

俄國運動社會學基礎

Mikhail Sinyutin *

Aleksander Gonashvili **

孫佳婷***

摘 要

具深厚歐洲淵源的俄國社會學與文化，在臺灣較鮮為人知，尤其是在運動與科學研究方面。本文首次概述了俄國運動社會學的發展歷史，行文主要集中於探究運動社會學科的發展與運動的定義，其被視為運動中社會論述的理論基礎。本文也呈現俄國（蘇聯）社會學傳統中，「運動」和「身體文化」概念的相互關係，同時指出了與俄國社會學概念密切相關的部分前沿作者。對運動之社會性質的看法變化，反映了俄國運動文化在過去一個世紀中的主要演變，因此，這篇研究預計將有助於臺灣讀者於當前世界趨勢中，拓展對俄國與其文化之理解。

關鍵詞：運動社會學、俄國歷史、社會理論、運動與身體文化

*Mikhail Sinyutin，俄國聖彼得堡國立大學社會學院教授。Email：sinewtin@yandex.ru。

**Aleksander Gonashvili，俄國聖彼得堡國立科技學院社會學系助理教授。Email：gon.01.07.94@yandex.ru。

***孫佳婷，國立體育大學師資培育中心兼任助理教授。Email：tinnalovefriend@gmail.com。(通訊作者)

Foundations of the Sociology of Sport in Russia

Mikhail Sinyutin *

Aleksander Gonashvili **

Chia-Ting Sun ***

Abstract

Russian sociology and culture have a close bond with Europe and are less known in Taiwan, especially in sports and scientific studies. This is the first paper that provides an overview of the history of the development of the sociology of sport in Russia. It primarily centers around the development of the sociology of sport subject and the definition of sports, which are viewed as theoretical fundamentals of sociological discourse in sports. This paper also demonstrates the interrelation of the concepts of sports and physical culture (спорт и физическая культура) in the Russian (Soviet) sociological tradition and meanwhile points out some front authors closely associated with Russian sociological concepts. The changing perception of the social nature of sports reflects the main evolution of Russian sports culture in the past century. Therefore, this retrospective article anticipates facilitating Taiwanese readers to have an advantage over the current global trend and expanding their awareness of Russian and Russian culture.

*Mikhail Sinyutin, Professor, Faculty of Sociology, Saint Petersburg State University, Russia. Email: sinewtin@yandex.ru.

**Aleksander Gonashvili, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Saint Petersburg State Institute of Technology, Russia. Email: gon.01.07.94@yandex.ru.

***Chia-Ting SUN, Adjunct Assistant Professor, The Center for Teacher Education, National Taiwan Sport University, Taiwan. Email: tinnalovefriend@gmail.com. (Corresponding Author)

Keywords: Sociology of sport (Спортивная социология), Russian history (История России), Social theory (Социальная теория), Sport and physical culture (Спорт и физическая культура)

專文引介

臺灣運動學界與國際學術社群，一直保持著密切的交流，這使得我們在各運動子領域的研究議題與方法上，屢有創新。在學術研究發表上，我們大多遵循美規的學術評鑑制度—如科學引文索引 (Science Citation Index, SCI) 與社會科學引文索引 (Social Sciences Citation Index, SSCI)—作為統一評估論文質量良窳的標準。隨著以此作為唯一標的之相關批判漸起，我們也可以發現，由於全球情勢與各國間的政治關係發展各異，有不少優秀的研究與學者，往往因學術慣習與制度、文化與政治社經背景之差異，而未進入我們的視野中，也有不少國家試著發展與 SCI、SSCI 相似，但能涵納不同地域研究的評鑑制度。

學術研究必有其問題意識與發展背景，上述缺乏對於學術研究而言，便是少了一種分析事理的可能角度，實屬遺憾。唯有更多觀點的參與及學者的往復論辯，方能更加完善我們對於社會與世界的理解。此篇文章之由來，便源於此因。

俄國在世界發展史上，一直佔有重要地位，與中美的關係，也牽動著世界局勢的變化。回顧其藝術、文化、運動、社會與哲學等各領域之發展，成果豐碩而蔚成一脈，但其研究卻少見於我們的視野中，臺灣過去對其認識不深，運動人文社會學界亦幾無相關討論。除俄國學術體制與慣常發表場域與我們多有差異外，臺灣學者較少鑽研俄語，使得許多俄國經典與學者論述較少被譯著，亦是一潛在的限制因素。隨著俄國近年在國際運動競技場域中的表現、在媒體上大幅增加的曝光率，及其當前在國際社會間所扮演的角色，筆者認為有必要於此時引入相關研究，促進人們對其觀點之

