

DOI: 10.37930/2782-618X-2022-1-1-109-120

Zhan T. Toshchenko

Russian State University for the Humanities (Moscow, Russia)

A NEW SOCIO-ECONOMIC PHENOMENON: PRECARIAT¹

Abstract: The article substantiates the emergence of a new social class – the precariat, explains the reasons for its emergence, its structure and its main characteristics. It is shown how ideas about the precariat matured in the depths of world and domestic social thought and the real practice of the functioning of the modern economy. The main features of this class are revealed, its specificity, its place and role in the modern division of labor, its position in the labor market, the first sprouts of its awareness as a “class for itself” are revealed. The consequences of the existence and functioning of this new social phenomenon are clarified.

Keywords: society, class, labor, employment, precariat.

For citation: Toshchenko Zh. T. (2022). A new socio-economic phenomenon: precariat. *Noonomy and Noosociety. Almanac of Scientific Works of the S.Y. Witte INID*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 109–120. DOI: 10.37930/2782-618X-2022-1-1-109-120.

Received December 24, 2021.

托辛科 Zh. T.

俄罗斯国立人文大学, 俄罗斯莫斯科

新的社会经济现象: 不稳定无产阶级

摘要: 本文论证了不稳定无产阶级这一新的社会阶层的出现, 阐述了该阶层出现的原因、结构和主要特点。本文说明了在世界和国内的社会核心思想中以及在现代经济现实中, 不稳定无产阶级的概念是如何形成的。文章揭示了这个阶级的主要特征和特殊性, 及其在现代劳动分工中的地位 and 作用, 在劳动力市场中的地位, 作为“自己的阶级”的意识的萌芽。阐明了这种新的社会现象的存在及其影响。

关键词: 社会、阶级、劳动、就业、不稳定无产阶级。

引文注释: 托辛科 Zh. T. (2022). 新的社会经济现象: 不稳定无产阶级//智力经济和智力社会. 新兴工业发展研究所论文选, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 109–120. DOI: 10.37930/2782-618X-2022-1-1-109-120.

文章已收到 2021 年 12 月 24 日

Introduction

The new realities of the 4th industrial revolution and the 6th technological mode have highlighted not only the implementation of radical changes in technology and engineering, but also

¹ This article was written within the framework of the Russian Science Foundation project No. 18-18-00024.

the fact that in many countries of the world a growing number of working-age people find themselves in a situation that many researchers and practitioners describe as distorted, shadowy, unstable and disadvantaged. This means that employment, that is, job security with all its attendant needs and life interests, has become an increasingly important issue in labor relations for more and more people. Both the state and employers began to distance themselves from social and legal obligations in one way or another: It was not uncommon, and even prevalent, for personal arrangements between employers and employees to occur without mutual legal guarantees, without guarantees of protection of the socially provided labor standards that used to exist in the civilized world. Such relations meant that employers (or their representatives, managers) could arbitrarily change the forms and scope of employment, the place of work, remuneration, seek “restraint” in the behavior of workers and their demands, invoking objective and other difficulties. This insecure, temporary and disempowered situation was particularly evident in the case of so-called temporary workers (seasonal, casual), who were employed without the right to permanent, regular and guaranteed employment and often at unsustainable wages. Young people were often hired, ostensibly to test their professional readiness to perform assigned tasks for a so-called “business” test, and then dismissed as having “unmet expectations,” while new people were hired in their place, agreeing to violated rights and temporary sacrifices and deprivations.

However, this awareness of new realities did not emerge immediately, although these changes in social and class structure were taking place all over the world, especially in developed countries. One of the first steps in this direction was taken by French sociologists in the 1980s. A fundamentally new approach to understanding changes in socioeconomic structure came from P. Bourdieu, who studied the situation of seasonal workers in French vineyards. He described this community in detail and included in his analysis the ever-growing mass of workers employed in temporary and casual jobs. At that time, the word “precariat” (from Latin precarious - impermanent, insecure) was coined for the first time to refer to a stratum of workers characterized by precarious employment, lack of guaranteed social benefits, insecurity in difficult life situations [Bourdieu, 1998].

