

Alena Vankevich, Olga Zaitseva
Vitebsk State Technological University
Vitebsk Belarus
E-mails: vankevich_ev@tut.by; olgazaitseva@gmail.com

Employment precarity and flexicurity issues in EU and Belarus

Abstract

The article studies the effect of objective processes of increasing labour market flexibility on precarization (precarity, precariousness) of employment, assesses precarious forms of employment standards in the EU-28 and in the Republic of Belarus, justifies modernization directions of flexicurity policy. Belarusian labour market shows quite authentic mechanisms for providing balance of social security and labour market flexibility where precarization is associated to greater extent with employment, but not unemployment. The main risks of employment precarization in Belarus are the following: high proportion of people employed under fixed-term contracts, the presence of actual unemployment, particularly among young people, the presence of the low-income workers, low standard of living of retirees. Identified risks of precarization require a transformation flexicurity policy in directions common for all the countries: creation of quality jobs; setting time limits on the use of fixed-term contracts; transformation of social protection based on using non-standard forms of employment; development of LMIS.

Key words: flexicurity, job security, labour market flexibility, precarity, social security.

Introduction

Globalization of the world economy, development of information and communication technologies, structural and demographic changes in economies of many countries have led to increasing labour market flexibility. It can be seen in the broad application of non-standard employment, flexible forms of payment and working hours, and increasing labour mobility. Labor market flexibility has a number of positive consequences for both employers and employees. Along with that, it also creates threats associated with destabilization of the labor relations, contradictions between economic efficiency of employment and social protection of employees. This leads to precarization of employment and contradicts with the ILO's principles of Decent work.

Thus, the concept "flexicurity" has appeared under conditions of increasing labour market flexibility and the spread of non-standard forms of employment. The concept can be characterized as a combination of flexibility and employment security. However, experience of a number of countries has shown that in modern conditions flexicurity does not always ensure the achievement of the balance, for which it was designed. Therefore, it is necessary to update its principles and mechanisms of implementation for overcoming the risks of employment precariousness, taking into account national peculiarities of countries.

The object of the research is to determine the effect of objective processes of increasing labour market flexibility on employment precariousness, to assess the scales of precarious employment and the directions of modernization of flexicurity principles in order to prevent the growth of employment precariousness. Realization of this goal requires solution of the following tasks: 1. to implement the operationalization of the term flexicurity and precariousness through the system of indicators; 2. to evaluate the dynamics of flexicurity indicators and employment precariousness; evaluate the relationship between the implementation of flexicurity concept and indicators of precariousness (for example, the EU-28 countries for the period 2005-2014 years); 3. to assess the scale of employment precariousness in the Republic of Belarus and to compare it with the EU level; 4. to formulate directions for updates of flexicurity concept in the Republic of Belarus. To achieve the research goals authors used the following methods and data: a comparative analysis, correlation and regression analysis, Eurostat's statistical data on the labor market development in the European Union for the period of 2007-2017, statistics on the labor market development of the Republic of Belarus and the empirical data of authors' survey on youth employment issues¹.

1. Flexicurity and employment precariousness: theoretical background

The objective trend of increasing labor market flexibility in the current conditions (Vankevich 2014a: 64) suggests increasing use of non-standard forms of employment, weakening of employers' obligations in relation to layoffs, liberalization of legislation of employment security. All this increases the adaptive capacity of the labour market to structural and cyclical changes in the economy, expands employment opportunities for different socio-demographic groups, but at the same time leads to a destabilization of the labour relations. The last above mentioned phenomenon is called

¹ The investigation was conducted within the frame of research work "Prevention of youth unemployment in the border regions of Latvia and Belarus in conditions of economic recovery", which has been carried out with financial support of the Belarusian Foundation for Fundamental Research in 2015-2017.

"employment precarity" in economic literature. Employment precarity (or "precarious work") - a technical term that describes the negative trends in the labour market resulting from increased labour market flexibility, the use of non-standard, "unsustainable" forms of employment, and associated with the lack of social guarantees for workers, insecurity, vulnerability, low earnings, high probability of dismissal, etc. (Bobkov, Veredyuk, Kolosova 2014: 7). Issues of employment precarity are investigated in the works of G. Standing (2011), D. Rodgers, J. Burgess, M. Gibney, V. Bobkov, O. Veredyuk, R. Kolosova, T. Razumova (2014), specialists from international organizations.