理解，這或將不只對運動社會學界有所貢獻，更能有利於大眾開展對俄國的認識及對國際情勢之分析。

筆者在數年前，有幸於國際運動社會學 (International Sociology of Sport Association, ISSA) 學術會議上，認識了現為 ISSA 諮詢委員會成員、任職於俄國聖彼得堡國立大學社會學院的 Mikhail Sinyutin。該校在歐陸與俄國皆舉足輕重，不只創校歷史久遠、曾培養出眾多諾貝爾獎得主，亦是俄國現任總統普丁 (Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin) 之母校。該校自身便是一掌握時勢脈動的龐大資源庫，不只見證了蘇聯以至俄國不同時期的演變，更是推動俄國整體發展的重要力量之一。而 Mikhail 長期投入社會學理論與運動社會學相關之研究，慣常透過跨地域之比較研究、歷史與經濟層面的爬梳，來分析當前運動場域中的重要議題，近期研究包含了對當代運動科技之關注，以及社會中的不同勞動形式。由於其學生常來自中、美、歐等地之故，因此其也積極地與各地研究者建立合作關係，並展現了對各式議題的獨到見解。

由於我們對俄國社會與運動發展之理解有待增補，因此，筆者冒昧的邀請他一同為《運動文化研究》撰寫一篇短文，概括性的介紹俄國的運動社會學之演進理路，期能拓展我們對俄國運動社會學發展之認識。為求完善此文，其也邀請現任職於俄國聖彼得堡國立科技學院社會學系、曾為其學生的 Aleksander Gonashvili 參與撰寫。Aleksander 近期之研究，主要包含運動禁藥使用之態度分析 (attitude analysis)、體育理論及實踐 (theory and practice) 工作，觸及層面廣泛。除此之外，筆者連續數年與他們一起於聖彼得堡大學之國際倫理學會議籌組論壇，並共同參與聖彼得堡市主辦之國際勞工論壇，由於這兩位之訓練主要源自社會學母學科，且亦曾負笈外地進學，因此能充分融會不同地域之觀點與理論，其分析現象之視角與取用之論述，多有過去我們未曾觸及之處。鑑於上述原因，與這兩位學者在俄國運動社會學界之長期耕耘，筆者認為，本文應有其高度的參考價值。

本文以歷史為經，社會演進為緯，深入描述了俄國運動社會學的起源與發展，間接呈現了文化與社會背景，對形塑運動社會學與身體活動的影響。立基於不同國情，本文概要的對「運動」與「身體文化」相關概念、定義、論述的轉變及其原由進行了闡述，說明了俄國如何看待運動與運動社會學的功能，以及俄國當前運動社會學相關研究方法與內容，呈現了多樣性與異質性的趨勢，尤其是從社會學中援引論述，如何可能為完善運動社會學研究產生助益。文中旁徵博引的指出了針對不同議題，可參考的學者與文獻，在不長的篇幅中，帶來了豐富的資訊含量。

不論政治局勢如何變化，學術研究是一刻不能暫緩，從另一方面來說，學術研究此時可能提供甚麼樣的貢獻，更是我們可以深入思考的議題。政治的交鋒愈是尖銳，學術場域或許便應提供更多的互動空間，以使彼此能相互理解。俄國社會學具深厚的歐洲淵源，但其社會發展的特殊性，使其思想上的拓展具有獨特的路徑，這尤其展現在蘇聯時期的運動研究方面。綜觀來看，對運動的社會性質的觀點變化，反映了過去一個世紀中，俄國運動文化的變革與過程。筆者預期本文將能從理論與實務層面，為我們初探俄國運動社會學發展帶來一些啟發，相信本文亦應會勾起我們對俄國的興趣與不少疑問。作為一引介，筆者期許本文能成為一個起始點，促成雙方未來更多的實務交流，以利雙邊學術研究之發展，並使所有研究都能有機會被看見。

1. Early Sociological Ideas of Sports in Russian and Soviet Sociology (First Quarter of the XX Century)

The sociology of sport (спортивная социология) has been around for more than a century. Its formation took place against the background of the development of capitalism (капитализм), which contributes to the mass sportification (спортификация) of leisure, the institutionalization of sports movements and the academic strengthening of sociological science. Russia was covered to a large extent by all these trends, which created the conditions for the Sociology of sport. The first to turn to the social issues of sports were none other than the devotees of the sports movement and education of Russia at the crossroad of the 19th and 20th centuries - Peter Lesgaft and Georg Duperron. The concepts of physical culture and sports developed by them had mainly the foundation of sociological positivism and didn't separate the sociology of sport from the theory of sport.

Like many countries of that time, the sports life of Russia was strongly influenced by British models, although adapted to local peculiarities. In Russia, the elite aristocracy of sports entertainment was combined in those years with the spread in the military environment in the form of disciplinary practices of physical exercises. The focal nature of sports life manifested itself in concentration exclusively in large industrial cities such as St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, Odessa and others. This is not surprising, since more than 80% of the population lived in rural areas and was associated with agricultural labor, excluding the possibility of sportification of leisure.