Gradually, these strata began to attract the attention of other researchers: Z. Bauman [Bauman, 1998], R. Castel [Castel, 2009] and others. At the same time, domestic researchers also paid attention to these changes and the actual practice of using the labor force in order to grasp the new realities, the deformation of certain economic and social processes, and the emergence of new social groups that were not present in the earlier stages of the societies’ development, but became a reality in post-Soviet Russia. These attempts are reflected in the study and analysis of the new social status of people associated with the phenomenon of unemployment (V.V. Radaev, O.I. Shkaratan, R.H. Simonyan), downshifting (N.E. Pokrovsky), freelancing (O.D. Strelkov, A.V. Shevchuk, V.S. Kharchenko) and others. A special place in this search was occupied by the concept of informal employment, where people enter into an employment relationship on the basis of a verbal agreement (V.E. Gimpelson, R.I. Kapeliushnikov). In other words, these researchers have drawn attention, to varying degrees, to the fact that changing labor relations greatly increase the risks for employers to violate workers’ labor rights and social guarantees. As a result, a significant portion of workers in this labor market acquire the status and characteristics of precariousness, instability, and insecurity.

As the new reality was being grasped, other original and detailed works gradually emerged analyzing the condition and problems of these groups of workers: Temporary work (I.M. Kozina), work of service workers with its specific feature as emotional labor and its social and psycholog-

ical characteristics (S.A. Druzhilov), concepts of employment strategies (Y.M. Reznik). The proposal of some researchers to refer to the concept of “class”, which, in our opinion, has some basis (S.G. Kordonsky, V.G. Nemirovsky), when they speak of such phenomena as the new aristocracy, the Cossacks, the “office plankton”, etc., can also be referred to the attempt to see the diversity of changes in the social and class structure.

We should also note that in modern conditions the concept of self-employment has become very important, which offers a different interpretation aimed at overcoming the inconsistency in the use of the concepts of the informal sector of labor and informal employment. This approach makes it possible to legitimize the existence of a part of informal workers when they obtain a formal recognition of their work and establish a special legal relationship with the state. In our view, however, this recognition is rather contradictory. On the one hand, according to the Presidential Decree on the recognition of this type of employment in the enumeration of professions, not all self-employed workers can exercise this right. On the other hand, this designation is associated with the difficulty of constituting oneself as a self-employed person, whose rights and obligations for many of them are fraught with uncertainty and insecurity about their present and future.

Moreover, layers, communities, and groups associated with the gray and black (shadow) economies have become a reality. It is therefore only natural that the question of their criminal component arises, because life has shown that it is often difficult to draw a line between them and the officially employed.

Thus, more and more researchers have paid attention to the fact that in the world, in most countries, a new type of social class structure has emerged, for the description and analysis of which the old concepts do not work [For more details see: Toshchenko, 2018]. This changed reality and the need to understand it was most clearly formulated and implemented by G. Standing, who was one of the first to note not only the peculiarities and characteristics of the new strata, but also their constant increase, their spread in almost all countries of the world and called this phenomenon precariat [Standing, 2014, p. 23]. In the 2000s, domestic researchers gradually began to understand the new situation [Bobkov, 2019; Golenkova, 2016; Biryukov, 2014; Tartakovskaya, 2019; Tikhonova, 2019; Shkaratan, 2015]. Each of them interpreted the essence and significant features of precarity differently, but all agreed that it is a new, objective and increasingly manifest phenomenon that cannot be ignored.

Main findings and discussions

How did the precariat emerge?

In the second half of the twentieth century – the beginning of the twenty first century, as engineering and technology began to change dramatically, a different approach to employment problems became necessary as new types of specialization and new occupations emerged and the forms of worker participation in production activities began to change significantly. Workers were employed in a variety of combinations and variants, which greatly differentiated the socio-professional and socio-classical structure of society, which in turn led to qualitative changes in the labor market and the emergence of new employment models. At the beginning of the third millennium, employment has become a mosaic reflecting a variety of forms and types of labor relations, most of which have emerged and are gradually being constituted under the influence of the scientific and technological revolution. The model of standard employment relations, characterized by stable, secure, and full-time employment, has gradually been replaced by flexible and nonstand-

ard forms of employment [Bertola and Rogerson, 1997; Davis and others, 2006; Garibaldi, 1998; Pissarides, 2000; Vosko, 2010]. The history of the emergence of non-standard forms of employment is long and their range is wide [Clement, 2007; Employment precarity..., 2017; Sinyavskaya, 2005].

