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Abstract
The sociology of emotions aspires to give a description of the emotional culture of modern societies (most notably western societies); the peculiarities of the said culture contribute to the surge of interest in emotions in knowledge and everyday life - the so called “emotional turn”. The author attempts to determine the outlines of “emotional culture” concept, show what constitutes the distinctive nature of the sociological understanding of the emotional culture, which could provide an increment of knowledge and critical re-evaluation of modern social realities. The modern studies in the field of the sociology of emotions allow to suggest that in the modern societies a neo-sentimentalist culture is forming as an unintended consequence of rationalization of all the aspects of society life, modern consumer culture, individualization, etc. The emotional culture of modernity is characterized by the combination of rational attitude to emotions and simultaneous special attention to feelings, specific expression of collective emotions, persistent search for authentic feelings. One of the striking manifestations of the emotional culture of modernity is a phenomenon of “emotional labour”, when the ability to control emotions is commercialized both in public and private sphere.
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1. The basic principles of the sociology of emotions and study of the emotional culture: structural context, historicity and cultural meanings

The rapid development of the sociology of emotions during the last decades changes the sociological knowledge in general, because it enables inclusion of emotional dimension in the research of social actions and social structures. The peculiarities of the phenomenon of human emotionality also allow sociologists to regard emotions as bearers of cultural meanings, as reactions that are closely connected to social norms and values and not only at a micro-level of social system. Some sociologists uphold a socio-structural approach to emotions, i.e., regard emotions as a consequence of structural relations between power and status; in this respect, emotions are not defined by cultural rules but by structural features of interaction, certain social relations (see, for example, Barbalet, 1999; Thamm, 2004). However, the modern sociology of emotions, first of all, occurs within the sphere of symbolic interactionism and cultural theories, where the rules of expression of emotions and the cultural beliefs, according to which people “organize” their emotional life, play the most important role (Hochschild, 1979, 2003; Shott, 1979; Thoits, 1996; Gordon et all, 1990). In such a case, the characteristics of the society type are of great importance, for example, in late modern or late capitalist societies emotional life is markedly affected by consumer culture and technological innovations, where representations of emotions and rules of their expression change while they are now constantly conveyed by the medium of electronic devices. For in-
stance, theories of “affective” or “emotional” capitalism are currently developed, where emotionality is regarded as an essential part for achievement of capitalist economy efficiency (see, for example, Karppi et al., 2016: 2).

During the various periods of development of humanities and social sciences different emotional cultures and their peculiarities were distinguished. One of the first was the anthropologist R. Benedict who explicitly distinguished the ideal types of emotional culture, namely American and Japanese, describing them respectively as “guilt culture”, which is individualist and encourages inner control, and “shame culture”, which is collectivist and cultivates outer control (Benedict, 2004). Although this theory was justifiably criticised, it nevertheless created a certain perspective of consideration of culture and society through the representations of the most important social feelings and corresponding behaviour. The fathers of sociology also back in the day described social life through its emotional background, though not using clear conceptualizations of emotions and emotional culture. For example, G. Simmel in the phenomena of the “blasé” of a city dweller intended to demonstrate that people did not lose emotionality, but that emotion control became value and necessity under urban conditions during the capitalist era (Simmel, 2002). T. Parsons describes the ideology of secular “instrumental activism”, according to which emotional states submit to rationality and reinforce it (Parsons, 1997). This list could be continued, but the main idea in sociological and anthropological works, both classic and modern ones, is that the emotional culture is closely connected to social structure, specifies various types of actions, relationships; for this reason it is necessary to review its role for a more complete understanding of society. Therefore, this is a fundamental principle of research of emotions in sociology: to review the connection between structure and action, what emotional states are produced by a social structure and what action trends emerge in such cases.

