

УДК 316.334:373.66
DOI: 10.26565/2218-2470-2020-10-01

IMMATERIAL LABOR AS A PHENOMENON AND CONCEPT: STATUS IN A WORLD OF INSECURITY AND RESEARCH POSSIBILITIES

Golikov Alexander – Doctor of Science (Sociology), Associate Professor, Professor of Department of Sociology, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 4, Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine, e-mail: a.s.golikov@gmail.com, ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>

Tyaglo Vladyslav – Second-year master's student of Department of Sociology Research Methods, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 4, Svobody Sq., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine, e-mail: marooceano@gmail.com, ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3288-0984>

The article is devoted to the problem of immaterial labor in the modern world as a phenomenon, as well as to the possibilities of studying it using sociological tools - as a category. Immaterial labor is considered by the authors as a specific phenomenon, the formation and spread of which is significantly associated with the world of global capitalism. The article describes the features and aspects of immaterial labor as a phenomenon and as a concept. Based on the developments of P. Bourdieu, M. Lazzarato, G. Standing, the researchers analyze the formation and development of immaterial labor phenomenality and epiphenomenality in the global world. Special attention to the precarious status of immaterial labor and its workers, the ratio of unreliability and precariousness in the nature of immaterial labor is paid. These concepts and ideas are used to study current transformations and attempts to predict future changes in the status, activities and characteristics of immaterial workers in the modern world. The authors argue that social policies and social work in relation to immaterial labor workers cannot be implemented according to modern models and patterns, but must be specified for new conditions. In addition, the authors argue that the unreliability of immaterial labor changes the prospects, limitations and features of both the status of labor itself (in particular, hiding a considerable part of it as labor), and the possibilities of instruments of state regulation, social policy and social work in relation to it: in particular, it turns out that the global world gives rise to whole groups of immaterial labor, included in the precariousness of the economy, the insecurity of social status - and at the same time excluded from social policy and social work. The very phenomenon of (immaterial) labor in this light becomes deinstitutionalized, amorphous, diffuse, constellative, oscillating and opalescent.

Key words: insecurity, globalization, social policy, immaterial labor, Maurizio Lazzarato, immaterial labor workers, precariousness.

НЕМАТЕРІАЛЬНА ПРАЦЯ ЯК ФЕНОМЕН ТА ПОНЯТТЯ: СТАТУС У СВІТІ НЕНАДІЙНОСТІ ТА МОЖЛИВОСТІ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

Голиков Олександр Сергійович – доктор соціологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри соціології Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна, майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна, e-mail: a.s.golikov@gmail.com, ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>

Тягло Владислав Ігорович – магістрант другого року навчання кафедри методів соціологічних досліджень Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна, майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна, e-mail: marooceano@gmail.com, ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3288-0984>

Статтю присвячено проблемі нематеріальної праці в сучасному світі як феномену, а також можливостям його вивчення соціологічними інструментарієм – як категорії. Нематеріальна праця розглядається авторами як специфічний феномен, становлення і поширення якого істотно пов'язано зі світом глобального капіталізму. У статті описуються особливості та аспекти нематеріального праці як феномену і як концепту. Спираючись на розробки П. Бурдьє, М. Лаццарато, Г. Стендінга, дослідники аналізують становлення і розвиток феноменальності й епіфеноменальності нематеріальної праці в глобальному світі. Особлива увага приділяється прекарному статусу нематеріальної праці та її носіїв, співвідношенню ненадійності і прекарності в природі нематеріальної праці. Ці концепції та ідеї використовуються для дослідження актуальних трансформацій і для спроби прогнозування майбутніх змін в статусі, діяльності та особливостей носіїв нематеріальної праці в сучасному світі. Автори доводять, що соціальні політики і соціальна робота відносно носіїв нематеріальної праці не можуть бути здійснені за модерним зразками і паттернами, але повинні бути специфіковані для нових умов. Крім того, автори аргументують, що ненадійність нематеріального праці змінює перспективи, обмеження і особливості як самого статусу праці (зокрема, приховуючи чималу його частину саме як працю), так і можливості інструментаріїв державного регулювання, соціальної політики і соціальної роботи відносно нього: зокрема, виявляється, що глобальний світ породжує цілі групи нематеріальної праці, по-різному включені в прекарну економіку, ненадійність соціального статусу – і при цьому виключені з соціальної політики і соціальної роботи, а також що сам феномен (нематеріальної) праці в такому світлі стає деінституціоналізованим, аморфним, дифузним, констелятивним, осцилюючим і опалесциуючим.

Ключові слова: *ненадійність, глобалізація, соціальна політика, нематеріальна праця, Мауріціо Лаццарато, робітники нематеріальної праці, прекарність.*

НЕМАТЕРИАЛЬНЫЙ ТРУД КАК ФЕНОМЕН И ПОНЯТИЕ: СТАТУС В МИРЕ НЕНАДЕЖНОСТИ И ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

Голиков Александр Сергеевич – доктор социологических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры социологии Харьковского национального университета имени В. Н. Каразина, пл. Свободы, 4, Харьков, 61022, Украина, e-mail: a.s.golikov@gmail.com, ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>

Тягло Владислав Игоревич – магистрант второго года обучения кафедры методов социологических исследований Харьковского национального университета имени В. Н. Каразина, пл. Свободы, 4, Харьков, 61022, Украина, e-mail: marooceano@gmail.com, ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3288-0984>

Статья посвящена проблеме нематериального труда в современном мире как феномена, а также возможностям его изучения социологическим инструментарием – как категории. Нематериальный труд рассматривается авторами как специфичный феномен, становление и распространение которого существенно связано с миром глобального капитализма. В статье описываются особенности и аспекты нематериального труда как феномена и как концепта. Опираясь на разработки П. Бурдьє, М. Лаццарато, Г. Стэндинга, исследователи анализируют становление и развитие феноменальности и эпифеноменальности нематериального труда в глобальном мире. Особое внимание уделяется прекарному статусу нематериального труда и его носителей, соотношению ненадежности и прекарности в природе нематериального труда. Эти концепции и идеи используются для исследования текущих трансформаций и попыток прогнозирования будущих изменений в статусе, деятельности и особенностей носителей нематериального труда в современном мире. Авторы доказывают, что социальные политики и социальная работа по отношению к носителям нематериального труда не могут быть осуществлены по современным образцам и паттернам, но должны быть специфицированы для новых условий. Кроме того, авторы аргументируют, что ненадежность нематериального труда меняет перспективы, ограничения и особенности как самого статуса труда (в частности, скрывая немалую его часть именно как труд), так и возможности инструментариев государственного регулирования, социальной политики и социальной работы по отношению к нему: в частности, оказывается, что глобальный мир порождает целые группы нематериального труда, по-разному включенные в прекарность экономики, ненадежность социального статуса – и при этом исключенные из социальной политики и социальной работы, а также что сам

феномен (нематериального) труда в таком свете становится деинституционализированным, аморфным, диффузным, констеллятивным, осциллирующим и опалесцирующим.

