

DOI 10.36074/logos-18.08.2023.02

LABOUR RELATIONS' TRANSFORMING: CHALLENGES AND OBJECTIVES DURING THE TRANSITION PERIOD

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2779-3736

Vladimir E. Shedyakov
Dr. Sc. (Sociology), Ph. D. (Economics)
Freelancer scientist

UKRAINE

Post-industrial global transformations include the transformation of labour relations. The labour dimension is a significant component of social change. Optimizing the course of change involves taking into account changes not only at the micro, but also at the macro level [1-5]. At the same time, the perception and evaluation of activities are historical; ideas about the fruitfulness, the productive power of labour are changeable. The economy is included as a subsystem in its organic social environment. For example, a resource-oriented economy cannot but recognize the primary importance of environmental factors of security and development of society, in particular, when studying the validity of the use of technologies. The technical and technological content of the process, replacing the performance of muscle-energy functions with various aggregates, allows (and makes it effective) to concentrate human efforts on creative tasks. At the same time, the growing tendencies do not at all mean an indispensable rejection of the achievements of Modernity and Tradition; they do not cross out their potentials. On the contrary, new facets of their combination and activation are opening up. But they manifest themselves differently in forms specific to each cultural and civilizational world. And the more fully the local conditions of activity are taken into account during the transition period, the more impressive the result can be achieved [6-17]. Thus, the paradigm features in the transformations of the socio-political order are superimposed on the attitude of man and society to the labour sphere, expanding interest in other areas of self-expression. Systemically, we are talking, first of all, about the factors of the importance of labour in society, external to the economy, about working conditions (external factors of the labour process), factors of labour as such and its quality, as well as factors of attitude to work and the qualities of an employee. Organizational and managerial relations bind, girdle and permeate all these levels together. Moreover, the prerequisites have been formed for creativity to become a concrete-universal process of self-disclosure of the masses from an element of strictly individual leisure, non-labour, a private hobby. If earlier a person, as a rule, was realized within the strict framework of a life path predetermined by birth, today, on a social scale, freedom of choice in the production of meanings has replaced the former freedom from choice with relegation to animal-thing reproduction [18-27]. The formation of an attitude to work adequate to the era on a social scale and the consolidation in society of the personal interest in the success of hyper-industrialization require a complex change in the conditions, process, subject-object relations in the production sphere.

The ratio of material, social and spiritual-ideological characteristics of activity influences the attitude to work. Now, first of all, this process is subject to the laws of the transformation of labour into creativity (as labour and, at the same time, non-labour). The way of thinking today absorbs, first of all, the motivations of not an

“economic person”, but a “creative person”. Thus, such significant changes in the social conditions of life, the composition of the labour potential and effective directions for its activation are displayed that the model of the “economic man” in practice demonstrates its limited truth, giving way to approaches based on the perception of the “creative man” [28, p. 18]. On the one hand, the degree of regularity of the phenomenon, as a rule, is opposite to its spirituality; on the other hand, the essence of the transformations experienced is connected with the transition to the priority of the spiritual-mental principles of activity. In turn, in a smart society, “free radicals” of the precariat and criticism of meritocracy are activated; the contradictions between the “smart crowd” and “elites”, “the people” and the “oligarchy” are intensifying.

Of course, along with the transformation of labour into creativity, there are other characteristics of changes: for example, “post-industrial”, “information” relations, and the like. But these are private aspects and spheres of transformations that are not related to the core of transformations in social relations and the wealth of society. The creation during the transitional period of conditions for an accelerated transition to an economy of creation based on creativity (primarily intellectually intensive) is the core of the hyper-industrialization strategy. At the same time, the matter is not limited to this: the cultivation of a creative environment is one of the priority areas not only for hyper-industrialization, but also for the success of the entire transition to a new paradigm. It is extremely important that public agreement be reached on a fruitful basis, that the harmonization of interests be carried out in conditions that elevate a person. And the value of labour here is among the priorities. Moreover, backwardness of public life and the emergence of features of the “new Middle Ages” may grow along with the postmodern atomization of society, and not at all be a return to the cohesion of society by tradition. So, a serious contradiction of time is between the formed need for the quality of work and the attitude to life. On the one hand, the cardinal increase in the complexity of human activity, the emphasis on unique creativity makes a highly responsible, interested attitude almost mandatory, removing the employee’s capabilities from effective external control and requiring reasonable initiative and search, often around the clock. On the other hand, the comprehensive propaganda of the consumer pursuit of pleasure has broken the working mood of society. The realization of post-industrial transformations significantly influenced the place of labour relations in the system of national heritage. High-quality provision of information: both to key figures and at the social level, is the most important factor in both success in the present and management of the future. A creative person “works by his soul” – both in the material and spiritual spheres of life. The vector of change in the attitude to work that dominates in society is one of the indicators of the socio-cultural landscape, and a characteristic of the existing conditions of activity, and an indicator of the quality of common goals and interests. On the one hand, in social relations that arise about creativity as the realization of a complex of individual giftedness, the importance of sociality naturally increases. On the other hand, if participation in production proper is time torn from human life itself, then creativity, on the contrary, as the embodiment of human essential forces, is the essence of human life. In other words, production relations are alienated, which presupposes and requires external influence – one form or another of coercion. On the contrary, creativity is based primarily on internal motivation and, as a manifestation of internal potential, is obviously spontaneous. At the same time, the gap between the objective requirements for maximizing the opportunities for development and creative embodiment of everyone and the socio-political order, which fixes a random place in the division of labour and property, is regarded as unfair. The transformation of the