The other core principle of the sociology of emotions is the study of emotions as historically changeable cultural phenomena, the representations of which change throughout time and from culture to culture (Simonova, 2016). Each society during a certain historical period promotes, fosters and encourages various particular emotions. The turn to research of emotions in sociology and related fields of knowledge, emergence of new research on the subject of principal representations of feelings (see: Plamper, 2018) allowed sociologists to begin theoretical comprehension of the phenomenon of “emotional culture” as a system of social expectations with regards to expression and undergoing of emotions corresponding to cultural representations in various social contexts. Emotions here are presented not only as signals and motives of actions, not only as typical reactions, but as a part of symbolic communication, some kind of “cultural events” that are shared and reproduce the main meanings of culture. Sociologists began to examine the suitable vocabularies of emotions that refer to certain representations and rules. “The analysis shows that the language of feelings (both on collective and individual level) depends on the larger structures of feelings”, it is formed by the time, as well as “norms and values, gender representations and class ambience. These factors define, which feelings are socially significant, which are dangerous, which expressions of feelings are desirable, which should be encouraged, and which should be rejected, which modes of expression or concealing of feelings have a high status in a society” (Johannisson, 2018: 266).

Hence a multitude of research works emerges on various social contexts with consideration of the role of emotions, including the ones on the sociology of city, sports, medicine, to name a few (Turner, Stets, 2014). For example, there are rea-
reasons to state that the late modern society is characterized by a specific culture of fear which allows people to orientate in a complicated world (Furedi, 1997). Aside from that each social group or community are prone to share emotions, which gives reasons to talk about the emotional climate of gathering that is a significant factor of group dynamics (Bericat, 2016), as well as about peculiarity of group rules in regards to emotions—“emotional communities” (Rosenwein, 2006). Thus, sociologists are able to study emotional cultures, emotional climates of collectives that conform to one or another society during a certain historical period, which gives an opportunity to contribute substantially to researching of the changes of social institutes and corresponding changes in the behaviour of individuals and groups. “A subject’s feelings occur freely and spontaneously, but they are formed and controlled by social and cultural mechanisms” (Johannisson, 2018, p. 265).

In this regard, the sociology of emotions faces a number of interconnected objectives: 1) to define the concept of “emotional culture” on the basis of the modern theories: particular values and norms connected to the emotions and feelings which are characteristic for various societies; 2) to outline social functions of emotional culture; 3) to detect the reasons of emergence of a special emotional regime of modern times: rationality and compensating power of attention to emotional experience; 4) to review “images” or main tendencies of the emotional culture of the late modern societies, i.e., the leading emotional moods, the most encouraged and cultivated emotions, as well as the ones that are necessarily roused in certain concrete-historical social conditions; 5) to describe the prospects of the research of emotional culture in sociology. It is obviously impossible to complete these objectives within the scope of this work, that is why our aim is only to give an outline of the sociological study of emotional culture. In the context of this aim it should be noted that sociologists recognize interdisciplinarity in the emotion studies as a necessary condition of research and find their own interests in this field. Therefore, some important concepts in the modern sociology of emotions are occasionally adopted from history, psychology, anthropology, and natural sciences. In this case, we will apply some concepts which are used today by historians of emotions and are assimilated by many sociologists of emotions.

2. Some conceptualizations of emotional culture

The theorist of culture R. Williams uses the notion of the “structure of feeling” in order to describe forms and tendencies of emotional behaviour at a certain period of time. He reviews the values depending on how they are experienced and selection of a definite intonation, models of expression of feelings and prohibitions of their demonstration. A structure of feelings is a social experience that seems to be individual and personal but has some definite common features; it is some kind of “emotional system of norms”, which is used for interpretation of the outside world and self-understanding as a part code system of social interaction. That is why it is necessary to define the dominating structure of feelings in order to understand society and boundaries of a historical period (see: Johannisson, 2018, p. 9-11; Stearns, 2019). Thus, these structures of feelings represent specific, often invisible, configurations of representations and undergoing of experience that enable us to understand both the peculiarities of historical time and its social orders.