Ключевые слова: *ненадёжность, глобализация, социальная политика, нематериальный труд, Маурицио Лаццарато, работники нематериального труда, прекарность.*

Global capitalism as a system is a product and, at the same time, a process of multiple differentiations. One of them is the formation of immaterial labor, which is explicitly produced and reproduced as a purposeful and expedient transformation of the ideal (figurative, extra-material, intellectual, epistemological) reality, but it implicitly contains many both ontological and epistemological challenges, which at the moment not revealed enough (or in some aspects at all) by sociology, economic theory, philosophy or psychology. Material labor as an effect on the material world, analogous to the characteristics listed above, is not only explicated, but also implied as an investment of time, effort, attention, and resources into the transformation of material reality. While immaterial labor, on the one hand, is often not considered as such a transformation. On the other hand, it does not always differ (both by participants and external observers) with other modes of human action. On the third, it problematizes the issues of assessment (including objective) and (re)estimation (including social) of human activity and its results. On the fourth – it generates unknown hitherto (socio)structural and sociocultural effects, in particular, in the spheres of social guarantees and the provision of immaterial labor, its social perception, social status, etc.

Immaterial labor is actively studied in the philosophy of post-operatism (in particular, in the works of Paolo Virno, Maurizio Lazzarato, in part – M. Hardt and A. Negri) [16; 19; 26; 34].

Immaterial labor itself has long been recognized as a specific form [14], which even sometimes provokes discussions among (post-)Marxist theorists about the essence of the proletariat and the status of immaterial labor workers (ILW) in such a world. It evokes both optimistic and pessimistic generalizations and forecasts. Thus, O. Penz offers an understanding of the new possibilities of equality [6], N. Sokolova - the chances of the «gift economy» in the conditions of the massization of immaterial labor [31], which is especially important in light of robotization and the emergence of society, the fundamental possibility of hyperproduction in the automated world of «disappeared labor» [12]; L. Chetyrova – the prospects for the formation of a digital society and the role of education in this process [38]. Also scientists often refer to the problem of freelancing as a relatively new social phenomenon and a fundamentally different value-emotional regime of work [36], equating the new labor practices of an artist or musician [17].

However, other researchers note that the central antagonism of capitalist society as an exploitative society does not disappear [25], that labor does not cease to be labor even in the non-material sphere [11], that information turns into an instrument of power [30], knowledge – into cognitive capital [37], and «communication environment» – into «coercive machines» [17].

That is why not only the conceptualization of immaterial labor as well, which have repeatedly carried out by researchers, is relevant, but also its specification, concretization and operationalization of the world of globality, world of precariousness, world of collapse of the modernity and the formation of insecurity [15]. This is exactly what will be the **purpose** of our article.

The generally accepted point is the judgment that there is a tendency in late capitalism to oust material (physical) work by immaterial (mental) work. This is conceptualized in the form, for example, of a «service society» [33], «post-capitalism» [24], «post-industrial» [9], «information» [10], «information» [20] society. However, for the microlevel - that is, for the nature of labor itself, its connection with (un)reliability and precariousness¹ - the understanding of these processes, as well as their social, cultural, political consequences, has not been fully carried out.

But the transformation of the production process towards informatization, for example, leads to a modification of both power relations and the class structure. Lukacs's «live» physical labor is gradually not only robotized,

¹ We distinguish these two categories as, respectively, generic and specific: unreliability concerns all aspects of human life and society (and in this sense, it is similar to Bourdieu's «lack of guarantees», which is «everywhere»), while precariousness - economic, professional, career, consumer aspects only.

preparing for a new, subordinate role in the arena of «cognitive capitalism», but also transferred to a post-Fordist mode of existence, in which a significant role in creating superprofits is assigned (at least, as it is manifested and declared) to vertical and horizontal communications, initiative, creativity, the production of solutions by the employee and his responsibility for them, and so on. The employee becomes «the interface between different functions, different groups of employees, different hierarchical levels» [21].

A «project» configuration of employment is not only manifestly but also explicitly, actually inherent to immaterial production. It means that various subjects and resources of immaterial labor are mobilized in a certain part of the network to achieve certain goals, and then seem to «dissolve» in order to organize again if necessary. Immaterial labor exists, wrote M. Lazzarato, «exclusively in the form of networks and flows» [21]. This gives grounds to put forward a hypothesis about the precariousness and unreliability of the position of immaterial workers. Apologists of the ongoing processes write about the formation of rhizome capitalism, the growing role of self-organization processes, the increasing role of man in the new economy, while their critics – about the destruction of systems of reliability and assurance [13; 32], about new ways of exploitation and inequalities [25; 11], about the preservation of the capitalist structures of alienation while filling them with «immaterial labor» as a new content of «old furs».

Here, the associated concept is, first of all, the concept of cognitive capitalism, that is, a variety of capitalism, the leitmotif and locomotive of which is immaterial labor; we propose, following M. Lazzarato, to define it as labor (that is, expedient and purposeful activity to transform reality), the result of which is the «informational and cultural content of the product» [21], that is, signs, symbols, programs, visuality, textuality, audibility, cultural norms, public opinion, values, frames, stereotypes, rules, memes, images and so on.