ILO specialists note, (...) *precarious work is a means for employers to shift risks and responsibilities on to workers. It is work performed in the formal and informal economy and is characterized by variable levels and degrees of objective (legal status) and subjective (feeling) characteristics of uncertainty and insecurity.* Employment precarity can be of both voluntary and forced nature. For example, e-employment, freelancing can act as unstable forms of employment, although such forms of employment are essentially the voluntary choice of workers. Workers often deliberately take on risks in return for a number of advantages of these forms of employment (higher income, independence from the employer, mobility, etc.). The generally accepted approach is the understanding of precarity as a form of involuntary employment – (...) *while underemployment remains involuntary alternative to the shortage of full employment, such employment relationship should be considered precarious*" (Vagner 2014: 22; Bobkov 2012). Thus, (...) *we say about precarity when the employment relationship does not provide established as the social standard level of income, security and integration into society* (Vagner 2014: 18).

The International Labour Organization defines two criteria for identification of the contractual arrangements, leading to precarity: 1. The limited duration of the contract (fixed-term, short-term, temporary, seasonal, day-labour and casual labour); 2. The nature of employment relationship (triangular and disguised employment relationships, bogus self-employment, subcontracting and agency contracts) (ILO 2012). In turn, it enables to distinguish four basic characteristics of precarious working conditions: 1. Low wages; 2. Poor protection from termination of employment; 3. Lack of access to social security and benefits usually associated with full-time standard employment; 4. Workers have no or limited access to exercise their rights at work (ILO, 2012).

Manifestations of employment precarity in the labour market can be classified in three directions:

Direction 1 - changing forms of employment, which means: a massive shift to the use of fixed-term contracts, the use of flexible forms of

employment by the initiative of the employer (that is, forms of involuntary part-time employment); mass dismissal and hiring of new employees by employer's initiative; unregistered labour migration.

Direction 2 - changing the form, size and regularity of remuneration regarding to which the precariousness means: "envelope" salaries, reduction of constant share of wages in the structure of total compensation and increase of variable share (non-guaranteed benefits); work delivery, provision of labour services without registration of the relevant contract resulting in pay off the books without paying taxes.

Direction 3 - change of working conditions, regarding to which the precariousness means: weakening of labour legislation enforcement, deterioration of working conditions, occupational health and safety.

As a possible solution to reduction of negative impacts of labour market flexibilization, European community proposed the concept of flexicurity which is aimed at achieving a balance between the necessary degree of labour market flexibility and social security of employees (Cazes, Nesporova 2007: 3). The elements of flexibility in this concept include numerical flexibility (adaptation of the number of employees); working time flexibility; functional flexibility (between different work tasks); wage flexibility. The elements of security include: job security (security enabling the worker to remain in the same job); employment security (security to remain employed, but not necessarily in the same job or by the same employer); income/social security (security which maintains one's income under conditions of unemployment, illness and accident); combination security: the possibility to combine working life with private life (e.g. child-care leave) (Bredgaard, Larsen 2006: 6).

Modern researchers claim that flexicurity needs to be updated, because it does not always fulfill its tasks (Smith et al 2012; Vichnevskaya 2013; Vankevich 2014b). The idea that the lack of flexibility of European labour markets became one of the reasons for severe consequences of the economic recession and a high unemployment rate (Boeri 2011), leads to the conclusion that it is necessary to increase labour market flexibility. However, this will increase the risks of employment precariousness as well. Institutional reforms in labour markets of several European countries in early 2000s (Germany, Denmark) resolved a number of employment problems, but they did not eliminate the need for their further modernization.

Researchers and experts made multiple attempts to measure the degree of implementation of the flexicurity principles, but exact figures were not developed (Tangian 2007b; Tangian 2007a; EU 2007; EMCO 2007). Issues of flexicurity influence on the efficiency of labour market were investigated in separate works (Vankevich 2014b: 18). It is found that flexicurity has a greater impact on the structure and a smaller one on the employment rate, but

not on the unemployment rate in a country, and determines employment of separate socio-demographic groups (women, elderly). There is no clear evidence that liberalization of employment security legislation and decline in the proportion of open-ended employment contracts affects intensification of labour security, productivity, mobility (Vankevich 2014b: 18). However, some works (Van Eyck 2003) proved that excessively flexible labour market is accompanied by rising social costs because income differentiation and labour market segmentation become prominent, and excessively rigid labour market is one of the reasons for constantly high unemployment (Vichnevskaya 2013: 3).