The historian W. Reddy formulated concepts of “emotives” and “emotional regimes” (and others: “emotional refuge”, “emotional liberalization”, “emotional suffering”, etc.), which, on the one hand, are generalizing, and on the other hand, give
an opportunity to compare different historical periods and cultures (Reddy, 2001; Stearns, 2019). Reddy suggests studying of the modes of utterances about emotions in each epoch: "emotives", speech acts about emotions, not only designate but also construct reality, i.e. can change it and thus change people’s actions: “Emotional utterances of historical actors cannot be separated from their feelings, there is always a feedback loop between uttered thought and felt emotion” (Plamper, 2018, p. 426-427). Emotional utterances or emotional metaphors, for example, are used for research of various social and, in particular, political processes: the last book of A.R. Hochschild (2016) is based on “unwinding” of emotional metaphors rooted in deep stories of the people who make one or another decision of political engagement.

“Emotional regime” is a combination of preassigned emotives and connected to them rituals and practices that usually accompany/support each political regime. Although Reddy defines emotional regime adding to it political connotation, today this notion (especially in sociology) is used to designate a combination of emotional norms and practices (Gonzalez, 2012). The notion of “emotional practices” of the German historian M. Scheer (Scheer, 2012), which is used after P. Bourdieu, is also important for sociological conceptualization of emotional culture. Emotions are reviewed in terms of emotional practices as historical-cultural phenomena connected to corporeality. Scheer distinguishes various types of emotional practices where people manipulate body and thoughts in order to cause feelings or find ways to give sense to their feelings. For example, naming emotional practices are connected to generation of meanings, when naming of emotions makes them available for experience and control. In these practices a human being is more likely ‘doing’ or ‘trying’ emotions, which can be arranged in a continuum from undeliberate and unconscious to deliberate and recognized. In an emotional practice a feeling subject as such emerges, locating oneself within a habitus.

With respect to group experience and simultaneously an opportunity to locate the outlines of emotional culture in some society, one of the most well-known concepts among researchers of emotions is the concept of “emotional communities” by the medievalist historian B. Rosenwein: those are “the same communities as the social ones: families, quarters, parliaments, guilds, monasteries, parishes. But a researcher, while studying them, first of all searches for systems of feelings: what these communities (and individuals inside them) define and regard as valuable or harmful for oneself; evaluations that they give to others’ feelings; nature of affective connections between people that they recognize; and also modes of expression of emotions that they expect, encourage, tolerate or condemn” (cit. ex.: Plamper, 2018, p. 111). Among the emotional communities Rosenwein distinguished “social” ones characterized by the unity of norms regulating emotional life of its members and “textual” ones based on the unity of ideology: one and the same person may be a part of different social and textual communities, the systems of norms in which may contradict each other (Rosenwein, 2006, p. 24–25). This concept is still rarely used by sociologists who attempt to distinguish common typical tendencies (rather than unique experience), review the main features of emotional culture of the modern societies where rational emotion control becomes value and institutionalizes in various social spheres; emotion management becomes ubiquitous and persistent, which, perhaps, is a unique sign of the times (Gonzalez, 2017; Hochschild, 1983; Elias, 2001). However, emotional experience of single communities

1 “Emotional regime’ is a set of regulatory emotions, official rituals, practices and emotives: necessary basis for any stable political regime” (Reddy, 2004: 129).
is also important: although it is unique to a certain degree, it could provide an opportunity for critical analysis of general tendencies and origin of new ones in emotional structure of feelings.

Overall, the definition of emotional culture could be the following: it is a dimension or a part of the common culture that contains a configuration of beliefs or representations of emotions and an emotional regime that encourages and prohibits certain emotions, or a system of norms for undergoing and expression of emotions, or rules for their control in various social contexts (Hochschild, 1979; Gonzalez, 2012, p. 1; 3). Emotional regimes introduce values in relation to emotions, develop the corresponding educational and instructional practices. That is why not only in the aspect of socialization but also in general regarding social life, one can add to the notion of emotional culture the notion of “emotional practice” which simultaneously reproduces some representations and rules and changes them. It is important to include here “emotives”, widespread and shared utterances about emotions that both describe contexts of action and to a certain extent serve as a basis for actions. It is not necessary that one or two emotions should be dominating, more likely that emotional culture in general represents historically developed configuration of various beliefs, norms, practices in relation to different emotions that may contain different emotional regimes, ideologies, “emotional communities” - rules and representations of emotions that are characteristic of single groups, categories of people, for example, poor people – (Scheff, 2014). Hence, we can study absolutely unique and, perhaps, similar to experience in other cultures emotional ‘tangles’, determined simultaneously by corporality and culture, emotionally loaded cultural configurations that describe and explain observed social phenomena. In such a case, the question about which is leading - social order/inequality system or emotional culture - is solved depending on the research subject because they are closely intertwined and mutually affect each other.