Cognitive capitalism as a sub-SEF (socio-economic formation) prescribes to be an «active subject of communication» [21], which favorably distinguishes its lability, mobility, concealment, latency and naturalization in comparison with traditional forms of capitalism. That is why M. Lazzarato especially refers to the plot of the potential totalitarianism of the imperative of this sub-SEF: «Everyone should express himself, everyone should speak, communicate, cooperate» [21], and the quantification of these acts of production of immateriality is extremely difficult, but the ability to control an employee, manipulate social and the collective guarantees for him is significantly increased. According to Jodi Dean, such a multiplication of communicative contributions only works in favor of communicative capitalism [28], since the very subjectivity of the worker in it should be consistent with his production functions. Modern researchers of emotions catch precisely this aspect of communicative capitalism when they write about the exploitation of emotions, emotional labor, etc [3; 4].

So, the very subjectivity of the employee becomes fabricated, which allows to produce and reproduce in the future a new technology of power, carried out through the employee's internalization of the company's goals, the appropriate legitimation of the management actions and of the technologies for increasing labor productivity. Subjectivity can be managed, for example, with the help of tools such as corporate culture (intertwining and rhizome of expectations regarding subjectivity, which contain values and norms of behavior in the company), various activities for team building and improving intragroup dynamics (team building, facilitation trainings, etc.), project management methodologies (traditional, waterfall, agile, etc.), productivity software, and so on. On the opposite side, also subjectivity is controlled by the order to refuse from the «traditional», «mossy» collective reliability guarantees, indoctrination and the dissemination of the discourses of «flexibility», «independence», the «self-made-man», «professional mobility», «lifelong learning», «freelancing», «private priority» and so on. Such management of subjectivity turns out to be objectively functional for curtailing social programs in global neoliberal capitalism world, for both narrowing the target base of these programs and reducing the volume of their implementation, for the passivization and privatization of social policies (up to the privatization of justice and penitentiary institutions).

Thus, a characteristic process that has intensified with the spread of remote work is online team building, this hybrid of the traditional conveyor of subjectivity in the form of team building and freshly relevant technologies of online presence and online subjectivity. The paradox of this hybrid lies in the fact that special events for the «production of teamness» (in both senses of the Russian word «team» - «collective» and «order») take place offline (especially when it comes to areas of activity, whose employees spend most of their working time sitting in front of the screen). However, one of such measures took place in the fall of 2020 in an outsourcing IT company Luxoft for a team, part of which is located in Kiev, and partly in Houston, USA [27]. Denis Ryzhikh, who nominates himself

«Agile Coach, Authorized Instructor IC Agile, Scrum Master», that is, a specialist in agile software development methodologies, admits: «I have not seen the urgent need for team building as a way to unite a team and create a team spirit. Our team has been working together for a long time..., but we just missed communication and each other». It is significant that the social design of online teambuilding is archetyped for the traditional (and even archaic) practices of compatibility and the production of sacred unity: sending food to participants using delivery services with the further unification of everyone at a virtual table (Claude Levi-Strauss could think a lot about such a commodified design of «raw and cooked»), further exchange of funny or instructive stories from life in quarantine (Pushkin and Boccaccio would easily recognize archaic modes of collectivity and community in this commercialized form of cohabitation of a social crisis situation), an exchange of emotions regarding what they heard and the final by voting to choose the three best stories. It is a complex practice in new postmodern globalist forms of unreliability (it is enough to simply imagine how often problems with communication, audibility, visibility, accessibility, and so on appeared in such a massive network set) of completely archaic contents, which, on the one hand, are normalized, routinized, rendered habitable communication contexts through the initiation of a public and a divided emotional labor (by A. R. Hochschild), on the other - management of productive subjectivity pits and participants, on the third - the production of new consumers of their services (or, at least, a favorable site of the network for their appearance due to the publication of information and cultural content and the socialization of the collective and intimate).

Another vector of changes is the growth of the strategic role of immaterial labor in the organization of production, which imposes new requirements on its efficiency: productive subjectivity should be productive. For this, the interests of the employee are functionally predisposed to subordination to the company interests, for which the company (in fact, the structures of the labor market and the market of subjectivity, if we are allowed to introduce such a new term) introduces various performance measurement metrics like KPI's (key performance indicators), resorting to the techniques of quantification described by D. Lukács [22], and this time, as predicted by K. Marx, alienation reaches the level of alienation of the human essence itself [23], because here we are already talking about the quantification of subjectivity. Quantification and management of subjectivity are represented as the fulfillment and overfulfilment of KPI's, which, on the loop of feedback from the system, meets with formal and informal positive sanctions. At the same time, such a system transfers a considerable part of the responsibility for the successes and failures of the company onto the shoulders of an individual employee, which, on the one hand, is characteristic of the post-Fordist model of organizing production, on the other hand, is an explication of the fundamental logic of capitalist privatization of profits and socialization of losses, and on the third, – it is a practical embodiment of neo-liberal and libertarian discourses of individual success as a highly individualistic phenomenon. Quantified professionalism acts as professional competence in creating information and cultural content of a product (hard skills), quantified subjectivity - as a measurable and codified set of skills independently, voluntarily and with the correct management of one's own emotions in this regard, to manage one's own subjectivity (soft skills). Both dehumanized, quantified sets of shackles are expected from a properly disciplined, submissive body engaged in immaterial labor.

In the world of global capitalism and technical communications it is indicated by the popularity of mobile and other applications for monitoring, measuring and increasing personal and collective productivity. This situation creates grounds for speculation about the specific problems faced by workers in late capitalist society. For example, the customizable task manager and scheduler «Amazing Marvin», which can be installed on a computer and smartphone, integrates planning tools, project management, calendar, timer, habit tracker, goal tracker and other functions – in other words, it integrates human and professional seeds, quantified professionalism and quantified subjectivity. Procrastination and stress as discourse antitheses of subjectivity and professionalism, respectively, in the description of this program are formulated as the value proposition on the main page of the site², namely in the slogan «Do more with easy effort». Quantified professionalism is accompanied by quantified subjectivity in clarifying the basic slogan: «Don't know what to grasp at? Worried about taking on a lot? Feeling overwhelmed by the amount of tasks you have to complete?».

² amazingmarvin.com; the original value proposition reads like this: «Get more done with more ease»; the site itself offers «incorporate principles from behavioral psychology to help you beat procrastination, feel in control and finish your to-do list».

