific literature on the sociology of labor. At the same time, such a discourse assumes that referring only to quantitative indicators of the citation of texts or the rating of a scientific journal is an insufficient, although formally desirable indicator of the analyzed texts. Meanwhile, as the practice of analyzing the texts available in the sociology of labor shows, their search by keywords and phrases does not give a satisfactory result. This is largely due to the use of key terminology of labor sociology in non-sociological disciplines, primarily economics and labor psychology, as well as labor law, especially when it comes to labor relations, which are the basic element characterizing the subject field of labor sociology. In addition, often so-

ciological articles with the phrase "labor relations" in their title do not analyze these relations in terms of content, without problematizing them, considering them a well-known concept. Because of this, the new quantitative search was not used when writing this review. However, a number of systematic sources were used in which this practice was applied, including the participation of the author of this review. Firstly, the systematization of the thematic literature on the sociology of labor was carried out by the author under the guidance of B.G. Tukumtsev and published under the title "Bibliographic list of reference literature for the Sociology of Labor course". This list contains a list of textbooks, manuals and monographs on the problems of labor sociology (42 sources), as well as more than 300 articles on labor sociology systematized by main topics published during 1908-2006. (Bocharov, Tukumtsev 2006). Secondly, the author of this review was a scientific secretary and an active participant in writing scientific articles in the currently basic theoretical and applied explanatory dictionary "Sociology of Labor" in Russian sociology of Labor, edited by V.A. Yadov (Theoretical and Applied Dictionary 2006). Thirdly, the author of this review took part in the systematization of the scientific heritage of his teacher and founder of the Samara School of Sociology of Labor B.G. Tukumtsev. According to the results, a collection of articles by this scientist (42 articles) on the problems of labor sociology and the thematic boundaries of its subject field was published (Tukumtsev 2023). Moreover, the author of this review teaches the course "Sociology of Labor" for undergraduate students, for which in 2024 methodological recommendations were prepared containing more than 250 Russian-speaking and more than 40 English-speaking sources (Bocharov 2024).

Also, the existing review articles devoted to the analysis of the subject field of labor sociology in the journal "Sociological Research", which is essential for Russian sociologists, played a role in the selection of literature. Among them, it is necessary to note a number of articles by Doctor of Sociological Sciences A.L. Temnitsky, who is a member of the SRC "Sociology of Labor" and a member of its governing council (Temnitsky 2007; Temnitsky 2022; Temnitsky, Besokirnaya 2024).

Finally, the author belongs to the Samara School of Sociology of Labor and many problems of this discipline have been repeatedly discussed both with its founder, B.G. Tukumtsev, and with its other members, who are also followers of B.G. Tukumtsev, colleagues of the author at work at Samara University, members of the SRC "Sociology of Labor" RSS and the Sociological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences – N.V. Avdoshina and Yu.V. Vaskina. Their opinions, ideas, as well as projects implemented jointly allow us to speak with confidence about the

Samara School of Labor Sociology as an active and important part of the discourse of Russian Labor Sociology (Avdoshina, Vaskina, Bocharov 2024).

The content and boundaries of the subject field of sociology of labor

According to D. Markovich, the need for the emergence of labor sociology as a special science was caused by insufficient study by other social sciences of the labor process, social industrial relations and the place occupied by a person in the labor process (Markovich 1997, p. 16). At the same time, this Marxist scientist referred to the main categories of labor sociology that make up the subject field of this discipline: labor, the nature of labor, the content of labor, the form of labor, division of labor, labor structure, labor functions, labor culture, labor environment, alienation of labor, liberation of labor (Markovich 1997, p. 18). An important methodological addition by D. Markovich is the need to consider these categories as a single system: *"the categories of labor sociology can serve as a basis for a comprehensive understanding of labor as a social phenomenon, but only if they represent a single system"* (Markovich 1997, p. 18). In many ways, the Soviet sociology of labor was characterized by this systematic approach. Moreover, it did not cause much controversy in the post-Soviet 1990s. So in one of the first post-Soviet textbooks on the sociology of labor published under the editorship of N.I. Dryakhlov, A.I. Kravchenko and V.V. Scherbina the sociology of labor refers to complex disciplines that focus on: *"the nature and content of labor, human attitude to work, organization and working conditions, value orientations, human role behavior in work, motivation and job satisfaction"* (Sociology of Labor 1993, p. 92), and the sociology of labor itself is a *"system of scientific knowledge, in which different levels of organization are distinguished"* (Sociology of Labor 1993, p. 93).

Currently, V.A. Yadov's point of view is quite conventional, according to which the sociology of labor is considered mainly as an industry-specific sociological discipline that studies labor activity and the peculiarities of its organization as an object (Yadov 2006, p. 313). Meanwhile, scientific discussions are still ongoing among Russian scientists about the very subject of sociology of labor.

Firstly, the complexity of defining the subject framework of the sociology of labor is associated with changes in social and industrial relations under the influence of scientific and technological progress, as well as the presence of various theoretical and methodological foundations for interpretations of social labor. Thus, the very concept of "labor" changed, supplemented, expanded the scope of its influence and as a result, *"from the original meaning associated only with "physical efforts", it began to include both mental, managerial, and creative work, i.e. practically all spheres of human transformative activity"*

(Toshchenko, Tsvetkova. 2012, p. 47), but at the same time with the transition to a post-industrial society, becoming more and more *"symbolic and less material"* (Makarova 2007, p. 48). And although V.A. Yadov's point of view is that work is *"a fundamental type of human activity and the basis for the emergence and functioning of society"* (Yadov 2006, pp. 332-333), is supported by almost all modern Russian researchers, but there is still no generally accepted definition of the category "labor" in Russian labor sociology. Close interpretations of labor as a meaningful, socially acceptable activity aimed at creating tangible and intangible products and services necessary to meet human needs are given by E.F. Molevich (Molevich 2001), Yu.E. Volkov (Volkov 2009), and Zh.T. Toshchenko (Toshchenko, Tsvetkova 2012). At the same time, the most detailed concepts are: the concept of E.F. Molevich, which analyzes the substantial (branching into typoid and generic) and formal structures of labor (Molevich 2001, pp. 38-41), as well as the concept of the sociology of life of Zh.T. Toshchenko, according to which work can be considered a structure-forming concept within the framework of the meaningful structure of the human life world (Toshchenko 2016, p. 132).

