CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL SPORT WITH OTHER TYPES OF SPORT: PROBLEMS OF TYPOLOGY
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Abstract: This article introduces the concept of "professional sport as a sub-institution." Its justification is connected with the need to overcome the contradictions that arose on the basis of the outdated classification of sport in the framework of the activity approach, when the markers that are not working in the new social conditions are used to distinguish its varieties, dividing sport into professional and amateur, professional and Olympic, professional and sport of the highest achievements. Social evolution of sport has led to the formation of its two forms: professional and mass. The author proposes a new concept, which, within the framework of the institutional approach of D. North, allows solving the problems of the typology of sport that sociology faces at the present stage.
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INTRODUCTION

The discursive space of the sociology of sport is an extremely confusing and contradictory field of research. Among sociologists, there is no unity in practically any of the basic concepts. This is predetermined by the peculiarity of the transformation processes taking place in the field of sports. In many ways, they have a heterochronous character. It is enough to point out two aspects: 1) some kinds of sport change faster than others; 2) different countries have different socio-economic conditions. All this leads to a certain rigidity of thinking not only in society, where sport is perceived very ambiguously, but also in science, which turns out to be a hostage of the multidimensionality of sports processes. As a result, the experts have repeatedly voiced the view that "sport, only at the first, superficial glance, is a phenomenon common in nature and form of representation. In fact, this is highly differentiated in many respects sociocultural practice, listing the directions, types, forms of which (even if there is no desire for inclusiveness and strict systematization) takes more than one line" (Bykhovskaya, 2014). The situation becomes clear only if the researchers do not consider the prevailing typologies of sport, but try to understand the nature of sport, focusing on its social essence. In this understanding of sport, sociologists agree that it includes three basic components, which, as a rule, are considered by scientists as initial signs: 1) competitiveness; 2) the intensity of physical activity (physicality); 3) the game by the rules (with its inherent uncertainty of the result). Based on the framework definition of sport, we set ourselves the goal of analyzing the correlation of professional sport with other types of sport, suggesting that this will make it possible to build its scientific typology related to modern trends in the development of sport in the world and in Russian society.

METHODS

The theoretical and methodological base of the research consists of the conceptual provisions of sociological theory, revealing four basic concepts: "sport", "typology of sport", "institute of sport" and "professional sport". We think that the most optimal solution for the operationalization of the concepts presented is the neoinstitutional methodology of Douglas North. The scientist understands a social institution as a set of stable formal and informal norms that developed to optimize costs for social actors to achieve their individual goals and to determine the most rational ways to achieve their targets. D. North emphasizes the importance of formal rules by the fact that they are "conciliation procedures and practical standards that structure relations between individuals" (North, 1990). Formal rules are written and represent decisions of specially authorized bodies, including state authorities, intergovernmental organizations and other structures whose administrative activities are recognized as authoritative and whose regulatory guidelines are based on dictating imperative will to social actors. Informal norms are also of equal importance for the formation of the regulatory space. These include business practices, traditions, corporate solutions of a recommendatory type (not formalized by law), etc. The collection of empirical information was carried out based on an expert survey in the form of a questionnaire conducted from November 23, 2019 to January 20, 2020 in three regions of the Russian Federation: Moscow, Rostov and Astrakhan regions. Professional athletes, coaches of professional teams, sports managers, sponsors, and leaders of sports teams were interviewed as experts. In total, the sample consists of 129 experts.
THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

We proceed from the position that professional sport is an integral part of the institute of Russian sport. At the hypothesis level, it is planned to justify this by the fact that its exclusion from the institutional environment of sport will be a consequence or a basis not so much for the transformation of professional sport as a social phenomenon, but rather its degradation; since its transformation into a pure business, on the one hand, will necessitate a decisive change in the institutional complex (formal and informal norms) due to the distortion of generally accepted values of sport (fairness of competition, openness of competition, unknown results of the competition, equal chances of participating in the competition, free entry into the competition process on the basis of a sports principle, etc.); on the other hand, it will lead to the loss of its popularity in society, since professional sports are massively interesting to society precisely because it is a sport, not a business. As soon as it begins to live by the principles of entrepreneurship, it will degrade to the early phases of its development, that is, to the turn of the 19-20 centuries, turning into a business of bookmakers, for whom disenfranchised professional athletes were nothing more than a means of earning.

