

RUSSIAN SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN CONDITIONS OF YOUTH PROFESSIONALIZATION CRISIS

Kirill A. Chernov¹
 Kristina S. Mukhina²
 Dmitry A. Lushnikov³
 Lyudmila A. Spektor⁴

1. Post Graduate Student of the Department of Personnel Management, Platov South-Russian State Polytechnic University (NPI), Novocherkassk, Russia.
2. Post Graduate Student of the Institute of Sociology and Regional Studies, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia.
3. Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Professor of the Department of Sociology, North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, Russia.
4. Candidate of Juridical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Institute of Service and Business (Branch), Don State Technical University, Shakhty, Russia.

Corresponding Author email: doc_kaftgip@sssu.ru

ABSTRACT: Young people represent the main source for development and realization of innovative features of small business and entrepreneurship. In the full knowledge of youth role in Russian innovative entrepreneurship development, it has two strikes against from the point of view of trade strategies and skills implementation in professional field. This is one of the factors of reproduction crisis and inefficient trajectory of Russian small business and entrepreneurship development. This factor determines the importance of sociological understanding of the problem through the prism of youth professionalization process in conditions of the modern labor market and socio-economic crisis. Methodological apparatus of Russian small business and entrepreneurship research in the context of youth professionalization crisis is based on the theory of professionalization, explaining the risks of youth deprofessionalization from the standpoint of professional identity and professional socialization destruction. Methodological background to this work was also based on neoinstitutional approach, reflecting the trajectory of business and entrepreneurship on the basis of prevailing socio-economic practices and activity approach, which presents a professional as a subject of social action. The study concludes that the youth interest to small business and entrepreneurship as an independent professional activity, promising a stable income and financial independence, cannot be realized on grounds of the following key reasons: 1) extremely unfavorable social and economic conditions for business and entrepreneurship development; 2) the youth professionalization crisis defines inappropriate (in conditions of contemporary labor market reality) level of youth professional training. The obtained results allow to raise the acute question about development of youth business and entrepreneurship in the light of mainstreaming the issue of youth professionalization as the source of a larger scale problem - the low degree of youth innovative potential realization. This potential is inherent in the very nature of the young people who socialize in the digital era. They are able and will to quickly master all the new things and be resilient in professional field. The solution to youth professionalization problem will overcome the risks of deprofessionalization which are so clear in Russian society, including the sphere of small business and entrepreneurship, which has low social responsibility and is oriented towards quality standards in its activities.

Keywords: Small business, entrepreneurship, young people, professionalization, education system, entrepreneurial culture.

INTRODUCTION

The theme of small business and entrepreneurship is still relevant since the Russian society moved to market relations. A number of challenges associated with development of Russian small business and entrepreneurship remain unsolved; the small business as an actor of socio-economic and market relations and processes has not yet reached the stage of institutionalization and integration, where it could become a true and significant force of socio-cultural dynamics. The impact of small business and entrepreneurship is linked with value content of entrepreneurial activity, professional culture, impact on the mass consciousness, behavioral practices and consumer behavior (Ostrovsky, 2019; Vereshchagina et al, 2018; Commons, 1950; Vodenko et a., 2019; Nikonov, 2017; Vereshchagina et al, 2016; Ward, 1993; Maidanevich & Bedrik, 2017; Zotov & Gorokhova, 2013; Kirillov & Paventa, 2018).

However, in the country there remain serious problems related to the low efficiency of development and functioning of small business and entrepreneurship. There are problems with the state policy in the field of socio-economic relations actors support, institutional factors and conditions of entrepreneurial activities development. There are also imperfections in the legal field of business activity regulation, high dynamics of Russian economy crisis factors etc. These problems, of course, affect social reputation of small business, its perception by the population, strategies and trajectories of businessmen and entrepreneurs adapting to modern realities of the market environment. The youth develops the field of entrepreneurship with difficulty, trying to find itself in this professional field. Though "profession" of a businessman is preferable for the young ones, the Russians themselves, both young people and adults, are convinced that it is quite difficult to make "youth business career" in the modern Russian reality: so answer 53% of respondents in the All-Russian Public Opinion Research Center (2018) study. The youth responded to this question in a similar way (The All-Russian Public Opinion Research Center, 2018). Sociological data also show that young people are manifesting considerable interest to businessman or entrepreneur profession (57%), but some of them are not ready to deal with it (48%). Scientists believe that is due to the atmosphere of this professional activity, requiring a high level of responsibility, including financial (payment of taxes), as well as responsibility for the progress, results of business activity, etc. In this regard, in addition to problems of economic (financial) nature, there arises the question about youth professional preparedness to entrepreneurship. In this work, we decided to address the issue of Russian small business development and entrepreneurship in the context of youth professionalization. The decline in quality of Russian education over the last decades, threatening its intellectual security, and unregulated nature of the labor market (especially of youth labor market) become sources of youth maladjustment in the field of professional activity and accumulation of professional field risks (in entrepreneurship in particular) for the whole Russian society. In this context, a sociological study of small business and entrepreneurship as a key economic sector and a factor of innovative social development (in the context of youth involvement in this field of professional activity) acquires particular social and scientific relevance (Artemov, 2016; Neverov & Davydenkova, 2016; Audretsch & Thurik, 2001; Drakopoulou & Anderson, 2007; Gibson & Schwartz, 1998; Parker, 2004; Storey, 1994; Ilyukhin & Ilyukhina, 2016; Prokhorov et al, 2019; Vereshchagina et al, 2015).