As noted on the site itself, among the users of the service, the most numerous are representatives of such categories as «entrepreneurs, freelancers, students, writers, programmers, designers, marketers, event organizers, teachers and others». It is characteristic that we are talking about representatives of immaterial labor, who with a high probability have structurally similar tasks and problems in managing subjectivity. Taking into account the information and cultural support Amazing Marvin programs (in particular, the value proposition and texts on the site) and immaterial features of the labor of M. Lazzarato, we can assume a list of the problems that characterize the activities of daily living immaterial labor in the society of late capitalism, and which are discursively opposed to the quantified subjectivity and professionalism:

- the dominance of factors of distraction, which claim to monopoly control of subjectivity and, accordingly, to heteronomization of immaterial labor;

- a high degree of implicit, non-reflective exploitation and even deeper self-exploitation, described in individualized, personal, subjective terms and categories;

- «work for the sake of work», which takes the discourse of immaterial labor beyond the limits of its possible comprehension in the categories of inequality, exploitation, alienation, meaning, humanity, reciprocity, social, emotional (except in a disciplinary manner), etc. ;

- unreliability (precariousness)³ of one's own position, which is presented as a) surmountable; b) technical (not systemic); c) problematic (not essential); d) shameful (not typical); e) private (not mass), etc;

- blurring the boundaries between working and non-working time / space, between work and rest. Such an occupation of the vital world by the system, as Y. Habermas would designate it [35], does not allow either quantifying the time of immaterial labor from the standpoint of protecting the worker's rights (and not from the opposite position), or «restricting it from above» (as opposed to limiting it from below), neither to include the traditional mechanisms of social security and social protection of his life-world, nor to produce an alternative, liberating subjectivity;

It is important to take into account that, as M. Lazzarato reminds us, the «reaction» of consumers of symbolic products is an important element of the cycle of non-material production, that is, the consumer is a co-producer of the product itself [21]. Outside of the Lazzarato metaphor, this means not only that the media text, like any text, is in Gadamer's way produced and hermeneutized by more than one instance, but also that the very consumption of the media text turns into obsessive, self-concealing, latentizing and reifying exploitation.

Realizing this, marketing and advertising communications specialists conduct marketing research of the socio-cultural environment in order to increase the likelihood of an effective act of consumer subjectivity, turning and transformed into a prosumer [5] in all senses of this neologism. This principle is adhered to, in particular, by the developers of the Amazing Marvin application, who even declare it as their competitive advantage: « Our users are the center of our universe ... Many of our functions are a direct result of electronic customer requests to us». These calls (part of the work that the developers themselves could do) are actually part of the (self)exploitation of the users of this application, in addition to the (self)exploitation that the application exposes users as part of their purely professional activities.

Thus, by studying the information and cultural content of successful product, we create the opportunity to reconstruct inductively socio-cultural environment factors that enabled the successful management of subjectivity. Such a reconstruction can both serve as the basis for a self-sufficient desk research and precede the field stage.

Here, the definition of information and cultural content becomes important, as well as its positioning and practicing in the cycle of non-material production. So, M. Lazzarato gives 3 stages of the cycle of immaterial production: immaterial labor itself, reproduction and reception [21]. At the first stage, productive subjectivity carries out the fabrication of information and cultural content, which is replicated at the stage of reproduction and delivered in the form of the results of immaterial labor to the consumer. Finally, at the stage of reception (namely, reception by consumers / communicators), products are «provided with a place in life» (that is, they are integrated into public communications), which allows them to «inhabit» the social space – in short, a place and functionality is produced in the communication system.

³ Here we speak of them as synonyms, since we describe precisely the area of economic and professional activity.

Maurizio Lazzarato calls the object of all these three stages, informational and cultural content, the interface of the «new relationship between production and consumption». So, immaterial labor is a strategic step in the cycle of production in a late capitalism society, in which the cycle and the process of information and cultural content consumption are also productive. With a small clarification: information as a (relatively immaterial) good is consumed along with other commodities, but not destroyed by the act of consumption. It continues to circulate further, acquires more and more new «traces of use» [8], produces communication, the beneficiaries of which are both the creators of information and cultural content (or their employers) and the platforms through which communication takes place (social networks like Instagram, Facebook, city lights on city streets, metro doors, etc.). That is why information and cultural content is both a product and a producer, in relation to which the consumer is a co-author, co-producer of the product (but almost never a co-owner). This turns immaterial labor into a fundamentally unaccountable (albeit quantifiable) «from below», but amenable to accounting (precisely due to the possession of the means of quantification) «from above». Accounting for immaterial labor becomes even more anisotropic than it was in relation to material labor, which is further facilitated by the discursive legitimation of information and cultural content primarily as a product (with the concealment of its nature as a producer), and the consumer as a «prosumer» (with a concealment of fundamental fact of his participation in production and the emphasis of the (in fact, secondary) fact of his consumer practices).

No less important is the fact for understanding the nature of immaterial labor, is the fact that it produces both subjectivity and economic value, meet the demand and – quite Baudrillardian – creates it. One of the aspects of the production of subjectivity can be defined according to M. Lazzarato as «the construction of the consumer/communicator, both of the «active subject» and his ability to consume and communicate» [21]. Here, the activity is heterogeneous: it is discursive «activity», legitimizing the order of production and concealing the true essence of this order, – and it is practical activity, differently subjectifying the producer and the producer-consumer in the production process. M. Lazzarato describes this in the hypothesis that «the process of production of communication goes directly into the process of valorization» [21]. Valorization is defined here as the increase in the value of capital that occurs as a result of its use together with human labor in the production process [1], or, more simply, the supply of greater value to something or someone.

It is in the process of valorization that a clash of objective (and by no means always, as the classics testifies, subjective) interests, positions and dispositions of production participants. Late capitalism in its communicative and globalist dimensions confronts them in the form of precarity generated by it (see more details about this [13; 15; 29; 32]), which, within the framework of our model, has two dimensions: objective (how it is reflected in the position of the individual in the social space) and subjective (how it is directly and indirectly experienced by the individual himself).

G. Standing's developments can be useful precisely in the characterization of the objective measurement of precarity. According to them the precariat is characterized primarily by the following characteristics, which can be effective blocks for the operationalization of the objective measurement of precarity:

- lack of stable long-term employment and remuneration for work;
- poor security of labor and workplace;
- the restriction of access to corporate and government guaranteed payments and benefits;
- lack of professional identification with limited career opportunities;
- lack of integration into the collective structures.

