

UDC: 316.728

Sudakov Volodymyr Ivanovich,

Doctor of Sociological Science, Professor, Head of the Department of Theory and History of Sociology of the Faculty of Sociology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine, 01601, Kyiv, Volodymyr-ska Str., 64/13, tel.: (067) 502 86 48, e-mail: vl_sudakov@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093

Судаков Володимир Іванович,

доктор соціологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри теорії та історії соціології факультету соціології, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Україна, 01601, м. Київ, вул. Володимирська, 64/13, тел.: (067) 502 86 48, e-mail: vl_sudakov@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093



Судаков Владимир Иванович,

доктор социологических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой теории и истории социологии факультета социологии, Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко, Украина, 01601, г. Киев, ул. Владимирская, 64/13, тел.: (067) 502 86 48, e-mail: vl_sudakov@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093

THE GLOBAL DETERMINANTS OF THE CONFLICT INTERACTIONS IN THE CONTEMPORARY MODELS OF EMPLOYMENT (ARCHETYPICAL ANALYSIS)

Abstract. The article presents analytical sociological approach that is oriented to the identification of the global determinants of the conflict interactions in the new contemporary models of employment. The situations of the “crisis and destruction of the labor societies” and of the “destandardization of employment” are investigated by the author. Underlined that the contemporary labor processes are based on the traditional social mechanism of exploitation. Devoted the necessity of further scientific researchers of the new standardized forms of the individualized employment, which reproduce the conflict interactions in the new inclusive and exclusive models of employment.

Keywords: labor, archetype, employment, employability, global labor market, destandardization of employment, models of employment.

ГЛОБАЛЬНІ ДЕТЕРМІНАНТИ КОНФЛІКТНИХ ВЗАЄМОДІЙ В СУЧАСНИХ МОДЕЛЯХ ЗАЙНЯТОСТІ (АРХЕТИПНИЙ АНАЛІЗ)

Анотація. У статті представлено аналітичний соціологічний підхід, орієнтований на виявлення глобальних детермінант конфліктних взаємодій в нових сучасних моделях зайнятості. Автором досліджуються ситуації “кризи і руйнування трудових колективів” і “дестандартизації зайнятості”. Підкреслено, що сучасні трудові процеси засновані на традиційному соціальному механізмі експлуатації. Позначена необхідність подальших наукових досліджень нових стандартизованих форм індивідуалізованої зайнятості, які відтворюють конфліктні взаємодії в нових інклюзивних і ексклюзивних моделях зайнятості.

Ключові слова: праця, архетип зайнятості, можливість працевлаштування, глобальний ринок праці, дестандартизація зайнятості, моделі зайнятості.

ГЛОБАЛЬНЫЕ ДЕТЕРМИНАНТЫ КОНФЛИКТНЫХ ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЙ В СОВРЕМЕННЫХ МОДЕЛЯХ ЗАНЯТОСТИ (АРХЕТИПНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ)

Аннотация. В статье представлен аналитический социологический подход, ориентированный на выявление глобальных детерминант конфликтных взаимодействий в новых современных моделях занятости. Автором исследуются ситуации “кризиса и разрушения трудовых обществ” и “дестандартизации занятости”. Подчеркнуто, что современные трудовые процессы основаны на традиционном социальном механизме эксплуатации. Обозначена необходимость дальнейших научных исследований новых стандартизованных форм индивидуализированной занятости, которые воспроизводят конфликтные взаимодействия в новых инклюзивных и эксклюзивных моделях занятости.

Ключевые слова: труд, архетип занятости, возможность трудоустройства, глобальный рынок труда, дестандартизация занятости, модели занятости.

Target setting. The current processes of globalization determine the real existence of two opposing trends. The first of these trends – the trend of radical internationalization of social life, the trend of intensive develop-

ment of global networks of interaction and communication that have a strong resource support from transnational business organizations (TNCs), media holdings, international political and cultural institutions. The second

trend — the trend of deepening global social drama, which reflects the new controversial realities of the new social division of human civilization into post-industrial center, industrial semi-periphery and agrarian periphery. Obviously, that this division is the main source of dehumanization of social life, actually leads to lower quality and living standards of the working population, increasing unemployment and to mass international migration. This is a serious problem for scholars who study current crisis of the global labor market and the new contemporary models of employment.