Radical changes in technology and the organization of production, expressed in the mass spread of flexible production systems and the need for rapid adaptation to the needs and demands of a constantly changing market, have contributed in a special way to changing previous forms of employment and, consequently, to the formation of new specific social groups (communities). New technologies and new engineering have had a significant and sometimes decisive impact on changing the structure of occupational groups, limiting and sometimes displacing the workforce. There has been an insurmountable contradiction between scientific and technological progress and the interests of workers. Radical changes in engineering and technology, coupled with selfish ambitions of owners seeking maximum profit margins, led to the formation of precarious strata of workers and not only physical but also mental labor. Accordingly, different real forms and uses of work have emerged and, accordingly, different explanations for the changes in the world of work have emerged.

The essence and content of the concept of precariat

So, what is precariat?

In the second half of the twentieth century, social strata (groups, communities) began to grow, which had their predecessors, but not to the same extent and in the same numbers. Moreover, they began to seriously influence the state and prospects of the labor market, leading to fundamentally new relations between workers and employers. When the specificity of these strata was discovered, they were first described and explained in terms of a particular socio-economic situation.

A number of researchers have analyzed the characteristics of social groups such as part-time and marginal workers, people combining study and work, and the career development of young people. As a result, there were important but ambiguous explanations of the state of the labor market and precise definitions of how to interpret the changes taking place there. More and more researchers began to focus their attention on those population groups who were disadvantaged in their labor rights, limited in the use of social opportunities and frequently changed their jobs and occupations. Therefore, their conclusions often involve assertion by denial [Wright, 2005]. Standing also resorts to phrases by denial in his definition of precarity - "is not", "does not possess", "has not", "is not included", etc. [Standing, 2014, pp. 36-39]. This approach severely limits the identification of the essence and content of this concept, as it only establishes the lack of participation in the basic features of the existing society.

If we start from the class-forming factors that constitute this socio-economic phenomenon, we should pay attention to what primarily determines its place in the modern social structure of society. In our opinion, the approach of paying attention to the essential characteristics of the analyzed social groups (communities) when characterising the precariat is rational and justified. First, the precariat is often interpreted as a conglomerate of disenfranchised people deprived of any social rights, which, according to the logical conclusion of the thought, means the collapse of the theory and practise of the welfare state [Bauman, 2005]. Some researchers point out that for these strata there is no longer any protection against unemployment, no compliance with social obligations and no guarantees of support in difficult situations [Anisimov, 2021, pp. 10-27]. Sec-

ond, the precariat is considered a form of wage labor that covers an overwhelming part of the population and has become an integral part of all branches of production and culture [Bobkov, 2019]. Thirdly, the definition highlights the marginal position of people who belong to the precariat, especially workers of liquidated enterprises who are not guaranteed to keep their jobs under regular employment [Tarkovskaya, 2019]. In our view, this is an incomplete definition of the sources of the social base of precariat - it is replenished from almost all social groups in modern society. Fourth, there are also such interpretations: The precariat is a class that takes the place of the proletariat. It is still a class in itself, but it is on the way to becoming a class for itself [Romanovsky, 2019]. But even this is an inaccurate definition. While the proletariat consisted mainly of workers in industrial production, the precariat is composed of all strata of modern society. Fifth, at the same time, there are views that we should not multiply the myths about the “disappearance” or “death” of the working class, because the proletariat in the form of the precariat has not disappeared anywhere – it has not only “returned”, but in fact has not disappeared anywhere [Biryukov, 2015, p.101]. Finally, there is a view that the precariat is mainly composed of disadvantaged groups of the population, which often includes the labor situation of migrants and young people [Malinkin, 1997; Zudina, 2019]. There are also viewpoints according to which we should only talk about certain social groups of precarious labor, but it is either wrong or premature to talk about the precariat as a class [Busygina, 2016, p. 44].

When we talk about the drastic deterioration of the situation in the labor market in the context of the ongoing economic and financial crisis, rising unemployment and falling levels of prosperity in many economies of the world, some researchers prefer to consider the precarisation of labor as a process that has manifested itself under the total domination of the principles of the “political economy of insecurity” [Bauman, 2008] and the introduction of new austerity measures. It is the process of precarisation that shows the depth of social instability, the unpredictability of the further development of many societies [Shkaratan et al., 2015].

