

# Development of the labor market in the context of global transformations

Gulnara Dzhancharova<sup>1,\*</sup>, Rimma Livanova<sup>1</sup>, Svetlana Pasternak<sup>2</sup>, Polina Rostovtseva<sup>3</sup>, Liliya Novak<sup>4</sup>, Ekaterina Arzamasova<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Russian State Agrarian University – Moscow Timiryazev Agricultural Academy, 127434 Moscow, Russia

<sup>2</sup> Empress Catherine II Saint Petersburg Mining University, 199106 Saint-Petersburg, Russia

<sup>3</sup> Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, 125167 Moscow, Russia

<sup>4</sup> Russian State University for the Humanities, 125047 Moscow, Russia

<sup>5</sup> Moscow Polytechnic University, 107023 Moscow, Russia

\* **Corresponding author:** Gulnara Dzhancharova, [gdzhancharova@rgau-msha.ru](mailto:gdzhancharova@rgau-msha.ru)

## CITATION

Dzhancharova G, Livanova R, Pasternak S, et al. (2024). Development of the labor market in the context of global transformations. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*. 8(14): 7132. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd7132>

## ARTICLE INFO

Received: 13 June 2024

Accepted: 1 November 2024

Available online: 21 November 2024

## COPYRIGHT



Copyright © 2024 by author(s). *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development* is published by EnPress Publisher, LLC. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

**Abstract:** Most countries have adopted a more liberal policy to socialize public relations under the influence of neoliberalism and lobbying by economic elites to strengthen the role of market mechanisms and citizens' entrepreneurial activity. The nature, scale, sequence, and strategy of economic and social reforms in each country have their specifics. Today multi-vector and large-scale changes are taking place in social and labor policy, and they do not always have an internal logic. The study assesses prospects for the development of the labor market in the context of global transformations. Within the framework of this study, the collected information was processed gradually. Data processing was modified during the study phase. At the first stage, data processing results were used to determine total and non-farm self-employment for two groups of countries with developing economies and estimate the scale of vulnerable employment. At the second stage, indicators were identified that characterize various categories of economically active population that belong to the precariat. At the third stage, the authors analyzed data on non-standard forms of employment. The authors assumed that these forms have a right to exist and will be implemented more often. There is an imbalance between standard and non-standard forms of employment. Further research should consider the transformation of labor from material and intangible dominants to creativity.

**Keywords:** globalization; employment; public relations; business adaptation; immigration

## 1. Introduction

Recently, Russian society has experienced large-scale, multi-vector changes that transformed almost all aspects of its socioeconomic development, with significant impacts on the labor market (Borodina et al., 2023; Starovoitov et al., 2023). However, these changes did not ensure stability, add sustainable positive dynamics to socioeconomic development (Bagratuni et al., 2023), or eliminate the asymmetry of business entities' economic results and the population's social achievements (Bobkov et al., 2020). Central to this instability is the precarious state of labor relations, marked by an increasing deficit in competitive, high-productivity employment opportunities. As the Russian labor market continues to evolve under the pressure of globalization, it faces distinctive challenges not commonly observed in other economies, stemming from both its specific institutional context and the broader geopolitical landscape.

The labor market in Russia has experienced significant institutional transformations, including changes in ownership structures, labor relations, and

employment modalities, accompanied by a heightened degree of market flexibility (Gurinovich and Petrykina, 2021; Kenzhin et al., 2021). This has led to an increased prevalence of precarious employment, a phenomenon closely linked to global trends but uniquely intensified by Russia's economic and historical context. Specifically, the ongoing decline of traditional manufacturing industries, coupled with the proliferation of non-standard forms of employment, highlights the complex interplay between global forces and domestic economic policy. Moreover, the persistent shortage of innovation-oriented, highly skilled jobs continues to limit labor market mobility and development, resulting in a substantial proportion of the workforce remaining in vulnerable employment conditions (Mirzabalaeva et al., 2019).

Under the influence of internal and external factors, social transformations occur in the social and labor sphere (Borodkin, 2023; Chanysheva et al., 2021; Serbina, 2023). The latter concern millions of people and arouse the natural interest of market participants and civil society in the solution of problems reproduced in the social and labor sphere.

In such conditions, it is necessary to study the problems of labor market development as components of global, large-scale, and multi-vector changes that do not have a sufficient assessment of their consequences. The Russian labor market has recently changed dramatically. However, these changes are more institutional; for example, changes in forms of ownership and owners, the emergence of new parties to labor relations, changes in the structure and form of employment, increased flexibility of the labor market, and the creation of new norms and institutions operating in the labor market (Ryssaldiyeva et al., 2019).

When the main social problems (employment, labor income, working conditions, quality of life) are considered from the perspective of real mechanisms for solving them, it becomes clear that most social and labor problems are associated with a critical shortage of new competitive, high-productivity jobs and decent work deficits.