Most scientists in their studies do not differentiate the concepts of business and entrepreneurship and use them interchangeably. The methodological setup of this article is not aimed to hold a rigid demarcation line between business and entrepreneurship, as in business there are required the properties and qualities, which researchers attribute to entrepreneurs. Namely: innovation and creativity, readiness and risk tolerance, personal responsibility, ability to make decisions and to bear responsibility for them, high self-motivation, mobility and initiative (Fadeeva, 2014: Escalera Chávez et al, 2019: Martins et al, 2018: Aksenova, 2012a: Aksenova, 2012b). We consider initiative to be a compulsory feature of business and entrepreneurship. In particular, giving a definition of small business, researchers note that "under the current legislation, it is a systematic, initiative, independent activity of individuals-entrepreneurs and legal entities of any organizational, legal and ownership forms registered in accordance with criteria of reference to business subjects and applicable law, carried out on person's behalf, at one's sole risk and under one's sole responsibility with the purpose of getting income" (North, 1993: Aleskerova, 2017: Piteira et al, 2018: Shcartan & Yastrebov, 2008: Aleynikov, 2008).

Apparently, we should recognize the fact that entrepreneurship is more often associated with innovativeness. The scholars state that "entrepreneurship is essentially focused on innovation activity", because entrepreneurs are characterized by risk and originality of thinking in organization of production and management...". Innovativeness is the essence of entrepreneurship, underscored by other researchers who believe that it "includes actions covering identification, assessment and opportunities to implement new products and services, new ways of organizing markets, processes and products". However, we share the common scientific approach, whereby small (medium and large) business is essentially treated as small (medium, large) entrepreneurship, for this reason in theoretical and practical parts of this paper we refer to the works revealing the peculiarities of functioning of small business and entrepreneurship in modern Russia (Fears, 2019: Satyr et al, 2017: Toshchenko, 2018: Gorshkov, 2017: Cherednichenko, 2015: Bahremand, 2015).

We consider small business and entrepreneurship to be associated with the social responsibility sphere, which is reflected in tradition of study of these social phenomena in Russian and, especially, in foreign scientific practices. From the point of view of foreign experts, in addition to economic factors and determinants of entrepreneurial activity it is necessary to take into account social and cultural factors that define the ethics of business activities and social portrait of a businessman. Russian experts state, that social responsibility is based on such components as: law-abiding businesses; responsibility for development of employees of business organizations; responsibility to society (partners and local communities) which constitute the social environment of business (Dylnova, 2011: Manokhin, 2012: Vodenko et al, 2019: Cherednichenko, 2015). The problem of Russian youth professionalization has been studied quite multidimensionally, with an emphasis on the processes of formation of professional identity, attitudes, values and competencies of youth, its relations to labor in the process of getting education and jobs. Most of researchers are solidary in their evaluations: they indicate negative trends in youth professionalization associated with a decrease in professional competence level and focus on material wealth as the key motivation of profession and employment choice, they highlight the decline of interest in work and profession as terminal values (Konstantinovskiy et al, 2014).

In our study, professionalization is treated as the process of becoming a subject of professional activity, capable of continuous development of professional qualities and skills, implementation of their skills in current conditions of the labor market. This

process is divided into two stages: professional choice (getting professional education) and professional development (starting professional activity, entering into profession of the labor market). The process can have multiple character, which is related to the theory of professionalization by such scientists as V.A. Tsvyk (2003) and I.M. Fadeeva (2014), outgoing from the fact that professionalization is a multilevel and multistage phenomenon which can acquire multi-vector nature. In other words, we are talking about multiplicity of professionalization that corresponds to specificity of the modern age, with its rapid changes, crises, social instability, as well as new opportunities and prospects in development of new professional roles and competencies opening up potential in these conditions (Nuriyev et al, 2018).

