

Kostrytysya, Vasyl; Burlai, Tetiana

Article

Informal and atypical work as the "New Normality" in the world and Ukraine

Economy and forecasting

Provided in Cooperation with:

ZBW OAS

Reference: Kostrytsya, Vasyl/Burlai, Tetiana (2019). Informal and atypical work as the "New Normality" in the world and Ukraine. In: Economy and forecasting (1), S. 5 - 30.
http://econ-forecast.org.ua/?page_id=189&lang=uk&year=2019&issueno=1&begin_page=5&mode=get_art&flang=en.
doi:10.15407/econforecast2019.01.005.

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11159/6907>

Kontakt/Contact

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft/Leibniz Information Centre for Economics
Düsternbrooker Weg 120
24105 Kiel (Germany)
E-Mail: [rights\[at\]zbw.eu](mailto:rights[at]zbw.eu)
<https://www.zbw.eu/>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieses Dokument darf zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Sofern für das Dokument eine Open-Content-Lizenz verwendet wurde, so gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte. Alle auf diesem Vorblatt angegebenen Informationen einschließlich der Rechteinformationen (z.B. Nennung einer Creative Commons Lizenz) wurden automatisch generiert und müssen durch Nutzer:innen vor einer Nachnutzung sorgfältig überprüft werden. Die Lizenzangaben stammen aus Publikationsmetadaten und können Fehler oder Ungenauigkeiten enthalten.

Terms of use:

This document may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes. You are not to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. If the document is made available under a Creative Commons Licence you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the licence. All information provided on this publication cover sheet, including copyright details (e.g. indication of a Creative Commons license), was automatically generated and must be carefully reviewed by users prior to reuse. The license information is derived from publication metadata and may contain errors or inaccuracies.



<https://savearchive.zbw.eu/terms-of-use>



Vasyl Kostrytsya¹,

Tetiana Burlai²

INFORMAL AND ATYPICAL WORK AS THE "NEW NORMALITY" IN THE WORLD AND UKRAINE

The article describes the modern understanding of the category of "New Normality" in the field of employment, including its informal segment. In the economic discourse of the problems of informal employment, the authors indicate two meanings of the category "New Normality": the first one characterizes informal employment as a new objective norm (as a characteristic, widespread, and stable phenomenon) of the present and the future; and the second one reflects the transformation of the sphere of employment, including its undeclared segment, in the process of creating a "New Normality" under the influence of demographic changes, globalization, digitalization and other global trends.

Analyzed the main global trends contributing to the normalization of informal employment in modern macroeconomic development. Particular attention is paid to the trend of digitalization and significant social challenges due to its spread, first of all, the narrowing of the field of social and labor relations, the growth of unemployment, and the spread of informal employment. Established the factors that determine undeclared labor activity as a new norm of functioning of the global labor market.

The authors substantiate the key systemic risks of transforming a high level of undeclared work into a "New Normality" of Ukraine's social and economic development. They include structural degradation of the national economy; demographic limitation for the potential of long-term economic growth; general institutional weakness and the strengthening of destructive institutions; high imbalance in the professional structure of labor demand and supply; and a significant deficit of decent work. One of the priorities of the national policy of state regulation should be the development of mechanisms to counteract and minimize the influence of the above mentioned five systemic factors, which would lead to the transformation of undeclared work in Ukraine into a "New Normality" of its socio-economic progress.