Despite the global transformations in the labor market and drastic changes in the context of effective employment that have occurred recently, an innovative type of employment has not been formed yet. The reduction of jobs that require higher education and good qualifications in some areas of activity, primarily in the manufacturing industry, is not accompanied by the replacement or growth of knowledge-intensive jobs in other types of economic activity.

The absence of innovation-oriented structural changes, the long-term underestimation of the social and labor sphere, the institutions that operate in its field, and the lack of mechanisms for regulating this sphere are serious obstacles to ensuring a balanced development of the Russian economy. The lack of adequate demand for qualified labor, the deskilling of those who are in marginal employment, and the spread of poverty among workers cause the reproduction and deterioration of labor market parameters with a critical mass of uncompetitive, low-productivity jobs, and jobs requiring low qualifications.

The article is organized as follows: the first part explains the research methodology; the second part presents the results and discusses the conclusions.

## **2. Literature review**

In economic literature devoted to the labor market and employment (Shadrina et al., 2018; Zhao and Zhang, 2023), discussions continue around the optimal level of self-employment in a market economy. Despite the diversity of opinions, most scholars believe that a too high level of self-employment (when its share reaches or even exceeds a third of the total number of jobs) is evidence of the archaic economy and a shortage of jobs in the formal sector.

Andersson (2021) claims that radical changes in the institution of employment are an objective response of the economic system and its social and labor components to dynamic changes: technological, organizational, motivational, economic, consumer, etc. This also confirms the development of relations in the post-industrial economy (knowledge economy) within the functioning of the modern labor market.

Dosi et al. (2022) emphasize that the new hierarchy of economic development factors, the intensive introduction of new technologies, primarily information and communications, determine the transformation of employment forms and the growth of requirements for subjects of labor activity. J. Ervin et al. (2023) note that strengthening the role of a creative person in production increases the demand for intellectual work and highly qualified workers striving for life-long learning, assimilation, and interpretation of new things.

Under these conditions, human capital becomes the main factor in economic development and an effective economic resource. The constantly growing requirements for the qualification and mobility of workers are combined with the problem of employment of low-skilled and insufficiently mobile citizens.

The Russian Federation, like most countries, is experiencing a profound employment transformation. This refers to basic forms, types, and content. The Russian labor market is gradually adopting global trends. Demkina et al. (2019) rightly note that the fundamental employment innovations include personnel leasing, remote employment, non-standard working hours, etc. We also agree with Harsløf and Zuev (2023) that the flexibility of the labor market gets new forms and manifestations. In Harsløf and Zuev's opinion, these processes in the sphere of employment have a significant impact on the social and labor sphere because they cause changes in both the structure and content of social and labor relations.

Studies by Johnson et al. (2023) allow identifying several interrelated processes that have occurred over the past 10-15 years and are growing in scale and intensity, which changes employment and established parameters of the labor market, namely: the spread of new, non-standard forms of employment and atypical models of organizing working time; increasing the flexibility of the labor market, which applies to all parameters (demand, supply, price of labor services); the decentralization of collective contractual regulation of employment relations; the differentiation of labor market segments, in which elements of the pre-industrial, industrial and post-industrial eras coexist; strengthening the trend, when a significant part of knowledge-intensive work coexists with the same part of low-complexity work; multi-vector processes occurring in the content and nature of labor.

At the beginning of the 20th century, hundreds of thousands of jobs emerged on conveyor lines with monotonous primitive labor. At the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, similar jobs appeared in offices and other structures using modern information technologies. Russian and international analytical materials on the population's economic activity (Agamirova et al., 2017; Chevrier et al., 2023; Loseva et al., 2017; Pilipchuk et al., 2024) use the terms “vulnerable employment”, “non-standard employment”, “precarious employment”, “self-employment”, etc. In other words, the established parameters of the labor market and employment, which had dominated until the 1980s, have other characteristics.

Kopackova et al. (2024) argue that almost half of employees throughout the world are in conditions of vulnerable employment, i.e., they are confined to unprotected jobs and, as a rule, are not subject to the jurisdiction of labor legislation and social protection. In response to economic instability and periodic crises, employers increasingly use part-time or temporary work.

We also agree with Rosenqvist and Sjöberg (2024) that many poor workers are involved in standard forms of employment: forced full-time employment and temporary work in developed countries and informal employment in developing countries.

This paper aims to evaluate of Russia's labor market within the context of these global transformations, offering analysis of the key institutional, social, and economic factors that shape its trajectory. By focusing on the Russian case, this study contributes to a broader understanding of global labor market dynamics and emphasizing the specificities of the Russian context.