Therefore, sociologists review interconnection between social order and emotional culture that includes vocabulary of emotions, classifications of acceptable and unacceptable emotions and rules of their expression [see: Gordon 1990; Hochschild 1979]. Individuals more likely will comply with the rules of emotional culture and attempt to correct situation according to the rules of broader culture, i.e., moral rules. Nowadays many sociologists and social psychologists specifically study “moral emotions” (See: Clark, 1997; Shott, 1979; Stets, Turner, 2005; Scheff, 2014; Barbalet, 1999).

There are quite a lot of insufficiently clarified theoretical and methodological issues in this field, which are still subject of modern discussion in the sociology of emotions and consensus on which is not reached. The most essential of them are: 1) the definition of emotions which are understood as a vast variety of genuinely different phenomena (Bericat, 2016); 2) classifications of emotions; authors frequently use their own classifications necessary for special research (Ibid); 3) the periodization of changes in emotional culture in history and existing general tendencies in contemporary emotional culture (Stearns, 2019); 4) the differentiation of social and cultural systems and their interplay and interdependence (Barbalet, 1999; Archer, 2000); 5) consequently, the issue of documentation of emotional states in an empirical research (see Olson et al., 2017; Simonova, 2016; 2014). Conceptualization of emotional culture may differ significantly depending on the position on these issues. These problems are awaiting of solving and here we only make a passing mention of them.
3. Emotional culture of modern societies: key and crucial points of sociological understanding

Due to the aforesaid, we cannot distinguish universal characteristics of emotional culture of modern world as a result of variety of historical-cultural and other local factors. In other words, knowledge about emotions is interdisciplinary, culture-specific, localized, rooted in everyday interactions (Cobb, 2018). The definition of emotional culture that is presented in this work is quite abstract, and in each case it should be reviewed in a certain historical, political, social context. However, from our point of view, we can easily reflect upon the general tendencies of West European culture, which somehow appear in other cultural spaces, i.e. attempt to distinguish universal characteristics of the modern emotional culture, without downgrading of specific ones but showing contradictions between them.

Nowadays, when we observe general activation of interest in emotions in various spheres of social life, there is no clear difference between scientific research of emotions and occurrence of modern emotional culture, scientific and mundane representations are intermingled in the notions of emotions, hence experts to a great extent rely on the everyday emotional culture, everyday definitions of emotions (Scheff, 2011) and their notions that are widespread in some or other society. In general, one can say that the modern emotional culture is characterised by constantly increasing presence of emotions in the public sphere, penetration of emotions from the private intimate sphere to the common public space (for example, the social media culture where events of ordinary people’s private life are discussed).

In this respect, it is important to understand the extent to which the notion of ‘emotional culture’ functions for comprehension of social processes and phenomena, as well as to understand changes in the modern emotional regime itself. There are reasons to state that in the modern type societies a peculiar emotional culture is formed, in which the main value is rational emotion control in all the spheres of social life and simultaneously individual/individualized feelings, ‘authentic/true’ feelings become especially valuable, which is supported by the structure of modern social institutions — economy, politics, family, marriage, etc. All of this affects different spheres of social life; social processes and phenomena start to be perceived from the perspective of feelings and emotions.

The historian of emotions Y. Plamper states that the emotional turn in humanities and social sciences starts since the events of September 11, 2001, when the role of emotions was reconsidered as such experience that systems of social control cannot cope with (Plamper, 2018). From our point of view, this event, perhaps, was catalysing but the emotional turn is related to the appearance of new emotional culture that started to establish together with the changes in the nature of modern industrial societies. Lately sociologists declare more and more emphatically that change of attitude to emotions, increased interest in them from science and other institutions, individuals and various publics are the evidence of change of cultural beliefs in regards to emotions, changes in the emotional culture of modern society (Gonzalez, 2017; Illouz, 2007; Hochschild, 2007, etc.).