Secondly, the change of theoretical paradigms in the Russian sociology of labor was reflected in the approaches used in empirical research to analyze labor interactions in the field of labor. In the early 1990s, the main point of the discussions was the need to distance oneself from Marxist interpretations of wage labor and appeal to other theoretical grounds. During these years, the dominant theory of numerous empirical studies carried out in the key of quantitative sociology was structural functionalism, including, above all, a systematic approach. The conflict approach was also present in research, but mainly in the spirit of a conciliatory paradigm, while Marxist theory was mostly criticized. At the same time, a direction of qualitative research (the "case study" strategy) appeared, close to the methodology of sociological nominalism. Since the beginning of the XXI century, the leading approaches to the study of social interactions in the field of work have become quite interrelated cultural (socio-cultural) and neo-institutional approaches (Bocharov 2010; Tukumtsev 2023). But, regardless of the theoretical foundations and the methods used, in most studies of Russian labor sociologists carried out before the mid-2010s, the object of analysis was hired industry workers. Since the mid-2010s, the main focus of research on wage labor and labor relations has shifted towards the analysis of atypical forms of employment and the processes of precarization of labor, remaining an actual trend in Russian research (Toshchenko 2018; Precariat... 2020; From precarious employment... 2022; The Life World... 2024).

As a result, at least six approaches to the consideration of the subject of labor sociology are currently presented in Russian literature:

1) the problems of labor relations are analyzed within the framework of the form of organization of production (industrial sociology), often using a systematic institutional analysis of enterprises and organizations (Podmarkov 1973; Podmarkov 1982);

2) an economic interpretation of the essence of labor is adopted and a unified discipline "economics and sociology of labor" is being developed (Adamchuk, Romashov, Sorokina 2000; Volovskaya 2001; Popov, Shevchuk 2003; Genkin 2005; Karpova 2008);

3) the sociology of labor is recognized as a part of economic sociology and its subject includes the study of social problems of employment and the labor market (Romashov 1999);

4) Marxist and neo-Marxist interpretations of labor and labor relations, analyzing labor as a social phenomenon within a class society (Markovich 1997);

5) a cultural approach based on the theories of E. Durkheim, M. Weber and J. Alexander, in which the subject of labor sociology is declared to be the culture of labor and labor relations (Tukumtsev 2023);

6) theories of social constructivism based on the concepts of P. Bourdieu and Yu. Habermas, giving priority to the study of labor consciousness and behavior (activity) of people as subjects of industrial life and the production environment (Toshchenko 2003).

At the same time, in terms of content, in Russian literature, one or another aspect of social interaction in the field of work is most often declared the subject of labor sociology:

1) labor and social relations that participants in the labor process enter into (Markovich 1997, p. 33);

2) labor relations "*studied both at the micro level (of labor organizations) and at the macro level (of society as a whole)*" (Tokarskaya, Karpikova 2006, p. 24) and their structure and mechanism. For example, O.V. Romashov formulates his approach to the subject of labor sociology as follows: "*the subject of labor sociology as a special sociological theory is the structure and mechanism of social and labor relations, as well as social processes and phenomena in the field of labor*" (Romashov 1999, p. 13);

3) socially typical processes that find their expression in a person's attitude to work and his work activity (Sokolova 2016, p. 52).

So, the interdisciplinarity of the object of sociology of labor (labor activity) and the multidimensional nature of its subject allow us to speak about the absence of rigid boundaries of the subject area of labor sociology. In many ways, its problems intersect with a number of social and humanitarian disciplines (labor economics, labor psychology, personnel management, etc.), as well as with sociological disciplines (sociology of organizations, sociology of management, economic sociology, etc.). Nevertheless, we have the core of the subject field – labor relations, which, regardless of methodological approaches and analytical models, are considered by all Russian researchers of

labor problems. Approaches to their consideration range from analyzing the system of interdependent interactions in the field of social work to giving labor relations the quality of synthesizing (unifying) concepts of key components of the employee's life world (labor consciousness, labor behavior and the work environment).

Methodological approaches to the analysis of labor relations

The concepts of the analysis of labor relations represent a number of analytical models based on various theoretical and methodological foundations and approaches that are applied by researchers to study the content structure of the main components of relations related to labor behavior and activity. Within the framework of the sociology of labor, the theoretical understanding of labor relations began in the USSR in the late 1980s. In 1989, the monograph "Social reserves of labor: topical issues of labor sociology", by Zh.T. Toshchenko was published, in which for the first time in Russian literature a comprehensive examination of the subject of labor relations was presented and the need for the formation of a "*new type of relationship between a supervisor and a subordinate*" was emphasized (Toshchenko 1989, p. 146). At that time, the need to analyze the concept of labor relations was actualized due to the need to study the market contractual relationship between an employee and an employer in the Soviet scientific literature. The main point of the discussions at that time was the need to distance oneself from Marxist interpretations of wage labor and appeal to other theoretical grounds. As a result, by the early 1990s, three areas of analysis of labor relations had been identified: 1) the study of the behavior of subjects of labor relations; 2) the formation of a new type of subjects; 3) problems of equality and justice in labor relations (Sociology of labor... 1993). Russian researchers have tried to formulate the concept of labor relations based on foreign "narrow" and "broad" interpretations (Silin 1993; Gordon et al. 1996; Barsukova, Gerchikov 1997). The result of the discussions in the 1990s was the rather conventional use of the term "labor relations" in Russian labor sociology. In a broad sense, they began to include all relations related to work and consider them as a product of the socio-economic system of society, and in a narrow sense, they were interpreted as relations between employees and an employer, including relations regarding employment, remuneration for work, its conditions, forms and methods of resolving labor conflicts (Tukumtsev 2006, pp. 365-366). Based mainly on this understanding of labor relations, concepts of their analysis were developed (Vaskina 1999; Labor relations... 1999; De Bardeleben, Klimova, Yadov 2004; Labor relations... 2013).

In modern sociology of labor, concepts of labor relations are presented, implemented within the frame-

work of the methodologies of 1) sociological realism (systemic, conflict, neo-institutional and cultural approaches), 2) sociological nominalism (the "case study" strategy) and 3) sociological constructivism (resource, neo-Marxist and synthetic approaches).

1. Concepts of sociological realism.

Systematic approach. Based on the theoretical prerequisites of systemic analysis in sociology (T. Parsons, N. Luhmann, E. Giddens), labor relations are considered as an integral "self-reproducing social system", not reducible to its constituent elements (subjects), within which participants interact through certain social mechanisms in order to ensure a stable state of the entire "social system", which includes the "wage labor system". This approach is reflected in the works of many foreign authors (Dunlop 1958; Craig 1975; Salamon 1987). These ideas have found many adherents among Russian researchers of labor relations. To substantiate the "systemic" concepts in the 1990s, an appeal was made to the "transitional", "post-Soviet" and transforming state of the "labor relations system". Labor relations themselves were interpreted as a complex system of relations that arise between people in the process of their industrial, economic, social, political and other forms of social activity, aimed at ensuring a high level of quality of life for a person, the labor collective and society (Kolesnikov 1993; Belyaeva 1995; Peschansky 1997).