The reasons for this are the systemically determined and capitalistically functional «course on the flexibility of the labor market», as well as the discursive, practical and structural encouragement of «a lifestyle based on competition, meritocracy and flexibility» [32, p. 46-48]. At the same time, precarity functions as a lottery with a low probability of winning, however, such a probability remains, which allows it to be discursively and symbolically (re)produced and function massively, an example of which can be such a spatially, socially and economically mobile category of people employed in immaterial labor as digital nomads (digital nomads), which need three things to work: a laptop, an outlet, Wi-Fi [7]. Examples, descriptions and symbolization of symbolic «lottery winners» play an essential role in both productive subjectivation and its normatization.

In order to describe, characterize and operationalize the subjective dimension of precarity, we propose to turn to the proposals of Pierre Bourdieu, who builds his conceptualizations around uncertainty about the future, noting that lack of security deprives the carriers burdened by it of «the minimum of hope and faith in the future, which is necessary for collective action against unbearable present» [13]. Reflecting on the subjective experience of precarity, P. Bourdieu defines its influence as «the destructuring of life, deprived, in particular, of its temporary structures, and the decline of any connections with the world, space and time» [13].

Precarity:

- reduces thinking to tactical (instead of strategic) perspective;
- produces problems with the exercise of control over their own time;
- produces problems with the control and management of attention;
- «feeds on fear and is motivated by fear» [32, p. 49].

And it is in the form of fear (fear of losing a job, guarantees, part of a salary, etc.) that precarity becomes all-pervading, socially universal, existentially legitimizing any economic practices of survival just as survival. This destroys the slightest chances of solidarity and joint struggle, erodes sociality itself, and global competition between workers and the lack of regular contact exacerbates this problem, preventing the fragmented and heterogeneous precariat from uniting. The struggle to increase wages or the number of jobs is not effective against the policy of flexibility, since «this struggle is completely fixated on its own work and thus allows the exploitation of others» [13].

Separately, it should be noted that all these remarks are especially relevant for ILW, who are fundamentally vulnerable to insecurity and precariousness in the society of late capitalism for a number of reasons, both objective and subjective:

O1. The crisis of overproduction of diplomas. Higher educational institutions in their very essence and mission (as opposed to the system of secondary vocational and technical education) prepare mainly future precisely ILW. Having received a sufficiently high level of education, their pupils are deprived of prospects and guarantees and are forced to agree to employment not according to their qualifications, to incur additional costs, to convert into material labor, etc.

O2. Deterritorialization of immaterial labor. Immaterial labor is the least tied to a specific space, like a factory for an industrial worker. ILW's are able to relatively easily change the view outside the window, with the help of coworkings and colivings, visa-free regimes, low-cost airlines and the like. However, despite the obvious advantages, nomadic lifestyle and remote work may have a lot of significant deficiencies that current pan-/epidemic events only eloquently emphasized: reduced productivity, the socialization of losses (for example, an increase in utility bills, the transformation of personal items such as smartphone or Wi-Fi router into political-economic items of exploitation), long-term stay in the same space, lack of live communication and direct interaction of the work collective, family erosion (activation of family conflicts) and the like. It is clear that immaterial labor is more susceptible to this. In addition, the deterritorialized Mr. spine multiplying competition for jobs due to expansion of the number of applicants.

O3. Project orientation of immaterial labor. The work of an ILW is naturally broken down into discrete separate projects instead of a continuous sequential extension, the only potential continuity being the portfolio. In addition to the fact that it discretizes human nature, alienates it in the logic of the same quantification mentioned above, this also constitutes a fundamentally new threat of breaking the chain: for a person engaged in immaterial labor with the onset of another micro- or macro-crisis (and even with the banal completion of a project) the following the project may not come.

O4. Alienation and anonymization of the immaterial labor products. This gives rise to the unreliability and precariousness of the market exchange of these products for remuneration, problematizes the very situation of labor (because of which a lot of time, effort, energy of workers is spent on the labor situation, and not on the labor process itself), in other words, paradoxically forces the ILW first to produce the means of production and the production situation (that is, to fulfill a considerable part of the burden that was previously the burden of the capitalist), and only then proceed to the production process itself. So, a modern teacher or speechwriter is already charged with the independent acquisition and amortization of his own means of production – not to mention the independent production of «consumables».

O5. Absence of predetermined, mutually transparent (and not anisotropically transparent) criteria for quantification and evaluation of the products of immaterial labor. In many respects arbitrary and situational and in the market for material products, this problem in the market for non-material products is finally desubstantiated and relativized. This often deprives ILW's of even minimal guarantees for the very reproduction of their own labor force.

S1. Subjectivity of ILW is firmly woven into the production process and plays an important role in the creation of (extra)profits. Therefore, all problems in the cycle of immaterial production are noticeably reflected in subjectivity, and sometimes are internalized as purely personal failures, although objectively and in reality they can be the result of an unfair, anisotropic redistribution of responsibility.

S2. The effectiveness of immaterial labor depends often on the communicative contribution of its results, that is, it is probabilistic in nature and significantly depends on the final stage of the cycle of immaterial production - reception by the consumer / communicator.

S3. The efficiency of immaterial labor is often «tied» not to the characteristics and properties of the product (that is, the result of «hard skills»), but to the characteristics and properties of the manufacturer (that is, the result of «soft skills»). This affects both the social essence of production (which is simulated, imitated, turns into a meaningless game), and the reliability of immaterial labor, where investments are often more reliable not in professional, technical, substantive aspects, but in «social», communicative, formal aspects.

S4. Non-guaranties as a conscious or unconscious strategy of the one who takes a leading position influences the dispositions of subordinate people. In particular (but not only), precarity becomes an integral part of the subjectivity of the immaterial worker. Whereas in the Fordist model of capitalism, «the virtuosity of the artisan has been replaced by the predictable routine tasks of the industrial worker» [29], the post-Fordist stage qualifies and quantifies virtuosity as machine performance objectified in KPI. But if earlier, when the machine was out of order, it was replaced and the worker continued to work, then the «disabled» subjectivity of the worker of immaterial labor remains his personal problem. This is another aspect of the socialization of losses, where, for example, the family, the education or health-care system («repairing» the «incapacitated» subjectivity of the immaterial worker) are exploited at the systemic level.