According to this hypothesis notable is the classification of sport offered by E.Yu. Perkova. The author identifies two large groups of sport: mass and sport of the highest achievements. To the first system, she listed student, adaptive, professionally applied, amateur, fitness, conditioned, children and youth sports, and to the second – sport of achievements and entertainment (commercial) (Perkova, 2019). The reasons for this typology are understandable - these are the goals that the participants in sports activities set to themselves. The author divides sport into mass sport, existing for the widest groups of the public, and sport of the highest achievements. In mass sports, students and children fulfil the need for physical activity, patients recover (Gafiatulina et al., 2019), people with disabilities solve inclusion problems, amateurs just love sport regardless of age, and in sport of the highest achievements, sports activities are subject to records and the desire for striking achievements in expanding the physical capabilities of a person. However, this typology raises several questions. Firstly, in sport of the highest achievements, the author emphasizes achievement sport, which seems to us to be a kind of tautology. Achievement sport cannot relate to the sport of highest achievements as a quotient to the whole, since the name implies the same thing. Secondly, the researcher very unconventionally understands the status of amateurs who, even now, are considered by many experts to belong to the sport of the highest achievements. According to the tradition accepted in science, amateurs are opposed to professionals, and professional sport in this typology is totally absent, being in the structure mass sport under the atypical name of professionally applied. Instead, E.Yu. Perkova introduces the concept of spectacular (commercial) sport. In the latter case, the grounds for the typology chosen by the author herself are generally violated, since in sport if we are talking about athletes, creating a spectacle cannot be an end in itself. Modern sport hasn’t lost the orientation to the priority of the result, which means the subordination of the entertainment element. If we are not talking about athletes, then there is no uniformity in the definition of achievement sport and spectacular one: the first determines the target orientations of the athletes, the second - of unknown entities.

Any interpretation of the analyzed concept doesn’t give the answer to the main question: where professional sports should belong. This, indeed, is a problem not only for the author, but for the whole of modern science. Not seeing the resources to
solve it, many scientists totally exclude it from the institute of sport. However, professional sport is still a sport. Its practices, if we evaluate them only within the framework of the activities of athletes, do not contradict the nature of sport, completely fit into its basic definition (Gafiatulina et al., 2018). The solution of this problem is seen in a fundamentally different typology of the institute of sport. Our understanding of a social institution has dual basis: its core consists of formal and informal norms, and their social meaning, including in terms of the dichotomy of “sustainability / development” of norms, is filled with goals defined by sports activity entities in the process of choosing the most rational models of behavior. Institutions have a stable structure consisting of regulatory restrictions, at the same time, they are developing and transforming due to the change of target orientation of different groups of social actors. Starting from the previously proposed understanding of the social institute of sport, we can distinguish two types of sport: mass and professional. As the base of the typology, we take target orientation of the sporting activity entities. This approach is consistent with the proposed methodological model of the social institute of sport, where the goals of social actors are a factor in shaping the stability of normative complexes.

In mass sports, setting the most diverse goals is possible depending on the needs of specific groups of sports activity entities. We largely agree with the way they are formulated by E.Yu. Perkova. However, we consider a detailed discussion of this issue unnecessary, since it goes beyond our cognitive interest. As for professional sport, its target nature follows from the name: it acts as a source of income for athletes participating in sports competitions (Vereshchagina et al., 2015). The presented typology assumes the absorption by professional sport of several other sports that have been opposed to it for a long time in theory and at the level of mass opinions. This is about the traditional division of sports into professional and amateur. Currently, this antagonism has completely exhausted itself. It was relevant during the formation of the world sports system, primarily Olympic, at the turn of the 19-20 centuries. At the same time, several criteria for distinguishing between pros and amateurs were determined. Among the main aspects, it was positioned that the former participates in sports activities for money, and the latter for fun, for the sake of demonstrating healthy physicality. However, now all the athletes, sometimes even at the level of corporate leagues, that is, in mass sports, and participants of regional, all-Russian, continental and world championships, receive regular and / or a fixed reward for their sports activities. In fact, no matter how they are called, they are professionals. This concerns all kinds of sport: widely popular (such as football and hockey) as well as not of interest to the public. The athlete’s income depends on this, but the fundamental remains unchanged.