Conflict-based approach. The systematic approach to the study of labor relations has been rightly criticized since its inception for being static, conservative, and inattentive to conflict (Flanders 1965). This resulted in the formation of a conflict approach, within which two of the most influential trends emerged: the "Marxist" one, recognizing class antagonism (Hyman 1975) and the "pluralist" one, denying the class nature of social conflicts and prioritizing the need for peaceful dialogue in the industrial environment (Farnham, Pimlott 1983). Among Russian scientists, an example of the implementation of the Marxist trend was the concept of G.Ya. Rakitskaya, who tried to create a general theory of labor relations (Rakitskaya 2003). The ideas of the pluralistic trend have developed in Russian studies on the problems of local labor conflicts and prospects for cooperation between the parties to labor relations, the role of trade unions in organizing collective bargaining at enterprises and the study of models of social partnership in the social and labor sphere (Tukumtsev 2023).

Neo-institutional approach. The methodological basis of the neo-institutional approach to the analysis of labor relations was the work of Western researchers D. North and R. Krouse. V.A. Yadov systematized and generalized the provisions of neo-institutionalism for their use in the analysis of any social relations (Yadov 2009). S.G. Kirdina writes in detail about the directions of Russian neo-institutionalism, applying this approach to the analysis of labor relations (Kirdina

2003). In general, proponents of this approach believe that such a methodology, on the one hand, allows us to focus on the microanalytical aspects of labor relations, and on the other hand, to comprehensively analyze their content within the framework of a social institution. This means a revision of the point of view when labor relations were completely identified with competitive relations in the labor market and, accordingly, the entire theory of labor relations was reduced to neoclassical models of their equilibrium, for which it was enough to achieve corresponding changes in labor prices (or wages). Within the framework of the neo-institutional approach, labor relations appear to be socially, economically and culturally rooted (Olympieva 2007). At the same time, according to a number of researchers, there are several institutional complexes regulating labor relations, which makes it possible to single out power-regulating, economic and socio-cultural labor institutions (Kizhevatoва 2008). At the same time, most researchers prefer to analyze labor relations from the point of view of the existence of a single ("universal") social institution that includes power, economic and cultural characteristics. Thus, as S.G. Kirdina notes: "wage labor is a universal institution that regulates the involvement of public forces in labor and ensures their reproduction in conditions of private ownership" (Kirdina 2000, p. 59). At the same time, such an institution represents an inseparable unity of formal and informal rules (Kirdina 2001). It is this point of view that allows the widespread informal practices of daily work in the field of labor to be included in the institutional analysis of labor relations. And within the framework of this approach, the social institution of wage labor is considered as a set of formal and informal roles, rules, norms, social mechanisms and procedures through which the wage labor system is organized, ensuring the stability and regulation of relations between subjects of labor relations (Bocharov 2010). The formation of the modern form and content structure of the social institution of wage labor is the result of the process of institutionalization of labor relations and depends on the level of technical, technological and socio-economic development of society (Bocharov 2001; Bocharov 2009). It is important that Russian researchers rightly emphasize that the peculiarity of the Russian way presupposes the uniqueness of the regulation of labor relations, which means that when analyzing the Russian social institution of wage labor, it is necessary to take into account Russian spiritual traditions and socio-cultural characteristics (Menshikova 1999). Currently, it is obvious that the ongoing processes of digitalization, deindustrialization and precarization of employment are changing the substantive structure of the social institution of wage labor, reducing the role of trade unions and abolishing collective procedures for regulating labor relations (Kalleberg 2000; Bocharov 2017; The life world... 2024).

Socio-cultural (cultural) approach. Sociology owes the emergence of a sociocultural approach to the legacy of M. Weber and E. Durkheim. In the future, this approach is modified and today it is more often called "cultural", based on the work of J. Alexander and P. Shtompka, and among Russian sociologists – A.L. Temnitsky (Temnitsky 2000). According to the cultural approach, the culture of each community or group has its own internal structure, which creates conditions for tracking the influence on behavior (including labor) of individual elements of the human cultural environment. V.A. Yadov and B.G. Tukumtsev supported the ideas of this approach in relation to the analysis of labor relations. Thus, B.G. Tukumtsev, discussing the position of V.A. Yadov, emphasized that *"the cultural approach to the analysis of social activity can be considered as a working model, as a methodological basis for research programs focused on the analysis of labor activity and interaction in the labor sphere"* (Tukumtsev 2016, p. 110). At the same time, as a subject of the sociology of labor, B.G. Tukumtsev proposed to study the culture of labor relations, and interpreting it within the framework of a systematic approach traditional for Soviet labor sociology: *"The culture of labor relations or the interaction of the parties to labor relations is a system of goals, values, social norms, customs, rules and behavioral practices that determine the content and perception of this interaction by the parties. The culture of labor relations is formed in enterprises and organizations under the influence of the social system of labor relations in society, state legislation, management policy of enterprises, organizational and informal practices that take place in them. The state of this culture largely determines the behavior of actors in the social system of labor relations and their relationship to each other"* (Tukumtsev 2023, pp. 66-67).

It should be noted that some authors consider the *civilizational approach*, which is closely related to the cultural one, as a separate independent approach. According to this approach, labor relations are considered "human relations" and their subject-content area is supplemented by an analysis of *"the goals of activity, interests and motives, as well as trust, mutual understanding, cooperation, argumentation of institutional differences and cultural diversity of labor relations in different countries"* (Nekhoda 2007, pp. 31-32).

2. Concepts of sociological nominalism ("Case study" of labor relations). The concepts of this direction have been developing since the early 1990s (Social regimes... 2008). The research carried out by the Institute for Comparative Studies of Labor Relations (ISITO) in collaboration with the Center for Comparative Labor Studies at the University of Warwick (UK) (Aswin, Clarke 2003), based on the research strategy "case study", which assumes *"a deep, complete and comprehensive analysis of a so-*

cial phenomenon using the example of a separate empirical object (case)", gained fame (Kozina 1997, p. 177). As part of this strategy, biographical, ethnographic and monographic research methods of labor relations were used. So, P.V. Romanov, relying on the ethnographic method, spoke about the ideological "repertoires" that have developed in Russian practice, setting the focus and scheme of the analysis of labor relations. Thus, speaking about the advantages of the ethnographic method of analyzing labor relations, P.V. Romanov criticized the concepts of sociological realism that dominated at that time, because, in his opinion, in them *"the object of research in the sociology of labor relations is not problematized in the light of the dynamics of modern social processes"* (Romanov 2000, p. 129). He also criticized the dominant definitions of labor relations at that time as the relationship between an employee and an employer regarding hiring and their field methodology, implemented in line with structural functionalism, based on data from local and national quantitative surveys of managers, workers and trade unionists of industrial enterprises (Romanov 2000).