Even indefinite full employment does not protect against low wages and do not always regulated by tariff agreements (Vagner 2014: 18). Summative evaluation (Smith et al 2012, cited in Vagner 2014: 21) shows that the results of flexicurity implementation are rather modest. Thus, according to the researchers, the emphasis is increasingly placed on flexibility (meeting the interests of employers), while the level of social security even decreased. Flexicurity policy was also unable to reduce gender inequality. Thus, there is no unambiguous answer about the effectiveness and efficiency of flexicurity as yet. Hence, the research problem can be formulated as the following: to evaluate the influence of flexicurity on employment precarity through an interconnected system of indicators; to measure employment precarity; to identify common features and characteristics of these processes in the EU and in the Republic of Belarus in the dynamics to justify ways of labour market policies improvement.

According to specialists of the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) (...) *in contrast to permanent employment, precarious or non-standard types of employment shift social risks from employers and government on to individual workers* (EKP 2011). Workers with these forms of employment are not subject to labour legislation and social security guarantees, they do not participate in trade union organizations. Consequences of precarization are the following: reduction of income of the working population (the so-called growth of low-income workers), irregularity of income, reduction of social protection, weakening trade union positions in certain segments of the labour market. It comes in a certain contradiction with the European Strategy *Europe 2020: for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth* (Eurofond 2015: 1), because it leads to polarization of jobs, destandardization of labor relations.

2. The scale and dynamics of employment precarity in the EU

The statistical data indicate increase in the size of non-standard employment, which consequently increases the risk of precarity. With the

proportion of part-time workers as a whole in the EU having increased to 19,4 p.c. over the period of 2012-2017, in eight countries (Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Austria, Sweden, UK) the maximum value of this indicator remained in the range from 21,8 to 49,8 p.c.. Non-standard forms of employment are closely connected with indicators of the labour market efficiency – in particular, with the level of unemployment. To provide for their more thorough records, beginning since 2012 European statistics has introduced a new indicator – the number of part-time workers willing and able to work full-time (under-employed part-time workers, percent of active population).

In order to understand how the principles of flexicurity concept help to reduce precariousness risks, the authors analyzed the correlation between the indicators that characterize the degree of flexicurity implementation and indicators reflecting employment precariousness (on the example of the European Union countries) for 2007-2017. Analyzing obtained data on the dynamics of the indicators characterizing the degree of flexicurity implementation, we can note that almost all indicators has been growth for the analyzed period. This indicates that there is growing interest to the problems of increasing labour market flexibility and its consequences all over the EU, and appropriate measures are taken to reduce the negative effects by implementing flexicurity.

Thus, it can be noted that the European countries are quite successful in implementing the principles of flexicurity; however, it remains an open question how the implementation of these principles affects the labour market success and provokes precariousness risks. In this research we analyze the relationship between indicators of flexicurity and precariousness. To do this we selected indicators characterizing certain aspects of the employment precariousness in the EU-28. The results of correlation between employment precariousness and indicators of flexicurity implementation in EU-28 are presented in table 1.

Table 1

The results of correlation between employment precariousness and indicators of flexicurity implementation

Individual indicators of precariousness (dependable variable) (y)		Linear coefficient of Pearson correlation under independent variables – indicators of flexicurity (x)						
		Percentage of the adult population at the age of 25-64 participating in education and training	Educational attainment of age cohort 45-54	Educational attainment of age cohort 25-34	Expenditure on active and passive labour market policies as a percentage of GDP	Expenditure on active and passive labour market policies per unemployed person	Aggregate replacement ratio	Unemployment trap (euro per a person)
		a	b	c	d	e	f	g
1	Labour transitions by type of contract (employees with a temporary job);	0.300	-0.277	-0.248	-0.002	0.146	-0.190	-0.255
2	Labour transitions by type of contract (employees with a temporary job);	-0.862	-0.364	-0.412	-0.001	0.081	-0.577	-0.142
3	Share of employees working in involuntary temporary employment ;	0.229	-0.473	-0.427	-0.231	-0.553	-0.112	-0.602
4	Share of employees working in involuntary part-time employment	0.585	0.852	0.870	0.227	0.161	0.815	0.680
5	Low wage trap (tax	0.116	0.835	0.806	0.254	0.446	0.506	0.850

	rate on low-income workers)							
6	Employed having a second job (1 000)	0.546	0.703	0.725	-0.343	-0.047	0.659	0.337
7	People at risk of poverty or social exclusion	0.392	0.840	0.833	0.005	-0.346	0.882	0.589

Source: author's elaborations on Eurostat Database

The results of analysis show that only two (1 and 3) of the seven precariousness indicators are autonomous, i.e. they do not correlate with flexicurity indicators. Other precariousness indicators are under the influence of flexicurity policy measures, and their dynamics are not always positive.