A review of the available perspectives leads to the conclusion that the precariat is an emerging socioeconomic phenomenon that represents, on the one hand, social strata that have professional knowledge, qualified experience and aspiration to establish rational relations with society and the state, and, on the other hand, is a rapidly growing stratum of precarious workers with insecure, flexible employment, with unstable forms of distribution of the surplus product and arbitrary optionality. They have no access, in whole or in part, to social and legal safeguards and means of social protection, and therefore do not have satisfactory prospects for civil (public) and private life. We should add that the speed and scale of these global changes have increased significantly.

It is clear that this definition of the precariat differs significantly from the Marxist one (based on socioeconomic indicators [See: Lenin, 1980, pp. 1-29] and from the Weberian interpretation of classes (based on the characteristic of power [Weber, 1994], which formulates other characteristics of class formation. The interpretation we propose is not based on a denial of what has been previously elaborated, what is valid for the state of knowledge and existing realities at that time. Our interpretation is based on the fact that there have been radical changes in the economic, social and political spheres that have produced other meanings and other reference points to explain the new social relations.

Hence the understanding of precarization as a process of quantitative and qualitative change in employment that affects the majority of the working-age population and that manifests itself in a constant clash between objective conditions and subjective factors represented by employers

and existing laws aimed at unconditional submission to those in power who exercise economic and political control.

The structure of precariat

What does the modern precariat consist of?

First, it is the part of the Russian population that the International Labor Organization (ILO) estimates is employed as undocumented workers (20% of the total population). According to our study Precariat (2018-2020), these social groups make up to 20% of the economically active population in Russia. This group is restricted in the use of their labor and is fully or partially deprived of the rights that full-time employees with secure jobs have. It is the informally employed who make up the bulk of the poor, who account for about 20 million people in Russia. At the same time, the income of informal workers is low, differing from official salaries by 43-65%. According to the ILO, poverty among the formally employed in industrialized countries does not exceed 12%, while among the informally employed it can range from 15% to 25%, depending on the sector of activity [Precarious Employment..., 2021, p. 327]. The members of these social strata (communities) usually do not have social rights due to their special position, they do not have paid vacations. They cannot count on assistance in obtaining housing. Taking care of their children becomes their own business, as well as acquiring education and improving their qualifications. In addition, temporary workers have virtually no opportunities for professional development and career advancement.

Second, the precariat in Russia consists of temporary workers who are limited to short-term contracts (up to 10% of the total workforce). It should be noted that this is a global trend: In Western European countries, this type of employment accounts for the majority of workers (over 20%); in Asian countries, the share ranges from 24% in the Philippines to 67% in Vietnam. According to the ILO, temporary workers are paid 15 to 55 percent less than workers on permanent contracts. One in three of them belongs to the precarious workforce, a group of workers living below the poverty line. According to J. Johnson, the head of the ILO department's analytical office, they are almost completely deprived of full social protection, exposed to a higher risk of illness and a higher likelihood of injury due to poor control of safety procedures and compliance with normal working conditions [Toshchenko, 2018, p. 82]. In Russia, for example, this has manifested itself clearly in the so-called rationalization of work for teachers at universities and other educational institutions, when they are transferred to part-time employment with an insufficient increase in work intensity under the banner of improving and increasing the efficiency of their work. Above all, *temporary employment becomes a permanent value* that begins to accompany a person throughout his life. It should be noted that this situation is not unique to Russia. According to C. Derre, a professor at the College of Jena, "every third employed person in Germany is in a state of suspended or current precarity" [Toshchenko, 2018, p.82].

Third, the precariat is made up of people who work part-time or scrape by with seasonal and casual jobs. This phenomenon allows us to disguise the extent of unemployment. In the vast majority of cases, these are people who have had to agree to work part-time. And as practice shows, they have to work more and receive less pay for their work than they expected. In addition, many from this group face greater exploitation and self-exploitation, often out of proportion to the compensation they receive for their work. This group finds itself in a situation where it is constantly exposed to restrictions of all kinds that force it to change jobs and look for a new one. The intensity of these job changes is increasing. For example, an observational study conducted in the

Novosibirsk region showed that in 1995, only 9.2% of people changed jobs several times, while in 2013, 21.2% had already experienced this [Volovskaya et al., 2015]. This form of employment is a source of misappropriation of the country's intellectual wealth. According to the all-Russian survey "Life World 2014" (October 2014, 1800 people, 8 regions of the country), almost 50% of respondents said that their education does not correspond to the work they do or found it difficult to answer this question [Vital World..., 2016, p. 351].