S5. Supported discursively and symbolically, the need and desire to meet the performance requirements (which are dictated by the acceleration and desire of modern capitalism to be «always-on»⁴) are generated incorporated experience of «destructuring life», in characterizing a subjective measurement of insecurity. Along with this, the so-called affective media, which hunt for the users' attention, pose a challenge to managing their own subjectivity. This is structurally homologous to the O2 factor, of course, but at the subjective level it receives a completely new operationalization (for example, the Internet and media strategies of behavior and positioning on the part of immaterial workers).

S6. The emergence of the phenomenon of work for work's sake, that is, unpaid work, which is necessary or desirable to do in addition to paid one, aimed at the creation of the product to avoid certain «negative consequences». The work-for-work are, for example, search for jobs and clients, standing in queues, collecting numerous inquiries, establishing business contacts, studying company reports during off-hours, fabricating various (self)(re)presentations, etc) [32, p. 209]. In the context of a pan-/epidemic situation, this list can be expanded with various offline and online meetings, calls, emergency force majeure, communication problems, etc. In this sense, we propose to consider work-for-work as the next stage after «work to live» and «work to consume. In a society of communicative capitalism, the ILW continues to work (primarily immaterially) during the time allotted for rest. This phenomenon alienates the subjectivity of the employee, turns him into a machine for the production of socially acceptable opinions, symbols, practices. This explains the seemingly inexplicable in within the modern work ethic, firing a person for online behavior outside of work hours, for actions outside the professional affiliation, etc. The very management of one's own subjectivity in order to achieve the desired and necessary level of productivity can be viewed as work-for-work:

⁴ This is how A. Penzin describes this problem in his publicistic article: A. Penzin (2020) «Always on»: the problem of continuity in modern capitalism [Electronic resource]. Moscow Art Magazine. Access mode to the resource: <http://moscowartmagazine.com/issue/101/article/2234> (Accessed: 11/15/2020)

ILW's are paid for the product, and not for overcoming the problems associated with creating the product (psychological, domestic, technical), especially when it comes to remote employment. And finally, work for the sake of work for many representatives of the creative intelligentsia is a literal characteristic of their daily life: to have additional work (material or immaterial) in order to be able to self-actualize in something else.

Thus, immaterial labor as a phenomenon in the modern world is a widespread phenomenon, while the sociological toolkit for studying it as a category is insufficiently developed, and we propose in this article to improve it. Immaterial labor as a specific phenomenon, the formation and development of which is essentially connected with the world of global capitalism, presupposes special methods of «production of the producers themselves», as Louis Althusser would call it. Namely, the production of their subjectivity, and a considerable part (moreover, the unquantifiable »from below«, not taken into account in payment, etc.) of immaterial labor consists precisely in this. Objective and subjective aspects of the phenomenality and epiphenomenality of immaterial labor, its determination and nature are directly related to its precarious status, to the processes of attention exploitation, with the phenomena of «socialization of losses» and «anisotropy of transparency». At the same time, as we demonstrated above, social policies and social work in relation to ILWs cannot be carried out according to modern models and patterns, since neither qualification nor quantification of this labor are currently carried out in an effective and reliable way, and this labor erodes extra-labor, everyday, life phenomena and practices. The unreliability and precariousness of immaterial labor change the prospects, limitations and features of both the status of labor itself (in particular, hiding a considerable part of it as labor, naturalizing it as a «technique of self-government» and turning exploitation into self-exploitation), and the possibilities of instruments of state regulation, social policy and social work towards him. We have shown that the global world «in a lottery way» generates whole groups of immaterial labor, included in the precariousness of the economy, contrary to their intention to «win the lottery», for the sake of participation in which these groups sacrifice the reliability of social status, inclusion in the mechanisms and structures of social policy and social work. The neoliberal and globally involved state only contributes to this processes, since it reduces and flattens its obligations. The very phenomenon of (immaterial) labor in this light becomes:

-deinstitutionalized (in other words, quantified and qualified labor is only subject to twice institutionalization (from below and from above), while the rest of it remains unnormalized, not subject to rules, etc.);

- amorphous: immaterial labor, both because of its diversity and because of its susceptibility to additional forms of exploitation and inequality, is functional for global capitalism precisely in the form of its lack of form and certainty;

- diffuse: immaterial labor is able to penetrate into extra-labor, everyday, leisure practices, signs, symbols and even things. Once acquired, a smartphone or tablet, router or computer can turn from a thing of a personal nature into a thing of a political-economic nature, into an instrument of (self)exploitation - of course, not by itself, but thanks to immaterial labor, carried out, among other things, by the owner of the thing;

- constellative: immaterial labor is not definite, limited, structurally given and systemically separated; it is represented as a constellation of complexly coordinated practices with unequally supported and non-uniformly reproducible connections between them, as well as with «voids» between them, where the economy system itself has to spend resources only on «centers» (that is, nodes and connections), and not on the entire «constellation space», which allows to increase the degree of exploitation;

- oscillating: immaterial labor is in the process of constantly changing the states of the system near the equilibrium point. This fact is functional for the production of «lottery illusions», for the maintenance and reproduction of the discourse of subjectivity;

- opalescent: immaterial labor «flickers», there is a constant fluctuation of its density, and «inside» immaterial labor itself there is a «dispersion» of purely political economic logic, which, in fact, determines the anisotropic transparency of the order of immaterial labor.

All this fundamentally complicates the empirical study of immaterial labor. Programs of this study cannot be reduced to programs for the study of any other form of labor. But it also actualizes both the study of its nature and its role in the (re)fabrication of systems of inequality and hegemony, and its place in the knowledge constitutions of social, political and political-economic consequences of (de- and re-)institutionalization of immaterial labor, which constitutes the prospects for further research in this area.