labour process into a form of interaction with an emphasis on the role of activity as a means of communication, development, self-embodiment fixes the socio-political significance of labour-creativity. The requirements for the quality of labour relations, objectively formed by the historical process, mean the need for cardinal transformations of organizational-managerial relations [29-38].

Thus, it was not information saturation that became the determining factor for change. And not employment in information technology characterizes the array of labour potential and consumption of services. At the same time, it is not agriculture, not mediation, not tourism, and the like that do not provide both a socio-economic upsurge and the quality of the demand for the population by the national economy. Consequently, they do not provide a solid foundation for sovereignty and development. But the creation of a social system that is beneficial for the creativity of everyone forms a structure for strengthening security and growth. Creativity combines the characteristic features of "labour" and "non-labour", raising labour activity and motivating the involvement of labour potential in creative projects. At the same time, providing conditions for the mass identification, stimulation and creative realization of the abilities of the population has a healing effect not only in the economic sphere, but also creates the effect of consolidating efforts precisely in the rush of development (and not, for example, maintaining comfortable idleness or aggressive expansion). Revealing the productive potential of socio-cultural capital and the possibilities of scientific, educational and industrial associations will transform not only the proto-clusters themselves, but the entire social way of life. That is, the prerequisites for a complex social pedagogy of the people are being created.

References:

- [1] Бузгалин, А.В., Колганов, А.И. (2003). Теория социально-экономических трансформаций. М.: Теис.
- [2] Платонов, С. (1991). После коммунизма. Второе пришествие. М.: Мол. гвардия.
- [3] Шедяков, В.Е. (2019). Вектор постсоветских трансформаций как фактор глобальных преобразований. *Economy and Society: the Modern Foundation for Human Development: Proceed. of III Intern. Scient. Conf. Leipzig* 40-41.
- [4] Шедяков, В.Е. (2015). Трансформации общественные и наук об обществе. *Развитие экономических и межотраслевых наук в XXI веке: Матер. XIII Междунар. конф. Ежемес. науч. журнал.* Новосибирск: НИГРЭ, № (6 / 13), 68-71.
- [5] Шедяков, В.Е. (2015). Будущее обществознания в контексте стратегической футуродиагностики. *Суспільні науки: напрямки та тенденції розвитку в Україні та світі: Матер. Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. Одеса*, 116-119.
- [6] Ухтомский, А.А. (1950). Учение о доминанте. *Собр. соч.:* В 6 т. Л.: ЛГУ, (1).
- [7] Борисов, В.В. (отв. ред.). (1976). Труд и трудовые отношения. Ярославль: Верхне-Волжское кн. изд-во.
- [8] Буян, И.В. (1987). Труд становится творчеством. К.: Политиздат Украины.
- [9] Шедяков, В.Е. (2012). Системні основи розвитку трудових відносин. *Вісник Київського нац. ун-ту. Філософія. Політологія*, (107), 43-46.
- [10] Шедяков, В.Е. (2019). Трудовые отношения в «новой экономике». *Habitus*, (9), 47-53.
- [11] Шедяков, В.Е. (2019). Трудовые отношения в экономике познающего общества. *Digital and Innovative Economy: Processes, Strategies, Technologies: Proceed. of Intern. Scient. Conf. Kielce*, 79-81.
- [12] Шедяков, В. (2012). Стан трудових відносин як джерело потенційних загроз стратегічного рівня. Аналітична записка. 09.04.2012. URL: <https://niss.gov.ua/doslidzhennya/socialna-politika/stan-trudovikh-vidnosin-yak-dzherelo-potenciynikh-zagro-z>
- [13] Шедяков, В.Е., Блінов, О.А., Морозов, П.Д. (2014). Удосконалення трудових відносин як основа стійкості та розвитку громадянського суспільства. К.: Задруга; рец.: *Економіст*. (2014), (4), 62-63.
- [14] Шедяков, В.Е. (1995). Циклы модернизации трудовых отношений. *Циклы природы и общества: Матер. 3 Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. Ставрополь*, (1, 2), 282-284.
- [15] Шедяков, В.Е. (2015). От постсовременных трансформаций к постиндустриальному уровню производственной демократии. Матер. XXXIII Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. М., 102-105.