- 1) In order to achieve the research aim, authors have pointed out several research questions:
- 2) How have global transformations impacted the structure and dynamics of employment in Russia?
- 3) What specific institutional and socioeconomic factors contribute to the rise of non-standard and precarious employment forms in Russia?
- 4) How does Russia's labor market compare with other transition economies in terms of self-employment, vulnerable employment, and the adoption of innovative labor practices?

### **3. Methods**

#### **3.1. Research approach**

The study is exploratory and based on a qualitative method. Using this approach, it aims to understand the features of labor market development in the context of global transformations. A distinct and growing segment of the labor market is the self-employment sector. According to the methodology, the institution of self-employment in the Russian labor market is developing in line with general trends and manifestations typical of countries with transition economies. Its development began with the start of economic reforms and is the result of two main factors.

### **3.2. Segmentation of the self-employed**

The first segment of the self-employed is represented by people who consciously chose this type of employment as the one meeting their interests and allowing them to obtain benefits and advantages: to ensure production independence; implement existing ideas and developments; achieve a higher level of income compared to the market price of employee services; take advantage of preferential tax conditions and other preferences.

In the second segment, some people have to choose this type of employment due to the shortage of decent jobs in the field of hired labor. According to special surveys, the proportion of those not involved in paid employment is especially high in countries with transition economies, including the Russian Federation. Using E. Ong's terminology, such forced self-employment constitutes the lower employment tier and should be considered an alternative to unemployment (Ong, 2023).

### **3.3. Economic role and international classification of self-employment**

Depending on a group of factors dominating the institution of self-employment, it is possible to determine the economic role of the latter, the socioeconomic status of this group of people in the labor market, their level of social security, etc. An in-depth analysis of self-employment and awareness of what remains outside the scope of the study and determines the development of this institution requires an international classification and relevant statistical data.

According to the international classification, the self-employed are divided into four main groups: individual entrepreneurs who do not use hired labor (own-account workers); non-corporate entrepreneurs using hired labor; members of production cooperatives; unpaid employees in family businesses.

### **3.4. Data collection and processing**

For this study, the information collected was processed gradually. The data used in this study were obtained from a variety of authoritative sources, including national statistical agencies, such as the Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation (Rosstat), Eurostat, and international labor market reports issued by organizations such as the International Labour Organization (ILO). Also authors have reviewed articles from peer-reviewed journals indexed in Scopus and Web of Science to ensure the academic rigor and credibility of the study. Data processing was modified similarly during the research phase.

### **3.5. Stages of the research**

At the first stage, the results of data processing were used to determine total and non-farm self-employment for two groups of countries with transition economies and to assess the scale of vulnerable employment. This was done to understand the reasons for turning to entrepreneurship and the main goals of such individuals.

At the second stage, indicators were identified that characterize various categories of the economically active population that claim to belong to the precariat. This was done because it is incorrect to assess the size of the precariat in the Russian

Federation by simply summing up the main groups of employees, i.e., the precariat can simultaneously belong to several groups.

At the third stage, we analyzed further data within the framework of non-standard forms of employment that have the right to exist. Attention was drawn to the fact that there have always been elements of instability in employment relations. At present, there are new forms and scales of precarious employment. Precarious employment and growing precarization lay the basis for the principles of decent work. Finally, we drew conclusions and summarized these findings to achieve the objectives of this study.

#### 4. Results and discussion

Data on total and non-farm self-employment for countries with transition economies are presented in **Table 1**. Non-farm self-employment is an important element of the labor market and requires innovations and financial investments, the lack of which is the main obstacle to its development. The lack of appropriate conditions for doing business in rural areas (transport and logistics, information and communications, credit and investment) and employing human assets make young people leave the countryside for employment in urban areas or abroad.

**Table 1.** Total and non-farm self-employment for two groups of countries with transition economies, 2022, %.

Country	Total self-employment	Non-farm self-employment
Macedonia	28.3	12.8
Romania	32.7	7.3
Bosnia	27.6	6.2
Poland	22.8	11.5
Croatia	21.7	11.6
Czechia	16.5	15.5
Slovenia	14.6	7.3
Slovakia	13.9	13.6
Bulgaria	12.5	8.5
Lithuania	11.6	7.4
Hungary	12.4	11.1
Latvia	10.1	6.5
Estonia	7.8	6.8
Kazakhstan	33.9	13.4
Russia	7.4	4.7

Source: Eurostat (2024).

Thus, we can conclude that the high proportion of self-employed most likely indicates that most were forced to turn to entrepreneurship. Their main goal is to provide for the current needs rather than develop one's own business, unlock new areas of activity, and get access to untapped markets. The scale of vulnerable employment around the world is presented in **Table 2**.