The activity approach potential is also important for each of the studied themes. This approach treats a professional as a subject of social action, able to work under conditions of risk, dynamic changes, social instability, adapting to them through the active use of innovation and potential of creativity, skilled work with risks and information flows. This actor of professional activities is able to formulate and solve professional, being a representative of activity approach, notes the following professional values of central importance character for the modern professional: relationship to profession as to the meaning of life; freedom in making professional decisions, freedom of action and professional liability. Thanks to these qualities' professional becomes an actor of social action (Chernysh & Epikhina, 2018). Neoinstitutional approach is methodologically valuable and meaningful for the study of Russian small business and entrepreneurship. It treats any social institutional practices as determined by the prevailing institutional system specific to that society (the system treated as a historical product of a particular era and a particular society). In other words, the institutional system of society and all the processes determined by this system should be analyzed in the context of institutional dependence phenomenon. The present society should be considered in the context of development processes in organizations, institutions, phenomena, etc. depending on historical trajectory of institutional development (Gorshkov, 2014; Migacheva, 2007; Gnatyuk, 2016; Ilyin, 2015; Korchagina et al, 2017; Ivanov et al, 2014).

RESULTS

Small business and entrepreneurship make up a significant portion of business enterprises in contemporary Russia, primarily in the sphere of trade and services. However, their contribution to economy of the country is significantly lower than in economically developed and developing countries of the modern world. Small businesses and entrepreneurship are important factors in development of economic sphere (as a sphere of direct operation of the business and spheres of social life as a whole),⁵ performing a number of important social functions: socio-economic, socio-political, spiritual, socializational and socio-cultural. Therefore it is fundamentally important to develop this sector of economy and professional activities, enhancing the quality of entrepreneurial activity and the level of its social orientation. Subjects of small business and entrepreneurship satisfy social needs; their activities translate socially oriented values of economic activities (contrary to opportunistic behavior principles). All that can exert a positive influence on various aspects of social life. However, Russian scientists have concluded that in modern Russia such (opportunistic) behavior is relevant among entrepreneurs and businessmen - there is still the crisis associated with sharp transition from Soviet planned economy to the market economy of post-Soviet period.

Other Russian scientists justify the low efficiency of Russian enterprises in consequences of collapse of the Soviet Union: in post-Soviet Russia, unlike in the countries of Eastern Europe and the Baltic States, there has been no radical turn to formation of highly competitive economy, democracy and civil society. Moreover, the continued dominance of etacratism put private economy in a secondary position with the trend towards consolidated market economy. In terms of institutional environment of modern Russian society small business is heavily dependent on the government. Some experts, describing the methodology of Russian business research analysis write about the need to assess the extent of "the state being captured by business" and "business being captured by the state". Of course, they need a free civil society and democratic state for development of free and efficient business. The pressure of state-bureaucratic structures makes development of a civilized and social-oriented business extremely difficult. On the background of manifestations of sufficiently high social responsibility level of economic entities and their respect for employees, high ratings, ability to achieve solid partnerships, sincere desire to participate in creation of a prosperous society, there reproduce the elements of socially irresponsible behavior of those entities: frauds, unfair competition, nonfulfillment of tax obligations to the state, lack of social guarantees for employees, etc. However, scientists state that historical image of Russian businessman is very attractive: "it is a person with unique, distinctive mentality and special ability to do business. It is known that Russian businessmen had tremendous capacity for work, strong leadership qualities, tenacity and desire to earn. The Russian state was able to explore new lands relying on Russian business initiative".

As we can see, the key mental characteristics of Russian entrepreneur are innovation and working capacity. Even at the present day, according to Vyacheslav Nikonov, the studies of small and medium business record that Russia (compared to entrepreneurs from other countries) show more independence and autonomy. Apparently, that is why profession of entrepreneur is in the rating of most popular among Russians (The All-Russian Public Opinion Research Center, 2018), including the young ones. This fact is proven by the data of sociological poll (2018): parents were asked what profession they would like for their children. Among the most preferred professions there were doctor (4.17 out of 5), scientist (3,78), businessman (3.4), civil servant (3.31) and military man (3.1) (The All-Russian Public Opinion Research Center, 2018). A somewhat different picture appeared in Levada Center survey (2018), but with certain differences, in the first place there was also a doctor, and in the third – a businessman. Experts of the Levada Center put a scientist, which was in second position in the rating polls, in a much less prestigious position; the second place was given to a lawyer. The choice that adults would have made for their children and grandchildren is justified from the point of view of profitability and prestige of profession that can offer sustainable income and can help to sidestep loss of health and poverty - the situation that appear to be one of the most dangerous, disturbing and feared in minds of Russians - as evidenced by the Levada Center in July 2019. However, with all the interest of youth to entrepreneurship as to a separate professional activity that promises stable income and financial independence, young people cannot start a business or a small enterprise to realize their potential in business sector as Russian conditions are extremely unfavorable for development of entrepreneurship.