3. Concepts of sociological constructivism.

Resource-based approach. Proponents of the resource approach proceed from the position that certain types of resources directly affect a person's place in society and his life opportunities. The most significant types of resources are: economic, qualification, power and social. The expediency of using a resource approach to the study of labor relations is argued by the fact that it allows you to find out the volume and structure of resources available to the subjects of these relations and take into account the state of inequality of these subjects in terms of resource allocation (Tikhonova 2006; Odyakov 2011). The quantity and quality of the resources available for the subjects of labor relations determine the strategies of their behavior, determines their roles and statuses in this interaction and in society as a whole (Chilipenok 2015; Sizova, Chilipenok 2017).

Neo-Marxist approach. Proponents of this approach continue to turn to a "broad" interpretation of labor relations, understanding them as one of the types of relations distinguished in the economic system and representing *"a set of really established relations regarding the implementation of the labor process"* (Marxist Economic... 2018, p. 307). However, at the same time, an analysis of the moral aspects of labor activity is introduced into the content of labor relations. New aspects of the analysis related to the consequences of globalization are also emerging, in particular, the problems of including migrant workers in civilized labor relations and recognizing the unwillingness of the traditional working class to change the capitalist order (Mikhailovsky 2017).

Synthetic approaches. Currently, the "new working class studies" approach is most common in West-

ern literature. According to this approach, the class conflict nature of labor relations is considered, affecting the culture and interests of the actors in these relations (Linkon, Russo 2016), i.e., neo-Marxist and cultural approaches are synthesized, but taking into account the emotional component of labor behavior (Gavrilyuk 2021). In Russian sociology, this approach (along with the resource approach) is close to the constructivist concept of the sociology of life developed by Zh.T. Toshchenko (Toshchenko 2000; Toshchenko 2016). It is important to note that, in general, constructivist theories carry out a kind of synthesis of understanding the objectively existing social structure (institutions) and the activities of subjects. This is what helps to overcome the critical shortcomings of the concepts of sociological realism and nominalism. It is necessary to emphasize a certain general similarity of the concept of sociology of life by Zh.T. Toshchenko with the theories of P. Bourdieu and Yu. Habermas (Table 1).

of subjects regarding future plans, goals and personal trajectories of life (Toshchenko 2016).

Constructing the content of the subject field of labor sociology

Based on the concept of the "sociology of life" developed by him, Zh.T. Toshchenko defines the sociology of labor as a special sociological theory that "represents the organic unity of labor consciousness and behavior (activity) of people as subjects of industrial life and the production environment" (Toshchenko, Tsvetkova 2012, p. 53). It is precisely this constructivist interpretation that makes it possible to focus the analysis of labor relations on considering the aggregate unity of objective conditions and subjective factors of the life world of employees. At the same time, the very concept of "labor relations" can be considered as synthesizing (unifying) in relation to the key components of the workers' life world (labor consciousness, labor behavior and the work environment), which in turn consist of a number of elementary

Table 1

Comparison of the authors' concepts of sociological constructivism

Таблица 1

Сравнение авторских концепций социологического конструктивизма

P. Bourdieu	Yu. Habermas	Zh.T. Toshchenko
"Structuring structures"	The "life world" (the world of shared experience)	"Life World"
The side of human consciousness (habitus)	The subjective world of inner experiences	Social consciousness (rational and emotional aspects)
Practices	The social world of norms and shared beliefs	Activity, actual behavior (the objective embodiment of knowledge, attitudes, motives and values)
The content of the "social space"	The objective world of facts	The conditions ("environment") in which consciousness and activity exist

Source: Bocharov 2023, p. 43.

The advantage of the concept of Zh.T. Toshchenko is the introduction of a synthesizing component (semantic indicator) – the "meaning of life" into the three-element structure of the life world. The very concept of "life world" characterizes the sphere of objectively conditioned and subjectively significant human experience, as well as the system of their communications and forms of social interaction regulated by means of value and symbolic intermediaries (Toshchenko 2024). The life world is also a space of vital activity in which a person can act as a creator, as a converter of this space, regardless of the vector of these transformations and their emotional assessment by others. It is important to note that the temporal dimension is important for the analysis of the life world, which allows a comprehensive analysis: 1) the significance of past events, 2) the value of currently objectively embodied practices, and 3) the goal-setting

concepts (labor motivation, social well-being, social tension, involvement in work, etc.) in the space of the social and labor sphere of society (a structure-forming concept) (Table 2).

In accordance with the methodology presented in Table 2, we can describe the subject field of labor sociology.

1. The social and labor sphere as a structure-forming concept of the subject area of labor sociology. The social and labor sphere, the area of relations that develop in organizations between subjects of labor activity, regarding the use of opportunities and abilities of an employee in the labor process, as well as the reproduction of his labor potential and improving the quality of working life (Tukumtsev 2006b, pp. 308-309). Initially, the term "social and labor sphere" was used in the Soviet economic and managerial literature in connection with the practice

Table 2

The content structure of the basic concepts of the life world of an employee

Таблица 2

Содержательная структура основных понятий жизненного мира наемного работника

The key components and the elementary concepts they consist of	Synthesizing (generalizing) concepts	The structure-forming concept
1. Labor consciousness: – motivation (individual); – opinion about the work team and the qualities necessary for successful work (group); – social well-being and standard of living (public)	Labor relations: all labor-related relationships	Social and labor sphere: the area of relations and relationships that develop between subjects of labor activity, formed by the current state and organizational policies, cultural norms, implemented in the daily working life of citizens
2. Work behavior: – vocational training and plans (temporal aspect); – involvement in work activities; – initiative (innovative aspect); – conflict (social tension)		
3. Work (production) environment: – a set of factors affecting the physical and mental state of a person in the course of work		

Source: Bocharov 2024a, p. 56.