**Table 2.** The scale of vulnerable employment in 2020 and 2022.

Indicator	Vulnerable employment, % of total employment	
	2020	2022
World	53.2	49.3
Developed countries and the European Union	11.3	10.2
Other European countries	23.9	19.8

Source: Eurostat (2024).

Therefore, the main component of changes in the global labor and employment market, including the Russian one, is the result of further research. The results prove that the modern labor market has contradictory trends. However, the list of phenomena and processes that change the labor market and employment is not limited to the above and can be expanded. The transformation of employment is an unprecedented use of non-standard (atypical, untraditional) forms of employment, including part-time employment or underemployment; fixed-term employment; temporary, non-permanent employment (i.e., hired labor); secondary employment; remote employment; employment based on civil contracts; informal employment and self-employment; unregistered employment in the formal sector.

The boundaries between various forms of non-standard employment are blurred and flexible. When defining the essence and features of the concept of non-standard employment, most scholars studying the labor market and employment (Dzhancharov et al., 2023; Nikolskaya et al., 2018a; Voskovskaya et al., 2022) justifiably start from the opposite, namely the concept of standard employment. The latter refers to full-time employment based on an open-ended employment contract and at a standard workplace.

Considering precarious employment, its long-term and deep source is the symbiosis of two factors that operate in space and time. In other words, the great need of employers (demand for atypical employment) is combined with a transformation of labor supply.

The factors increasing demand for atypical employment include structural shifts in the process of transition from mass production to production typical of the new economy (knowledge economy); increased global competition; significant expansion of the services sector; unprecedented use of information and communication technologies; increasing flexibility of the labor market and production.

Changes in the structure of labor supply are stimulated by the following factors: the growing involvement of women and young people, in particular students, in the economically active population; increasing household income; computerization and increase in technical equipment of households; the gradual transformation of a person into a creative personality; increasing the importance of non-material motives in the life of the economically active population.

The expansion of precarious work is not a short-term anomaly or a political miscalculation, which can be easily eliminated with the help of “correct” laws or other levers of state economic policy. This is a global trend with deep social, economic, political, and technical roots.

The following questions can be considered. How is the spread of precarious employment consistent with the interests of employees? What is the ratio of benefits and losses of parties to social and labor relations from the use of atypical employment? Do relations in the sphere of direct employment become healthier? Answering these questions is the key to obtaining objective information about the consequences of precarious work.

When trying to answer the questions, it is necessary to understand that using certain forms of non-standard employment is voluntary and motivated. This is the desire to combine study and work under an atypical employment contract; part-time work with childcare options; temporary or other non-standard employment with the opportunity to have more free time for a person's self-realization in other areas of life.

However, there is another more complex problem for the economically active population. Special studies and numerous publications on labor market and employment issues demonstrate that using non-standard forms of employment is not voluntary but forced. The latter is associated with a shortage of jobs and the inability to work under a standard employment contract (not limited to a certain period and full working hours).

We should pay attention to the interpretation of unstable (non-standard) employment contained in the materials of the International Labor Organization (ILO) and directly related to precarization. The ILO proposes to consider precarious employment through the prism of contractual agreements and precarious working conditions (Konovalova et al., 2018; Nikolskaya et al., 2018b; Postnikova et al., 2021).

Significant features of contracts are as follows: a limited term of the contract (fixed-term, short-term, temporary, seasonal, shift, and casual work); the nature of labor relationships (multilateral and hidden employment, fictitious self-employment, subcontracts and agency contracts).

Unstable working conditions comprise low wages; poor protection after the termination of employment relationships; the lack of access to social protection mechanisms and benefits traditionally associated with standard employment; and the lack or restriction of an employee's access to exercise their rights.

As a rule, employees face the following problems: an employment agreement (contract) is not drawn up; a fixed-term employment contract is concluded instead of an open-ended agreement without any reason; wages are reduced (delayed in payment) and their level fluctuates; social guarantees are not provided or not paid (paid sick leave, maternity leave, industrial accident compensation, etc.); unsatisfactory working conditions are worsening; unpaid leaves are being forcibly expanded; overtime work is not paid.

In the EU, the main reasons for the spread of precarious work include employer strategies (flexibility and cost reduction as the basis for competitiveness); government strategies (changes in legislation that contribute to the expansion of precarious work); global competition; limited or weak opposition.

The growth of precarious employment has affected almost all countries, including developed economies. According to various estimates, from 15 to 25% of employees in the member states of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and



Development are involved in precarious employment (Dzhancharova et al., 2023; Lebedev et al., 2018; Mukhlynina et al., 2018). In general, tens of millions work outside the permanent employment sector. Many of them have an academic degree which ceases to guarantee a stable social condition. In this case, we should consider statistics on employees who have a contract of limited duration (**Table 3**).