Література:

1. Baycan T. Knowledge Commercialization And Valorization In Regional Economic Development. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2013. 284 p.
2. Dean J. Communicative Capitalism: Circulation and the Foreclosure of Politics. *Cultural, Politics and International Journal*. 2005. №1. С. 51–74.
3. Hochschild A. R. The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling. University of California Press, 1985. 161 p.
4. Illouz E. Consuming the Romantic Utopia: Love and the Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism. University of California Press, 1997. 388 p.
5. Kotler Ph. The Prosumer Movement: a New Challenge For Marketers. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 1986. Vol. 13. Pp. 510–513.
6. Penz O. Immaterielle Arbeit und Chancengleichheit. *Gleichheit: Momentum 11*. Hallstatt, 27-30 Oktober 2011. P. 1–16. URL : https://www.momentum-kongress.org/system/files/congress_files/2020/penz_2011_paper11_10_2011_2545.pdf (дата звернення: 23. 02. 2020).
7. Woldoff Rachael A., Litchfield Robert C. Digital Nomads: In Search of Freedom, Community, and Meaningful Work in the New Economy. Oxford University Press, 2020. 288 p.
8. Барт Р. Избранные работы : Семиотика: Поэтика. Москва : Прогресс, 1989. 616 с.
9. Белл Д. Грядущее постиндустриальное общество. Опыт социального прогнозирования. Москва : Академия, 2004. 788 с.
10. Бехманн Г. Современное общество : общество риска, информационное общество, общество знаний. Москва : Логос, 2010. 248 с.
11. Бигзаев Ф. Ф. Производительный труд и нематериальное производство. *Известия Иркутской государственной экономической академии*. 2004. № 4. С. 4–9.
12. Бойченко Д. С. Уничтожение труда : капитализм, информационализм и прерванная история автоматизации. *Шаги-Steps*. 2017. Т. 3. № 2. С. 168–189.
13. Бурдые П. Негарантированность повсюду. *Redflora*. 2013. URL : http://www.redflora.org/2013/07/blog-post_23.html (дата звернення: 23. 02. 2020).
14. Вахабова С. А. Специфика современных нематериальных форм труда. *Современные научные исследования и разработки*. 2018. Т. 1. № 5 (22). С. 133–134.
15. Голіков О. С. Ненадійність як фактор трансформації соціальної роботи в сучасному світі : до постановки проблеми. *SOCIOПРОСТИР*. 2020. № 9. С. 7–16. URL : <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2470-2020-9-01> (дата звернення: 23.02.2020).
16. Григорова Я. В. Проблема труда в философии постопераизма. *Философия хозяйства*. 2015. № 2 (98). С. 46–50.
17. Григорова Я. В. Информационные технологии как «машина эксплуатации». *Вестник Пермского национального исследовательского политехнического университета. Культура, история, философия, право*. 2016. № 3. С. 98–102.
18. Григорова Я. В. Искусство и «нематериальный труд». *Вестник Пермского национального исследовательского политехнического университета. Культура, история, философия, право*. 2017. № 4. С. 69–73.
19. Григорова Я. В., Гриценко В. С. Концепция нематериального труда в философии постопераизма и её критика. *Вестник Пермского университета. Философия. Психология. Социология*. 2016. № 2 (26). С. 39–44.
20. Кастельс М. Информационная эпоха : экономика, общество и культура. Москва : ГУ ВШЭ, 2000. 608 с.
21. Лацарато М. Нематериальный труд. *Moscow Art Magazine*. 2008. URL : <http://moscowartmagazine.com/issue/23/article/369> (дата звернення: 23. 02. 2020).
22. Лукач Г. История и классовое сознание. Исследования по марксистской диалектике. Москва : Логос-Альтера, 2003. 416 с.
23. Маркс К. Экономико-философские рукописи 1844 года / К. Маркс и Ф. Энгельс. Собрание сочинений. Изд. 2. Т. 42. Москва : Издательство политической литературы, 1974. С. 41–174.

24. Мэйсон П. Посткапитализм: путеводитель по нашему будущему. Москва : Ад Маргинем Пресс, 2016. 419 с.
25. Наумова Е. И. Новый дух капитализма: антагонизм нематериального труда. *Конфликтология*. 2014. С. 116–118.
26. Негри А. Размышления о Манифесте акселерационистской политики. *Логос*. 2018. Т. 28. № 2 (123). С. 103–116.
27. Рыжих Д. Тимбилдинг в условиях карантина : с какими сложностями столкнулась наша команда и как у нас все получилось URL : <https://dou.ua/lenta/articles/remote-team-building-and-food-delivery/>. (дата звернення: 23. 02. 2020).
28. Сафронов Э. Е. Концепция коммуникативного капитализма Джоди Дин. *Знание. Понимание. Умение*. 2020. № 1. С. 236–247.
29. Сеймур Р. Ми всі вразливі: про концепцію «прекариату» та її хибні використання. *Commons*. 2012. URL : <https://commons.com.ua/uk/mi-vsi-vrazlivi-pro-kontseptsiyu-prekar/> (дата звернення: 23. 02. 2020).
30. Соколова Н. Л. «После киберпространства» : социальные медиа и проблема власти. *Теория и практика общественного развития*. 2010. № 3. С. 30–33.
31. Соколова Н. Л. Кибер-развлечение, «свободный труд» и экономика дарения. *Вестник Самарского государственного университета*. 2010. № 1 (75). С. 18–25.
32. Стэндинг Г. Прекариат : новый опасный класс. Москва : Ад Маргинем, 2014. 328 с.
33. Сухарева М. А. От концепции постиндустриального общества к концепции экономики знаний и цифровой экономики : критический анализ терминологического поля. *Государственное управление*. 2018. С. 445–464.
34. Тинус Н. Антонио Негри и его работа «К онтологическому определению множества». *Свободная мысль*. 2018. № 4 (1670). С. 205–209.
35. Хабермас Ю. Отношения между системой и жизненным миром в условиях позднего капитализма. *THESIS*. 1993. Вып. 2. С. 123–136.
36. Харченко В. С. Фрилансеры : трудовые ценности и удовлетворенность работой. *Социальные инновации в развитии трудовых отношений и занятости в XXI веке*. НГУ имени Лобачевского. 2014. С. 513–518.
37. Хумарян Д. Г. Принуждение, когнитивный капитал, стоимость : к вопросу о принципах управления знанием. *Социология власти*. 2020. Т. 32. № 1. С. 55–88.
38. Четырнова Л. Б. Труд и образование: от общества трудового к цифровому. *Вестник Самарского университета. История, педагогика, филология*. 2018. Т. 24. № 4. С. 85–90.