of state planning in order to distinguish from the general complex of labor activities those areas that relate to the labor resources of the enterprise: organization and labor protection, the use of working time, increasing the stability of personnel, as well as the development of social infrastructure (medical care, catering, recreation). In the 1970s and 1980s. attempts were made to sociologically rethink this term within the framework of the "sphere" approach (Osadchaya 1996), where the social and labor sphere was separated from the industrial and economic sphere, which included a complex of organizational, technical, technological and economic relations, as well as the material and technical base of enterprises (Social problems... 1979; Podmarkov 1982). At the same time, the first sociological studies at enterprises in those years focused exclusively on data obtained in the social sphere of the enterprise, without taking into account economic and technological indicators. It was only in post-Soviet studies that the social and labor sphere began to be considered as a complex of social ties and relations related to all subsystems of an enterprise (organization). It is from such positions that large-scale projects on the study of indicators of the social and labor sphere began in the post-Soviet space in the 1990s. In 1994-2004, a comprehensive sociological and statistical study "All-Russian monitoring of the social and labor sphere" was conducted (jointly by the Ministry of Labor of Russia, the State Statistics Committee of Russia, the Research Institute of Labor, the All-Russian Center for Living Standards) (Antosenkov 1995; Malyshev 2006). Gradually, the practice of conducting research in the social and labor sphere has spread in many Russian regions. The most

well-known experience in Russia is the one of Samara monitoring, carried out in 1995-2014 at industrial enterprises, non-industrial commercial and budgetary organizations, as well as organizations working in agriculture (Social and labor... 2010; Bocharov 2010; Tukumtsev 2023).

Monitoring studies of the social and labor sphere allow us to identify the following problems of the subject field of modern labor sociology: 1) the labor potential of employees and its use (analysis of the professional and qualification composition of employees, the level of their general education, work experience, work culture, compliance of the work performed with existing qualifications and the extent of underemployment); 2) remuneration and living standards of employees; 3) working conditions and health of employees; 4) the state of labor relations the state of labor relations (negotiation process, collective agreement, state of social tension); 5) the state of the moral and psychological climate in organizations.

Currently, Russian research on the social and labor sphere is conducted taking into account the need to overcome the negative trends of recent years (pandemic, economic crisis, sanctions pressure) and transition to an innovative type of development, the formation of a model of "decent work" and, in general, improving the quality of workers' working lives (Kolmakova I.V., Kolmakova E.M. 2021; Leonidova 2022).

2. Labor relations as a synthesizing (generalizing) concept of the subject area of sociology of labor. Within the framework of this methodology, labor relations can continue to be considered in a broad sense as all relations related to work, and in a

narrow sense as relations between employees and an employer, including relations regarding employment, remuneration for work, its conditions, forms and methods of resolving labor conflicts. The main focus of research on labor relations in modern Russian enterprises: 1) study of the behavior and life world of subjects of labor relations in conditions of precarious employment, 2) analysis of the new content and composition of participants (subjects) of labor relations, 3) problems of inequality and justice in the conditions of everyday labor interactions of subjects of labor relations (Bocharov 2022).

3. The key components and their constituent contents are elementary concepts of the subject field of labor sociology.

The key components of the life world of employees are: work consciousness, work behavior and the work (production) environment (understood as a set of factors affecting the physical and mental state of a person in the course of work). At the same time, the main elementary concepts that are necessarily included in the subject field of labor sociology are the following: "motivation of labor", "involvement in the organization", "social well-being", "social tension". It should be noted that each of these concepts within the framework of the Samara school of Labor Sociology, in addition to theoretical interpretation, has a measurement methodology based on empirical data from mass questionnaires (Avdoshina, Bocharov, Vaskina 2024; Bocharov 2024a):

Motivation of labor – 1) the internal motivation of an employee to work, the main component of an employee's self-awareness that determines his behavior in the field of work and reactions to specific working conditions; 2) the process of encouraging an employee to work actively by meeting important needs in the field of work (recognition, self-realization, success, creativity, belonging to significant social groups, etc.).

Involvement in an organization is an emotional state of an employee based on his or her feelings of commitment (dedication) to his or her organization and involvement in its affairs. It is also characterized by the subjective predisposition of an employee to consider the problems of the organization in which he or she works as personally significant, and his or her willingness to contribute to the success of his or her organization. Being involved in an organization means that an employee accepts its values and norms; agreement with its goals plays an important role in the formation of work motivation, is a key factor in solving the problem of staff turnover, is a necessary condition for the formation of social partnership relations in the organization and has a positive effect on job and life satisfaction.

Social well-being is a state indicating the level of adaptation of a person to the surrounding reality and the degree of satisfaction of his social needs, which is the result of a person's self-assessment of his social

status, life successes and failures in relation to the position of other people and groups, as well as his or her own life prospects and the success of the implemented life strategy.

Social tension in an organization is a persistent mismatch of interests of subjects of labor relations, which manifests itself in latent (implicit) or explicit contradictions between employees and management, potentially threatening to turn into an open labor conflict. Latent social tension can be expressed in dissatisfaction with work, a bad (irritated, depressed) mood, and a desire to find another job. The highest degree of increase in the level of social tension is conflict.

Conclusions

The subject area of labor sociology remains a controversial issue to this day. There are at least six approaches to the consideration of the subject of labor sociology in the Russian literature: 1) the problems of labor relations are analyzed within the framework of the form of organization of production (industrial sociology), often using a systematic institutional analysis of enterprises and organizations; 2) an economic interpretation of the essence of labor is adopted and a unified discipline "economics and sociology of labor" is developed; 3) the sociology of labor is recognized as a part of economic sociology and its subject includes the study of social problems of employment and the labor market; 4) Marxist and neo-Marxist interpretations of labor and labor relations, analyzing labor as a social phenomenon within a class society; 5) a cultural approach based on the theories of E. Durkheim, M. Weber and J. Alexander, within the framework of which the subject of labor sociology is declared to be the culture of work and labor relations; 6) theories of social constructivism based on the concepts of P. Bourdieu and Yu. Habermas, giving priority to the study of labor consciousness and behavior (activity) of people as subjects of industrial life and the production environment.

In terms of content, in Russian literature, one or another aspect of social interaction in the field of labor is most often declared the subject of labor sociology: 1) the attitude of society to work (work as a social phenomenon), 2) relations between participants in the labor process (labor relations), 3) the attitude of participants in the labor process to their work. This approach was proposed and developed by B.G. Tukumtsev and his followers (N.V. Avdoshina, Yu.V. Vaskina, V.Yu. Bocharov) within the framework of the Samara School of Labor Sociology. At the same time, the central (generalizing) concept of the subject field of Russian sociology of labor is labor relations. The methodical and methodological difficulties of analyzing labor relations are associated with the existence of many overlapping and contradictory approaches within the directions of sociological realism, nominalism and constructivism, which interpret

both their content and the factors influencing them in different ways. The most important area of analysis of labor relations is the application of the concept of sociology of life (Zh.T. Toshchenko) in which labor relations can be considered as a synthesizing (unifying) concept in relation to the key components of the employee's life world (labor consciousness, labor behavior and work environment).