As was already mentioned, the fathers of sociology long ago paid attention to the fact that there is a special attitude to emotions in the nature of capitalism, when the emotions that are considered uncontrolled become a problem and control of feelings becomes one of core values while the emotions shift into the domain of intimacy and privacy and are valued as something authentic, unique, live. Modern emotional culture and “peculiar emotional regime of capitalism” (Illouz, 2007) are...
connected to high degree of rationalization and individualization. Nowadays there is a widespread general concept that it is in individual’s inner world where source of social problems is concealed; these problems thus should be solved by individual himself. It is a part of the general process of individualization, as a result of which “social problems are increasingly more perceived in terms of psychological patterns: as personal inadequacy, feeling of guilt, anxiety, conflicts and neuroses” (Beck; Beck-Gernsheim, 2001).

Many sociologists wrote about the process of “psychologization” of modern society, demoralisation of communities, narcissistic cultural tendency as a consequence of ideology of individualism that is caused by the “late capitalism” (Rieff, 1987; Ahmed, 2004; Lasch, 1979; Hookway, 2013, etc.). The process of psychologization leads to interest in an individual’s life, his experience, thoughts, biography and, consequently, emotions (Flamarique, 2012). Scientific and practical psychology, psychotherapy appear to be one of the available languages for speaking about emotions in everyday life (or microlevel). This tendency is to a great extent connected to “therapeutization” of culture (Furedi, 2004; Illouz, 2012; Gonzalez, 2017). All these processes decreased significance of social and cultural conditions in the public perception in favour of discussion of personal emotions that should be simultaneously controlled or expressed according to a social context. “The economic and social determinism of yesterday was overcome by new and no less rigid determinism – the emotional determinism” (Scheff, 2011: 353). Hence the studies emerge that address separate emotional states, which shape the image of collective representations, social memory, social practices etc. (see, for instance, the works on sympathy – Clark, 1997; on fear – Furedi, 1997; Plamper, 2010; on love – Illouz, 2012; on nostalgia – Abramov, 2012; on culture of depression – Bardina, 2017; on melancholy – Johannisson, 2018, on shame – Scheff, 2014; Misheva, 2000 and many others). All these studies of distinctive emotional states in modern and pre-modern societies help to understand the main trends in emotional culture such as general rationalization of emotional sphere known as Elias hypothesis (Stearns, 2019; Elias, 2000) and may be testing or challenging it.

Social changes today occur at a quick rate, global-scale events occur one after another. The realization of risks that accompanies social changes results in intensification of fear and anxiety, concerns about future (Beck, 2000; Furedi, 1997; Sennett, 2006); that is why control of feelings allows to think that one can cope with a situation, emotions as such have a function of overcoming future's uncertainty in combination with rational thinking (Barbalet, 1997, p. 49). Emotion control in modern society is a sign of “vital connection between social contradictions and personal attempts to control one’s own feelings” (Hochschild, 1983, p. 202). It corresponds with the area of study of “emotional intelligence” in psychology, psychotherapy, management sciences (as well as the application of this concept as a basis for therapeutic and commercial training practices), which serves as “protective myth of individualism” (Scheff, 1990: 12), i.e., its development “protects” from difficulties and “facilitates” successfullness. Therefore, emotions function as highly reflexive phenomena (see, for instance, Rosenberg, 1990; Holmes, 2015) and attention to them is a display of general social reflexivity concerning complicated and rapidly changing world (Giddens, 1990; Gonzalez, 2017). Reflexivity is expressed in reflexive identity, reflexive life story, while observation of feelings actually provides sensation of genuineness/authenticity. Emotions become “drivers” of moral choice in an attempt to confirm one’s own identity [Bauman, 1993: 67].