As a manifestation of the crisis we shall consider the paradox — there is a clear demand for new generation of workers - innovative and mobile, which can be provided only by the youth. But the youth (along with women community) is, as noted by Zh.T. Toshchenko (2018), the most disadvantaged and discriminated social group, as indicated

by youth unemployment data: the youth unemployment rates are several times higher than older age groups. The youth falls into the list in the first place in case of reductions and industrial closures. In hiring, compensation, provision of financial support, social services and skill development it also falls into the discriminated category. It is not surprising that, in general, young people evaluate the quality of available places with possibilities for professional growth, good wages and employment not very optimistic. Those with diplomas of higher education evaluate the situation more positively (Toshchenko, 2018), although today higher education does not guarantee successful employment. According to Russian Federal State Statistics Service, the share of young specialists among the unemployed ones with higher education is 48.6%, i.e. about a half. R.Kh. Simonyan (2017) spoke quite critical about the situation in Russia and the market of youth work. He was positive about the youth and rated it as the most socially responsible social group with the greatest potential of public modernization and innovation: the young people have access to the sources of information, vital energy, social mobility, diversity of professional orientation and interests; they lack reflection of the blame for modern condition of the country. But in contradictory conditions of the labor market, when the demand does not correspond to the offer, many graduates who are unable to help parents and friends fall into a situation of misunderstanding - they don't know what to do next.⁶

Under these conditions, there increase the number of young people working in public sector and public service: they are tired of instability and uncertainty; they search for some certainty and stability on the labor market in traditional forms of labor relations organization with stable and guaranteed employment, mainly in the service sector and intellectual services, i.e. the scope of activities involving physical labor does not attract them. In fact, that does not contradict the current structure of modern Russian labor market. Thus, there emerges the image of innovation-oriented and active young people, seeking not so much to establish themselves in the profession, but to achieve social and material success, using the latest knowledge, opportunities of a rapidly changing era, its risks, uncertainty, and variability. Here young businessman and entrepreneurs find themselves, trying to develop this field of prospects in spontaneous space of market relations. It is difficult to develop youth entrepreneurship in Russia, because the very institutional environment is not conducive to development of sustainable business structures, especially focused on innovations. However, they are present, although youth entrepreneurship and small business as its key represent a small sector of Russian business system. The youth entrepreneurial activities, of course, require serious support. The low level of economic activity of Russian youth is associated with bureaucratic obstacles, especially manifested in setting business up and inefficient tax policy of the state towards entrepreneurs, especially the young ones, whose resources do not allow to fully comply with the rules and regulations of state tax policy; imperfection of the legislation; vulnerability of Russian businesses (especially small and medium) from criminal element of Russian economy and destruction of vocational training system.

In terms of socio-economic crisis, which continues to define social development of Russia, the growth of entrepreneurs' opportunistic behavior is predictable and understandable - they react to the growing threat to state stability and security that forces them to go on about increased and even exaggerated self-interest under the influence of threats. Of course, in this situation, the principles of social responsibility as components of professionalism fade into the background, and the protracted crisis trajectory of Russian social development causes serious concerns about the further development of small business and enterprises. The growth of professional level of subjects of business

activities in a crisis will be assigned to the same adaptive, "survival" strategy, which is not connected with the value of professionalism as a fundamental one in the labor market. The Russian reality is full of risk and uncertainty, growing insanely rapidly. In a crisis format, it determines the need to be mobile and flexible in strategies, to combine different activities and use different forms of employment. Under these conditions the process of youth professional adaptation in the labor market is often accompanied by deprofessionalization: loss of professional knowledge and skills, lower level of professional competence and professional qualifications.⁵

Obviously, this negative trend characteristic of the Russian society necessitates solution of the problems (giving rise to this trend) linked with the lack of a comprehensive and effective system of youth professionalization included in the system of vocational training and professional integration in the labor market. The rapid decline in quality of Russian education threatens its intellectual security, as well as the unregulated nature of the labor market, (especially youth labor market). All that becomes a source of youth maladjustment in the field of professional activity. Russian society needs a principal reform of the entire system of youth professional adaptation, based on systemic nature of this process, in which there can be small elements, aspects and components. Since the early childhood, the younger generation should be taught the value of work and importance of correct choice of profession (as one associated with abilities and priorities of the individual). This right choice should not become a source of frustration and subsequent occupational maladjustment. It needs governmental support to be successfully implemented.