Scientific discussions conducted by Russian sociologists in recent years have shown that most researchers in their scientific search rely on new approaches that are methodologically close to sociological constructivism (Bocharov, Klimova 2022; Anisimov, Klimova 2024). Currently, researchers rarely turn to the theories of realism (institutional and systemic approaches) and nominalism (the "case study" strategy). More popular are resource and cultural approaches, neo-Marxist research directions of labor relations in the spirit of Western new working class studies, as well as the methodology that allows a comprehensive study of the phenomenon of the life world of Russian workers - "sociology of life", developed by Zh.T. Toshchenko, who noted that "*the content of the sociology of labor is not constructed arbitrarily, by itself – it reflects the actual situation: an employee is involved in the labor process through the realization of his consciousness, his activity (behavior), depending on conditions, objective circumstances and the environment*" (Toshchenko, Tsvetkova 2012, p. 53). Based on the experience of empirical research accumulated during the post-Soviet period and using new theoretical foundations, the main directions of modern research in the subject field of Russian sociology of labor are: 1) the study of behavior and life world of subjects of labor relations in conditions of precarious employment, 2) the analysis of the variety and composition of participants (subjects) of labor relations, 3) the problems of inequality and social justice under conditions of everyday labor interactions.

References

- Adamchuk, V.V., Romashov, O.V. and Sorokina, M.E. (2000), *Economics and Sociology of labor*: textbook for universities, UNITY, Moscow, Russia.
- Anisimov, R.I. and Klimova, S.G. (2024), The Lifeworld of Labor Workers: Preferences and Institutional Possibilities, *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 5, pp. 158–161, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.31857/S0132162524050147>.
- Antosenkov, E.G. (1995), Monitoring of the social and labor sphere of the Russian Federation (1992–1994), *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 9, pp. 50–65.
- Aswin, S. and Clarke, S. (2003), *Russian Trade Unions and Industrial relations in transition*, Basingstoke and New York, Palgrave Macmillan, USA.
- Avdoshina, N.V., Bocharov, V.Yu. and Vaskina, Yu.V. (2024), Samara School of Labor Sociology: History and Modernity, *St.-Petersburg Sociology Today*, no. 23, pp. 39–56, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.25990/socinstras.pss-23.m4m3-vj34>.
- Baimurzina, G.R., Bessokirnaya, G.P., Bocharov, V.Yu., Demidenko, S.Yu., Klimova, S.G., Kozina, I.M., Popov, A.V., Strebkov, D.O. and Temnitskiy, A.L. (2024), Labor in a Changing World: Labor Transformations and the Focus of New Research (round table), *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 5, pp. 3–26, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.31857/S0132162524050019>.
- Barsukova, S.Yu. and Gerchikov, V.I. (1997), *Privatization and labor relations: from the common and general to the private and different*, IEiOPP SO RAN, Novosibirsk, Russia.
- Belyaeva, I.F. (1995), *The concept of labor relations development in Russia in the transition period*, Min-vo truda RF, Institut truda, Moscow, Russia.
- Bocharov, V.Yu. (2009), Institutional approach to the analysis of contractual labor relations, *University proceedings. Volga region. Humanities*, no. 2(10), pp.151–160.
- Bocharov, V.Yu. (2010), *Social Institute of wage labor in modern Russia*, Publishing house "Samara University", Samara, Russia.
- Bocharov, V.Yu. (2017), The Role of Trade Unions to Modernize the Russian Wage Labor Institution, *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Sociology*, vol. 10, issue 1, pp. 4–22, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu12.2017.101>.
- Bocharov, V.Yu. (2022), Changing Approaches to the Studying of Labor Relations in Russian Sociology, *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 7, pp. 41–52, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.31857/S013216250019650-8>.
- Bocharov, V.Yu. (2023), Intersectional approach to the analysis of the life world and the study of everyday practices of labor interactions of Russian workers, *Science and education in the context of global challenges: collection of articles on the results of the Fifth Professorial Forum on November 22-24, 2022*, in 2 volumes, vol. 2, pp. 42–47, Russian Professorial Assembly, Moscow, Russia.
- Bocharov, V.Yu. (2024a), Labor Relations Differentiation in a Modern High-Tech Enterprise (a case study), *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 5, pp. 54–65, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.31857/S0132162524050042>.
- Bocharov, V.Yu. (2024b), *Sociology of labor: methodological recommendations for independent preparation for classes in the discipline*, Publishing house "Samara University", Samara, Russia.
- Bocharov, V.Yu. and Klimova, S.G. (2022), Is Russian Sociology of Labor Ready to Respond to New Challenges? (Analytical Review of Two Scientific Conferences), *Sotsiologicheskiy zhurnal. Russian So-*

ciological Journal, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 178–191, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.19181/socjour.2022.28.2.8993>.

Bocharov, V.Yu. and Tukumtsev, B.G. (2006), *Bibliographic list of reference literature for the course sociology of labor: methodological recommendations for students of the Faculty of Sociology of full-time and part-time education*, Publishing house "Samara University", Samara, Russia.

Bocharov, V.Yu., Klimova, S.G. and Sizova, I.L. (2023), Innovative Resources and Trajectories of Russian Workers in Modern Conditions of Labor Deconversion, *Socialnoe prostranstvo. Social area*, vol. 9, no. 3, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.15838/sa.2023.3.39.5>, [Online], available at: <http://socialarea-journal.ru/article/29754>.

Chilipenok, Yu.Yu. (2015), *Social and labor relations: theory and practice of interaction of subjects in the sphere of Small and Medium Businesses*, NISOC, Nizhniy Novgorod, Russia.

Craig Alton, W.J. (1975), A Framework for the Analysis of Industrial Relations Systems. In: *Industrial Relations and the Wider Society*, Barrett, B., Rhodes, E. and Beishon, J. (eds.), Collier Macmillan, London, UK.

De Bardeleben, J., Klimova, S.G. and Yadov, V.A. (2004), *The formation of labor relations in post-Soviet Russia*, "Academic project", Moscow, Russia.

Democratization of management, or the search for a new motivation for work: an interuniversity collection of articles (1993), Publishing house "Samara University", Samara, Russia.

Dunlop, J. (1958), *Industrial Relations Systems*, Holt and Winston, New York, USA.

Farnham, D. and Pimlott, J. (1983), *Understanding Industrial Relations*, Second edition, Cassell, London, UK.

Flanders, A. (1965), *Industrial Relations: What is Wrong with the System? An Essay on Its Theory and Future*, Farber & Farber, London, UK.

From precarious employment to precarization of life (2022), Toshchenko, Zh.T. (ed.), "VES' MIR", Moscow, Russia.