Indicator 2 "Labour transitions by type of contract (employees with a temporary job)":

- correlates with the variable "a" (the connection is strong, negative) – this means that increasing share of the adult population participating in programs of training and retraining leads to reducing the number of temporary workers. There is a reason to assume that "life-long learning" programs contribute to the employment and retraining is, to some extent, an alternative to involuntary unemployment,

- has a negative correlation of medium strength with the variable "f", that is, the increase in workforce turnover reduces the number of temporary workers under fixed-term employment contracts, which could mean a high staff turnover.

Indicator 3 "Share of employees working in involuntary temporary employment" has a negative relationship of moderate strength with the variables "b", "e", and "g". That is, temporary employment serves as an alternative to unemployment, and the expansion of measures of active labor market policy leads to a reduction in temporary employment.

Indicators 4-7 are the most deterministic indicators of precariousness representing flexicurity policies. Thus, part-time employment (involuntary part-time employment), secondary employment, low wages, and risk of poverty appeared to be the most vulnerable in the labour market to the flexicurity policy. Most of their growth is influenced by such elements of flexicurity as an educational level of young people (at the age of 25-34) and matures (at the age of 45-54). This can be interpreted both as increasing employment precariousness indicators and as raising educational level of

population, which can be related to increased competition on labor market caused by increasing number of competitive persons, and as a result of the expansion of employment of part-time work,

- high workforce turnover greatly affects part-time employment, secondary employment and risk of poverty;

- unemployment rate affects level of wages and risk of poverty.

Thus, we can say that there is a relationship between flexicurity and precarization indicators, but this relationship does not always reflect the positive effects of implementation of flexicurity.

3. Employment precarity and labour market flexibility in Belarus

The Republic of Belarus has quite original labour market, which is a unique combination of a high degree of social security and low economic efficiency of employment. The phenomenon of employment precarity in Belarus has not been analyzed individually. Therefore, we make it in the three main areas of precarization (type of employment, income and working conditions), using two empirical databases: data of the National Statistical Committee of the Republic of Belarus and the results of the author's study of the problems of youth employment and unemployment.

The peculiarity of the Republic of Belarus is the presence of flexible forms of employment (seasonal and temporary work, use of flexible working arrangements, job sharing, etc.), a full-scale statistics of which hasn't been organized as yet. Possible scale of employment precarity in the economy of Belarus is indicated by widespread non-standard forms of employment, in particular, temporary employment (the number of employees on fixed-term labour agreements (contracts)), which accounts for more than 80 p.c. (Khodosovsky 2011) and involuntary part-time employment. Government employment service is monitoring parameters of involuntary part-time employment in the Republic of Belarus which level was discretely changing in 2007-2017, responding to cyclic changes in the economy. In 2015 (10 months) it accounted for 8.6 p.c. of total number of employees (in comparison in the EU-28 the average value was 5.7 p.c.). Initiative of the employer either to transfer workers to part-time or to provide unpaid holidays is an involuntary measure, which has not only positive consequences for the labour market. On the one hand, this is one of the ways of adapting businesses to worsening of the economic situation, which allows avoiding high expenses in case of layoff and prevents the growth of unemployment. On the other hand, the use of involuntary part-time employment provokes independent outflow of the best workers, reduces motivation to work, and hampers necessary changes in the structure of employment.

Unemployment can be considered as a specific form of precarization,

because labour relations are canceled for indefinite period and the income level of an individual decreases significantly. The labour market of the Republic of Belarus is characterized by low level of registered unemployment, however its distinct feature is the presence of actual unemployment of 5 p.c. rate (based on survey of households on employment matters), and informal employment (by the beginning of 2014 10 p.c. of labour force in Belarus can be assigned to informally employed (Vankevich, Zaitseva 2015: 144).