Of course, the problems of youth adaptation in professional labor market are connected not only with the economic crisis, unregulated labor market, its instability and too high demands from employers to young professionals. The fact is that the level of training and qualification of young specialists in modern Russia, indeed, does not meet the minimum requirements of professional competence. This problem is a consequence of crisis of the education system (Vereshchagina, Samygin & Imgrunt, 2016). Focused on business activities but lacking the necessary level of professional knowledge and skills young people have difficulty in adapting to crisis socio-economic realities of Russian society, their main purpose and meaning in professional activity is the payment of labor, material profit. Instability in the labor market and higher demands from employers to candidates do not always meet the youth and its level of training. All that becomes the background against which there unfold destructive (from perspective of youth professionalization) processes. This is manifested in reduction of education value and unwillingness to work on the received specialty, low commitment in labor and reduction of labor responsibility, quality of work, frequent change of professional activity that, in the aggregate, does not allow for professional growth and self-improvement and forms a discontinuous trajectory of young Russians professionalization.

In the current system of employment and remuneration the strategy of choice of profession and employment "in the circumstances" becomes a source of youth deprofessionalization. The young people cannot find their place in the labor market in accordance with the acquired specialty, which actualizes the problem of interaction between educational system and the labor market. In Russian reality, this interaction is not effective, as evidenced by low rates of youth employment in the framework of received specialty and demand of professional competences acquired in the process of education. It should also be indicated the objective processes associated with the global dynamics of development of professional activity sphere, which scientists fairly characterize on the one hand, by trends of rapid obsolescence of professional knowledge,

and on the other hand, - by changes in the kinds of professional activity, emergence of new, rapidly changing professional landscape and infrastructure, providing existence and reproduction of professions.

It is obvious to assume that the problems associated with deprofessionalization in Russia have their roots in the problems of professional and labor socialization; in socio-economic ill-being of society with destroyed channels of social and professional mobility and growth of social inequality. All that automatically determines the format of professional socialization focused on finding the most effective career path and professional formation of personality from the point of view of survival in crisis reality. No wonder that scientists assess the system of professional socialization in Russia negatively, which generates distorted views on the prestige of professions among young people. There is no transfer of professional values, professional experience and formation of professional subjectivity of young professionals to engage them in professional community and make the youth an actor of professional activities most effectively. When the motives of youth professional choice are largely determined by material factors, rather than professional interests, values and abilities, their work becomes a source of individual's professionalization, as this activity lacks the emotive component, where labor is associated with pleasure and joy.

In these conditions development of Russian small business and entrepreneurship is a part of the same negative trend - being the most important sector of social and economic relations it is subject to the logic of institutional development. In the framework of neoinstitutionalism theory D. North draws attention to the fact that changes in the economy is an all-encompassing, ever-growing process, the result of everyday choices of individuals and entrepreneurs in organizations. And as a result there gradually change and disappear informal and formal rules of governing the exchange and transforming institutions. D. North treats institutions as a set of formal rules, informal constraints and mechanisms for their enforcement (North D. "Contribution of Neo-institutionalism to Understanding of Transitive Economy Problems"). it is important to bear in mind that formal rules can be changed by the state, but informal constraints change very slowly. The operating force of changes, according to D. North, is an entrepreneur - political or economic. D. North states that potential entrepreneurs define institutional constraints - if the constraints are constructed so that more profit can be earned from criminal activity, or a firm wins only if it absolutely destroys its competitor, the organization will have the structure, which would allow to maximize profits in the current conditions. On the other hand, if it is necessary to increase productivity to get profit, the process will result in economic growth. In any case, the entrepreneur and his organization will invest the capital in knowledge, education, and acquisition of additional skills to increase their profit potential.

The importance of D. North's theoretical structure is that it reveals dependence of institutional system and its development from historical trajectory of a particular society and its history of institutional development in terms of economic relations (efficiency/inefficiency). Thus, in neoinstitutionalism methodology, entrepreneurship acts as a result of previous development of social and economic institutional system; its efficiency or inefficiency is determined, to a greater extent, by historical trajectories of development at the time of formation and institutionalization of economic relations. So, D. North sees the complexity of situation in countries with economies in transition (former Soviet bloc countries and, above all, Russia) in that "system of faith and values, which is formed on the basis of past experience, cannot help economic agents to solve new problems..." (North, 1997). V.I. Ilyin (2015) writes in the same neoinstitutionalism

vein, stating that "it is not surprising that in Russia, after the time of troubles of the 1990s, when the dream of being entrepreneur (a vivid example of professional space "fluid zone") was popular (especially among the youth), a different life strategy that involves self-fulfillment through some for 1994m of public service gets the increasingly prominent place". Instability, uncertainty and the crisis have characterized the Russian space, including professional labor, for so long, that the accumulated fatigue from unrealized hopes and career plans became a source of inertial processes of Russian society. Attention is again attracted by sustainable forms of social practices and patterns of professional conduct. But the effectiveness of any professional strategy as a strict professional track, proven by the older generations, or a different one, unfamiliar (modernist), depends on a type of person adequate of this track; therefore, professionalization is treated as the most important factor.