**Table 3.** Employees who have a contract of limited duration for 2020–2022, % of the total number of employees.

<b>Countries</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>
Belgium	8.1	9.0	8.1
Bulgaria	4.5	4.1	4.5
Czechia	8.9	8.5	8.8
Denmark	8.4	8.8	8.5
Germany	14.7	14.7	13.9
Estonia	3.7	4.5	3.7
Ireland	9.6	10.2	10.2
Greece	12.4	11.6	10.0
Spain	24.9	25.3	23.6
France	15.0	15.2	15.2
Croatia	12.3	12.7	12.8
Italy	12.8	13.4	13.8
Cyprus	14.0	14.1	15.0
Latvia	6.8	6.6	4.7
Lithuania	2.4	2.7	2.6
Luxemburg	7.1	7.1	7.7
Hungary	9.7	8.9	9.4
Malta	5.6	6.6	6.9
Netherlands	18.5	18.4	19.5
Austria	9.3	9.6	9.3
Poland	27.3	26.9	26.9
Portugal	23.0	22.2	20.7
Romania	1.1	1.5	1.7

Source: Eurostat (2024).

In many EU member countries, a new trend in employment is the massive creation of internship jobs for graduates of higher education institutions. According to a survey conducted in Germany, the number of graduates who receive an internship rather than a permanent position after graduation is constantly growing, with 39% of the respondents working full time for free, and half of the respondents report harassment and humiliation of human dignity.

The mass formation of internship jobs leads to the fact that hundreds of thousands of young professionals remain in an uncertain state between education and work. In addition, the development of non-standard forms of employment and the instability of social and labor relations are the main reasons for precarization. This

destabilizes the social and labor sphere, predetermining the desocialization of relations between labor and capital, and reduces the quality of labor life.

For the first time, scholars (Shakhmametev et al., 2018) mentioned precarization as a social phenomenon in the 1980s. In general, the precariat is a social system that is in a complex, unstable situation. Accordingly, members of the precariat are people with unstable labor relations, in which non-standard (unstable, atypical, temporary, etc.) forms of employment are expanding; people who live on a stringent budget. The precarization term can be interpreted as an expansion of diverse forms of precarious employment and a social phenomenon associated with an increase in the number of people who feel the unreliability and instability of their social existence.

Precarization leads to deviations from standard employment relations; standard relations regarding labor income; standard relations of protection from social risks; standard and legally enshrined labor rights.

Factors in the potential and actual acquisition of the precarious status by the economically active population can include the lack of stable work and uncertainty about the future; the low level of labor income through forced non-standard employment; reduction in the level of social protection; “shadow” social and labor relations; disruption in labor rights; complete/partial reconstruction of a standard employment contract.

The precariat can be viewed as a sociological neologism used to define a heterogeneous group of employed and unemployed people living in conditions of socioeconomic security. The precariat can be defined as a growing group of those who live below the poverty line or are generally disconnected from civilized social aspirations.

The precariat consists of people who are disadvantaged in seven ways: 1) labor market security (adequate opportunities to earn an income); 2) job security (protection against illegal dismissal; provisions that regulate hiring and firing; imposition of fines on employers for violating the rules, etc.); 3) job security (the ability and opportunity to maintain existing employment, as well as barriers to the professional replacement of some skilled employees by unskilled ones and opportunities for vertical mobility in terms of status and income); 4) occupational safety (protection against accidents and occupational diseases through, for example, regulations governing safety and health, limiting working hours, night shift work, etc.); 5) qualification reproduction (the opportunity to master skills through apprenticeship, vocational training, etc., as well as the opportunity to use competences); 6) income security (guarantee of an adequate stable income protected through, for example, the establishment of a minimum wage, wage indexation, comprehensive social security, progressive taxation); 7) freedom of opinion and expression (collective right to vote in the labor market through, for example, independent trade unions with the right to strike).

For a comprehensive description of the precariat category, it should be considered from at least four positions: a) the precariat is a category of the economically active population that is partially or completely excluded from the official labor force, and this withdrawal is enforced; b) the precariat is the economically active population that feels social danger; c) the precariat is the

economically active population, in relation to which a standard employment contract is being completely or partially terminated not at the initiative of the employee; d) the precariat is the economically active population that does not have the opportunity to realize their right to decent work.

The need for a systematic study of precarization is stipulated by serious consequences for employees, the economy, and society. For an economic person, precarious status means material, moral, psychological, and social losses. There are obvious material losses, such as the inability to ensure decent living conditions, the inadequate reproduction of the labor force, and the lack of prospects for human capital development.

There are more significant drawbacks: a person feels disconnected from social life, finds themselves in a state of stress and uncertainty, and loses the opportunity to start a family, have a child, educate their children, and purchase durable goods. A person feels unprotected and is left alone with their problems. Under forced non-standard employment, a person loses peace of mind and becomes dissatisfied with their life. The consequence is moral and physical deterioration, a decrease in motivation, the quality of work, and its results.