Considering importance and severity of unemployment issues, especially those among the youth, and insufficiency of statistical data provided by state employment agencies on its actual size in the economy of Belarus, the authors investigated unemployment issues among the youth with the help of a poll. According to the results of this research the unemployment rate among the youth accounted for 15,6 p.c.; 2,3 p.c. of the youth were not officially registered at their regular jobs and 11,9 p.c. - at additional jobs. The reasons why young people are not officially registered at their regular jobs were uniformly distributed as the following: "The employer did not wish to officially register"; "The respondent did not want to be registered officially"; "It was their mutual desire"; "The job was sporadic or irregular". The major reason why young people are not officially registered at their additional jobs is a sporadic, irregular character of a job (85 p.c. respondents). Statistics show a constant growth of wages and income of Belarusians. Poverty decreased to 5,1p.c. of population (2015). However, wages level measured in US dollars remains low - 395\$ in 2015. In 2016 there is a negative tendency in the level of wages and income of population. The ratio of average pensions to the average size of payroll varies within the limit of 40 p.c. (38,8 p.c. in 2014) (Annual Statistics 2015) in comparison with 50-55 p.c. in the EU countries, which indicates a low level of retirees' wellbeing. Working conditions, as an indicator of employment precariousity, show positive dynamics in Belarus, i.e. working conditions are gradually improving.

Realization of flexicurity within the frame of Belarusian government's social and labour policies can be analyzed in terms of individual elements (because it is not officially declared): 1. flexible contract relations 2. life-long learning, 3. active policy on labour market and 4. effective social security. Traditionally, Belarusian labour market is characterized as a rigid one, however, it mostly relates to the legislation on employment security (prohibition for layoff). At the same time, the labour market in Belarus can be considered as flexible in terms of the general practice of fixed-term employment contracts, the use of part-time jobs. Flexibility is largely achieved through the development of the informal labour market (related to employment without official registration, independent job search and

employment avoiding registration in state employment agencies).

The concept of continuous life-long learning is one of the most important components of flexicurity, a necessary condition for innovative development and its major direction. Professional training of workers by curricula of supplementary education for adults accounted for 10,8 p.c. in Belarus in 2012 (Labour and Employment 2014), which corresponds to European level (in the EU countries it comprises 9-10 p.c.).

One of the indicators of flexicurity implementation is expenditure on active and passive labour market policies. Existing programs of active labour market policy (ALMP) in Belarus contain a standard set of measures accepted in many countries, which includes assistance in job search, retraining, employment stimuli, welfare activities and programs for entrepreneurship support. However, relative expenditure on these programs are considerably lower in Belarus than these values in the EU countries, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and in former socialistic countries: expenditure accounted for 0,036 p.c. of GDP in Belarus in 2013 (Eurostat, World Bank). It mostly relates to distinctive features of Belarusian labour market, as the expenditure is calculated and spent for those who applied to state employment agencies and registered unemployed (which comprises only 5-6 p.c. of economically active population).

One of the forms of social security of the unemployed in the Republic of Belarus is financial assistance to them during the period of job search in the form of the following payments: redundancy payments; welfare benefits (state subsistence allowance); allowances during the period of training organized by agencies of labour, employment and social security; financial aid; compensation of costs relating to a employment (study) in a new distant location offered by agencies of labour, employment and social security; other payments.

A distinctive feature of social security of the unemployed in the Republic of Belarus is a small redundancy payment which prevents from development of employment agencies into the institution which is able to offer qualitative labour force to employers and contribute to the restructuring of economy. An average size of redundancy payment has accounted for 25,7\$ in the country by 01.01. 2018 (25 p.c. of the minimum subsistence budget per capita on average). An existing system of unemployment insurance is unable to provide adequate financial support for living standards and job seeking of the unemployed. The Belarusian unemployed have the ability to apply for state subsistence allowance which maintains a family income of an unemployed at the level of minimum subsistence budget per a family member (poverty threshold existing in Belarus) for 6 months a year. Since

January, 1, 2014 the unemployed who rejected job offers or professional training or retraining initiated by agencies of the Ministry of Labour have not been eligible for subsistence allowance. An existing system of unemployment insurance maintains the consumption level for 3 months only of those employees who were made redundant (they receive dismissal pay which equals to their average monthly salary for three months). In total, redundancy payment and welfare benefits (state subsistence allowance, etc.) allow for maintaining the income of an unemployed at the level of minimum subsistence budget which can prevent from mobility and active job search. In this respect Belarus significantly differs from developed countries where it is understood that job search is the most productive activity in point of view of the whole society. In comparison, while in Belarus expenditure for redundancy payments accounted for 0,004 p.c. of GDP in 2012, in transitive countries this indicator equaled to 0,39 p.c., in OECD member countries it equaled to 0,61 p.c. (Akulich et al 2015).