***Key words:** "New Normality", informal employment, state employment policy, systemic risks, Ukraine*

JEL J46, J48, O50, P21

¹ **Kostrytsia, Vasyl Ivanovych** – professor in the Department of Personnel Management and Labour Economics, Ukrainian State Employment Service Training Institute (17, Novovokzalna St., Kyiv, 03038, Ukraine), kostrytsya2@gmail.com

² **Burlai, Tetiana Viktorivna** – PhD in Economics, Senior Researcher, State Institution "Institute for Economics and Forecasting, NAS of Ukraine" (26, Panasna Myrnoho St., Kyiv, 01011, Ukraine), btv2008@ukr.net

For nearly a decade, the employment issues are top of the agenda in international institutions and broad range of experts. The employment issues are considered in the context of the "New Normality" – a concept that means the establishment of new norms and rules but has some specificity of its interpretation. The "New Normality" is often associated with atypical work which comprises all its types that do not have standard employment attributes – an indefinite duration employment contract, a full-time work schedule, a localized job that meets the relevant requirements. Atypical work by definition involves the presence of social and labour relations, while informal employment does not involve such relations and is the manifestation of a very atypical work. In this article, the attention is focused on informal employment which recently has become an integral part of the "New Normality" not only in the national but also in the global dimension.

The definition of informal employment. Informal employment in the broad sense of the term is identified with trade, economic, financial or professional activities carried out violating the law. In particular, the concealment of income received without: the initiation of an enterprise, the acquisition of a license, official registration, the documentation of the actual number of employees or actually manufactured products by them, etc. [1, p. 284-285]. Quite often experts use the terms 'informal employment' and employment 'undeclared', 'unofficial', 'unregistered', 'unaccounted', 'unobserved', 'half-shade' as synonyms. However, the most commonly used are the terms 'informal employment' – in the documents of the International Labour Organization (ILO), as well as in domestic practice and 'undeclared work' – in the documents and practice of the European Union.

According to the adopted Recommendations on the Statistical Identification of Informal Work in 2003 [2] at the 17th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS), informal work covers informal workspaces in both formal and informal sector. This approach is based on the Methodological provisions that define informal work of the population. These provisions are approved by the order of the State Statistics Service of Ukraine dated on January 23, 2013 No. 16 and provide that informally employed workforce include the following categories of employed population [3]:

- employed in the enterprises of the informal sector (unregistered self-employed, employers and their employees, free-working family members, etc.);
- free-working family members at the enterprise of formal sector;
- employees working in informal jobs of the formal sector (persons who were working according to the oral agreement or did not have any social guarantees, in particular: they were not paid for the single contribution to the compulsory state social insurance, they did not have annual holiday or sickness benefit).

Obviously, in the coming years the conceptual framework for informal employment which was identified by the 17th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) will be revised in the light of the latest realities. This was emphasized during the 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians held in October 2018 under the authority of the International Labour Organization (ILO) where it was stated about the necessity [4]:



- to create a single conceptual framework for the harmonization of three different statistical and theoretical concepts: the informal sector, informal employment, as well as informal labour (which goes outside the bounds of informal employment);
- clarify informal employment notion due to the introduction of a new statistical definition of labour – the notion of employment in the informal sector can be complemented by unpaid internships, volunteer work, as well as the production of goods for private use in the informal sector.

Regarding the European practice, today there is no legally enshrined in law notion of informal (undeclared) work in the EU-28. The basic conceptual approaches of the International Labour Organization (ILO) are considered relevant, as well as the definition given by the European Communication in "On undeclared work" dated on April 7, 1998 № 219 [5]. According to this definition undeclared work means any type of paid activity that is absolutely legitimate in origin (criminal activity is completely excluded) but it is not declared in the relevant state bodies. The differences in the regulatory systems of the EU member states are taken into account. A similar definition uses in its work the European platform to enhance co-operation in the prevention and deterrence of undeclared work [6, p. 1-2]. This platform operates since May 2016 and aims to produce universal and non-declarative work statistics for EU member states by 2020.

Modern understanding of the "New Normality" of macroeconomic development. The analysis of the scientific practice of the use "New Normality" concept shows that it has a narrow and extended interpretation. *In the narrow interpretation*, this concept describes the theoretical concept, introduced in 2009 in a scientific and expert circle by one of the leaders of the international investment fund PIMCO (Pacific Investment Management Company) M. El-Erian. Taking into account the existing configuration of national and global factors, the author predicted that after the global financial crisis industrialized countries of the West will not develop according to the rules of macrocycles. These rules include the circulation of recessions and relatively rapid recovery of the economy. Today industrialized countries start living according to a "New Normality" with such manifestations: low rates of economic growth; a stable high unemployment rate that will increasingly become structural; a significant increase in the uncertainty of development and the impact of politics on the economy [7].