The “culture of fear” is often named as the principal feature of the modern emotional culture (Furedi, 1997). However, frequently basing on the works of the clas-
sic authors, the modern emotional culture was defined as “culture of emotional coldness” (Illouz, 2007), “culture of unacknowledged shame” (Scheff, 2014), “culture of sympathy” (Clark, 1997), “culture of sadness/depression” (Bardina, 2017) etc. Therefore, emotional culture is complex, it can be viewed from different perspectives, in relation to different emotions the attitude to which changes with time. For example, transition from traditional collectivist societies to modern individualist social formations, from the point of view of some researchers, signifies increase and distribution of feeling of guilt as a typical emotional experience in the situations related to moral order of society. However, it does not mean that feeling of shame loses its significance, decreases, is not included in the process of socialization (Elias, 2000; Scheff, 2014). Anthropologists, sociologists and psychologists used the opposition of emotions of shame and guilt as principles of the general typology of cultures (see, for instance, Benedict 2004; Misheva 2000). Shame and guilt thus function not only as emotional experience connected to different moral sanctions but are also viewed as determinant of cultural image. The image of modern culture and moral order appears as the one that contains a peculiar emotional culture, in the context of which feeling of guilt is recognized, undergone, emphasized and even praised while shame is considered to be a negative emotion and is concealed. Individualism of modern society suggests complication of internalized moral sanctions, however, in different societies this process proceeds unevenly, whereas the traditional forms of social control (in this case, feeling of shame) continue to function. It can be affirmed that the historical definition of shame transformed. Presently loss of respect and self-respect causes fear, prompts to avoid emotional experience of shame, although it is one of the most important emotions that constitute moral order of society. That is why one can say that historically new ratio of feelings of shame and guilt as moral regulators of individuals’ behaviour develops in the modern emotional culture, as evidenced by social-psychological, sociological and socio-historical studies of recent years (see: Scheff, 2011; 2014).

From our point of view, emotional culture does not have one pronounced tendency; it possesses different dimensions and more likely is represented by some configuration of cultural representations and corresponding emotional norms practiced by communities (“emotional communities”). Emotional culture is characterized by a peculiar combination of emotional practices, styles, scenarios that appear in response to different stimuli, challenges and threats. Heterogeneity, complexity of emotional culture can be interpreted as a variety of reactions to typical threats that come from modern world. That is why, together with intensification of anxiety and fear, regime of sympathy can also be preserved, while visible emotionlessness can transform into emotional experience of unacknowledged shame with its own specific consequences; pursuit of emotion control can be combined with fixation on various emotional experiences, search for authentic feelings, cult of feelings (Hochschild, 1983; Illouz, 2012; Gonzalez, 2012; Salmela, Mayer, 2009 and others).

Emotional culture of modern societies (rather western ones) is a combination of rational attitude to emotions and is accompanied by collective (often institutionally limited) surges of enthusiasm, bursts of anger and indignation, excessive emphasis on some feelings, for example, genuine romantic love (Illouz, 2012), genuine ego or “authentic self” (Hochschild, 1983). Emotional reflexivity, which is regarded as attributable to majority of social actions, characterizes individual consciousness that grasps complicated and rapidly changing world by means of feelings, thus overcoming its complexity and segmentation and assigning to it wholeness and genuineness through feelings. It is sustained by the modern consumer culture (Campbell, 2005) and media development (Gonzalez, 2012) that produce corresponding products and narratives.
Not only scientists but ordinary people deeply internalize scientific modes of thinking about emotions. Emotions become one of the main instruments of social reflexivity: not only people are interested in emotional experience as it is, but they also attempt to acquire knowledge about emotions in order to control them. Rationalization as a social process, about which wrote sociologists, partially caused nostalgia for live emotions and feelings (Gonzalez, 2017), however, people address to scientific thinking in order to understand their own emotional experience. Nowadays with the appearance of social media individual emotional experience becomes known through communication in social virtual networks, experts started talking about peculiar ‘confessional’ emotional culture (Gonzalez, 2012). Emotions (and interest in them) appear to people as something live, genuine, authentic and means of maintaining contact with other people in individualized societies (in fact, according to sociological understanding, it is a social function of emotions (Scheff, 2014)). This feature of modern culture characterizes communication in social media where the distinction between individual’s public and private domain fades.