The first sociological work on sports was Grigori Tsyperovich's article "Sport" in the popular magazine "The Modern World" for 1913¹. Here, sports life was viewed in the context of a socio-class structure from positions close to Marxism (Марксизм), although not advertised due, apparently, to censorship considerations. Tsyperovich sees in the success of sports a natural desire for the harmonization of human nature, violated by the capitalist division of labor. The article presents interesting material from the history of social differentiation of sports in the early 20th century. At the same time, he sets the tasks of spreading sports among workers and giving sports practices features characteristic of workers, aimed specifically on recreation. It is significant that Tsiperovich was an active figure in the revolution of 1917, and later headed the early Soviet trade union movement, worked in state planning bodies and headed a number of educational academies.

The first decades of Soviet power gave a huge impetus to the development of the sports movement, as well as the scientific study of sports. The socialist ideology set the political tasks of turning sports into a mass movement aimed at preparing individuals for work and military service, and developing collectivism and a healthy lifestyle. This line of development of Soviet sports was superimposed on the policy of forming a new proletarian culture and a new human being of a future socialist society. Naturally, education has become the most important feature of sports development. Terminologically, a complex of disciplines called the theory of physical culture and sports has appeared. It was in this complex that there was a significant segment of sociological knowledge. And although this did not

¹Grigori Tsyperovich, "Sport," *The Modern World*, 11 (St-Petersburg, November 1913): 136-197.

contribute to the scope of the sociology of sport, the latter still received serious help for development. Due to the fact that Marxism became the political ideology of the Soviet Union, the studies of society received a predominantly Marxist justification.

The politicization of the organization of sports activities increased the possibilities of both sports practices and their scientific study. Universities of physical education are emerging, such as the Leningrad Institute of Physical Culture named after Lesgaft. A special journal "Theory and Practice of physical culture" appears in 1925. The most influential researchers and organizers of soviet sports in the 20-30s were Elysari Zelikson, Albert Zygmunt, and Nikolai Semashko. In 1927, professor Zelikson started reading his pioneering course on the sociological foundations of physical culture. A big portion of the educational component in his course was explained by the socialist goal of designing a new generation through sports. It must help the soviet people to perform their labor. Sport became part of a large cultural system of socialism.

By raising the sociological topics of sports, soviet scholars show the shortcomings of bourgeois sports, which they recommend from the practices of Soviet sports. A lot of space in sociological works was occupied by the discussion of the class features of individual sports and the justification of the usefulness or uselessness of these types from the point of view of the development of a socialist person. The Soviet Union was creating a new society with new social institutions, which meant introducing new socialist meanings into sports practices that were to be served state purposes. Accordingly, the tasks of sociology aimed at identifying such a semantic component. Methodologically, conceptualizing sports as a social corpus of

practices was based on dialectical materialism.

2.Improvements of Sociological Knowledge about Sports in the USSR (1960-1980)

The next important period in the development of the Soviet Sociology of sport was the success of sociological knowledge since the 1960s. By this time, both the Soviet society itself and its sports life had changed, which could not but affect the scientific study of these processes. If socialism was only a political goal during the first decades of the Soviet Union, now it has become a proclaimed reality of social life. The political consciousness of the internal class struggle was replaced by a worldview regarding the consistent unity of the Soviet people as a socio-class structure. The standard of living had increased and the social structure had changed towards an industrial society. More than 70% of the population was urbanized and received ample opportunities for sports leisure. Physical excellence became the public duty of the soviet people at the level of everyday life since the Soviet government invested a lot in mass sports of various forms and levels.

At the same time, despite the start of The Cold War, the Soviet Union became actively involved in international political life, which dictated the need for public representation of the benefits of the socialist system, including at the level of sporting achievements. The Soviet Union began to participate in major international tournaments and the professionalization of athletes in hidden social forms started. The professional status of sport was politically forbidden, but developing high-level skills needs regular training and exclusion from any labor activities. International prestige contradicts ideological principles.

On the other hand, the ruling Communist Party decided to support the contacts of Soviet scientists with international professional communities at the level of the International Sociological Association. After the first appearance of ten Soviet representatives, headed by Petr Fedoseev and Mikhail Kammari, at the International Sociological Congress in 1956 in Amsterdam, the Soviet Sociological Association was established in 1958 to maintain this cooperation. The early leaders of the Association were Yuri Frantsev and Gennady Osipov. The political purpose of international contacts was to spread the influence of Soviet Marxist sociological theory, precisely by showing its superiority over western thought.