In the broad interpretation, "New Normality" has a slightly different meaning, reflecting new phenomena, factors and institutional norms in the socio-economic sphere (including the employment sector) which are defined by modern trends in global development. In the economic discourse of informal employment problems, this interpretation is used in two meanings: *the first* describes informal employment as a new objective norm (in the sense of a distinctive, widespread, established phenomenon) of present and future and *the second* – the transformation of employment sphere including undeclared work in the process of creating a "New Normality" under the influence of demographic changes, globalization, digitalisation and other global trends. In both cases, whether informal employment is considered either as

a component or as an object of "New Normality" the researchers' ultimate interest lies in developing strategies and effective public policy approaches to foster the formalization of employment and maximize the opportunities for decent work for all. It means the guarantee for each employee to provide the conditions and wages on decent level, social protection and representative participation in conducting social dialogue.

Informal employment as a new norm for the functioning of the global labour market. The perception of informal employment by the scientific and expert community as an integral part (a certain norm of functioning) of modern labour markets is associated with the study of the *dynamics and extent* of this phenomenon in the international dimension. The main and most powerful generator of informal labour relations remains the shadow economy. The degree of expansion is quite significant even in the industrialized countries. Thus, according to figures in 2003–2018, the share of the shadow economy among the countries of this group on average was: in the USA – 7.4% of GDP, Japan – 9.7%, Great Britain – 11.2%, France – 12, 9%, Germany – 14.4%, Sweden – 15.8%, Spain – 20.5%, Italy – 23.4%, Turkey – 30.4% of GDP [8, p. 3].

The informal sector in the countries with low economic development is more impressive. It was estimated by the World Bank that the share of shadow production is one third of GDP and in Africa it reaches 50–80% of GDP providing 90% of new jobs. In fact, it means that the informal sector provides maintenance and employment for a very significant segment of the population of developing countries [9, p. 4, 6]. It is not surprising that the basis for a new understanding of the role and importance of unregulated labour activity is the experience of the mentioned above states. These countries are characterized by widespreading and establishment of this phenomenon and it accounts for more than four-fifths of the global employment.

In 2009 the analytical center of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) published a report "Is Informality Normal? Towards More and Better Jobs in Developing Countries" [10]. The report stated about limited opportunities in the context of the global crisis to raise the level of qualifying and officially declared employment and expectable significant increase in informal employment in prospect.

According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development estimates (2009), in the informal economy sector (except for agricultural industry), there were $\frac{3}{4}$ of jobs in sub-Saharan Africa, more than $\frac{2}{3}$ of jobs in Southern and Southeast Asia, $\frac{1}{2}$ jobs in the countries of Latin America, North Africa and the Middle East, as well as about $\frac{1}{4}$ jobs in countries with economies in transition. In general over 1.8 billion employees or 60% were working without an official employment contract and social protection (informal employment). Taking into account the stable demographic trends, as well as the impact of the global financial crisis on the dynamics of economic growth and cross-border labour migration, OECD experts predicted that by 2020 this figure will increase to $\frac{2}{3}$ (almost 67%) of the global workforce [11].



Taking into account the economic figures of informal employment provided by the International Labor Organization in 2018 [12], in this case the forward looking tendency for the growth of informal jobs in the world was determined correctly by OECD in 2009³. Despite the measures taken to combat informal employment, its levels remain very high – 61.2% of the total employed in the world overall, reaching 85.8% in Africa, 68.6% in the Middle East and 68.2% in Asian countries, except for the Central and Pacific region (Table 1).