We share the opinion that the development of non-standard forms of employment not only expands the experience of citizens in the field of labor relations but also makes them economical. Thus, employees focus on additional income, which is associated with significant physical and psychological overload, and the risk of devaluation of accumulated qualification in cases where additional work does not correspond to the main specialty or is significantly lower in terms of qualifications.

To assess the scale of precarization based on available statistical data, the following groups of criteria can be used: 1) market (unemployment, forced underemployment, seasonal work); 2) legal (unofficial employment, uncertain legal status of a person in the country); 3) social and labor (labor instability, employment flexibility, workload, and workplace hazards); 4) socio-psychological (self-doubt, social rejection, uncertainty about the future); 5) economic (in particular low income).

Despite different age, status, and social composition of the population belonging to the precariat, we can identify common features: the lack of social guarantees, stable work, earnings, and sometimes even civil rights. Unemployment is a special form of the precariat, when labor relationships between the employee and the employer are severed, and financial income is extremely limited.

Let us identify population categories belonging to the precariat and indicators characterizing their numbers: the unemployed (aged 15–70 years); the employed population with the lowest level of income (full-time employees whose salary is within the minimum wage); the population employed in the formal sector of the economy; employees working under civil contracts; employees not covered by collective agreements; employees on leave without pay (during the suspension of work); transferred to part-time employment for economic reasons; seasonal workers; workers who work in difficult working conditions; illegal immigrants.

How many people belong to the precariat in the Russian Federation? Indicators related to different categories of the economically active population claiming to

belong to the precariat (according to official statistics for 2020–2022) are presented in **Table 4**.

The number of illegal immigrants is difficult to determine since there is only indirect data. However, it would be incorrect to evaluate the size of the precariat in the Russian Federation by simply summing up the main seven groups presented in **Table 4** because the precariat can simultaneously belong to several groups.

**Table 4.** Indicators characterizing various categories of the economically active population of the Russian Federation who claim to be the precariat, 2020–2022, thousand people.

Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2022 vs. 2020, in %
Unemployed population	4321.3	3630.5	2950.7	68.3
Full-time employees who are paid the minimum wage	1453.5	1191.5	561.7	38.6
Population employed in the informal economy	12129.5	11067.4	7252.0	59.8
People who work under civil contracts	672.5	551.1	362.7	53.9
Employees who are not covered by collective agreements	5135.9	4801.7	3444.0	67.1
Employees who are on vacation without receiving wages	359.6	238.3	144.5	40.2
Part-time workers	1921.3	1882.6	1418.3	73.8
Seasonal workers	116.6	54.6	31.8	27.3
Workers who meet sanitary and hygienic standards	3125.2	2732.8	1717.9	55.0
Economically active population	74,776.8	75222.4	74,809.2	100.0

Source: Calculated by the authors based on data from the Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation (2024).

According to official statistics, the share of these groups in the structure of the economically active population varies significantly. For international comparisons and to assess the precarization of the social and labor sphere in the Russian Federation, it will be more indicative to estimate the share of various groups claiming to belong to the precariat within the economically active population (**Table 5**).

**Table 5.** Population groups claiming to belong to the precariat for 2020–2022, %.

Indicator	2020	2021	2022
Unemployed population	0.1	0.0	0.0
Full-time employees who are paid the minimum wage	1.9	1.6	0.8
Population employed in the informal economy	16.2	14.7	9.7
People who work under civil contracts	0.9	0.7	0.5
Employees who are not covered by collective agreements	6.9	6.4	4.6
Employees who are on vacation without receiving wages	0.5	0.3	0.2
Part-time workers	2.6	2.5	1.9
Seasonal workers	0.2	0.1	0.0
Workers who meet sanitary and hygienic standards	4.2	3.6	2.3

Source: Calculated by the authors based on data from the Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation (2024).

In 2022, it varied from 0.1 to 9.7%. Based on this, the main groups claiming to be the precariat in the economically active population in the Russian Federation are

the unemployed and the population employed in the informal economy. According to our estimates, 27.2% to 32.2% of the economically active population in the Russian Federation can be classified as the precariat.

## 5. Conclusions

There have always been elements of instability in employment relations. New forms and scales of precarious employment hinder sustainable social dynamics and achieving a high quality of working life. Precarious employment and growing precarization lay the basis for the principles of decent work.

Non-standard forms of employment have the right to exist. Their use will increase as these are forms of business adaptation to globalization. However, there is an imbalance in the use of standard and non-standard forms of employment. Social and labor relations are developing asymmetrically. The rights of employees, rather than employers, are mainly limited.