Therefore, the earlier ideological mission of winning internal class struggle had moved to the external international scope. Sociologists thus performed the role of ideological warriors. But in reality, professional roles and professional interests bring another strategy to the agenda. It helps to refresh Soviet sociological discourse and enrich theoretical horizons. Soviet scientists actively participated in the creation of the International Sociology of sport Association (ISSA).

At the first meeting of the International Committee for the sociology of sport in Geneva in 1964, which launched the history of ISSA, an active role was played by soviet sociologist Aleksandr Novikov. A few years later in 1968, he initiated the creation of a research committee for sociological problems of physical culture and sports at the Soviet Sociological Association. From the 1970s to the 1980s this committee was headed by Natalya Valentinova. A very active and influential role in developing and teaching the sociology of sport was played by professor Vladislav Stoljarov from the State Central Institute of Physical Culture in Moscow. Later in post-soviet times, he

was during many years an Advisory Board member at ISSA.

Soviet professor Oleg Milstein used to be an editorial board member of *International Review for the sociology of sport* (1972-2002), and Mait Arvisto, Irina Bykhovskaya, Nikolay Ponomarev, Mikhail Ripa, and many others published their numerous articles. It is also significant that universities and research centers specializing in sports and institutionally connected with the State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports have become a nest for the development of the sociology of sport in these years. In sum, these processes strengthen the forming of independent sociology of sport and improve its theoretical fundamentals.

Along with the former mass nature of the physical culture movement, a sport of the highest achievements has now appeared in the public space, designed to symbolize the advantages and victories of socialism over capitalism in international sports arenas. Technically, the highest sport became professional, but in the service of the Soviet government. Therefore, the state has expanded its interest in the sociological study of not only mass involvement in physical education, but also the social problems of top-level sports. The goals and objectives of the research depended on government policy and left certain room for maneuvering for sociologists. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that organizationally, these sociological studies of the sports life of Soviet society were connected with the institutional structures of sports movement management in the country. This was especially true of the work within the scientific and educational centers of physical culture and sports.

Definitions of the subject of sociology of sport were carried out mainly in the Marxist spirit. Also, the theoretical development of the sociology of sport

strongly depended not only on the state ideology of Marxism, but also on the priority concepts of the theory of physical culture and sports. Typically, Pavel Stepovoi in his book "Sport and Society" formulates a brief and detailed definition of the subject of the Marxist sociology of sport:

*Marxist sociology of sport is a field of public knowledge about physical culture and sports, physical education, their significance in the life of society, social role and social functions.*²

The difficulty was that understood as branch sociology, the sociology of sport could no longer flexibly develop independent concepts in a Marxist way without the risk of challenging the general theory. The current situation opened up a wide field of empirical research, but froze the theoretical progress of sociological knowledge of the sports life of society. The most productive researchers of physical culture and sports in the USSR in the 1960s to 1980s like Viktor Artemov³, Irina Bykhovskaya⁴, Oleg Milstein⁵, Nikolai Ponomarev⁶, Vladislav Stolyarov⁷, Nikolay Vizitei⁸ turned to be not creative enough to seriously improve the Marxist understanding of sports in relation to the society of the XXth century. It is hard to judge how much they were

²Pavel Stepovoi. *Sport and Society: Some Methodological and Social Problems*, (Tartu: State University of Tartu, 1972), 67.

³Viktor Artemov. "About the Study of the Sociological Aspect of Physical Culture," *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 4 (Moscow, April 1963): 58-60.

⁴Irina Bykhovskaya, "Sociological Analysis of Mass Physical Culture and Sports," Osipov Gennady and Ivanov Vilen. *Marxist-Leninist Sociology*, (Moscow: Nauka, 1988), 107-112.

⁵Oleg Milstein. "On the Subject of Sociology of Sports and Its Development in the USSR," *Social Foundations of Physical Culture and Sports*, (Kiev: KGIFK, 1973).

⁶Nikolai Ponomarev. "The Phenomenon of Play and Sport," *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 8 (Moscow, August 1972): 6.

⁷Vladislav Stolyarov. "Philosophical and Sociological Problems of Physical Culture and Sports," *Questions of Philosophy*, 2 (Moscow, February 1981): 168-173.

⁸Nikolay Vizitei. *Lifestyle. Sport. Personality*. Chisinau: Stiinza, 1980.

constrained institutionally, but how much intellectually.

In Soviet literature, studies of the impact of physical culture and sport on social life, were conducted with the aim of developing a harmonious personality of a Soviet person, as well as a healthy and active worker and defender of the country⁹. The main thematic blocks that were discussed during the Soviet period were researched into the problems of mass sports and physical culture and some aspects of the sport of higher achievements. All thematic blogs can be united under a single agenda. These agenda acts - physical culture and sports in the way of life of Soviet people, which covered many research areas, including: identifying and substantiating the socio-economic effect of the development of mass sports and physical culture, with an emphasis on its recreational value; obtaining and summarizing information about the interests and demands of different population groups for these practices.