Equally doubtful is the contrast between professional sport and sport of the highest achievements. In fact, this has long been the same thing. Modern sport has reached the highest level of its development in various positions. In terms of effectiveness, it is impossible to be successful if you do not devote a significant part of your life to training daily. Under such circumstances, sport can no longer be recognized as a hobby, an interesting pastime after a “hard working day”. Economically for the “pure” amateurs sport of the highest achievements is not available, because it contains high entry barriers in the form of the need to purchase expensive sports equipment. This equipment, without which sports performance will deteriorate significantly, acts as a guarantee that ensures equal starting opportunities for athletes. Nevertheless, it cannot be purchased without sponsorship, and a business should have an interest in linking advertising of its products to at least
a relatively successful athlete who is able to demonstrate sponsor products at major competitions (Kovalev et al., 2018). Otherwise, sponsorship is devoid of economic meaning. This forms a vicious circle that can break apart only with a professional attitude to sport.

The same should be said concerning Olympic sport. The participation of exclusively amateurs in it stopped in the middle of the 20th century, when athletes from the socialist camp could participate in the Olympic Games. Even then, they were professionals whose status was ensured by appropriate state support. Toward the end of the century, professionals from some economically interesting for organizers, leagues, and sports were admitted to the Olympics. As a result, since the beginning of the 21st century, Olympic sport has become professional. It is believed that Olympic sport and sport of the highest achievements should be separated from the professional through a competitive attribute (Safonov et al., 2010). It means that professionals take part in it, but they do not receive wages for their participation. In a sense, this is so, but at the Olympic, world and continental tournaments, athletes are rewarded lump sum payments, which represent a substantial addition to their basic income. This conclusion is confirmed by the results of our expert survey.

Table 1. In your opinion, can sport of the highest achievements (Olympics, continental and world championship) currently exist as an amateur sport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection options</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, the entire sport of the highest achievements is a professional sport</td>
<td>59,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, the IOC, international and national federations are competitors for professional leagues for making money in sports</td>
<td>18,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, professionals participate in the sport of the highest achievements, acting as amateurs (without material compensation)</td>
<td>21,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, professionals have no place in the sport of the highest achievements</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the majority (78.2%) of experts believe that high-performance sport is a special kind of professional sport. At the same time, 18.8% believe that the IOC, which was once a platform for combating the penetration of professionals into sports, itself transformed into a business entity. It can be summarized that sport of the highest achievements and Olympic sport have long ceased to be a sphere where athletes implement their leisure activities. To have high achievements in sport, it is chosen as a profession, assuming that the result will be indexed in a reward worthy of the achieved successes. This means that modern professional sport forms a single institutional space of formal and informal norms governing the conduct of competitive practices both in domestic sports leagues and in international competitions. Therefore, in a broad sense, Olympic sport and sport of the highest achievements (world and continental championships) can be considered as varieties of professional sport, which in the narrow sense should be
understood as stable regulatory systems for organizing and conducting sports leagues and participating in commercial tournaments.

This typology assumes that there is a single institutional system of sport in which sports professionals occupy a separate place. The opposite position which presents sport as a part of the social institution of entrepreneurship is based on blurring the boundaries between amateur and professional sports. Historically amateur sport was divided into mass sport, sport of the highest achievements and Olympic sport. The last two varieties were quite like each other, but could have institutional distinctions, because not every sport became Olympic. As for professional sport, initially it had a narrower social location, and did not always involve the best athletes (especially not in Anglo-Saxon countries, where sports pros had long had extremely negative connotations in public opinion, as they were associated with the criminal world, betting on games, excessive cruelty, relevance to sports rules). However, with the acquisition of sports broader social functions beyond the construction of the image of physical attractiveness and enhance the physical, mental and social health (Ponomarev et al., 2019), professional sport, without losing touch with the business, gradually began to change its social nature acquiring features typical for the sport in general. This evolution has led to the absorption of the Olympic movement and sport of highest achievements by professional sport. If we do not go beyond the concept according to which sport belongs to the Institute of Entrepreneurship, then we get its fundamentally new model, which in fact is being developed from sport as a special kind of economic activity and physical education related to the social institute of health care. Accordingly, the goals of sports activities entities, in the first case, will be aimed at maximizing profits, and in the second - at strengthening health and the cult of physicality (Toropov et al, 2019).