Further research should consider the transformation of labor from material and intangible dominants to creativity, the formation of the labor market in an innovative economy, cultural aspects of the formation of an innovative labor market, the impact of labor migration on the transformation of the labor market, and challenges and risks of the modern labor market in the context of transformations.

**Author contributions:** Conceptualization, GD and RL; methodology, PR; software, SP; validation, LN, EA and GD; formal analysis, PR; investigation, RL; resources, EA; data curation, LN; writing—original draft preparation, GD; writing—review and editing, SP; visualization, PR; supervision, RL; project administration, GD; funding acquisition, EA. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Conflict of interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- Agamirova, E. V., Agamirova, E. V., Lebedeva, O. Ye., et al. (2017). Methodology of estimation of quality of tourist product. *Quality – Access to Success*, 18(157), 82-84.
- Andersson, A. B. (2021). Social capital and self-efficacy in the process of youth entry into the labour market: Evidence from a longitudinal study in Sweden. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 71, 100580. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2020.100580>
- Bagratuni, K., Kashina, E., Kletskova, E., et al. (2023). Impact of socially responsible business behavior on implementing the principles of sustainable development (Experience of large business). *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, 18(8), 2481-2488. <https://doi.org/10.18280/ijstdp.180819>
- Bobkov, V. N., Simonova, M. V., Loktyuhina, N. V., et al. (2020). Peculiarities of unstable employment in the era of a digital economy from data of social media of Russia. In: Ashmarina, S., Mesquita, A., & Vochozka, M. (editors). *Digital Transformation of the Economy: Challenges, Trends, and New Opportunities*. Springer, pp. 235-243. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11367-4\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11367-4_22)
- Borodina, M., Idrisov, H., Kapustina, D., et al. (2023). State regulation of digital technologies for sustainable development and territorial planning. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, 18(5), 1615-1624. <https://doi.org/10.18280/ijstdp.180533>
- Borodkin, L. (2023). Transformatsiya universitetskogo istoricheskogo obrazovaniya na fone tsifrovoy epokhi: Nauchno-metodicheskiy seminar v MGU [Transformation of university history education against the backdrop of the digital era:

- Academic and methodological seminar at Moscow State University]. *Istoricheskaya informatika*, 1, 1-10.  
<https://doi.org/10.7256/2585-7797.2024.1.70393>
- Chanyshva, A., Kopp, P., Romasheva, N., & Nikulina, A. (2021). Migration attractiveness as a factor in the development of the Russian arctic mineral resource potential. *Resources*, 10(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/resources10060065>
- Chevrier, S., Goiseau, E., Lugosi, P., et al. (2023). Managing mentoring for the labor market integration of humanitarian migrants. *Journal of International Management*, 29(6), 101062. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2023.101062>
- Demkina, N. I., Kostikov, P. A., & Lebedev, K. A. (2019). Formation of professional competence of future specialists in the field of information environment. *Espacios*, 40(23), 3.
- Dosi, G., Pereira, M. C., Roventini, A., et al. (2022). Technological paradigms, labour creation and destruction in a multi-sector agent-based model. *Research Policy*, 51(10), 104565. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2022.104565>
- Dzhancharov, T., Rozanova, T., Pasternak, S., et al. (2023). Introduction of economic and legal measures for the development of the ecologization system at an enterprise. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 11(8), e972.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v11i7.972>
- Dzhancharova, G., Kosheleva, A., Drobysheva, N., et al. (2023). Economic and legal aspects of foreign economic risks within the framework of sustainable development of Russian enterprises. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 11(3), e0317.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v11i3.317>
- Ervin, J., Taouk, Y., Hewitt, B., et al. (2023). The association between unpaid labour and mental health in working-age adults in Australia from 2002 to 2020: A longitudinal population-based cohort study. *The Lancet Public Health*, 8(4), e276-e285.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(23\)00030-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(23)00030-0)
- Gurinovich, A. G., & Petykina, N. I. (2021). Specifics of developing the Institution of Public Service: International Experience and its application in Russia. *Jurídicas CUC*, 17(1), 253-276. <https://doi.org/10.17981/juridcuc.17.1.2021.09>
- Harsløf, I., & Zuev, D. (2023). Temporary transnational labour mobility and gendered individualization in Europe. *Mobilities*, 18(2), 232-249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2022.2092417>
- Johnson, L., Mikulewicz, M., Bigger, P., et al. (2023). Intervention: The invisible labor of climate change adaptation. *Global Environmental Change*, 83, 102769. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2023.102769>
- Kenzhin, Z. B., Tulegenova, A. U., Zolkin, A. L., et al. (2021). Labor market under economy digitalization. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 311, 08007. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202131108007>
- Konovalova, E. E., Yudina, E. V., Bushueva, I. V., et al. (2018). Forming approaches to strategic management and development of tourism and hospitality industry in the regions. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism*, 9(2), 241-247.  
[https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v9.2\(26\).03](https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v9.2(26).03)
- Kopackova, H., Simonova, S., & Reimannova, I. (2024). Digital transformation leaders wanted: How to prepare students for the ever-changing demands of the labor market. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 22(1), 100943.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.100943>
- Lebedev, K. A., Reznikova, O. S., Dimitrieva, S. D., et al. (2018). Methodological approaches to assessing the efficiency of personnel management in companies. *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics*, 9(4), 1331-1336.  
[https://doi.org/10.14505/jarle.v9.4\(34\).20](https://doi.org/10.14505/jarle.v9.4(34).20)
- Loseva, E. S., Chasovskaya, L. A., Lebedev, K. A., et al. (2017). Optimizing the effect of international trade on population well-being. *Espacios*, 38(24), 28-33.
- Mirzabalaeva, F. I., Shichkin, I. A., & Neterebsky, O. V. (2019). Economic depression in regional labor markets and subsidy dependence of regions. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 10(2), 1838-1845.
- Mukhlynina, M. M., Shishanova, E. I., Nikiforov, A. I., et al. (2018). Economic and legal aspects of environmental protection when using artificial water bodies. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism*, 9(3), 633-638.  
[https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.9.3\(27\).23](https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.9.3(27).23)
- Nikolskaya, E. Yu., Kovaleva, N. I., Uspenskaya, M. E., et al. (2018a). Innovative quality improvements in hotel services. *European Research Studies Journal*, 21(2), 489-498. <http://dx.doi.org/10.35808/ersj/1017>
- Nikolskaya, E. Yu., Lepeshkin, V. A., Kulgachev, I. P., et al. (2018b). Methodological approaches to assessing the innovative potential of enterprises in the hotel business. *Espacios*, 39(27), 30.
- Ong, E. (2023). Learning labor economics through narrative interviews on the work that people do. *International Review of Economics Education*, 43, 100260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iree.2023.100260>