The number of studies related to the study of physical culture and sports as a means of personal socialization also grew quite intensively, especially the emphasis was placed on the comprehensive development of personality through sports, as well as the construction of a social portrait of the athlete as a representative of a special type of activity. Soviet period creates interest in sport as a social institution; there is a sociologically colored development of issues related to the use of sport as a "soft power" in politics. The main vector

⁹Anatolyi Frenkin, "Comprehensive Personal Development and Physical Education Issues," *Questions of Philosophy*, 3 (Moscow, March 1962): 87-91; Vladislav Stolyarov, et al., eds., *Sport and Lifestyle*, (Moscow: Physical Culture and Sports, 1979); Vinogradov, Petr, Zholdak, Vladimir, *Organization of Promotion of Physical Culture and Sports Taking into Account the Interests of the Population*, (Moscow: Physical Culture and Sports, 1979); Irina Bykhovskaya, Vladislav Stolyarov, "Socialist Way of Life and Physical Culture," *Inform. Materials of the Philosophical Society of the USSR*, 3 (Moscow, PhSoc of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, 1983): 11-18

for all these decades remains the study of physical education in the frameworks of the Marxist theoretical and methodological basis for all the above directions, including historical materialism, dialectics, class analysis, and interpreting sports as a part of the superstructure or ideological form of the social system.

3.Sociology of sport in the Russian Federation (1990-2020)

All legacies of the Soviet sociology of sport have survived and continue to develop in the discourse of contemporary Russian scholars to this day. The irony is that most sociologists are trying to escape the Marxist approach, but the Soviet experience highly dominates intellectually due to the strong theoretical fundamentals hardly being able to be replaced. Paradoxically, Karl Marx gave no clues to understanding sports but to understanding capitalist society. Nevertheless, the idea of the social reproduction of sports on a Marxian basis seems to be attractive to today's Russian community of sports sociologists. The work done during the Soviet period still influence sociological conceptualizations of sports, precisely if capitalist contradictions are inevitably manifested throughout Russian sports life.

Today, when social reality has changed and new sociological experience has accumulated, general theoretical and even worldview foundations serve as the basis for all kinds of research solutions in Russian reality when studying the place and role of sport in the life of society or its individual groups and layers, an important methodological role in the discussions about the forms of sports activity is played by understanding the social essence of sport and

physical culture. As sport is increasingly studied by contemporary Russian sociology, two trends are becoming clearer.

First, the variety of methodological approaches to the study of sport is growing, and the diversity of modern schools and trends that address this phenomenon in public life is becoming more and more diverse. The widespread seems to be structuralism or social action theory as an instrument of slightly reshaping the old-fashioned Soviet understanding of sports, manifested in the works of Vladislav Stolyarov¹⁰ and Ludmila Lubysheva¹¹. Although Lubysheva recently showed a tendency of developing the concept of sports culture as a specific social phenomenon. The culturalist dimension in understanding sports prevails in the publications of Ivan Babanov, Elena Grishina, and Maria Fedorovskaya¹². Political symbolism in understanding sports is well designed in publications of Oleg Kildyushov¹³. Second, the study of sport is becoming more detailed and concrete, an increasing variety of problems is being highlighted, and a multitude of concepts is being proposed. A brilliant example of consumer-style research in frameworks of economic sociology gives the article of Yulya Kharchenko¹⁴.

¹⁰Vladislav Stolyarov, *Introduction to the Sociology of Sports, Physical Culture and Physical Culture Motor Activity*, (Moscow: Humanitarian Center "SpArt" RGAFK, 2013).

¹¹Ludmila Lubysheva, *Sociology of Physical Culture and Sports: Textbook*, (Moscow: Academia, 2001).

¹²Ivan Babanov, Elena Grishina, "Modern Sport - Problems and Contradictions," *Sociological Research*, 6 (Moscow, June 2018): 116-124; Maria Fedorovskaya, "Retrospective Analysis of Sports as a Socio-Cultural Phenomenon of Modernity," *Socio-Political Sciences*, 1 (Moscow, January 2020): 137-142.

¹³Oleg Kildyushov, "National Identity Team: World Football and Dramaturgy of Public Consensus," *Protected by the State*, 3 (Moscow, March 2018): 47-49; Kildyushov, Oleg, "Depicting the Nation: Football and National Representation (To the Political Sociology of Sports)," *Questions of Nationalism*, 22 (Moscow, February 2015): 3-8.

¹⁴Yulya Kharchenko, "Sporting: Sports, Leisure and Consumption Styles in Modern

Sport as a part of media culture is considered in the work of Vera Zverev¹⁵. Pavel Goryunov presented an attempt of combining structuralism and a consumerist approach in studying the football fandom of St-Petersburg¹⁶. Nikolai Karbainov provided a sociological survey of recent sports mega-events in Russia¹⁷. As a result, the current discourse of the sociology of sport looks much more heterogeneous than in earlier times, and each element of this discourse finds its rightful place, strands within sociology specializing in one single issue and striving to perfect its sociological specificity.