Under these conditions Labour Market Information System plays an important role for the assistance to all its participants and for making effective decisions. An important condition of flexicurity is an information support for employees about situation on labour market and economic demand for personnel. In many countries this task is performed by a complex labour market information system (LMIS). It is mainly developed by the European Training Foundation and the International Labour Organization. LMIS is defined as an information system about the size and composition of labour market or any of its part (statistics, data provided by government and businesses, reviews, surveys, etc.), the way of operating of labour market or any of its part, problems the labour market faces and available opportunities for development, intentions relating to employment or expectation of those who constitutes a part of labour market. It enables to receive exact and actual information which helps all participants of labour market and training system perform effectively, increase labour market results and output of educational system, determine imbalances and bottlenecks for their timely elimination" (Sparreboom, Powell 2009: 3). In the Republic of Belarus under administrative prohibition against layoff businesses give corrupted signals to the labour market and education services market outlining excessive demand for personnel. Information on available jobs and vacancies submitted to state employment agencies is not actual either, since unattractive vacancies are submitted to the system more often (about 37,7 p.c. vacancies offering salaries twice as little as average level in the country).

Information about the current labour supply is estimated only by the number of those who applied to the state welfare agencies - which is under 5p.c. of economically active population, while the total annual labour

turnover in the country (the number of employed and dismissed workers in employment) accounted for 49-51p.c. in 2005-2015. Nevertheless, there are no special reports on the state of labour market and the system of personnel training, forecast demand for personnel in individual sectors or branches. There is also no information on prospective demand for professional knowledge and skills. Non-state portals and agencies provide online information about current proportion of vacancies to resumes by individual professions which add to the data of the state employment agency. Above mentioned facts hinder labour market participants from making reasonable decisions, especially at meso- (sector, region) and micro-levels (a business, citizens).

Thus, not having officially declared concept of flexicurity Belarus puts into practice many of its statements. It relates to active policy on labour market, system of measures on supplementary education for adults, the system of social security. It's characterized by an extensive use of contract relations and maintaining of high employment rate (due to rigid legislation on employment security) at the expense of economic efficiency. It leads to low levels of wages and retirement pensions in the economy, maintaining excessive numbers of workers at enterprises (and, respectively, extensive use of involuntary part-time employment) and low level of registered unemployment with rather moderate actual level. Precarization is mainly caused by inefficient employment but not unemployment.

Conclusions: directions of flexicurity concept updates in the Republic of Belarus

Understanding of risks of precarization requires changes of approaches to government's labour policy and mechanisms of social security. Common actions are the following: to develop qualitative jobs; to set time limits for use of fixed-term contracts, and contract workers; to provide nationwide access to social welfare through the use of minimal social security for everyone; to provide complete information service for all labour market participants and monitoring of situation an labour market and prospective demand for personnel.

In the Republic of Belarus a balance between labour market flexibility and employment precarity should be achieved through improvement of government's labour policy in the following directions:

1. *Adoption of ILO principles of Decent work in the Republic of Belarus, development of the harmonized system of indicators with methodological approaches of the ILO.* The ILO's program of Decent work represents a general trend for preventing employment precarity and reducing its negative consequences.

2. Development of more effective social welfare system.

This direction suggests changes in the principles of social insurance against unemployment, including the development of normative legal acts providing for the improvement of the appointment mechanisms, payments and determining the size of unemployment benefits, providing more targeted measures of social support on the one hand, and bringing the amount of unemployment benefit to the minimum subsistence budget, on the other hand. In order to implement the concept of flexicurity and transition to a secure flexible labor market, it is also necessary to develop a more effective social security system. Today, this essential component of employment regulation is reduced mainly to the financial support of the officially unemployed.

The recommendations are the following: to change eligibility criteria and the amount of unemployment benefits, providing for: strengthening of target principle (reduction of categories who are eligible for benefits); to broaden responsibilities of an unemployed to enhance their individual efforts on job seeking; to change the amount and duration of payments (to limit the right to receive unemployment benefits for people who have lost it due to the expiration of the period of entitlement, and re-registered at the employment agencies); to cancel early retirement pension; to gradually increase retirement age.

3. The development of labour market information system in the Republic of Belarus, the purpose of which is to eliminate imbalances between the labor market and training systems, to ensure the dynamic equilibrium of the labor market and training systems in the short and long term, harmonization of the labor market and training system on the basis of consolidation of efforts of governments, employers, educational institutions and other stakeholders, continuous updating of requirements for qualification and competence of personnel, scope, and structure of training in accordance with the objectives of social and economic development of Belarus.