Only competent policy in the field of youth professionalization and professional realization on the labor market will change the socio-economic outlook which is pretty dim now. Of course, there is no need to expect a rapid effect - it is difficult to change the situation in historically short time, and, therefore, there is a need to think about long-term projects and trajectories of socio-economic development. There is a need to rely on those agents (social institutions), which are at the origin of social reproduction and form resource and social capital of society. Of course, we need to work with potential of institute of education, which, according to Russian scientists, is designed to form a reservoir of knowledge, skills, competence of those preparing for entrepreneurship and the enterprise culture. All that, in turn, determines the most important mission of the education system - cultural, culture-forming. It is obvious that in the basis of entrepreneurship with high professional appearance there must be high enterprise culture, educational setting forming its primarily environment (Vodenko et al., 2019). We should understand that without support of public and state institutions the institute of education will remain "one in the field", and, therefore, "without a shield". Scientists analyzed the issues of support and development of Russian youth business and entrepreneurship. They state that a unified system of support for young entrepreneurs and businessmen has not yet developed in Russian society, though there are different methods, programs and concepts. There is a need to develop and implement some legislative measures in the field of youth business and entrepreneurship support, financial support for youth business projects and initiatives within the small business to implement the existing methodological and conceptual projects. Specialists also draw attention to the problem of youth professionalization in entrepreneurship, offering to return to the practice of mentoring as "non-financial" engine and "locomotive" support for youth entrepreneurship. The future layout of Russian business and entrepreneurship depends on today's youth, and therefore the right approach to business must be imbedded in minds of young people. They should understand that both society and the state are interested in development of youth business sector as the basis of well-being for the youth itself and the whole society.

CONCLUSION

The youth in part of the original concept and the proposed topic is treated as a subject of professional labor relations, characterized by its own attitude to work and profession, strategies and mechanisms of adaptation in the labor market, problems of professionalization, labor, and socialization. Young people have their own ways of problem solving in the context of historical and socio-cultural specificity of subjectivity

formation in Russian society; the influence of contemporary realities - social, economic, political and cultural. In general, the situation in the field of youth professionalization is paradoxical. The importance of youth professional realization for prosperous development of society is obvious, but there are clear trends of its deprofessionalization and deadadaptation in the labor market. There is a decline in economic activity, which indicates the lack of working measures and mechanisms for effective youth professionalization, including the field of business and entrepreneurship. The crisis in youth professionalization threatens to become a trend of Russian entrepreneurship deprofessionalization, described as uncompetitive on the world market, poorly oriented to social problems and interests, unable to develop in the wake of global innovation economy in given social reality. The complexity, risks and threats that accompany business activities in Russia do not inspire the youth to engage in business and entrepreneurship at professional level, though there is a significant interest in this kind of activity. However, the modern Russian youth is afraid of high responsibility - social and legal. It strives to ensure the well-being in a more stable and predictable areas of professional activity, which reduces the resource potential of Russian entrepreneurship and small business. In this regard, the Russian society has a very serious problem associated with production and reproduction of human and professional potential of business and entrepreneurship. Of course, the priority should be given to education system as the primary agent for youth professionalization. Thus, the problem of Russian small business and entrepreneurship development is directly related to the problem of youth professionalization, which, being mobile, adapted to the information age and focused on business and innovation activity, is not able to fulfill its potential in this area of professional activity. These circumstances determine the need and prospects for further studies of the issues proposed in this paper.

Acknowledgments

The research was performed within the grant of the President of the Russian Federation for state support for the leading scientific schools of the Russian Federation (NSh-2582.2020.6) «Public policy in the field of higher education and development of innovative potential of youth: economic and non-economic determinants and mechanisms in the conditions of regionalization of social space and the formation of industry 4.0».

REFERENCES

1. Ostrovsky, V.I. (2019). The Role of International Cooperation and Integration of Small and Medium Entrepreneurship in Implementation of the New Quality of Socio-economic Progress of Russia. *Gumanitarij Yuga Rossii*, 8(4), 257-268.
2. Vereshchagina, A.V., Gnatyuk, M.A., Pechkurov, I.V., Gegel, L.A. & Kazakova, E.O. (2018). The Sociocultural Determinants of Conspicuous Consumption in Russian Society in the Context of Spiritual Crisis. *The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication*, 8, 2244-2251.
3. Commons J.R. (1950) *Economics of Collective Actions*. New York (In English).
4. Vodenko, K.V., Griбанov, G.A., Chernov, K.A., Mukhina, K.S. (2019). Russian Entrepreneurship in the Context of Socio-Economic Crisis: The Risks of Deprofessionalization. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 5(10), 1495-1500.