Table 1

The level of informal employment in the world in 2016*
(in terms of regions, sectors and levels of economic development),
% of total employment in the economy

Region / Level of economic development	Total level of informal employment, %	including economic branches		
		Agriculture	Industry	Service industries
World total	61,2	93,6	57,2	47,2
Africa	85,8	97,9	77,4	70,2
Americas	40,0	77,5	38,4	35,5
The Middle East and other Arab States	68,6	95,6	80,9	57,3
Asia and the Pacific	68,2	94,7	68,8	54,1
Europe and Central Asia, including:	25,1	71,6	21,9	20,2
North, South and Western Europe	14,3	47,5	10,1	14,2
Eastern Europe	31,5	64,5	30,2	26,9
Developing countries and countries with emerging markets**	69,6	94,3	67,2	55,5
Africa	85,8	97,9	77,4	70,1
Americas	53,8	79,9	49,8	49,6
The Middle East and other Arab States	68,6	95,6	80,9	57,3
Asia and the Pacific	71,4	94,9	73,4	57,2
Europe and Central Asia	36,8	76,5	33,5	27,8
Developed countries**	18,3	58,7	15,8	17,5
Americas	19,4	50,2	18,2	19,1
Asia and the Pacific	21,7	75,5	20,3	19,1
Europe and Central Asia	15,6	52,5	11,5	15,3

* Based on data from 119 countries of the world, which together account for 90% of the world's total employment.

** The ILO's implementation of the division of countries according to the level of economic development is based on the relevant World Bank's classification for 2018 according to the income level criterion (GNI per capita) and suggests that developing countries include low-income countries – \$1005 and less; for countries with emerging markets refer countries with lower incomes – \$1006 to 3955 dollars. As well as higher-income countries, ranges from \$ 3956 to \$ 12235; to developed countries refer countries with high income – \$ 12236 dollars and more.

Source: [12, p. 23-26; 40-41; 76].

³ There are currently no OECD estimates at the level of informal work in the world over the last period. The relevant data presented by the ILO in 2018 are calculated according to another methodology and with a higher level of representative coverage of countries.

According to the data of the Table 1, there is no region or country of the world (developing countries or developed countries, etc.) where informal employment would be overcome. Due to this fact we agree that this phenomenon can be seen as a new norm (a widespread and established) of the modern global labour market. This new norm is considered to be a transitional phenomenon that would be minimized in the course of technological changes, convergence of more or less developed economies, as well as the implementation of the relevant state policy on formalizing employment. This is due to the fact that for a long time the informal segment of the labour market was considered relatively temporary. However, such expectations turned out to be mistaken and despite the significant progress made in formalizing employment in a number of Latin America countries and other regions, experts predict that future perceptions of informal employment as a norm at the global level will only be strengthened. This is primarily caused by the sectoral and regional specifics of the spread of undeclared jobs, as well as the impact of information and communication technologies (ICTs) and structural changes.

The highest sectoral level of undeclared employment, as shown in the Table 1, it is observed in agriculture: the corresponding indicator in the world is 93.6%; developing countries and countries with emerging markets – 94.3%; developed countries – 58.7%. The domination of the agrarian sector in the employment by industry type in the countries and regions of the world characterized by a low level of economic development, taking the lion's share of the global labour market, is the reason for the "normalization" of informal employment in the world. According to the calculations of the ILO, in 2017 in developing countries, the agrarian sector accounted for more than 70% of the total number of employees and by 2025 this figure will not decrease significantly – only by 3.5 [13, p. 30]. Consequently, in the medium-term and long-term transformations taking into account the inertness of the police in the long run, informal employment will remain an integral part of the "New Normality" in global dynamics.

As ILO experts noted, the proof of that is the fact that *unofficial labour activity is actively gaining new forms* and retaining itself as the dominant form of employment in the Global South (in developing countries) is increasingly spreading to the Global North (in developed countries). At the same time, the "Global South" continues to maintain traditional forms of informal employment. In most countries of "Global South" more than half of all employees are engaged in informal labor relations, without any social protection, such as day laborers, independent contractors, homeworkers, domestic workers, etc. At the same time, in the "Global North", the trend is increasing the deregulation of the labour market and the spread of various forms of flexible, non-standard employment of both traditional (temporary and part-time employment) and new one – including outstaffing, outsourcing, on-call work, employment in the "gig-economy" (freelance), etc. Everything mentioned above can be regarded as ways of "shadowing" social and labor relations [14, p. 1-2].

