

Commitment Flexibility at Public University in Central Mexico

Lirios CG^{1*} and Sánchez AS²

¹Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, Huehuetoca, México

²Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala, Mexico

*Corresponding author:

Cruz García Lirios,
Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de
México, Huehuetoca, México

Received: 17 Sep 2023

Accepted: 18 Oct 2023

Published: 23 Oct 2023

J Short Name: UJMHC

Copyright:

©2023 Lirios CH. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and build upon your work non-commercially.

Citation:

Lirios CG. Commitment Flexibility at Public University in Central Mexico. *Uni J Med & Health Care*. 2023; 2(1): 1-7

Keywords:

Behaviors; Labor culture; Emphasis placed

1. Abstract

The relationship between climate and labor flexibility is one of the antecedents of performance. In this context, this work aimed to explore the factorial structure of the organizational binomial. A cross-sectional, psychometric and correlational study was carried out with a sample of 300 employees from organizations in central Mexico. Respondents were selected based on their affiliation with the local chamber of commerce. The results show the prevalence of six factors related to the leadership climate, compensation, structure, logistics, contingencies and risks. The total explained variance is 71%, although the correlation analysis and the factorial structure indicate the inclusion of another factor that the literature identifies as entrepreneurial and innovative flexibility.

2. Introduction

Labor culture, also known as work culture or work environment, refers to the attitudes, values, beliefs, behaviors, and practices that prevail in a workplace or among workers in a particular industry or organization (Oltmisheva, 2021). It encompasses how employees and employers interact, the way work is organized, the level of employee engagement, and the overall atmosphere and working conditions.

Key aspects of labor culture may include:

Work Ethic: The collective work ethic of employees, which often reflects their dedication, commitment, and motivation to perform their job responsibilities efficiently and effectively (Syarif et al., 2023).

Communication: The style and frequency of communication within the workplace, including how ideas, feedback, and information

are shared among employees and between management and staff (Hu & Ma, 2022).

Collaboration: The extent to which employees work together as a team and support one another to achieve common goals (Sine, 2020).

Leadership: The quality of leadership within the organization, including the style of management, decision-making processes, and the degree of empowerment given to employees (Doshniyazov, 2021).

Work-Life Balance: The emphasis placed on balancing work responsibilities with personal and family life, promoting employee well-being and preventing burnout (Purvis, 2021).

Learning and Development: The opportunities provided for employees to enhance their skills, grow professionally, and advance within the organization (Имомов, 2020).

Diversity and Inclusion: The level of inclusivity and respect for diversity in the workplace, promoting an environment where employees of different backgrounds, cultures, and perspectives can thrive (Cherny, 2023).

Recognition and Rewards: The methods used to acknowledge and reward employees' contributions and achievements, fostering a sense of appreciation and motivation (Teixeira de Almeida, 2023).

Flexibility: The extent to which employees have control over their work hours, location, and work arrangements (Struthers, 2022).

Health and Safety: The measures taken to ensure the physical and mental well-being of employees, including safety protocols, ergonomics, and mental health support (Taylor III, 2022).

Measuring work culture is essential to understand its strengths and weaknesses, identify areas for improvement, and assess its impact on employee satisfaction and overall organizational performance (de Almeida, 2023). While work culture is intangible and can be challenging to quantify directly, there are several methods and tools used to assess and measure different aspects of work culture. Here are some common approaches:

Employee Surveys: Conducting anonymous surveys among employees is a popular method to gauge their perceptions of the work culture (Waldron, 2022). These surveys typically include questions related to work satisfaction, communication, collaboration, leadership, diversity and inclusion, work-life balance, and more. Analyzing survey responses can provide insights into the prevailing culture and identify potential areas of concern.

Focus Groups and Interviews: Organizing focus groups or conducting individual interviews with employees can offer a more in-depth understanding of their experiences, attitudes, and feelings about the work culture. This qualitative approach helps to gather rich, nuanced feedback (Juravich, 2020).

Cultural Assessments: Organizations may use cultural assessment tools or third-party consultants to evaluate their work culture (Shoup, 2021). These assessments often involve comprehensive surveys and interviews with employees at various levels to assess cultural strengths, weaknesses, and alignment with the organization's values and objectives.