5. Nikonov, V.A. (2017). Characteristics of Russian Entrepreneur in the Mirror of Public Opinion. *Izvestiya vuzov. Povolzhskiy region. Obshhestvennye nauki*, 2(42), 97-108.
6. Vereshchagina, A.V., Samygin, S.I. & Imgrunt, S.I. (2016). Intellectual Security of Russia in Conditions of the Crisis of Science, Education and Growth of Social Inequality. *Gumanitarij Yuga Rossii*, 2, 52-65.
7. Ward, E. (1993). Motivation of expansion plans of entrepreneurs and small business managers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 1, 32-38.
8. Maidanovich, Y.P. & Bedrik, K.A. (2017). Small Business: The Concept and Benefits. *ANI: ehkonomika i upravlenie*, 2(19), 177-186.
9. Zotov, A.N. & Gorokhova, A.E. (2013). Development of Innovative Entrepreneurship in Russia. *Izvestiya MGTU*, 4(18), 204-209.
10. Kirillov, Yu.G. & Paventa, E. (2018). Study of Development Factors in Entrepreneurial Activities at their Early Stages in Russian Companies. *Rossijskoe predprinimatel'stvo*, 19(9), 2595-2607.
11. Artemov, A.V. (2016). Small and Medium business: The Concept, Criteria, Categories of Subjects, Place and Role in a Market Economy. *Sotsial'no-politicheskie nauki*, 2, 44-49.
12. Neverov, A.V. & Davydenkova, E.S. (2016). Social Responsibility of Small and Medium Business in Russia. *Vestnik RUDN. Seriya: Sotsiologiya*, 1, 130-140.
13. Audretsch, D.B. & Thurik, R. (2001). What's New about the New Economy? Sources of Growth in the Managed and Entrepreneurial Economies. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 1, 267-315.
14. Drakopoulou, S.D. & Anderson, A.R. (2007). Mumpsimus and the Mything of the Individualist Entrepreneur. *International Small Business Journal*, 4, 341-360.
15. Gibson, E.P. & Schwartz, H.S. (1998). Value Priorities and Gender. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 1, 49-67.
16. Parker, S.C. (2004). *The Economics of Self-employment and Entrepreneurship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
17. Storey, D.J. (1994). *Understanding the Small Business Sector*. London: Routledge.
18. Ilyukhin, A.A. & Ilyukhina, V.S. (2016). Professional Orientation of Young people and the Balance of Labor market. *Interaktivnaya nauka*, 1, 124-126.
19. Prokhorov, A.V., Fomenko, A.V. & Takishina, E.A. (2019). The Influence of Vocational Orientation on Efficiency of Labor and Productivity, *Izv. Sarat. un-ta Nov. ser. Ser. Ehkonomika. Upravlenie. Pravo*, 1, 74-81.
20. Vereshchagina, A., Volkov, Yu., Krotov, D. & Ukolov, R. (2015). Labour Socialization of Young People in Today's Russia: The specificity of sociological discourse. *Asian Social Science*, 11(8), 88-95. Tsvyk, V.A. (2003). Professionalization as a Social Process. *Vestnik RUDN. 2003. A Series of "Sociology"*, 4, 258-269.
21. Fadeeva, I.M. (2014). Professionalization and Deprofessionalization in the Modern Russian Society: View of a Sociologist. *Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N.I. Lobachevskogo. Seriya: Sotsial'nye nauki*, 1(33), 108-113.
22. Escalera Chávez, M. E., Moreno García, E., & Rojas Kramer, C. A. (2019). Confirmatory Model to Measure Attitude towards Mathematics in Higher Education Students: Study Case in SLP Mexico. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 14(1), 163-168. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iejme/3984>.
23. Martins, V. F., Sampaio, P. N. M., Cordeiro, A. J. A., & Viana, B. F. (2018). Implementing a Data Network Infrastructure Course using a Problem-based Learning Methodology. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management*, 3(2), 10.