One of the main reasons for the transformation of informal employment into a part of the "New Normality" of global development is a new economic paradigm.



Experts refer to a new economic paradigm – the formation of a model of a hybrid economy that simultaneously comprises traditional and new forms of employment, its formal / informal sides, large / small proportions [15]. The solution to the problems caused by unregulated work within this model is seen in the implementation of alternative approaches to the legalization and social protection of informal workers, based on their recognition by national and international institutions as representative players, who should be included in the system of social dialogue. Such approaches take into account that due to significant structural, institutional and technological barriers (particularly in fragile economies), the formalization of a significant segment of undeclared employment is objectively inaccessible and involves recognition by the national governments and their social partners of the institutional importance of informal employment, at the same time the orientation towards its formalization as a "gold standard" from the point of view of social and economic results [16, p. 26]. One of these approaches, according to the Ex-Secretary of State at Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Germany) Th. Albrecht (now a member of the ILO Global Commission regarding Future Areas of Work), can be provided to all employees, regardless of their contractual relationship or employment status, "universal labour guarantee", which would include the basic rights of workers and a set of basic working conditions. In fact, it is about guaranteeing each worker – both formally and informally – a minimum social standard, which must include a sufficient living wage, restrictions on the length of working time, as well as guarantees for safe and healthy working conditions [17].

The results of current trends analysis in dynamics and the development of employment forms signify a likely strengthening in the future of trends that stimulate the expansion of the informal labour market (Table 2).

Table 2

Prognostic assessment of trends associated with informal employment

№	Current trend (phenomenon)	Estimated dynamics (changes)	Mechanisms of prevention
1	Existing informal self-employment	It will save – with some shifts across branches of industry	Significant increase in formal jobs
2	Existing informal wage employment	It will save – with some shifts across branches of industry	Significant increase in formal jobs
3	Informalization of once-formal wage jobs	It will continue – in current climate of de-regulation & flexibilization of labour	Regulation or reorganization of labor markets
4	New forms of informal wage jobs and / or dependent contractors	There will arise and increase in numbers – with the spread of outsourcing, off-shoring, digital platforms / "gig-economy" (the "free-earning economy")	Regulation of new forms of work
5	Workers displaced by automation	The transition is pushed out by the automation of workers to self-employment in the informal economy – outside the social insurance system in case of unemployment, schemes of guaranteed employment and ensuring occupational safety	The acquisition of new skills by dismissed workers or the acquisition of new occupations

Source: [18, p. 5, 7].

Listed in Table 2 assumptions about trends that potentially expand the scope of undeclared work have given foreign experts the opportunity to reach absolutely tenable conclusions about:

- informal employment is likely to remain the "norm" in the labour market;
- informal workers should not be ignored or stigmatized, but it is worth recognizing and developing mechanisms for their inclusion in social security systems;
- it is advisable for national governments to formulate a relevant policy and legislative framework to target workers in informal employment through social and labour relations and appropriate social protection.

Transformation of the employment sphere under the influence of global trends. Modern trends of global development form a "New Normality" as a sphere of change in the sector of employment, affecting its informal segment. Geopolitical and demographic trends have a significant influence, which determines the dynamics of the number of labour force and labour migration.

But even more attention is being attracted by the current trends of globalization – in particular, connected with the rapid development of the global information network and in general the processes of digitalisation⁴, the reduction of the government role in the management of the national economy and the corresponding strengthening of international management structures, an increase in the global unbalance of economic development and welfare of people. Under the influence of these current trends they are losing, in comparison with the developed countries they are less developed ones, which are also called "the world's periphery" [19, p. 16, 19]. Ukraine's willingness to counter such influences should be demonstrated in order to strengthen the manageability of the employment sector, including informal and adapt it to global time challenges.