Employee Feedback Platforms: Some organizations use internal feedback platforms or suggestion boxes to encourage employees to share their opinions and suggestions regarding the work culture. These platforms provide a continuous channel for open communication (Kovalesky, 2022).

Performance Metrics: Analyzing key performance metrics, such as employee turnover rates, productivity, absenteeism, and customer satisfaction, can indirectly reflect the health of the work culture. Positive work culture is often associated with higher employee engagement and better performance outcomes (VanGompel et al., 2021).

Observations and Cultural Artifacts: Observing daily interactions, team dynamics, and cultural artifacts like office decor, communication patterns, and rituals can offer insights into the prevailing work culture (Cole, 2022).

Benchmarking: Comparing the organization's work culture with industry benchmarks or best practices can help identify areas where improvements are needed or areas where the organization excels (Richardson, 2022).

Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS): eNPS is a metric used to measure employee loyalty and satisfaction. It asks employees if they would recommend the company as a great place to work (Goings, 2023). This score can give an overall picture of employee

sentiment towards the work culture.

It's essential to combine multiple methods to gain a comprehensive understanding of the work culture (Syarie et al., 2022). Regularly measuring and analyzing work culture metrics can help organizations make informed decisions to foster a positive and productive work environment. Additionally, taking action based on the findings is crucial to continually improve the work culture and create a thriving workplace.

A work culture scale is a standardized tool or questionnaire used to assess and measure various dimensions of work culture within an organization (Bowthorpe, 2021). These scales typically consist of a series of statements or questions that employees respond to, allowing for the quantitative measurement of different aspects of work culture. Work culture scales aim to provide insights into the prevailing cultural norms, values, and behaviors in the workplace.

Different organizations or researchers may develop their own work culture scales, focusing on specific aspects of work culture that they want to evaluate. Some commonly used work culture scales include (Sa, 2020):

Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI): Developed by Cameron and Quinn, this scale assesses organizational culture based on four cultural types: Clan, Adhocracy, Hierarchy, and Market. It helps identify the dominant cultural style within an organization (Walsh, 2021).

Denison Organizational Culture Survey: This survey evaluates work culture based on four key traits: Mission, Adaptability, Involvement, and Consistency. It assesses how well the organization aligns with these cultural dimensions (Walsh, 2021).

Competing Values Framework (CVF): The CVF is used to identify and measure four cultural types: Collaborate, Create, Control, and Compete. It helps organizations understand their cultural emphasis and how it affects their performance (Music, 2021).

Work-Life Culture Scale: This scale focuses on assessing the organization's support for work-life balance and the level of flexibility provided to employees (Music, 2021).

Leadership and Culture Survey: This survey measures employees' perceptions of leadership effectiveness and its impact on shaping the work culture (Zhuravleva et al., 2022).

Employee Engagement Survey: While not solely focused on work culture, employee engagement surveys often include questions that indirectly reflect the work culture's impact on employees' level of engagement and commitment (VanGompel et al., 2023).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale: This scale measures the extent to which employees engage in extra-role behaviors, such as helping colleagues, volunteering for additional tasks, and contributing to the organization's welfare, which can be influenced by work culture (Musurmon, 2020).

When using a work culture scale, it is crucial to ensure that the

questions are well-designed, reliable, and valid. It's also essential to keep in mind that work culture is a complex and multifaceted concept, and no single scale can capture all its aspects comprehensively (Xiao, 2022). Therefore, a combination of different assessment methods, including surveys, interviews, and observations, can provide a more holistic understanding of an organization's work culture.

A positive labor culture is vital for employee satisfaction, retention, and overall organizational success. It promotes productivity, creativity, and a sense of belonging among employees (Magesh & Wallace, 2023). On the other hand, a toxic or negative labor culture can lead to employee disengagement, high turnover rates, and diminished productivity. Employers and organizations must actively cultivate a positive work culture and address any issues that may hinder a healthy and conducive work environment.

Which are the axes of the trajectories of dependency relations between the factors related to flexibility and the labor climate in MSMEs in central Mexico?