Fourth, similar characteristics can be attributed to employment through hired-out workers, the essence of which is that intermediary firms have emerged that hire workers and give them to other firms, companies, organizations to perform the work they need or provide services to other clients. It is a fundamentally new form of employment in which workers are used through an intermediary. In this case, the worker is likened to a commodity that benefits everyone involved in this particular logistics except the worker himself. And this is already the case with many types of workers, including highly skilled workers. Unlike staffing agencies, which only offer specific vacancies, these companies both hire and pay the worker, but not the place where he or she works according to specific agreements between the employer and the intermediary [Kozina, 2013].

Fifth, a number of researchers count the unemployed, whose number is quite high, among the precariat. It becomes particularly acute in the crisis years. Thus, after the 2008 crisis, the unemployment rate increased by almost 50% and in 2009 it amounted to 6373 thousand people. The same situation is characteristic of the economic crisis of 2014-2015, as well as after the imposition of sanctions against Russia and the fall in oil prices. According to experts, the difference between registered and total unemployment varies from 3.5 to 7 times. Thus, S. Glaziev believes that in Russia "hidden unemployment is up to 20%" [quoted from: Istomin, 2015, p.17]. It should be especially noted that hidden unemployment is often hidden by unwillingness to register, casual work and occasional employment in the private sector, especially in the agricultural sector.

Finally, in our opinion, the precariat should also include the part of migrants, whose number is considerable in many countries of the world, including Russia. Their situation is also characterized by the fact that many of them are disadvantaged, they are paid less than official citizens and they are not guaranteed many social benefits. They are often subjected to indirect, if not direct, ethnic and religious discrimination [Kozin, 2021, p. 115].

In this structure, we believe that we should single out the candidates of the precariat who are in a borderline state, occupying an intermediate state and exposed to the blurring of their commonalities. In our view, these include freelancers and young professionals (mostly students) who are in a waiting situation to occupy or prepare for the social position they desire.

As for freelancers, they represent a social group of the so-called creative professions - IT specialists, programmers, etc. - which is difficult to grasp. Often, attempts are made to portray them as followers of a free spirit, independent of the strict and petty regulation of official (state, share-based, private) companies and organizations [Kharchenko, 2014, p. 57]). But their nonconformism, their absence of external, everyday control turns out to be the fact that this ostentatious and sometimes attractive independence is affected by the same limitations as the previously mentioned groups - defenselessness, lack of social guarantees, being alone in case of unforeseen life circumstances, deprivation of stability and confidence in the future. That is, the very problematic situation of many of them in terms of permanent employment is also relevant for this category [Strebkov, Shevchuk, 2017].

Among the candidates for the precariat should be such a problematic group as the youth and especially the students who seek a stable position in society and in the profession. It is this part of young people, who are in a state of insecurity and accept casual and non-permanent forms of employment, which are often below their abilities and legitimate aspirations [Krekhovets, Shpilev, 2020].

All these social groups, which form the precariat in all its manifestations, are the answer to the question of Russian Deputy Prime Minister O. Golodets, who stated in April 2013 at the international conference “Modernization of Economy and Society” XIV that 38 million people of working age work in opaque conditions, that “our labor market is almost illegal and only a small part operates according to normal rules” [Golodets, 2013]. According to them, with this number of more than 76 million working-age Russians, it is not clear where they are employed, what they do, how they are employed, which means that their living conditions and income are not reflected in the official statistical data.

Overall, in many countries of the world, these groups form quite a significant stratum, accounting for between 30 and 50% of the working-age population.

Thus, in Russia, as elsewhere in the world, a new social class has emerged in the late 20th and early 21st centuries: the precariat, characterized by informal, temporary, seasonal or part-time employment that is precarious, unstable and transient. Its number is constantly growing and has the tendency to increase, including people who previously had permanent employment and are often counted among the middle class.