Analysis of recent publications on the issue. In recent decades scientists have paid much attention to the problems on the global labor market and of the global employment. The processes of economical, political and cultural globalization transformed traditional archetype of employment. The situations of the “crisis and destruction of the labor societies” and the “destandardization of employment.” were investigated by M. Archer, J. Baudrillard, Z. Bauman, U. Beck, Ph. Brown, R. Dahrendorf, A. Heskeith, A. Giddens, D. North, J. G. Ritzer, L. Sklair, J. Stiglitz, Ch. Tilly, M. York. It will be reasonable to evaluate these investigations as the positive cognitive foundation for further scientific researches that oriented to identification of the new contemporary models of employment.

The purpose of the article. The main purpose of this article is to elaborate analytical sociological approach which is oriented to identification of the global determinants of the conflict interactions in the contemporary models of employment.

The statement of basic materials.

First of all, I'd like to underline that the most evident consequences of current crisis of the global labor market are: new social inequalities, social conflicts and increasing social tensions. Obviously, under the current context of globalization the technological programs of social policy, which was introduced within particular countries, acquiring the features of a transnational character. It should be noted that this process, as I believe, really causes different institutional contradictions which lead to a significant deterioration in the quality of national programs of social policy and inefficiency of administrative regulative measures.

Firstly, global economic competition between countries can encourage them to reduce the total cash budget for social protection in order to increase the competitiveness of national economies.

Secondly, the migration of the economically active population objectively creates precedents of the global redistribution of incomes among national states that restricts economic opportunities for particular countries to implement effective policies forced paternalism and social policies to stimulate processes of self-employment.

Thirdly, the global labor market and financial markets create the possibility of supranational authorities (for example the European Union), whose activities may create difficulties for full implementation of elaborated programs protecting social rights at the national level.

From my point of view, these reasons are important factors in strengthening transnational social conflicts that quite clearly manifested in the recent

trends in the global transformation of the labor practices and employment. So I agree with D. North who writes that the main task of social sciences “is to explain the performance characteristics of societies through time, including the radical gap in human well-being between rich countries and poor as well as contrasting forms of political organization, beliefs and social structures that produce these variations in performance” [1, p. 1].

In this connection it is important to take into account the fact that in today’s global network of resource distribution significantly change the public role of labor: labor fulfills its role not only as a means of overcoming the traditional resource deficit but becomes a fundamental social resource for development of industrial and post-industrial societies. J. Stiglitz in his book “Making Globalization Work” points to the arising conflict interactions between skilled and unskilled labor in the global labor market which constitutes “the asymmetry in liberalization of capital and labor flows” [2, p. 90].

The scientific and technological revolution also stimulates the process a radical change in the social role of labor. This process manifests itself in contradictory tendencies: 1) intensive intellectualization of the labor activity, 2) reduction of employees in industrial systems, 3) arising development of new models and subcultures of employment.

These new tendencies, as I consider, in the specific way reflect the basic traditional contradictions of the employment archetype.

It is important to emphasize that understanding the phenomenon of labor employment is really the reproductive

social process of the functional inequality between master and worker. Therefore the labor itself in its social dimension, as argues American sociologist T. Lasswell, incorporates some conflicts and tensions of “various forms of institutional behavior”. So managers must organize the search for optimal organizational interaction in the workplace, which would reflect a reasonable balance of interests in order to solve tasks of specific work faster, better and better [3, p. 267–295].

The specific “conflict” aspect of this problem was investigated by the western sociologists. It is well-known, that R. Dahrendorf underlined that the labor process in industrial society traditionally existed as the conflict interaction between the dominate and the subordinate groups which had different volume of authority. Authority is inherent in the social positions themselves, and is not result of behavioral characteristics of the individuals who occupy them. Subordinate groups have an interest in shifting the distribution of authority to their own advantage. The process of historical evolution of this “shifting” Dahrendorf tried to present as the main source of the new social conflicts. These new conflicts produce different risks that enable to destroy the institutional system of employment. In the contemporary societies a large number of categories of workers fall into a situation of “out of work” because there are no more traditional appropriate forms and quantity of available work in order to determine the structure of society [4, p. 141–165].