One of the legacies of Soviet sociology in the field of sport that survives to this day and that has been the subject of much discussion in Russian academic circles is the study of sport through the prism of the discipline of “sociology of physical culture and sport” or as it is commonly called “sociology of sport”. This dualistic name is due to the fact that in scientific circles there is still no consensus in the definition of the object of these disciplines: “sociology of sport” and “sociology of physical culture and sport”. As Stolyarov notes in his work:

There are a variety of opinions in the scientific literature regarding the object area of the sociology of physical culture and sport. Often a single object is considered to be its main object. Some researchers consider

Russia,” *Economic Sociology*, 11.2 (Moscow, March 2010): 73-90.

¹⁵Vera Zvereva, “TV Sport,” *Logos*, 3.54 (Moscow, March 2006): 63-75.

¹⁶Pavel Goryunov. *Near-Football Community of St. Petersburg. Spectators, Fans, Hooligans. Structure, Norms, Practices*, (St-Petersburg: Taro, 2013).

¹⁷Nikolai Karbainov, “The Impact of Mega-Sports Events on the Development of Mass Sports in the Host Cities of Russia (on the example of the Universiade 2013 in Kazan and the Olympic Games 2014 in Sochi),” *The Symposium on Xi Jinping's Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era*. (Beijing, March 2018): 105-111.

*sport, others consider physical culture, and still others consider motor (physical) activity as such an object. At the same time, sometimes other objects, such as physical education, physical exercise, physical recreation, the human body, etc., are included among the main objects of research in the sociology of physical culture and sport in addition to these objects.*¹⁸

According to the authors, the diversity of the definition of the object of these disciplines is related to the ontological essence of the very concepts of “physical culture” and “sport”. If we move from the discourse on recreation to sport, we should first say that sport is studied in many scientific disciplines. However, the definition of sport is different in each scientific discipline and represents the subject matter and methods of the particular discipline. However, the content of the concept of sport differs across disciplines and thus reflects the subject matter and methods of the particular discipline through which sport is studied. When examining sport from a sociological perspective, it is important to note that sport is a multifaceted social phenomenon. This tells us that sport contains components that together reflect the essence of sports practices. For example, according to Igor Barchukov, “Sport as a social phenomenon has formed the following main activities: labor, education, play”¹⁹.

The author of this approach understands labor as the expenditure of “some physical and mental effort”, which aims to develop and display the

¹⁸Vladislav Stolyarov. *Sociology of Physical Culture and Sports (Introduction to Problems and New Concept): Scientific and Methodological Manual for Institutes and Academies of Physical Culture*, (Moscow: Humanitarian Center “SpArt” RGAFK, 2002), 10.

¹⁹Igor Barchukov. *Physical Training: Textbook for Students of Higher Professional Education*, (Moscow: Academia, 2013), 8.

athlete's abilities in a competitive environment. He understands education in sport as a process whose aim is to learn from the knowledge and experience of others. He writes that education in sport is about “learning exercises and sporting activities, to build competitive abilities in the context of sporting events”²⁰. By play he means a kind of “motive for activity”. The game is understood by him as a “motive for activity” which takes place by mutual consent of the participants, following the rules laid down by certain sports organizations. The meaning of the game is the unpredictability of its results. According to Barchukov, a game is an imitation, containing excitement.

There is another approach to defining the content of the phenomenon of sport, which is presented in the works of Russian researchers, such as Nikolai Ponomarev, Grigori Nagalov, Boris Lisitsyn. From the position of the authors, sport implies playfulness, competitiveness, educational orientation and physical activity. Ponomarev defines sport as an educational, playful, competitive, physical activity of the individual²¹. Gregory Nagalov's study of sport emphasizes that the starting point of the historical development of sport lies in the imitation of basic forms of motor activity²² that lead to a sporting result. In his turn, he reveals the content of the concept “sport performance” as follows, saying that sport performance is the goal of sports activity, it is an external and measurable comparative effect of the implementation of certain types of motor activity, which is achieved in the process of competitiveness. Following the author's idea, we get that the essence of sport is a sporting result

²⁰Igor Barchukov. *Physical Training: Textbook for Students of Higher Professional Education*, (Moscow: Academia, 2013), 9.

²¹Nikolai Ponomarev. “The Phenomenon of Play and Sport,” *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 8 (Moscow, August 1972): 6.

²²Gregory Nagalov. “The System of Concepts of the Theory of Sport and Methods of Its Presentation,” *Theory and practice of physical culture*, 2 (Moscow, February 1974): 58.

achieved through the process of competition.