Principles of Belarusian model of LMIS: multi-level, which implies not only macro-level, but also its development at meso - (region, industry) and micro-levels, differentiation of methods depending on a predicting level and a time interval; development of institutional environment; differentiation of results and expansion of the range of users of LMIS products. It involves development of a single information and analytical environment that is available for all users (government agencies and citizens); development and publication of supply and demand forecasts on labor market and the market of educational services to eliminate the information asymmetry of its members; increase the competitiveness of graduates of educational institutions due to focusing of educational curricula on prospective qualifications, enhancing their awareness, professional flexibility and

mobility, and their behavior on the labor market.

References:

1. Akulich, V. Valetko, V. Navrotsky S. Ravinsky Y., 2015, *Рынки труда и капитала в Беларуси: равный статус для долгосрочного роста*, [Labor and capital markets in Belarus: equal status for long-term growth]. Working materials, February 2015. DOI: http://case-belarus.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/FINAL-Belarus-Capital-and-LM_2015.pdf (date of access: 20.09.2018).
2. *Annual Statistics of the Republic of Belarus*, 2015, National Statistical Committee of the Republic of Belarus. Available: http://www.belstat.gov.by/ofitsialnaya-statistika/publications/izdania/public_compilation/index_724. (date of access: 20.09.2018).
3. Bobkov V., 2012, *20 лет капиталистических трансформаций в России: влияние на уровень и качество жизни*, [20 years of capitalist transformations in Russia: the impact on the standard and quality of living], "World of Russia" 2: 3-26.
4. Bobkov V. Veredyuk O. Kolosova R., 2014, *Занятость и социальная прекаризация в России: введение в анализ*, [Employment and social precarization in Russia: an introduction to the analysis]. Monograph. M. TEIS. 96 p.
5. Boeri T., 2011, *Institutional reform and dualism in European labor markets*, *Handbook of labor economics*, "Elsevier", 13(4b): 1173-1189.
6. Bredgaard T. Larsen F., 2006, *Comparing flexicurity in Denmark and Japan*, Centre for Labour Market Research at Aalborg University (CARMA). Denmark, 2007. Available: http://www.jil.go.jp/profile/documents/Denmark_final.pdf. (date of access: 15.09.2018).
7. Cazes S. Nesporova A., 2007, *Flexicurity: A relevant approach for Central and Eastern Europe*, ILO, Geneva.
8. ЕКР, 2011, *Life without economic security: women with precarious employment*, ЕКР, March, 8.
9. EMCO. 2007, *Monitoring and analysis of Flexicurity policies*. The Employment Committee. Progress report. Available: http://www.coe.gov.fr/IMG/pdf/Agenda_item_6_Flexicurity_indicators_-_progress_report.pdf. (date of access: 03.09.2018).
10. EU, 2007, *Towards Common Principles of Flexicurity: More and better jobs through flexibility and security*. European Commission, Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. Unit D.2. Available: http://www.da.dk/bilag/flexicuritypublication_2007_en.pdf. (date of

- access: 28.08.2018).
11. Eurofond, 2015, *Updating or polarisation? Long-term and global shifts in the employment structure: European jobs monitor*. Office of the European Union, Luxemburg. Available: http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_publication/field_ef_document/ef1516en.pdf. (date of access: 20.09.2018).
 12. Eurostat, 2012, *Europe in figures*, Eurostat Yearbook, 2012, Available: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/5760825/KS-CD-12-001-EN.PDF>. DOI:10.2785/20539. (date of access: 12.09.2018).
 13. ILO. 2012. *From precarious work to Decent work. Outcome Document to the Workers Symposium on Policies and Regulations to combat Precarious Employment*. International Labour Office, Bureau for Workers' Activities. Geneva: ILO, 2012. 1 v. 29.
 14. Khodosovsky V., 2011, *Реформы: между гибкостью и защитой* [Reforms: between flexibility and security], *Belarusians and Market*. № 39(974), Available: <http://m.belmarket.by/ru/page/190/11572>. (date of access: 18.09.2018).
 15. *Labour and Employment*, 2014, Statistical reference book Minsk, National Statistical Committee of the Republic of Belarus. Available: http://www.belstat.gov.by/ofitsialnaya-statistika/publications/izdania/public_compilation/index_526. (date of access: 20.09.2018).
 16. National Bank of the Republic of Belarus, 2016, *Exchange Rate Indices of the Belarusian Ruble Against Currencies of Major Trade Partners*. Available: <http://www.nbrb.by/statistics/Rates/RatesMonth.asp> (date of access: 18.09.2018).
 17. *National Statistical Committee of the Republic of Belarus*, 2016, Available: <http://www.belstat.gov.by/ofitsialnaya-statistika/>, (date of access: 18.09.2018).
 18. Smith R. Pavlovaite I. Jurado E. Weber T., 2012, *Evaluation of flexicurity 2007-2010: Final Report*, ICF GHK, Brimingham.
 19. Sparreboom T. Powell M., 2009, *Labour market information and analysis for skills development*, International Labour Office, Employment Trends Unit, Economic and labour market analysis department, ILO, Geneva.
 20. Standing G., 2011, *The precariat: The new dangerous class*, A&C Black.
 21. Tangian A., 2007a, *European flexicurity: concepts, methodology and policies*, "Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research", Winter, 13(4): 551-573.
 22. Tangian A., 2007b, *Protected mobility for employment and decent work: labour market security in a globalized world*, ILO Employment Strategy