Summarizing the ideas expressed and relying on the analysis of the real social and economic practice, we can define the criteria by which belonging to the *precariat is determined as follows*: (a) *the absence of a labor contract or its registration for no more than a year*; (b) *the mismatch between training and qualifications for the job performed*; (c) *the deformation of the labor process (uncertain duration of the working day (week, month, year) with predominance of part-time or temporary work*; (d) *the unstable and hidden forms of payment (the salary “in an envelope”*. To this we can add such a socio-psychological feeling as *uncertainty of life prospects, uncertainty of the future* [Precariat: Education..., 2020, p. 82-83].

This approach allows us to talk about both general indicators of precarious employment and its intensity (based on the coefficient). At the same time, these indicators can vary depending on the presence of some features of precarity, which allows us to draw a more flexible picture - from a light to a high severity of this type of employment, highlighting the “core” and “periphery” of precarity (in the study this was done by I.O. Shevchenko, see: [Precarity: Emergence..., 2020, pp. 83-92]). The set of attributes can be adjusted depending on the theoretical assumptions and possibilities of the database used. If we include not only the characteristics of the worker’s employment conditions, but also his subjective perception of these conditions as voluntary or forced, it seems appropriate to create a classification of workers based on the combination of the values of two attributes: the degree of employment insecurity and subjective assessment of one’s position (satisfaction with working conditions, desire (or not) to change jobs, etc.) [Popov, Solovyova, 2020, pp. 103-113].

Conclusions

The analysis suggests that society has been confronted with a new kind of alienation, unprecedented in this form and to this extent in history.

The precariat inherits many of the characteristics of the 18th century factory worker. Having become a mass social stratum within the class of hired, exploited manual and head laborers, these strata show a contradictory tendency in the development of socioeconomic relations in contemporary society. The precariat represents a large mass of people who, on the one hand, retain the essential characteristics of an exploited class, but on the other hand, occupy an unstable, precarious social position in social production that is not temporary but permanent. These people have no confidence in their necessity for society, in their right to employment in their own or a related occupation, to social security, to a secure future for their families and their dependents. These people have been placed by capital and political power in a position where they have no one to whom they can lay claim except the nameless organizational institutions of modern society.

Consequently, we are dealing with a fundamentally new socioeconomic formation, the precariat, which at present still bears to a considerable extent the features of a proto-class. The social strata and groups of which it is composed have not yet developed a sense of self-identification and solidarity, are only weakly organized or not organized at all, and have no unified but only a vaguely perceived political program and ideology. The precariat is still a “class in itself” and is on the verge of becoming a “class for itself.” But it is already gradually forming stable social class formations that unite huge masses of people and anchor them in a status of permanent transience of social position and a pronounced sense of lack and limitation in the realization of their possibilities and abilities.

Like other sections of the labor market, the precariat began to use the instruments of class struggle that had been tried in the past, such as strikes, rallies, demonstrations, etc., and to look for new, unfamiliar and little-tried forms of struggle. Such forms of protest as participation in actions to protect the environment, ecology, infrastructure, history and culture are gaining weight and influence. One thing is certain: the level of discontent in society also feeds from these ranks. To the extent that we become aware of these circumstances, the precariat tends to evolve from a potentate to a formidable entity - a future class described by G. Standing as dangerous.

Today, the question of what to do in this situation is particularly acute for political authorities. Although the analyzed text focuses on the acute problem of employment and considers it fundamental for solving the existing socio-economic problems, one can only agree with the technocratic claims based on the fact that the ongoing modernization with its flexible technology replaces the living labor force with robots and various automated systems. With these claims, moreover, they and the (neo-)liberals cover their narrow-mindedness by scaring others (including the political authorities) with the inevitable existence of a social class like the precariat. Meanwhile, if we look at the history of the development of capitalist society since the 18th century, we cannot see a steady decline in employment. Of course, there have been crises, there have been recessions, there have been dramatic changes in technology, but on the whole, the number of people involved in social production has not only not decreased, but on the contrary, has actually increased. The technological revolutions in the past, as well as the fundamental information technology and digital changes in the present, are transforming not so much the quantity but the quality of the workforce, producing new occupations to replace those that are obsolete and out of date. Therefore, it is necessary not to excuse the current employment situation or to invoke the insurmountable objectivity of scientific and technological progress, but to adapt economic policy to the needs and interests of the population and, above all, of the workforce. This does not require

tricks and manipulations of employment, but a political will that would free many people from the humiliating role of beggars and opportunists.