Another way of looking at sport from a social perspective is offered by Lisitsyn, who writes that sport is a physical activity, the aim of which is to achieve the highest practical results in particular types of physical exercise that reflect social acceptance²³. Lisitsyn identifies three main attributes, namely the pursuit of maximum performance in a particular physical activity, the mandatory presence of competition and the public recognition of the results that have been demonstrated in the competition. In his approach, the author places a special emphasis on competition in sport, which he sees as having certain autonomy in the eyes of the public. These competitions are the final result of training, they are the only visible measure of an athlete's preparedness, and the results shown in the competition are the criterion for public recognition of his performance.

Lisitsyn also points out that when motives in sport are transferred to the result of the sporting process, the role of sport as a game process gradually disappears and play ceases to be an important component of sport and gradually recedes into the background. Thus, on the one hand, sport is a complex, multifactorial phenomenon and, on the other hand, there is a diversity of contemporary sociological discourse in the study of sport. The components of sport such as play, education, competition, motor activity and work are conditioned by certain social relations. Considering the components of sport outside the social dimension reduces the sociological value of its research.

Another important phenomenon in understanding the social in sports

²³Boris Lisitsyn, "On the Concept of «Sport»," *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 2 (Moscow, February 1974): 62.

practice is the concept of physical culture. In Russian reality, the emergence of the concept of "physical culture" is very closely associated with sports. There are different points of view in Russian studies related to the emergence of "physical culture" in scientific discourse. According to some authors the idea of "physical culture" was first introduced by the rector of the Moscow Institute of Physical Culture, Professor Varnava Ignatyev at the II Congress of Vsevobuch (A system of compulsory military training for men practiced in the early Soviet Union) in 1919.

Due to the high political bias of early Soviet science, the consideration of sports practices turned out to depend on the attitudes towards the mass health movement among the population. Therefore, the sport has been interpreted in a narrow sense as a part of the physical culture associated with the competition. The parallel creation of a special theory of physical culture and sports as a single discipline, consolidated this interpretation, and also spread this dual scheme among Soviet sociologists. The creation of special universities of physical culture has institutionalized the dominance of this concept. At the same time, the theoretical elaboration of concepts in the discourse of sociology turned out to be vulnerable, which, however, was not pedaled during the Soviet era.

Today some Russian researchers derivate the concept of sport from the concept of physical culture; others believe that physical culture and sport are independent concepts; others identify physical culture with the concept of human kinetics, which includes sports practices related to dynamic actions of human body. On the other hand, the very understanding of physical culture among Russian scholars seems to be contradictory. Therefore, Russian scholars can hardly talk about an immutable definition of the concepts of sport

and physical culture as a whole. This, in turn, causes additional problems for Russian sociologists to use the western ideas of sport without damaging the old-fashioned dual theory of physical culture and sport.

4. Concluding Remarks

No doubt that the centennial history of the sociology of sport in Russia gives an obvious example of path-dependency. Main fundamentals were designed under the powerful intellectual and institutional impact of Marxism with the historic-materialist dualism of the basis and superstructure. This societal dimension in approaching sports survived through the decades of penetrating the social action theory in the Soviet and later Russian sociological community. On the other hand, the development of the independent theory of physical culture as the educational discipline in sports universities increased the value of actionist and motivational definitions of sports practices. As the sport has expanded its social space in the last half-century, sociologists have come across the need to consider it from a variety of sides - economic, political, legal, and value-symbolic.

Although this allowed for new methods of studying sports, it did not improve the theoretical foundations of its sociological research as a separate discipline. Finally, the aggravation of the crisis of capitalism in the modern world demonstrates to Russian sociologists the importance of understanding sports in accordance with the trends in the development of the social system as a whole. But this brings back the relevance of Marx's theory and the relevance of its improvement in relation to the sports life of society. At the current critical point in the history of the sociology of sport in Russia, it is crucial how

much sociologists will be able to conceptualize sports, guided by the arguments of their own discipline. Today not only institutional but geopolitical factors play against them at the time of severe sanctions against Russia and Russian sports specifically. But the true course of sociological theory follows its own specific logic.

Russian culture is little known in Taiwan, especially in sports and scientific studies. Therefore, a retrospective article on the Russian sociology of sport could enrich Taiwanese readers with new insights. This is important due to the fact that Russian sociology, having deep European roots, due to the peculiarities of social development, has always tended to formulate independent ideas, which is especially evident in relation to sports studies during the Soviet period. Today, when the trend of anti-Eurocentrism is gaining strength in world sociology, such an experience would be useful for Taiwan to estimate current development. Also, interest in the Russian experience of studying sports culture is increasing due to the great successes of Soviet athletes, which is ensured by the social processes in the country that fueled mass interest in sports. The changes in the basic perception of the social nature of the sport, in general, reflect the main steps in the evolution of Russian sports culture over the past century.