In virtue of the fact that labor flexibility is a political institutional guideline, the climate of relationships that is built in the small and medium-sized companies of the study will tend to be unfavorable to the climate of tasks, supports and innovations, with leadership emerging as an axis of decision, communication and motivation of personnel. It is true that The labor climate, being influenced by political flexibility, generates an unfavorable environment for the balance between the demands of the environment and the capabilities of MSMEs, as well as anti-cyclical to the dynamics of organizations, but strengthens the competitive advantages of polyvalence or multifunctionality of the labor force since such sector adjusts not only to employment policies but also adapts to the requirements of the economy 4.0 which is distinguished by its ambivalence and lack of opportunities with which millennial generations learn to develop their skills and knowledge.

3. Methods

Design. A non-experimental, cross-sectional, exploratory and correlational study was carried out.

Sample. It held a nonrandom selection of 300 micro, small and medium enterprise managers in central Mexico. Sixty-seven per cent are female and the remaining 33% are male. Thirty-two per cent completed their baccalaureate studies, 41% completed their bachelor's degree and the remaining 27% had postgraduate studies. 45% declared having an income of less than 3500 pesos per month ($M = 3412$, $SD = 23.14$), 41% mentioned that their income ranged between 3500 and 7000 pesos per month ($M = 5813$, $SD = 113.24$) and the remaining 14% recognized that their income exceeded 7000 pesos per month ($M = 8124$, $SD = 234.56$). 42% are in marriage, 24% in single and the remaining 34% in free union. Authors can put this information in a Table for easy understanding of the readers)

Instrument. The Labor Flexibility of Carreón scale (2017) and the Sanchez Labor Climate Scale (2017) were used, which were built using the Delphi and Likert technique, assuming that the reagents of the literature could be adjusted to the study context. Provided they were tested in samples similar to those of the study, as well as the inclusion of response options that implied significance intervals in the responses of each reagent.

In the case of labor flexibility, the respondents' intentions were weighted with respect to informality and staff turnover. This is the case of the reactive "If there were unemployment, it would take turns to have a job opportunity". Each item corresponds to one of the five response options: 0 = not at all probable, 1 = very unlikely, 2 = unlikely, 3 = somewhat probable, and 4 = very likely.

Regarding the work environment, the needs and expectations of workers are measured with respect to their leaders, structure and working conditions. Consider the item: "In the face of looming unemployment, the boss's experience is necessary in layoffs." Each reagent includes five options: 0 = not at all probable, 1 = very unlikely, 3 = somewhat probable and 4 = very likely.

Procedure. The surveys were carried out in the facilities of the MSMEs, with information that the results of the study would not negatively or positively affect their employment status. In addition, the anonymity and confidentiality of the data were guaranteed in writing. The information was processed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences ver 20. The Cronbach alpha statistics was estimated to interpret the instrument's internal consistency, the adequacy and sphericity statistics of Bartlett and Kaiser Meyer Olkin. To establish the factorial solution, as well as the factorial weights and the percentage of variance explained in an exploratory factor analysis of principal axes with promax rotation in order to establish the validity of the instrument, which assumes a construct that emerges in different contexts and samples. Finally, the correlation parameter was calculated to establish the probable paths relations put forward factors. (Indicate the Cronbach's alpha values and KMO bartlet values in this section only).

4. Results

The general internal consistency of the instrument (alpha of 0.889) exceeds the minimum required (alpha of 0.70). This means that the Flexibility and Organizational Climate Scale can be applied in different contexts and samples, yielding results similar to those of the present study (Table 1). If a minimum requirement of 0.70 and a maximum of 0.90 is assumed as the exclusion criterion then none of the items would be excluded because they are in the ideal range of expected consistency.

The prerequisite for estimating the instrument's validity is the scale's adequacy and sphericity, understood as tests that establish the volume of partial correlations and the absence or presence of a factorial identity. Low correlations circumscribed to an entity

suggest that analyzes are not recommended to establish the dimensions or factors, Extraction method: main axes, rotation: Promax. Adequacy and sphericity [$X^2 = 1864,322$ (300gl) $p = 0.000$; $KMO = 0,857$] indicating the further data analysis can be carried out. Climate of the leader (alpha of 0.878 and 30% of the total variance explained), Clima of compensation (alpha of 0.870 and 8% of the total variance explained), Climate of structuring (alpha of 0,894 and 7% of the total variance explained, Working conditions climate (alpha of 0,892 and 5.84% of the total variance explained), Flexibility before contingencies (Alpha of 0,782 and 5% d% of the total variance explained), Flexibility before risks (alpha of 0.746 and 5%% of the total variance explained) (Table 2).