In this part of the article we made an attempt to reflect typical and general substantive tendencies of modern emotional culture which are nevertheless obviously determined by structures of social inequality of modern world (see Barbalet, 1999; Jacobsen, 2019); it is also obvious that the distinguished features are distributed unevenly in different social classes (see Chase, Walker, 2013; Simonova, 2014).

4. Culture of emotional labour as the most important feature of modernity

One of the main peculiarities of modern society and respectively emotional culture is the process of commercialization of feelings and regulation of feelings that is used with commercial purposes, especially in the service industry. The process of rational emotion control is fulfilled as one of the main values in the concept of “emotional labour” (Hochschild, 1983): it is, in fact, emotion management according to requirements of an employer in order to achieve various benefits for both parties, although it is also based on general cultural representations. Actually, the numerous studies on emotional labour following Hochschild made the sociology of emotions critically focused on the research of various aspects of modern social inequality that became evident during the research of this phenomenon (Lively, Weed, 2014; McKenzie et al., 2019).

The value of emotional labour nowadays becomes widespread and influential, changing the emotional regime of labour practices and also simultaneously generating significant impact on private sphere. A. R. Hochschild demonstrates emergence and establishment of the idea/value of “genuine ego” (or “true self”) or “genuine feelings” that are concealed, suppressed, etc., during the process of emotional labour, first of all, in the service industry. The value of emotional labour as a necessary part of numerous occupations nowadays affect culture in general, with appearance of suitable educational practices for future generations that prepare for rational emotion management in professional sphere. For example, children of members of different social classes may have different disposition to emotional labour: there is a probability that children from middle class realize in a greater degree the value of emotional labour, pay more attention to emotional experience and, consequently, learn more skills of emotion management in public sphere (Hochschild, 1979). This attitude to feelings also creates the representation of estrangement or alienation from “genuine” or “authentic” feelings as the reasons of emotional exhaustion, stress and burnout, as well as various types of resistance to the existing order.
The idea/value of “genuine ego” or “genuine feelings” that can be interpreted as the value of emotional labour/rational control of one’s own emotions allows to exploit the human ability of emotional regulation in order to receive financial profit and sometimes becomes a burden for employees, generates excessive emotion control which could cause various involuntary and damaging personal and social consequences. Since service sphere nowadays “enters” into private sphere through performance of services involving housekeeping, child upbringing, organization of home celebrations and parties, dating, family therapy and much more, the value of emotional labour and/or emotional work also increases and crosses the line between public and private spheres.

Modern studies on emotional labour demonstrate (Bolton, 2009; Hochschild, 2007; Hochschild, 2011; Lively, Weed, 2014) that there are various kinds of emotion management in public and private space and emotional labour is just one of them, whereas employees increasingly more recognize various types of inequality and injustice, become involved in various forms of protest activities, search for different adaptation strategies and modifications of undesirable consequences of emotion management. One of the main problems here stays the same: do “authentic self” and “authentic feelings” have ontological status? It is more likely that they represent ideals of the individualism era that may serve both for liberalization of emotional labour and its enslavement, may serve as a resource for self-realization and simultaneously exploit individual’s personal abilities, both with resources for submission and resistance. In employees’ emotions as such manifests the inconsistency of the late capitalism era, because, on the one hand, during the process of emotional labour signal function of emotions is weakened, it does not allow an employee to recognize alienating emotion management, hyperregulation of emotions becomes habitual; on the other hand, human emotionality allows to feel and, consequently, perceive this situation and attempt to resolve it, because results of emotional labour do not actually belong to him, but to those who sets the rules of emotion management. Hence sociologists begin pose the questions about alienation and emotions (Burkitt, 2019) and the culture of emotional alienation, culture of depression, culture of emotional burnout etc. (Brook, 2009; Warton, 2009).