We believe that the State and society have all the means and are able to provide work to all who want to work, which will eliminate the current problems of insecure employment and, to the same extent, provide a high quality of life and the realization of spiritual aspirations that uplift man, including through the introduction of a basic material income. Before all these socio-economic problems, there is, in our opinion, a more significant, strategic and fateful decision that the Russian authorities should make: to whom to give priority in determining the future of the country - the program of a socially oriented state or the market developments of the (neo-)liberals or technocratic projects that pretend to be non-partisan.

It is obvious that the solution of the contradictions is not only due to the emergence of the precariat, but also to other contradictions that have arisen in the course of the liberal reforms, and that it is connected with the necessity of a fundamental restructuring of the existing social relations, with the creation of a new model of the socio-economic, socio-political and socio-cultural structure of contemporary Russian society. Otherwise, according to the forecast of the London Center for Economic and Business Research, by 2032 Russia with the existing model will not be among the first ten countries in terms of GDP (the chain will be as follows - China, the USA, India, Japan, Germany, Brazil, the UK, South Korea, France, Indonesia), because the Russian economy on its current course will grow by 1.5-2%, while the world economy on average - by 3.7%. This is despite the fact that this growth will be measured at 6.6% in China and 2.5% in the US. All this raises the question of many parameters of development, among which a rational solution to the problems of labor relations, employment of the working-age population and productivity growth plays a key role.

References

- Anisimov R.I. (2021). Precariat as a new social class in the context of Marxist theory. *Sociological Journal*. Vol. 27. No. 1, pp. 10–27 (In Russ.).
- Bauman Z. (2005). *Individualized society*. M.: Logos. 390 p.
- Bauman Z. (2008). *Fluid modernity*. SPb., Peter, 240 p.
- Biryukov A. A. (2015). The emergence of the precariat or the return of the proletariat? (About the book by Guy Standing “Precariat – a new dangerous class”). *Sociological Research*. No. 10, pp. 158–162. (In Russ.).
- Bobkov V.N. (2019). Unstable employment in the Russian Federation: the state and directions of decline. *Population*. T. 22. No. 2, pp. 91–104. (In Russ.).
- Bulanova M.B., Artamonova E.A. (2020). NEET youth: European context and Russian realities. *Bulletin of RUDN University. Ser. Sociology*. Vol. 20. No. 1, pp. 64–73. (In Russ.).
- Busygina I.M. (2016). Precariat: a new challenge for modern societies and its conceptualization (Reflections on G. Standing’s book). *Social Sciences and Modernity*. No. 3, pp. 34–45. (In Russ.).
- Weber M. (1994). *Favorites. Society image*. M.: Lawyer. 704 p.
- Volovskaya N.M., Plyusnina L.K., Rusina A.V., Inozemtseva A.V. (2015). Unemployed population and self-employment in the Siberian region. *Sociological Research*. No. 5. (In Russ.).
- Golenkova Z.T., Goliusova Yu.V. (2015). *Precariat as a new phenomenon in the modern social structure / Hired worker in modern Russia*. Moscow: New Chronograph. pp. 121–138.
- Golodets O. (2013). 38 million able-bodied Russians are busy with unknown things. *Russian newspaper*. April 3rd. (In Russ.).