Gavrilyuk, T.V. (2021), The Working Class in the Service Sector: Outlining the Issue and Reviewing Current Sociological Discourse. *Sotsiologicheskii zhurnal. Russian Sociological Journal*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 78–96, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.19181/socjour.2021.27.3.8425>.

Genkin, B.M. (2005), *Economics and sociology of labor*: textbook for universities. 5th edition, "Norma", Moscow, Russia.

Gordon, L.A. et al. (1996), On the study of social labor problems in Russia in the first half of the 90s: subjects and objects of social and labor relations. *Social and labor research*, Issue 5, IMEMO RAN. Moscow, Russia.

Hyman, R. (1975), *Industrial Relations: A Marxist Introduction*, Macmillan, London, UK.

Kalleberg, A.L. (2000), Nonstandard employment relations: Part-time, temporary, and contract work, *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 26, pp. 341–365.

Karpova, N.V. (2008), *Economics and sociology of labor: social and labor processes in the market economy system*: textbook for universities, "Thin science-intensive technologies", Stary Oskol, Russia.

Kirdina, S.G. (2000), *Institutional matrices and the development of Russia*, TEIS, Moscow, Russia.

Kirdina, S.G. (2001), Do new institutional theories allow us to understand and explain the processes of transformation in modern Russia? *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 3, pp. 136–140.

Kirdina, S.G. (2003), Labor relations in redistributive economies: the case of Russia, *Social Partnership Policy (Russian and foreign experience)*, Velbi, Prospekt, Moscow, Russia, pp. 37–55.

Kizhevato, V.A. (2008), Institutional approach to the regulation of the social and labor potential of Russian society, *Chelovek i trud. Man and labor*, no. 6, pp. 39–41.

Kolesnikov, N.E. (1993), *Social and labor relations: modern problems and practices*, ISEP RAN, St.-Petersburg, Russia.

Kolmakova, I.V. and Kolmakova, E.M. (2021), Social and labor sphere: trends of the new millennium. *Human Progress*, vol. 7, issue 3, p. 1–19. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.34709/IM.173.8>.

Kozina, I.M. (1997), CASE STUDY: Some methodological problems, *Rubezh. Frontier*, no. 10–11, pp. 177–189.

Kravchenko, A.I. (1994), Sociology of labor: trends and results of development. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 6, pp. 40–50.

Kravchenko, A.I. and Shcherbina, V.V. (1998), Sociology of Labor and Production, *Sociology in Russia*, Yadov, V.A. (ed.), Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia, pp. 211–239.

Labor relations and collective actions in modern Russia: political, legal and social aspects (1999), Katsva, A.M., Kudyukin, P.M. and Patrushev, S.V. (ed.), Editorial URSS, Moscow, Russia.

Labor relations: the state and trends of development in Russia: collection of scientific articles (2013), Yadov, V.A. et al. (ed.), Samara State University, Samara, Russia.

Lapin, N.I. (1990), Total alienation and the general crisis of early socialism. *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR*, no. 5, pp. 15–23.

Leonidova, G.V. (2022), Social and labor sphere in the Russian Federation: trends and risks in the formation of the quality of working life, *Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 182–198, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15838/esc.2022.6.84.11>.

- Linkon, S.L., Russo, J. (2016), Twenty Years of Working-Class Studies: Tensions, Values, and Core Questions, *Journal of Working-Class Studies*, no. 1(1), pp. 4–13, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13001/jwcs.v1i1.5799>.
- Makarova, M.N. (2007), “The End of labor”: the myth and reality of postindustrialism, *Economic sociology*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 45–52.
- Malyshev, M.L. (2006), Monitoring of the social and labor sphere: the experience of organizing and conducting. *Sociology of power*, no. 3. pp. 47–57.
- Markovich, D.J. (1997), *Sociology of Labor*. RUDN Publishing House, Moscow, Russia.
- Marxist Economic Theory in the History of Capitalization of Russia* (2018), Simchenko, N.A. et al. (ed.), ARIAL, Simferopol, Russia.
- Menshikova, G.A. (1999), Institute of Labor in Russia: past and present of labor relations, *Social and labor relations: the state and trends of development in Russia*, RAKS, Samara, Russia, pp.124–134.
- Mikhailovsky, V.S. (2017), The Neo-Marxist search for revolution and its agents, *History and Modernity*, no. 2, pp. 247–264.
- Molevich, E.F. (2001), Labor as object and topic for general sociology research. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 7, pp. 38–41.
- Motivation and human behavior in the sphere of work: a collection of scientific papers* (1990), Antosenkov, E.G., Belyaeva, I.F. and Bogatyrenko, Z.S. (ed.), Research Institute of Labor, Moscow, USSR.
- Nekhoda, E.V. (2007), *Methodological and theoretical foundations of the study of social and labor relations*, Tomsk State University, Tomsk, Russia.
- Odyakov, S.V. (2011), Methodological problems of the resource approach in the study of social and labor relations, *Scientific problems of humanitarian research*, no. 9, pp. 266–273.
- Olympieva, I.B. (2007), Perspectives of the institutional approach to the study of industrial relations in Russia, *Problems of labor, labor relations and quality of life*, Univers grupp, Samara, Russia, pp. 177–186.
- Osadchaya, G.I. (1996), *The social sphere of society: theory and methodology of sociological analysis*, Soyuz, Moscow, Russia.
- Peschansky, V.V. (1997), Industrial Relations in Russia: towards Democratization or Authoritarianism? *World Economy and International Relations*, no. 3, pp. 71–78.
- Podmarkov, V.G. (1973), *Introduction to industrial sociology*. “Mysl”, Moscow, USSR.
- Podmarkov, V.G. (1982), *Man in the labor collective: problems of the sociology of labor*, Economics, Moscow, USSR.
- Popov, Yu.N. and Shevchuk, A.V. (2003), *Modern economics and sociology of labor*, Academy of National Economy under the Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia.
- Precarious employment: origins, criteria, features* (2021), Toshchenko, Zh.T. (ed.), Moscow, Russia.
- Rakitskaya, G.Ya. (2003), *Social and labor relations*, Institute of Prospects and Problems of the Country, Moscow, Russia.
- Romanov, P.V. (2000), *Sociological interpretations of management: Studies of management, control and organizations in Modern society*, Saratov State Technical University, Saratov, Russia.
- Romashov, O.V. (1999), *Sociology of Labor*: textbook for university students, “Gardariki”, Moscow, Russia.
- Salamon, M.W. (1987), *Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice*, Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd, London, UK.
- Silin, A.A. (1993), The concept of labor and industrial relations. *Trud za rubezhom. Labor abroad*, no. 1 (17), pp. 5–15.
- Sizova, I.L. and Chilipenok Yu.Yu. (2017), The Social Responsibility within Labour Relations Among the Employers in Small and Medium Businesses, *The Journal of Social Policy Studies*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 67–80, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.17323/1727-0634-2017-15-1-67-80>.
- Social problems of production* (1979), Podmarkov, V.G. (ed.), “Mysl”, Moscow, USSR.
- Social regimes of post-Soviet production* (2008), Kabalina, V.I. (ed.), Publishing House of the Komi Scientific Center of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Syktyvkar, Russia.
- Sociology of Labor* (1993), Dryakhlov, N.I., Kravchenko, A.I. and Shcherbina, V.V. (ed.), Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia.
- Sociology of Labor in new conditions: interuniversity collection of articles* (1993), Samara State University, Samara, Russia.
- Sociology of Labor. Theoretical and applied explanatory dictionary* (2006), Yadov, V.A. (ed.), Nauka, Saint-Petersburg, Russia.
- Sokolova, G.N. (2016), Creation of the national paradigm of labor sociology: scientific contribution of V.A. Yadov, *Yadov readings: perspectives of sociology*, collection of scientific reports of the conference, St.-Petersburg, December 14–16, 2015, Bozhkov, O.B., Yaroshenko, S.S. and Bocharov, V.Yu. (ed.), Eidos, Saint Petersburg, Russia, pp. 50–60.
- Temnitskiy, A.L. (2000), *Labor Relations at a New Private Enterprise (Sociological Analysis of Data from Three Studies)*, IS RAN, Moscow, Russia.
- Temnitskiy, A.L. (2007), Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of labor behavior in a transforming Russian society, *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 6, pp. 60–71.
- Temnitskiy, A.L. (2021), Traditions and innovations in labor culture of Russian workers, *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 4, pp. 61–73, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.31857/S013216250010467-6>.