Based on the reliability and validity analyses, it is recommended to adjust the observed factors to the theoretical dimensions, suppress those dispersed reagents, or reconceptualize the dimensions. This would allow the contrast of reflective models of the organizational climate, considering the theoretical dimensions and the empirical factors. In addition, the matrix of correlations shows positive and significant relationships among the five factors, evidencing the possibility of a reflective structure of the organizational climate as a second-order factor (Table 3).

The adequacy and sphericity [$X^2 = 789,577$ (10gl) $p = 0.000$; $KMO = 0.833$] suggests carrying out the second order factorial analysis. The second order or organizational climate factor included each of the five factors, explaining 76.690% of the total variance, which suggests the model's contrast from five reflective factors in which the relationship with the boss would be the predominant factor. Once established factors first and second order, we proceeded to establish the dependency relationships between the factors of the organizational environment as determinants of factors labor flexibility and dimensions relative to contingencies and risks.

It is possible to observe that the organizational climate, as a second order factor formed by the relationship with the boss, compensation, structure, compensations and motivation are determinants of labor flexibility as a second-order factor indicated by the isolation, overload, complicity and queries ($\beta = .634$, $p = .000$; $R = 0.634$, $R^2 = 0.402$, $R^2_{jd} = 0.399$). Regarding the other dependency relations, low values tend to spurious and insignificant relationships.

Once established multiple regressions, a model of dependency relationships paths where you can observe established climate leader as the determinant of labor flexibility (0.58), followed by climate of working conditions (0.41). In the case of the organizational climate, the climate of compensations was its main determinant (0.48) and the labor condition, the relationship with the leader was its determinant (0.86). Once the six first-order factors and their linear relationships were established, we observed their structure to establish the determining trajectories of labor flexibility.

Finally, the adjustment parameters [$\chi^2 = 5.552$ (2gl) $p = 0.062$; $GFI = 0.974$; $NFI = 0.964$; $IFI = 0.977$; $CFI = 0.972$; $RMSEA = 0.229$] show the adjustment of the theoretical structure with respect to the weighted observations.

Table 1: Kaiser Meyer Olkin test

	MSA
Overall MSA	0.865
r1	0.9
r2	0.838
r3	0.845
r4	0.845
r5	0.942
r6	0.873
r7	0.827
r8	0.898
r9	0.803
r10	0.888
r11	0.837
r12	0.915
r13	0.885
r14	0.842
r15	0.612
r16	0.815
r17	0.759
r18	0.837
r19	0.876
r20	0.795
r21	0.886
r22	0.858
r23	0.893
r24	0.922

Table 2: Facctor loadings

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Uniqueness
r1		1.098					0.136
r2	0.579				0.645		0.066
r3	-0.68						0.043
r4		1.112					0.092
r5	0.952						0.094
r6	0.913						0.055
r7				0.634			0.268
r8	0.974						0.038
r9		-0.571	0.507				0.042
r10	0.856						0.025
r11			-0.91				0.06
r12	0.824						0.176
r13			-0.425		-0.594		0.451
r14	0.944						0.059
r15						0.659	0.579
r16		0.506	0.57				0.195
r17			-0.515	0.812			0.198
r18	0.728						0.029
r19		0.831					0.041
r20			0.902				0.202
r21	0.54	0.763					0.053
r22				-0.551			0.134
r23	0.684						0.064
r24	0.87						0.045

Note: Applied rotation method is promax.