Ch. Tilly in the monograph research “Democracy” [5] proposed the innovative research strategy which was pri-

marily aimed to the identification and description of the main kinds of resources as sources of inequality in the workplaces. This strategy, I regard as promising for further development, despite of some discussion problems. Ch. Tilly argues that the simple attempt to organize professional work always provides different forms of control concerning certain scarce socially significant material and financial resources. On the basis of such forms of control appear and assert themselves two mechanisms for social reproduction of “categorical inequalities” between two “closed groups” controllers and employees: 1) the mechanism of exploitation and 2) mechanism of usurpation. “The mechanism that generates inequality, we call exploitation takes effect when those who control the resource: a) employs others to create value means the use of the resource, but b) does not allow these to others use the full amount of the costs, which increased due to their work. The second mechanism of generating inequality would be called usurpation, accumulation opportunities. It is that resource – a source of wealth – manage members of a single closed group” [5, p. 138]. Thus, according to the analyzed position the availability of some scarce resource situation creates competition for control over it. This control reproduces the organization conditions for teamwork by institutionalized mechanisms of exploitation and usurpation.

As I consider, theoreticians of post-modern sociology have been proposed additional conceptual explanations of exploitation and usurpation phenomena as the global conflict determinants of the new international inequalities.

According to J. Baudrillard’s argumentation the trend of the global “symbolic exchange” on labor markets causes the “social deconstruction” of the traditional relations of full-time employment. This process cannot be linked to the relations of exploitation. Therefore labor becomes socially unstable process that is not be directly connected to the results of activity on the working-place. Labor is a social gift from capital [6, p. 104–110] and at the same time this gift is a kind of compensatory function of the real social power of capital – “labor is not exploitation and presents as a gift from capital”. Baudrillard believes that in advanced societies labor becomes the general code of social reproduction. In its symbolic form of social control, modern labor is the sign of general social employment. Due to labor processes, people must be fixed whether in schools, in factories, on the beach, in front of the TV, or being retired.

The author of innovative conception “Risk Society” German sociologist U. Beck underlines that the main consequences of the contemporary transformation of the global labor market are increasing poverty and risks. “There is a systematic “attraction” between extreme poverty and extreme risk” [7, p. 41]. In the globalized societies of the “second modernity” the constant reproduction of extreme poverty through communicative risks deforms the channels of social mobility. “Global risks tear down national boundaries and jumble together the native with the foreign. The distant other is becoming the inclusive other – not through mobility but through risks” [8, p. 331]. The extreme international inequalities are the determining factors of increased conflict

interactions under the global conditions of “destandardization of employment” – the process that transforms relations of full time employment in various forms of incomplete employment. This process causes different global threats and risks. “We are becoming members of a “global community of threats”. The threats are no longer the internal affairs of particular countries and a country cannot deal with threats alone. A new conflict dynamic of social inequalities is emerging” [9, p. 4].

From my point of view it will be reasonable to conclude that social scientists for a long time not paid due attention to the detailed study of the specific communicative and conventional resource foundations which constitute the professional labor practices. I think that communication and conventional conditions of professional work structured the standardized employment of various social groups of the working population. Therefore the employment relations as a communicative process involve the creation of a special situation of conventional reconciling the interests of the employer and employee.

This conventional reconciling is an evidence of appearance the new labor subcultures which represent the new standardized forms of individualized employment. These labor forms of individualized employment some scholars propose to analyze by using the concept of “employability”. I agree with Ph. Braun and A. Hesketh [10] who believe that the essential characteristics of this concept describe the broader perspectives of individual employment beyond the particular circumstances of personnel employment as current inclusion to concrete orga-

nization. Therefore, the “employability” is the abstract concept that reflects “an opportunity to be busy, but not real time”. It is important to conclude that Ph. Braun and A. Hesketh propose to analyze ontological shift from employment to employability as the complicated competitive and conflict process. “The shift in focus from employment to employability reflect the view that many companies are no longer able (or willing) to offer long-term career opportunities to their managers and professionals, Competitive pressures and the drive to increase shareholder values requires numerical flexibility that enables firms to restructure and eliminate “surplus employees” whenever necessary” [10, p. 18].