References:

1. Baycan, T. (2013) *Knowledge Commercialization And Valorization In Regional Economic Development*. Edward Elgar Publishing
2. Dean, J. (2005) Communicative Capitalism: Circulation and the Foreclosure of Politics. *Cultural, Politics and International Journal*, 1, 51-74
3. Hochschild, A.R. (1985) *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. University of California Press
4. Illouz, E. (1997) *Consuming the Romantic Utopia: Love and the Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. University of California Press
5. Kotler, Ph. (1986) The Prosumer Movement: a New Challenge For Marketers. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 13, 510-513
6. Penz, O. (2011) Immaterielle Arbeit und Chancengleichheit. *Gleichheit: Momentum 11*. Hallstatt, 27-30 Oktober (pp. 1-16). URL: https://www.momentum-kongress.org/system/files/congress_files/2020/penz_2011_paper11_10_2011_2545.pdf (Accessed: 23. 02. 2020)
7. Woldoff Rachael, A., Litchfield Robert, C. (2020) *Digital Nomads: In Search of Freedom, Community, and Meaningful*. Work in the New Economy. Oxford University Press
8. Barthes, R. (1989) *Selected works: Semiotics: Poetics*. Moscow: Progress [in Russian]
9. Bell, D. (2004) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. A Venture in Social Forecasting*. Moscow: Academy [in Russian]

10. Bechmann, G. (2010) *Modern society: risk society, information society, knowledge society*. Moscow: Logos. [in Russian]
11. Bigzaev F.F. (2004) Productive labor and non-material production. *Herald of the Irkutsk State Economic Academy*, 4, 4-9 [in Russian]
12. Boychenko, D.S. (2017) The Destruction of Labor: Capitalism, Informationalism and the Interrupted History of Automation. *Steps*, 3, 2, 168-189 [in Russian]
13. Bourdieu, P. (2013) Out-of-warranty everywhere. *Redflora*. URL: http://www.redflora.org/2013/07/blog-post_23.html (Accessed: 23.02.2020) [in Russian]
14. Vakhobova, S.A. (2018) Specificity of modern non-material forms of labor. *Modern research and development*, 1, 5(22), 133-134 [in Russian]
15. Golikov, A.S. (2020) Insecurity as a Factor in the Transformation of Social Work in the Current World: Before the Problem is Posed. *SOCIOPROSTIR*, 9, 7-16. URL: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2470-2020-9-01> (Accessed: 02/23/2020) [in Russian]
16. Grigorova, Ya.V. (2015) The problem of labor in the philosophy of postoperaism. *Economy philosophy*, 2 (98), 46-50 [in Russian]
17. Grigorova, Ya.V. (2016) Information technologies as an «exploitation machine». *Bulletin of the Perm National Research Polytechnic University. Culture, history, philosophy, law*, 3, 98-102 [in Russian]
18. Grigorova, Ya.V. (2017) Art and «immaterial labor». *Bulletin of the Perm National Research Polytechnic University. Culture, history, philosophy, law*, 4, 69-73 [in Russian]
19. Grigorova, Ya.V., Gritsenko, V.S. (2016) The concept of immaterial labor in the philosophy of postoperaism and its critic. *Perm University Bulletin. Philosophy. Psychology. Sociology*, 2 (26), 39-44. [in Russian]
20. Castells, M. (2000) *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Moscow: SU HSE [in Russian]
21. Lazzarato, M. (2008) Immaterial labor. *Moscow Art Magazine*. URL: <http://moscowartmagazine.com/issue/23/article/369> (Accessed: 23.02.2020) [in Russian]
22. Lukacs, G. (2003) *History and Class Consciousness. Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Moscow: Logos-Alterra [in Russian]
23. Marx, K. (1974) *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*. Moscow: Publishing house of political literature [in Russian]
24. Mason, P. (2016) *Postcapitalism: A Guide to Our Future*. Moscow: Ad Marginem Press [in Russian]
25. Naumova, E.I. (2014) The new spirit of capitalism: the antagonism of immaterial labor. *Conflictology*, 116-118 [in Russian]
26. Negri, A. (2018) Reflections on the Accelerationist Policy Manifesto. *Logos*, 28, 2 (123), 103-116 [in Russian]
27. Ryzhikh, D. Team Building Under Quarantine Conditions: What Difficulties Our Team Faced And How We Did It. URL: <https://dou.ua/lenta/articles/remote-team-building-and-food-delivery> (Accessed: 23.02.2020) [in Russian]
28. Safronov, E.E. (2020) Concept of communicative capitalism Jody Dean. *Knowledge. Understanding. Skill*, 1, 236-247 [in Russian]
29. Seymour, R. (2012) We Are All Precarious: About the Concept of the Precariat and Its Misuses. *Commons*. URL: <https://commons.com.ua/uk/mi-vsi-vrazlivi-pro-kontseptsiyu-prekar> (Accessed: 23.02.2020) [in Ukrainian]
30. Sokolova, N.L. (2010) «After Cyberspace»: Social Media and the Problem of Power. *Theory and practice of social development*, 3, 30-33 [in Russian]
31. Sokolova, N.L. (2010) Cyber Entertainment, «Free Labor» and the Economy of Gift. *Samara State University Bulletin*, 1 (75), 18-25 [in Russian]
32. Standing, G. (2014) *Precariat: A New Dangerous Class*. Moscow: Ad Marginem [in Russian]
33. Sukhareva, M.A. (2018) From the Concept of Post-Industrial Society to the Concept of Knowledge Economy and Digital Economy: a Critical Analysis of the Terminological Field. *Public administration*, 445-464 [in Russian]
34. Tinus, N. (2018) Antonio Negri and His Work «Towards an Ontological Definition of a Set.» *Free thought*, 4 (1670), 205-209 [in Russian]

35. Habermas, J. (1993) Relations Between the System and the Life-World in the Conditions of Late Capitalism. *THESIS*, 2, 123-136 [in Russian]
36. Kharchenko, V.S. (2014) Freelancers: Work Values and Job Satisfaction. *Social Innovations in Labor Relations Development and Employment in XXI Century*, 513-518 [in Russian]
37. Khumaryan, D.G. (2020) Coercion, Cognitive Capital, Value: on the Question of the Principles of Knowledge Management. *Sociology of Power*, 32, 1, 55-88 [in Russian]
38. Chetyrova, L.B. (2018) Labor and Education: from Labor Society to Digital One. *Samara University Bulletin. History, pedagogy, philology*, 24, 4, 85-90 [in Russian]