- [16] Шедяков, В.Е. (2020). Консолидация интересов в формировании качества общественной формы труда. *Вісник Одеського національного ун-ту. Економіка*, (25 - 1 / 80), 17–22. DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2304-0920/1-80-2>
- [17] Shedyakov, V. (2022). Consolidation without suppression of alternatives: recourse and methodological bases of management. *Transformation of economy, finance and management in modern conditions* / Pawlik, A., Shaposhnykov, K. (eds.). Kielce: Baltija Publishing, 236-256. DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-220>
- [18] Агг, А. (1984). Мир человека как субъекта производства. М.: Прогресс.
- [19] Буслинский, В.А. (отв. ред.). (1987). Диалектика превращения труда в первую жизненную потребность. К.: Наук. думка.
- [20] Разжигает, А.Ф. (1977). Экономические проблемы становления труда как потребности. М.: Мысль.
- [21] Лейтес, Н.С. (1950). Склонность к труду как фактор одарённости. *Известия АПН РСФСР*, (25), 7-49.
- [22] Ананьев, Б.Г. (1962). О соотношении способностей и одарённости. *Проблемы способностей*. М.: Изд-во АПН РСФСР, 15-32.
- [23] Ткаченко, И.Е., Шедяков, В.Е. (1992). Способности трудящихся: природа, управление развитием и использованием в условиях радикальной экономической реформы. *Вестник Харьк. ун-та*, (356), 3-10.
- [24] Шилов, В.В., Турубарина, А.С., Мирошникова, А.В. (2014). Новое поколение «трудовых ресурсов» в зеркале социологии. *Проблемы экономики, организации и управления в России и мире*: Матер. V Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. Прага, 430-433.
- [25] Шедяков, В.С. (2013). Культура праці як чинник підвищення якості життя під час переходу до соціальних технологій, іманентних постсучасним трудовим відносинам. *Нова парадигма*, (115), 164-174.
- [26] Шедяков, В.Е. (2021). Формирование отношения к себе и миру как фактор трансформаций. *Scholarly disputes in philosophy, sociology, political science, and history amidst globalization and digitalization*: Proceed. of Intern. scient. conf. Venice, 127-130. DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-181-7-33>
- [27] Шедяков, В.Е. (2015). Трансформация отношения к труду: в фокусе личного и общественного. *Розвиток сучасного суспільства в умовах глобальної нестабільності*: Матер. Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. Одеса, 75-78.
- [28] Шедяков, В.С. (1996). Постмодернізація трудових відносин як об'єкт соціального управління: Автореф. дис. ... доктора соціол. наук. Харків: ХДУ.
- [29] Шедяков, В.С. (2014). Управління працею в умовах підвищення рівня взаємозалежності в економічному житті суспільства: актуальні питання стратегічних трансформацій. *Економіст*, (7 / 333), 26-32.
- [30] Шедяков, В.С. (2017). Рефлексивні організація та управління працею як риси постсучасної модернізації. *The Visegrad Four – Ukrainian dimension. Integration – step by step* / Derkach, T. (ed.). Riga: Baltija Publishing, 78-91.
- [31] Shedyakov, V. (2019). Creation and realization of organizational-management strategy during paradigm transformation. *Organizational-economic mechanism of management innovative development of economic entities* / Bezpartochnyi, M. (ed.). Przeworsk: WSSG, (3), 345-364. DOI <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.9731429.v1>
- [32] Шедяков, В.Е. (2015). Тенденции создания постиндустриальных отношений и стимулирование желательных трансформаций. *Актуальные проблемы науки XXI века*: Матер. I Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. М., (II), 183-187.
- [33] Шедяков, В.Е. (2016). Стимулирование желательных процессов как форма стратегического управления при становлении «умного общества». *Современная экономика и финансы: исследования и разработки*: Матер. XLII Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. СПб., 18-23.
- [34] Шедяков, В.С. (2016). Гармонізація інтересів в постіндустріальному суспільстві механізмами виробничої демократії та соціального партнерства. *Економічний вісник Запорізької державної інженерної академії*, (3), 22-26.
- [35] Шедяков, В.С. (1996). Виробнича демократія і трудові відносини. *Вісник Київського ун-ту ім. Т. Шевченка. Соціологія. Психологія. Педагогіка*, (2), 36-42.
- [36] Шедяков, В.Е. (2015). Производственная демократия и социальное партнерство – формы проявления гражданской ответственности субъектов трудового процесса. *Наукові здобутки на шляху до вдосконалення економіки країни*: Матер. Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. Дніпропетровськ, (I), 32-36.
- [37] Шедяков, В. (2012). Роль соціального партнерства в забезпеченні системного рівня розвитку громадянського суспільства. *Віче*, (19 / 328), 20-23.
- [38] Шедяков, В.Е. (2019). От трипартизма к общегражданскому полилогу. *Регіональні студії*, (16), 97-103.