Table 3: Factor correlations

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Factor 1	1	-0.1	-0.09	-0.177	-0.081	-0.357
Factor 2	-0.1	1	0.102	-0.33	0.749	0.418
Factor 3	-0.09	0.102	1	0.076	0.132	0.224
Factor 4	-0.177	-0.33	0.076	1	-0.444	-0.011
Factor 5	-0.081	0.749	0.132	-0.444	1	0.373
Factor 6	-0.357	0.418	0.224	-0.011	0.373	1

Source: Primary data processed M = Average of each factor, DE = Standard deviation of each factor, N = Number of observations in each factor, F1 = Climate of the leader, F2 = Climate of compensation, F3 = Climate of structuring, F4 = Climate of working conditions F5 = Flexibility before contingencies, F6 = Flexibility before risks. * p <0.01; ** p <0.001; *** p <0.0001

5. Discussion

About the theoretical, conceptual and empirical frameworks, which highlight leadership as a factor linking climate and labor flexibility, establishing that bidirectional communication and intrinsic motivation are indicative of levels of external demands and internal resources, weighting of equilibrium s when establishing

a climate of relationships, tasks, supports and innovations with respect to conditions, rotations, salaries, rewards and benefits in situations that are increasingly contingent on the market. The present work, rather proposes that leadership is an intangible capital in terms of skills, knowledge and experiences, which will determine not only the climate but also motivate staff to such a point that a

climate of relationships will coexist with a rotation of functions and decrease of salaries in situations of unemployment.

However, the type of non-experimental and exploratory study, as well as the type of non-probabilistic and rather intentional sampling selection, limit the study's results to the sample surveyed. It is recommended to carry out an experimental study with a probabilistic selection in order to be able to contrast the hypotheses in a different context and sample from the present work.

Market contingencies are indirect determinants of the work environment and the performance of organizations. In other words, to the extent that business development and microfinance policies promote productivity, leaders are committed to carrying out strategies that, due to their degree of improvisation, imply one-way communication and motivation in remuneration that allows them to be at the market height. demands. In such a scenario, the work climate is a mediating factor of economic, productive and employment policies, but in the labor relations climate leadership prevails, flexibility being a distinctive feature of the environment rather than of the organization or groups. working within them.

However, the influence of leadership in vocational training not only implies a work environment that can be oriented towards labor flexibility, but also implies the predominance of the relationship climate with other types of work environments. Tasks, goals, innovations and supports, which involve traditional leadership that guides employees or subordinates, while motivating talents and intellectual capital.

If the working environment is a result of local policies and simultaneously determines a type of informal performance and rotation, then explain and anticipate the Exit meeting the organizations in establishing a scenario of trust and expectation that could influence constant professional training, specialized training and self-motivation to achievements, which explain the type of leadership for medium-sized companies. It is necessary to carry out the contrast climate organizational and labor flexibility in groups of micro, small and medium enterprises to establish the organizational determinants and their influence on the similarities and differences between MSMEs when weighing their performance, commitment and satisfaction. Such a design could also be extended to the groups of sex, age, income and marital status to elucidate the profiles that would adjust to informal and austere working conditions.

6. Conclusions

The contribution of this work to the state of the question lies in establishing the reliability and validity of an instrument that measures the climate and labor flexibility, but the type of design and sample selection imitate the findings in the study sample.

The statistical properties of the instrument indicate that the labor climate is more multidimensional than the flexibility since, it seems to be a mediator of the policies of local impulse on the opportunities and the informal labor capacities. This reflects a validi-

ty of context that the instrument in question could develop further in samples and scenarios different from the study one.

In addition, about other variables such as leadership, the instrument can be extended in order to incorporate leadership as a determinant of climate and labor flexibility, main findings reported in the literature consulted.