- Life world of Russians: 25 years later (late 1980s–mid 2010s)* (2016). / Ed. Zh.T. Toshchenko. M. 367 p. (In Russ.).
- Istomin V. (2015). Crisis and unemployment threaten the country with a social explosion. Version. No. 3:17. (In Russ.).
- Castel R. (2009). *Metamorphoses of the social question. Chronicle of hired labor* / Per. from fr., total ed. ON THE. Shmatko. St. Petersburg: Aleteyya, 574 p.
- Clement K. (2007). “Flexibility in Russian”: an essay on new forms of labor and subordination in the service sector. *Sociological Journal*. No. 4, pp. 75–96.
- Kozin S.V. (2021). Precariat: from protoclass to new class. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 18. Sociology and political science*. No. 27(2), p. 202–208. (In Russ.).
- Kozina I.M. (2008). Terrestrial labor: social aspects // *Sociological Research*. No. 8, pp. 3–13. (In Russ.).
- Krekhovets E.V. Shpilev D.A. (2020). The role of informal social connections in the employment of students and school graduates. *Sociological Research*. No. 4, pp. 78–89.
- Lenin V.I. (1980). *The Great Initiative (On the Heroism of the Workers in the Home Front. Concerning the Communist Subbotniks)*. Poln. coll. op. Vol. 39, pp. 1–29. (In Russ.).
- Malinkin A. N. (1997). Max Scheler’s Doctrine of Resentment and Its Significance for Sociology. *Sociological Journal*. No. 4, pp. 116–150. (In Russ.).
- Employment instability: international and Russian contexts* / Ch. scientific ed. V.N. Bobkov (2017). Moscow: RealPrint Publishing House.
- Popov A.V., Solovieva T.S. (2020). Precarization of employment: analysis of scientific discourse on the essence and vectors of measurement. *Sociological Research*. No. 9, pp. 103–113.
- Precariat: the formation of a new class* / ed. Zh.T. Toshchenko (2020). M.: TsSPiM. 400 p.
- Precarious Employment: Origins, Criteria, Features* (2021). M. 400 p.
- Romanovsky N.V. (2019). Dangerous class? The topic is not closed (thoughts about the problem). *Sociological Research*. No. 9, pp. 96–105.
- Sinyavskaya O.V. (2005). Informal employment in Russia: measurement, scale, dynamics. *Economic Sociology*. Vol. 6. No. 2. (In Russ.).
- Strebkov D.O., Shevchuk A.V. (2017). Labor values of independent and organized employment. *Sociological Research*. No. 1, pp. 81–93. (In Russ.).
- Standing G. (2014). *Precariat: a new dangerous class*. M., Ad Marginem Press. 328 p.
- Tartakovskaya I.N., Vanke A.V. (2019). Labor trajectories of precarious workers and the formation of precarious habitus. *Sociological Journal*. Vol. 25. No. 2, pp. 99–115. (In Russ.).
- Tikhonova N.E (2019). Precariat and prospects for changing the social structure of Russian society. *Sociological Research*. No. 2, pp. 167–173. (In Russ.).
- Toshchenko Zh.T. (2018). *Precariat: from protoclass to new class*. M.: Science. 350 p. (In Russ.).
- Kharchenko V.S. (2014). Lifestyle of Russian freelancers: a sociological analysis. *Sociological Research*. No. 4. pp. 54–63. (In Russ.).
- Shkaratan O.I., Karacharovskiy V.V., Gasyukova E.N. (2015). Precariat: Theory and Empirical Analysis (Based on Polls in Russia, 1994–2013). *Sociological Research*. No. 12, pp. 99–110.
- Betola G., Rogerson R. (1997). Institutions and Labour Reallocation. *European Economic Review*. Vol. 41, pp. 1147–1171.
- Bauman Z. (1998). *Work, consumerism and the new poor*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Bourdieu P. (2003). *Counterfire: Against the Tyranny of the Market*. London: VersoBooks.

- Bourdieu P. (1998). Le precariate est aujourd'hui partout (Precariousness is Everywhere Nowadays). *Contre Feux*. pp. 96–102.
- Davis S.J., Faberman J., Haltiwanger J. (2006). The Flow Approach to labor Markets: New Data Sources and Micro-Macro Links. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. Vol. 20. No. 3, pp. 3–26.
- Garibaldi P. (1998). Job Flow Dynamics and Firing Restrictions. *European Economic Review*. Vol. 42. No 2, pp. 245–275.
- Hochschild A. (2003). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkley: Univ. of California Press.
- Pissarides C. (2000). *Equilibrium Unemployment Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vosko Leah F. (2010). *Managing the Margins. Gender, Citizenship and the International Regulation of Precarious Employment*. New York.
- Wright E.O. (2005). *Approaches to class analysis*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Information about the author

Zhan T. Toshchenko

Dr. Sc. (Econ.), Professor, Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Scientific Supervisor of the Faculty of Sociology, Russian State University for the Humanities; Principal Research Fellow, Institute of Sociology (branch) FCTAS RAS (Miuskaya sq. 6, Moscow, GSP-3, 125993, Russia)
E-mail: zhantosch@mail.ru