British sociologist M. Yorke pays his attention to the important fact that each human individual has interest to realize own aspirations to be really busy and find appropriate place in the labor market. Therefore this individual must somehow demonstrate and present the real achievements in learning new knowledge, acquired skills, and the ability to interact effectively with others in a certain structure of social relations using available resources as capital. This demonstration of individual achievements, as believes M. Yorke, is the important circumstance for correct interpretation of the “employability” concept: employability – “is a specific relationship of the individual to work in a situation where an individual demonstrates a set of achievements relative to specified task” [12, p. 7].

Obviously, the global shift from employment to employability causes arising conflict interactions due to the strengthening of international migra-

tion and the increasing competition in the national labor markets. I consider that these trends lead to the emergence of the new transnational models of employment that reflect the controversial processes of the social inclusion and social exclusion. As I believe the inclusive models of employment are:

1) bureaucratic model of employment – organization of work of legally invited migrant workers; working places;

2) ethnic-network model of employment – informal organization of the working places for migrants who have a common ethnic roots with the citizens of the particular country: (working places for Chinese migrants in Chinatowns in the US);

3) familyist model – informal inclusion in the family business of the new members who arrived from other countries;

4) educational model – temporary employment of various groups (mainly young people) in training at schools and institutes of education.

It is also important to identify the two exclusive models of employment. These are:

1) model of the formal replacement of the job-positions – reorganization of working places and acceptance of the new workers with lower wage;

2) criminal employment model – the formal exclusion the members of the national and international criminal groups who are died after criminal conflicts and executed for their criminal activities.

Of course, the further researchers of the models of employment require the new conceptual arguments and empirical surveys.

Conclusions. 1. The processes of economic, political and cultural globalization cause the radical transformation of the basic structural components of the national labor markets and of the traditional archetype of employment. The global situations of the “crisis and destruction of the labor societies” and the “destandardization of employment” are the objective reasons for organization the new scientific researchers that will be oriented to the identification of the global determinants of the conflict interactions in the new contemporary models of employment. 2. The contemporary labor processes are based on the traditional social mechanism of exploitation that determinates different inequalities and conflict interactions between professional group and individuals. 3 The new standardized forms of individualized employment are reflected by the concept “employability”. The essential characteristics of this concept create the cognitive foundation for the identifications of the conflict interactions in the new inclusive and exclusive models of employment.

REFERENCES

1. *North D. C., Wallisd J. J., Waingast B. B.* Violence and Social Orders. A conceptual framework for interpreting recorded human history / D. C. North, J. J. Wallisd, B. B. Waingast. – N.-Y.: Cambrige univ. press, 2013. – 320 p.
2. *Stiglitz J. E.* Making Globalization Work / J. E. Stiglitz. – N.-Y., London: W. W. Norton and company, 2007. – 374 p.
3. *Lasswell T.* Class and Stratum / T. Lasswell. – Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965. – 497 p.

4. *Dahrengorf R.* The Modern Social Conflict. The Politics of Liberty / R. Dahrengorf. — Berkley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California press, 1990. — 219 p.
5. *Tilly Ch.* Democracy / Ch. Tilly. — Cambrige (Mass.): Harvard univ. press, 2007. — 248 p.
6. *Baudrillard J.* Symbolic Exchange and Death / J. Baudrillard. — 2nd ed. — London: SAGE Publ., 2017. — 280 p.
7. *Beck U.* Risk Society. Toward a New Modernity / U. Beck. — London: SAGE Publ., 2009. — 272 p.
8. *Beck U.* Living in the world risk society / U. Beck // Economy and Society. — 2006. — № 3 (Vol. 35). — P. 329–345.
9. *Beck U.* World at Risk / U. Beck. — London: SAGE Publ., 2009. — 226 p.
10. *Brown Ph., Hesketh A.* The mismanagement of talent: employability and jobs in the knowledge economy / Ph. Brown, A. Hesketh. — N.Y.: Oxford univ. press, 2004. — 288 p.
11. *Yorke M.* Employability in higher education: what it is — what is not / M. Yorke. — Aberdeen: The Higher Education Academy, 2006. — 18 p.