- Pilipchuk, N. V., Aksenova, Z. A., Lupacheva, S. V., Markova, O. M., & Tamov, R. M. (2024). Digital Development of Russian Regions: Prospects and Contradictions in a Period of Turbulence. In *Advances in Science, Technology and Innovation, Part F2356*, 393–398. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-49711-7\\_65](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-49711-7_65)
- Postnikova, L. V., Khoruzhy, L. I., Postnikova, D. D., et al. (2021). Foreign economy activity of agricultural organizations in Russia: Risk assessment. In: Bogoviz, A. V. (editor). *The Challenge of Sustainability in Agricultural Systems*. Springer, pp. 329-334. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72110-7\\_34](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72110-7_34)
- Rosenqvist, C., & Sjöberg, Ö. (2024). The difference that the institutional environment makes: Leveraging coordination to balance platform dominance, mutuality and autonomy in geographically fragmented hospitality labour markets. *Digital Geography and Society*, 6, 100078. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.diggeo.2023.100078>
- Ryssaldiyeva, A., Zhunisbayeva, G., Osmanova, G., et al. (2019). Realization of preventive functions of criminal punishment through the institute of exemption. *Opcion*, 35(88), 394-414.
- Serbina, A. S. (2023). Ekonomicheskiye instrumenty politicheskogo vliyaniya YES v Tsentral'noy Azii [Economic instruments of the EU's political influence in Central Asia]. *Konfliktologiya / nota bene*, 4, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.7256/2454-0617.2023.4.68783>
- Shadrina, M. A., Shelemekh, N. N., Mizyureva, V. V., et al. (2018). The recognition and valuation of an asset's productivity in business accounting and reporting. *European Research Studies Journal*, 21(4), 129-141. <https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/1108>
- Shakhmametev, A. A., Strelets, I. A., & Lebedev, K. A. (2018). Strategic mechanisms for the future development of the international e-commerce market. *Espacios*, 39(27), 21.
- Starovoitov, V. G., Krupnov, Y. A., & Lapenkova, N. V. (2023). Investitsionnaya deyatelnost' v rossiyskikh regionakh v usloviyakh sanktsionnykh ogranicheniy [Investment activity in Russian regions under sanctions and restrictions]. *Voprosy bezopasnosti*, 4, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.25136/2409-7543.2023.4.44135>
- Voskovskaya, A. S., Karpova, T. A., Tantsura, T. A., et al. (2022). The risk management system as an enhancement factor for investment attractiveness of Russian enterprises. *Risks*, 10(9), 179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/risks10090179>
- Zhao, Z., & Zhang, C. (2023). The mechanisms of labor division from the perspective of task urgency and game theory. *Physics A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 630, 129284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2023.129284>