Such a classification contains many advantages. For example, it is difficult to deny the obvious: professional sport has absorbed the Olympic movement, and the quality of existing professional athletes has grown compared to the beginning of the 20th century and has become much higher than that of modern "amateurs." The question, however, is whether it was the absorption or transformation. In the second case, we are referring to the mutual influence of the emergence of a fundamentally new institutional quality, as a result of this transformation. We believe that this is precisely the second option. In addition, within the framework of a model that includes professional sport of different quality and physical education, it is extremely difficult to understand the relationship between youth and adult sports, including professional. Moreover, this connection certainly exists. However, sports activities carried out by children and adolescents in the course of participation in sports sections cannot be called physical culture in the strict sense, because it is focused on achieving a certain result, which is irrelevant to the tasks defined for physical education (Bolozin, 2018). Consequently, the hypothetical typology of sports activities proposed above, including professional sport and physical education, does not fully correspond to the institutional nature of modern sport. In our opinion, a completely different classification is more appropriate, focused on the allocation of two basic varieties of sports: professional and mass. These two forms of sporting activity form a social institution of sports content, as it is at the present stage.

DISCUSSIONS

The analyzed issue arose a discussion in domestic sociology. Different approaches to the classification of sports have been developed in science. Some of
them are tied to the peculiarities of the sports process (Kasyanov et al., 2019), others are repelled from the substantive features of science (Gafiatulina et al., 2018) the third from the characteristics of athletes (Aksenova, 2018), the fourth are determined by regional affiliation (Krasilnikov, 2006), fifth are deduced from the nature of the impact on the athlete’s health (Bykov et al., 2019; Gryshai et al., 2018). It can be noted that modern science is developing based on specific tasks the researcher faces. Therefore, sports typologies in recent years have been created not with the aim of offering some comprehensive explanations that can suit all scientists, but considering the resolution of a specific problem. In our case, such a problem is the determination of the place of professional sport at the institute of Russian sport. The analysis of the literature shows that a significant part of scientists working within the framework of the institutional approach generally do not see professional sport in any manifestations of sports activity, since they consider it as an entrepreneurial activity. The latter has completely different targets and subjective composition and, in the best case, can be called sport only because of the conditional similarity with sport on some formal signs. There are other estimates, according to which professional sport has not yet transformed so much as to lose its original connection with the institute of sport, but basically, it has already become part of the institution of entrepreneurship (Kasyanov et al., 2019).

CONCLUSIONS

We can suggest that professional sport and sport of the highest achievements (including Olympic sports) throughout the 20th century were influenced by certain laws of development, the result of which was their mutual merger and the emergence of a fundamentally new social quality that retained the old name "professional sport". However, due to the impact of transformational processes, the new professional sport, as it would be more correct to call it, has a fundamentally different institutional nature than the old professional sport. It includes both new sustainable combination of formal and informal norms and markedly different targets of the sporting activities entities. The main watershed forming the differences between professional and mass sports is the differentiation of their target nature. The common goal in any kind of sport is one - victory. However, an additional goal in mass sport is the cult of physicality and health, and in professional sport - material income. The existence of children and youth sport as a reserve for recruiting into professional sport, on the one hand, preserves a holistic understanding of sport preventing it from disintegrating and being absorbed into other social institutions, and on the other hand, it keeps the state's interest in professional sport as a special social phenomenon that has the most important functions beyond the institution of entrepreneurship, as a set of norms and stable relations aimed at the production of commercially attractive products. Professional sport also has important economic functions, but by its institutional nature, it is a sport, not a business. If sport is considered to be a social institution consisting of a stable set of formal and informal norms, then the sub-institute of professional sport will be a combination of norms of a formal and informal type reflecting its specific features and aimed at regulating the interaction of sports activities entities. Professional sport is just such a sub-institute, which includes formal and informal rules aimed at reducing contradictions in social communication within this part of the sports institute, as well as on its fields of encounter with the adjacent sub-institute of mass sport or with other social institutions such as state and entrepreneurship.
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