During the last forty years the representation of emotional labour in general within labour relations was significantly enriched: new variables, reasons and aspects of these phenomena were detected, new classifications emerged. Experts developed an understanding that these notions should not be applied to all the occupations and professions and that for each labour context one needs a detailed analysis of the factors affecting emotional labour, including clients, heads of organizations, employees, working conditions and of course common cultural, sociostructural and even event context of employees’ actions (Lively, Weed, 2014; Bolton, 2009). In some studies researchers suggest renouncing the term “emotional labour” considering it narrow and use the term “emotional work” or “emotion management” in order to avoid limitation of a general picture of emotionality in a workplace and social consequences of this phenomenon (Bolton, 2005; 2009). Currently Hochschild still insists that it is the notion of “emotional labour” that reflects the nature of modern welfare capitalism, because it is performed consciously for financial reward and now it is present even in those private spheres of people’s life where market has not intruded earlier. Although necessity of emotional labour generates internal identity crises, employees continue to adapt to these conditions rather than protest against them (Hochschild, 2011). Therefore, the notions of “emotional work”, “emotional labour”, emotional norms (feeling rules and display rules, i.e. the rules of emotion expression), “emotional alienation”, “emotional culture”,
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“emotional ideology” are essential for Hochschild in description of not only modern labour processes but also of nature of everyday interactions in general. Together with the notion of “emotional labour” the notion of “emotional intelligence” came from psychology to the world of mundane representations, thus reinforcing and distributing values of rational emotion control in all the spheres of social life: nowadays both emotional labour and emotional intelligence should be learnt, as they are connected to the values of life success and individual’s happiness.

Conclusion

On the whole, emotional turn in sciences and culture is an appearance of new emotional reflexivity: “emotional turn can be called “neo-sentimentalist movement in modern science”, researchers view a human as (first of all) a sensitive being, they attempt to establish epistemological, ethical and esthetic bases of human emotional experience, speaking about the role of certain emotion in development of person and entire communities (Vinnitsky, 2012). We can call the culture of modern societies new “sensitive” age, neo-sentimentalist culture, and it has its peculiarities. Now the scientific worldview does not seem complete without the study of emotional dimensions of human experience: emotions appear as a kind of access to live and genuine human experience. Nowadays values of individuality and self-expression are characteristic for an individual, whereas social experience is undergone through emphasis on his personal feelings. Distinction between reason and feelings can now be viewed as a historical social construct, because modern research works indicate that brain activity does not conform with the scope of such distinction (Plamper, 2018). However, it should be noted that despite the historicity of the distinction between reason and emotions, it still continues to perform its heuristic functions: a human being simultaneously controls emotions and aspires to express them freely (for example, during sport events); rational instrumental individualism coexists in the modern world together with collective enthusiasm and excitement.

The objective of the sociological research here is the search of how, under which socio-structural conditions, in what social situations, according to which rules people manage emotions and why. It gives an opportunity to view emotional culture, emotional regimes, emotional practices as a whole, review the variety of emotional communities included in social order and coexisting and fighting in the modern emotional culture. Furthermore, as shown by the theories of identity in the sociology of emotions (Stets, Turner, 2014, pp. 33-50), emotions help to develop one’s own identity, fulfilling the role of evaluation of situation and communicative function. Emotions are dynamic experience of social structures, for example, moral rules and an important part of orientation of social actions and interpretation of situations; they enable reinforcement of cultural symbols, simultaneously combining physical, cognitive, phenomenological (linguistic, cultural) and sometimes clearly behavioural reaction, thus serving as (corporal) bearers of senses and values that “happen” as micro-cultural events. Emotions “tell” an individual about his connections to social world, they are comments of his interest and aspirations (Archer, 2003), sources of self-discovery, building blocks of identity, subjective experience of cultural values. That is why conceptualization of emotional culture is of great importance for sociology, which allows to understand endured experience of modern society people in various contexts, at various levels of social structure, observe emotional mechanisms of maintenance, transformation and destruction of existing
social orders. For instance, it is not always possible to characterize the state of the modern social inequality (including on a global scale) by quantitative data, that is why, from our point of view, the most important objective of the modern sociology of emotions is supplementation of modern research on social stratification by means of study of its emotional undergoing and consequent understanding of the attitude to it.
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