- Paper 1, Geneva.
23. Tangian A., 2010, *Not for bad weather: flexicurity challenged by the crisis*, "ETUI Policy Brief. European Economic and Employment Policy", Issue 3.
 24. *The Republic of Belarus in Figures, 2016*, National Statistical Committee of the Republic of Belarus, 2016, Available: http://www.belstat.gov.by/ofitsialnaya-statistika/publications/izdania/public_compilation/index_4920/?sphrase_id=104768, (date of access: 21.09.2018).
 25. Vagner A., 2014, *Прекаризация и атипичная занятость женщин и мужчин в Германии и Европе*. [Precarization and atypical employment of women and men in Germany and Europe], Fridrich Ebert Stiftung.
 26. Van Eyck K., 2003, *Flexibilizing Employment: An Overview*, ILO, Geneva.
 27. Vankevich E., 2014a, *Гибкость рынка труда: единство макро- и микроподходов*. [Labour market flexibility: the unity of macro and micro approaches], VSTU Vitebsk.
 28. Vankevich E., 2014b, *Обновление ориентиров политики занятости в современных условиях* [Updating of employment policy guidelines in contemporary conditions]. *Social Sciences Bulletin*. Daugavpils University, 1(18): 7-23.
 29. Vankevich E. Zaitseva O., 2015, *Нестандартная занятость: сущность, формы, масштабы, регулирование*, [Non-standart employment: nature, forms, scale, regulation], *Belarusian Economic Journal*, 2015 3: 129-146.
 30. Veredyuk O. V., *Неустойчивость (прекаризация) занятости: оценка масштабов на рынке труда в России*, [Employment instability (precarization): assessment of the scale on the labor market in Russia]. Available: <http://www.gosbook.ru/node/70195>, (date of access: 15.09.2018).
 31. Vichnevskaya N., 2013, *Реформа немецкого рынка труда: особый случай или пример для подражания* [German labor market reform: a special case or example to follow], Higher School of Economy, Preprint WP3/2013/10, Moscow.

Problemy prekaryzacji pracy i elastyczności rynku pracy w UE i Białorusi

W artykule omówiony został wpływ polityki flexicurity (połączenia elastyczności rynku pracy i zabezpieczenia społecznego) na prekaryzację pracy (jej niestabilność). Zawiera także ocenę niestabilnych form

zatrudnienia w UE i Białorusi oraz uzasadnienie niezbędnych reform polityki flexicurity na rynku pracy. Białoruski rynek pracy dysponuje oryginalnymi mechanizmami zapewniającymi równowagę między zabezpieczeniem społecznym i elastycznością rynku pracy, gdzie prekaryzacja bardziej jest związana z zatrudnieniem niż z bezrobociem. Głównymi czynnikami ryzyka prekaryzacji pracy na Białorusi są: wysoki udział osób zatrudnionych na podstawie kontraktów terminowych, występowanie bezrobocia niezarejestrowanego (szczególnie wśród młodzieży), duża liczba pracowników o niskich dochodach, niski poziom życia emerytów i rencistów. Stwierdzone ryzyka wymagają reformy polityki flexicurity, która powinna być prowadzona w trzech ogólnych kierunkach: tworzenie wysokiej jakości miejsc pracy; ustalenie limitów umów o pracę na czas określony; przekształcenie ochrony socjalnej w oparciu o niestandardowe formy zatrudnienia; rozwój informacyjno – analitycznej infrastruktury rynku pracy.

Słowa kluczowe: flexicurity, bezpieczeństwo zatrudnienia, elastyczność rynku pracy, niepewność czasowa, zabezpieczenie społeczne.