24. Aksenova, O.V. (2012a). Peculiarities of Russian Professionals Activism: Social Practice. *Vestnik Instituta sotsiologii*, 5, 135 — 137. URL: www.vestnik.isras.ru.
25. Aksenova, O.V. (2012b). Problems of Research Methodology of Russian Professional as a Subject of Social Action. *Vestnik Instituta sotsiologii*, 5, 35-42. URL: www.vestnik.isras.ru.
26. North, D. (1993). Economic Performance through Time: Nobel lecture (9 December 1993). URL: <http://www.strana-oz.ru/?numid=21&article=981>.
27. Aleskerova, S.E. (2017). Opportunistic Behavior of Entrepreneurship as an Informal Institution in Market Economy of Russia. *Rossijskoe predprinimatel'stvo*, 18(2), 111-120.
28. Piteira, M., Costa, C. J., & Aparicio, M. (2018). Computer Programming Learning: How to Apply Gamification on Online Courses? *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management*, 3(2), 11.
29. Shcartan, O.I. & Yastrebov, G.A. (2008). Russian Neo-etacratc Society and its Stratification. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya*, 11, 39-46.
30. Aleynikov, A.V. (2008). To the Problem of Political and Sociological Analysis of Russian Business Genesis. *Vlast'*, 5, 9-11. Nikonov, V.A. (2017). Characteristics of Russian Entrepreneur in the Mirror of Public Opinion. *Izvestiya vuzov. Povolzhskiy region. Obshhestvennye nauki*, 2(42), 97-108.
31. Fears. (2019). From Opinions - To Understanding. URL: <https://www.levada.ru/2019/08/26/strahi-3/>.
32. Satyr, T.S., Kalmykov, N.N. & Ogneva, Y.I. (2017). Expert Assessment of the Current State and Prospects of Development of Business Climate in Russia. *Rossijskoe predprinimatel'stvo*, 18(1), 77-87.
33. Toshchenko, Zh.T. (2018). Precariat: from Protoclassic to the New Class. Institut sotsiologii FNISTS RAN, RGGU. Moscow: Nauka.
34. Gorshkov, M.K. (2017). Youth Employment in Motivational and Structural Dimensions. Moscow: Institut sotsiologii FNISTS RAN. Simonyan, R.Kh. (2017). Migration Intentions of Russian Youth: Regional Aspect. *Monitoring obshhestvennogo mneniya*, 6(142), 318-328.
35. Cherednichenko, G.A. (2015). The New Structure of Employment and Orientation of Young People. Moscow: Novyj khronograf.
36. Bahremand, A. (2015). The concept of translation in different teaching approaches and methods. *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 5-9.
37. Dylnova, Z.M. (2011). Youth Segment of Entrepreneurship in Modern Russia: State and Prospects. *Izv. Sarat. un-ta Nov. ser. Ser. Sotsiologiya. Politologiya*, 2, 15-16.
38. Manokhin, A.Yu. (2012). Strategy for Development of Youth Small and Medium Entrepreneurship in Russian Regions. *Nauchnye vedomosti Belgorodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Ehkonomika. Informatika*, 13(132), 47-52.
39. Vodenko, K.V., Gribov, G.A., Chernov, K.A., Mukhina, K.S. (2019). Russian Entrepreneurship in the Context of Socio-Economic Crisis: The Risks of Deprofessionalization. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 5(10), 1495-1500.
40. Cherednichenko, G.A. (2015). The New Structure of Employment and Orientation of Young People. Moscow: Novyj khronograf.
41. Konstantinovskiy, D.L., Voznesenskaya, E.D. & Cherednichenko, G.A. (2014). Youth of Russia at the Turn of XX-XXI Centuries: Education, Work, Social Well-being. Moscow: TSSP i M.

42. Nuriyev, M., Sovetkanova, D., & Seysenbayeva, Z. (2018). Achievements and new challenges in the area of education of independent Kazakhstan. *Opción*, 34(85-2), 337-352.
43. Chernysh, M.F. & Epikhina, Yu.B. (2018). *Multidimensional Social Mobility in Contemporary Russia*. Moscow: Institut sotsiologii FNISTS RAN.
44. Gorshkov, M.K. (2014). Social Inequality as an Object of Sociological Analysis. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya*, 7, 20-31.
45. Migacheva, M.V. (2007). The Nature and Characteristics of Professional Socialization of Young Specialists in the Period of Transformations. *Vestnik SamGU*, 1(51), 95-96.
46. Gnatyuk, M.A. (2016). *Transformation of Labor Values of Russian Youth in Conditions of Globalization: PhD Thesis*. Rostov-on-Don. North, D. (1997). Contribution of Neo-institutionalism to Understanding of Transitive Economy Problems. URL: <http://www.finansy.ru/publ/north.htm>.
47. Ilyin, V.I. (2015). Profession as an Individual Life Track: Conceptualization of the Category. *Zhurnal issledovaniy sotsial'noj politiki*, 13(14), 523-536. Avilkina, S.V. & Leontieva, L.S. (2017). System of Higher Education as a Resource of Development of Business Environment. *Rossijskoe predprinimatel'stvo*, 18(3), 427-438.
48. Korchagina, I.V., Rogov, K.V. & Korchagin, R.L. (2017). Involvement of Russian students in Innovative Entrepreneurship. *Rossijskoe predprinimatel'stvo*, 18(16), 2301-2316.
49. Ivanov, G.G., Orlov, S.L. & Bazhenov, Y.K. (2014). Youth Entrepreneurship: Current Realities and a Look into the Future. *VEPS*, 4, 54-58.