Additional Information

The reported study was funded by RFBR, project number 20-311-90002.

Reference

- Artemov, Viktor, "About the Study of the Sociological Aspect of Physical Culture," *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 4 (Moscow, April 1963): 58-60.
- Babanov, Ivan, and Grishina, Elena, "Modern Sport - Problems and Contradictions," *Sociological Research*, 6 (Moscow, June 2018): 116-124.
- Barchukov, Igor, *Physical Training: Textbook for Students of Higher Professional Education*, Moscow: Academia, 2013.
- Bykhovskaya, Irina, "Sociological Analysis of Mass Physical Culture and Sports," *Marxist-Leninist Sociology*, ed. Osipov Gennady and Ivanov Vilen, Moscow: Nauka, 1988, 107-112.
- Bykhovskaya, Irina, and Stolyarov, Vladislav, "Socialist Way of Life and Physical Culture," *Inform. Materials of the Philosophical Society of the USSR*, 3 (Moscow, PhSoc of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, 1983): 11-18.
- Fedorovskaya, Maria, "Retrospective Analysis of Sports as a Socio-Cultural Phenomenon of Modernity," *Socio-Political Sciences*, 1 (Moscow, January 2020): 137-142.
- Frenkin, Anatolyi, "Comprehensive Personal Development and Physical Education Issues," *Questions of Philosophy*, 3 (Moscow, March 1962): 87-91.
- Goryunov, Pavel. *Near-Football Community of St. Petersburg. Spectators, Fans, Hooligans. Structure, Norms, Practices*, St-Petersburg: Taro, 2013.

- Karbainov, Nikolai, “The Impact of Mega-Sports Events on the Development of Mass Sports in the Host Cities of Russia (on the example of the Universiade 2013 in Kazan and the Olympic Games 2014 in Sochi),” *The Symposium on Xi Jinping's Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era*. (Beijing, March 2018): 105-111.
- Kharchenko, Yulya, “Sporting: Sports, Leisure and Consumption Styles in Modern Russia,” *Economic Sociology*, 11.2 (Moscow, March 2010): 73-90.
- Kildyushov, Oleg, “Depicting the Nation: Football and National Representation (To the Political Sociology of Sports),” *Questions of Nationalism*, 22 (Moscow, February 2015): 3-8.
- Kildyushov, Oleg, “National Identity Team: World Football and Dramaturgy of Public Consensus,” *Protected by the State*, 3 (Moscow, March 2018): 47-49.
- Lisitsyn, Boris, “On the Concept of «Sport»,” *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 2 (Moscow, February 1974): 62.
- Lubysheva, Ludmila, *Sociology of Physical Culture and Sports: Textbook*, Moscow: Academia, 2001.
- Milstein, Oleg, “On the Subject of Sociology of Sports and Its Development in the USSR,” *Social Foundations of Physical Culture and Sports*, (Kiev: KGIFK, 1973).
- Nagalov, Gregory, “The System of Concepts of the Theory of Sport and Methods of Its Presentation,” *Theory and practice of physical culture*, 2 (Moscow, February 1974): 58.
- Ponomarev, Nikolai, “The Phenomenon of Play and Sport,” *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture*, 8 (Moscow, August 1972): 6.

Stepovoi, Pavel, *Sport and Society: Some Methodological and Social Problems*, Tartu: State University of Tartu, 1972.

Stolyarov, Vladislav, "Philosophical and Sociological Problems of Physical Culture and Sports," *Questions of Philosoph*, 2 (Moscow, February 1981): 168-173.

Stolyarov, Vladislav, *Introduction to the Sociology of Sports, Physical Culture and Physical Culture Motor Activity*, Moscow: Humanitarian Center "SpArt" RGAFK, 2013.

Stolyarov, Vladislav, *Sociology of Physical Culture and Sports (Introduction to Problems and New Concept): Scientific and Methodological Manual for Institutes and Academies of Physical Culture*, Moscow: Humanitarian Center "SpArt" RGAFK, 2002.

Stolyarov, Vladislav et al., eds., *Sport and Lifestyle*, Moscow: Physical Culture and Sports, 1979.

Tsyperovich, Gregory, "Sport," *The Modern World*, 11 (St-Petersburg, November 1913): 136-197.

Vinogradov, Petr and Zholdak, Vladimir, *Organization of Promotion of Physical Culture and Sports Taking into Account the Interests of the Population*, Moscow: Physical Culture and Sports, 1979.

Vizitei, Nikolai, *Lifestyle. Sport. Personality*, Chisinau: Stiinza, 1980.

Zvereva, Vera, "TV Sport," *Logos*, 3.54 (Moscow, March 2006): 63-75.