Temnitskiy, A.L. and Bessokirnaya, G.P. (2024), Changes in the Problem and Subject Field of Labor Sociology Against the Backdrop of the Time Challenges (based on publications in the journal "Sociological Studies" over 50 years), *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no 7, pp. 48–60, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.31857/S0132162524070062>.

The key issue of the sociology of labor: a collection of scientific papers (1988), Antosenkov, E.G., Katulsky, E.D., Belyaeva, I.F. and Bogatyrenko, Z.S. (ed.), Research Institute of Labor, Moscow, USSR.

The life world of employees: sustainability versus precarity (2024), Collective monograph., Toshchenko, J.T. (ed.), Publishing House «Ves Mir», Moscow, Russia.

The precariat: the formation of a new class (2020), Collective monograph, Toshchenko, Zh.T. (ed.), Center for Social Forecasting and Marketing, Moscow, Russia.

The social and labor sphere of agriculture in the Samara region: state, trends, prospects (2010), Bokovenko, A.F., Bocharov, V.Yu. and Molevich, E.F. (ed.), Publishing house "Samara University", Samara, Russia.

Tikhonova, N.E. (2006), Resource approach as a new theoretical paradigm in stratification research, *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 9, pp. 28–39, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.17323/1726-3247-2006-3-11-26>.

Tokarskaya, N.M. and Karpikova, I.S. (2006), *Sociology of labor: a textbook*, Vinokurov, M.A. (ed.), Logos, Moscow, Russia.

Toshchenko, Zh.T. (2000), Sociology of life as a concept of social reality research, *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 2, pp. 3–12.

Toshchenko, Zh.T. (1989), *Social reserves of labor: Topical issues of labor sociology*, Politizdat, Moscow, USSR.

Toshchenko, Zh.T. (2003), The subject and structure of sociology of labor, *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 3, pp. 46–58.

Toshchenko, Zh.T. (2016), *Sociology of Life*, UNITY-DANA, Moscow, Russia.

Toshchenko, Zh.T. (2018), *Precariat: from pro-to-class to a new class*, Science, Moscow, Russia.

Toshchenko, Zh.T. (2024), Life World as a Basic Concept of the Sociology of Life, *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 7, pp. 10–22, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.31857/S0132162524070035>.

Toshchenko, Zh.T. and Tsvetkova, G.A. (2012), *Sociology of labor*, Textbook for universities. Center for Social Forecasting and Marketing, Moscow, Russia.

Tukumtsev, B.G. (2000), *Essays on the history of the first Samara Sociological Laboratory*, Samara State University, Samara, Russia.

Tukumtsev, B.G. (2006a), Labor relations, *Sociology of Labor. Theoretical and applied explanatory dictionary*, Nauka, St.-Petersburg, Russia, pp. 365–366.

Tukumtsev, B.G. (2006b), Social and labor sphere. In: *Sociology of Labor. Theoretical and applied explanatory dictionary*, Nauka, Saint-Petersburg, Russia, pp. 308–309.

Tukumtsev, B.G. (2016), V.A. Yadov on the application of the cultural approach in the sociological analysis of labor relations, *Yadov readings: perspectives of sociology*, collection of scientific reports of the conference, St.-Petersburg, December 14–16, 2015, Bozhkov, O.B., Yaroshenko, S.S. and Bocharov, V.Yu. (ed.), Eidos, St.-Petersburg, Russia, pp. 103–113.

Tukumtsev, B.G. (2023), *Selected articles: a collection of articles*, Bocharov, V.Yu. (ed.), Publishing House of Samara University, Samara, Russia, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.18287/BGT1011927>.

Vaskina, Yu.V. (1999), Labor contractual relations and the need to study them in modern conditions, *Social problems of labor in modern society and issues of improving the teaching of labor sociology in universities*, St.-Petersburg State University Publishing House, Saint Petersburg, Russia, pp. 103–112.

Volkov, Yu.E. (2009), Towards the development of a modern understanding of the essence of labor, *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. Sociological Studies*, no. 3, pp. 27–35.

Volovskaya, N.M. (2001), *Economics and Sociology of labor: textbook for universities*, Infra-M, Moscow; Siberian Agreement, Novosibirsk, Russia.

Yadov, V.A. (2006a), Labor, *Sociology of Labor. Theoretical and applied explanatory dictionary*, Nauka, Saint-Petersburg, Russia, pp. 332–333.

Yadov, V.A. (2006b), Sociology of Labor, *Sociology of Labor. Theoretical and applied explanatory dictionary*, Nauka, St.-Petersburg, Russia, pp. 315–317.

Yadov, V.A. (2009), *Modern theoretical sociology as a conceptual basis for the study of Russian Transformations: a course of lectures*, Intersocis, St.-Petersburg, Russia.

Дата поступления: 06.10.2024

рецензирования: 22.11.2024

принятия: 16.12.2024