References

1. Bowthorpe A. Seamen and Sinners: Piracy and the Labor Culture of the Early Eighteenth-Century British Atlantic World. 2021.
2. Cherny RW. Elizabeth E Sine Rebel Imaginaries: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Depression Era California. 2023.
3. Cole P. Elizabeth E. Sine Rebel Imaginaries. Labor, Culture, and Politics in Depression-Era California. Duke University Press, Durham (NC) 2021. *International Review of Social History*. 2022; 67:143-6.
4. de Almeida NLT. Trabalho, cultura e políticas Sociais na trajetória da Faculdade de Serviço Social (Uerj). Labor, culture and social policies in the trajectory of the UERJ School of Social Work. *Revista Em Pauta: teoria social e realidade contemporânea* 21. 2023.
5. Doshniyazov JK. The Traditional Labor Culture Of The Karakalpak People. *European Scholar Journal*. 2021; 2: 93-96.
6. Goings A. Corporate Colonialism, Class, and Conflict in Southeastern Alaska's Canneries-Diane J. Purvis Ragged Coast, Rugged Coves: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Southeast Alaska Canneries. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 2023; 2021: 384, pp 26.95 (paperback). *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 22: 96-98.
7. Hu W, Ma K. Labor Culture and Ecological Environment: The Renewing Path of the Nurturing Concept of "Nurturing Talents for the Country" in Labor Education. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*. 2022.
8. Juravich, T. "Bread and Roses" The Evolution of a Song, Labor Songbooks, and Union Culture. *Labor*. 2020; 17(2): 81-100.
9. Kovalesky B. Rebel Imaginaries: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Depression-Era California. By Elizabeth E. Sine. 2022.
10. Magesh S, Wallace LS. RE: Culture That Facilitates Change: A Mixed Methods Study of Hospitals Engaged in Reducing Cesarean Deliveries. 2023.
11. Music BT. Music for Advertising and Labor. *The Oxford Handbook of Music and Advertising*. 2021; 28.
12. Musurmon, I. The essence of the concept of "culture", "professional culture" in shaping professional culture for students of professional colleges. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*. 2020; 8(1).
13. Oltmisheva, NG. Formation of labor culture in youth facilities. *Экономика и социум*. 2021; 289-90.
14. Purvis DJ. Ragged Coast, Rugged Coves: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Southeast Alaska Canneries. U of Nebraska Press. 2021.
15. Richardson P. Rebel Imaginaries: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Depression-Era California, by Elizabeth E. Sine. 2022.

16. Sa J. Freiburg FABRIK, a Living Community with Labor, Culture, Art and Ecology-A Model for a Sustainable Society. 2020.
17. Shoup LH, Sine EH. Rebel Imaginaries: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Depression-Era California. *Journal of Labor and Society*. 2021; 24(4): 625-8.
18. Sine EE. Rebel Imaginaries: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Depression-Era California. Duke University Press. 2020.
19. Struthers DM. Rebel Imaginaries: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Depression-Era California. 2022.
20. Syarieff F, Nindiasari H, Martanto M, Febriani B. Bukti Korespondensi-e-HRM: Changes in Business and Labor Culture in the Digital Paradigm. *Bukti Korespondensi*. 2022; 6(1).
21. Syarieff F, Nindiasari H, Martanto M, Febriani B, Wujarso R. e-HRM: Changes in Business and Labor Culture in the Digital Paradigm. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*. 2023; 6(1).
22. Taylor III JE. *Ragged Coast, Rugged Coves: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Southeast Alaska* by Diane J. Purvis. 2022.
23. Teixeira de Almeida NL. Labor, culture and social policies in the trajectory of the UERJ School of Social Work. *Em Pauta*. 2023; 21(52).
24. VanGompel ECW, Perez SL, Datta A, Carlock FR, Cape V, Main EK. Culture that facilitates change: a mixed methods study of hospitals engaged in reducing cesarean deliveries. *The Annals of Family Medicine*. 2021; 19(3): 249-57.
25. VanGompel EW, Radke S, Singh L, Carlock F. *Family Medicine Presence on Labor and Delivery: Impact on Quality and Safety*. 2023.
26. Waldron C. Rebel Imaginaries: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Depression-Era California. 2022.
27. Walsh O, Elizabeth E. Sine, Rebel Imaginaries: Labor, Culture, and Politics in Depression-Era California (Durham, NC: Duke University Press. *Journal of American Studies*. 2021; 55(5): 1232-3.
28. Xiao S. The Cultural Studies on Labor Education. *Journal of East China Normal University (Educational Sciences)*. 2022; 40(2): 17.
29. Zhuravleva L, Zarubina E, Ruchkin A, Kruzhkova T, Ruschitskaya, O. Farm labor: problems and main directions of growth. In *BIO Web of Conferences*. EDP Sciences. 2022; 51: 6001.
30. Имомов Х. Ш. Labor culture and economic culture of personality. *Вестник Таджикского национального университета*. 2020; 2: 231-6.