The profound consequences that potentially leave the effects of global trends on employment are clearly understood and focused on by the leading international institutions. First of all, this is reflected in the General Assembly's 2015 Global Sustainable Development Report, adopted in 2015. One of Report's seventeen Goals of Sustainable Development, namely Goal 8 is aimed at promoting economic growth, full and productive employment, decent work for all and one of the key indicators of its achievement is the share of informal employment in non-agricultural sectors (in a gender perspective). It is ideologically important that the fundamental principle of this Order, which is binding on all member states of the United Nations, is the principle of "no one left behind", which in particular, implies the inadmissibility of discrimination against people regardless from the employment status which they have [20, p. 3-4].

⁴ According to the definition of the World Bank, digitalisation is the process of forming a system of economic, social and cultural relations based on the use of digital information and communication technologies. In particular, such as the Internet, analysis of large data (Big data), quantum computing, artificial intelligence, neurotechnology and biotechnology, nanomedicine, three-dimensional printing, robotics, wireless technology, blockade (distributed registry systems), virtual and complementary technology reality, etc.



According to the OECD, the work of national governments, business and the public on reaching of the global Sustainable Development Goals already forms a "New Normality" environment. Due to this fact the necessity for appropriate re-thinking of production, employment and consumption increases in order to raise the level of well-being and quality of life of the population [21, p. 11]. In addition, the OECD believes that the current priorities of national government policies should be linked to the potential large-scale transformations in employment caused by demographic change, globalization and digitalisation. Today, approximately 14% of workplaces in OECD countries are highly automated, and another 32% of existing workplaces are likely to be significantly affected by digital technology. This impact also results in a change of the standard forms of employment – self-employed in OECD countries account for almost 16% of the total number of employees, as well as 13% of workers are with temporary employment contracts [22].

Digitalisation promotes the spread of non-standard forms of employment – such as partial, temporary, distance employment or self-employment, as well as new forms of social and labour relations (freelance, crowdsourcing, outstaffing, outsourcing, etc.). In general, it creates new opportunities for hired workers and labour markets, but at the same time generates serious social challenges, including the shadowing of employment (Table 3).

Table 3

Opportunities and challenges of atypical work in the era of digitalisation

Opportunities	Challenges
<i>Labour markets</i>	
Flexible access to work and income opportunities	Non-standard work, small jobs, production micro-tasks
Possible inclusion of marginal groups in labour force	Potential employment model 'race to the bottom' and wage penalty
Low barriers to entry and exit of work	Less amount of employer-sponsored training of workers
<i>Working conditions</i>	
Flexible working hours, availability of digital services	Job insecurity, high unemployment risk
Autonomous work organization	Less or more expensive social protection and benefits
Potentially higher productivity	Potential stress due to self-management and social isolation

Source: [23, p. 36].

According to the authors, one of the serious challenges of atypical work can be its transformation into informal work (for a short period or on an ongoing basis), which requires the timely implementation of appropriate institutional safeguards to prevent this situation.

OECD experts [23] emphasize that in the face of the digitalization of the economy, in addition to greater workplace insecurity, potentially lower earnings

and fewer employer-funded training programs, hired workers with non-standard employment tend to be significantly lower or even a "zero" level of social protection. Consequently, it can be assumed that there is a noticeable limiting effect of the spread of ICT on overcoming of decent work deficit. Firstly, they take into account the effects of digitalisation, such as the growth of unstable and unprotected employment, as well as the reduction of workplaces requiring human presence. However, for the sake of objectivity, we note that today international experts diverge in assessing the impact of digitalisation on the dynamics of workplaces. For example, experts from the World Economic Forum (WEF) consider this influence to be positive and predict that the active introduction of digital technologies will make it possible to achieve a positive balance in the global labour market at the level of 58 million new workplaces in 2023 (75 million "outdated" or unnecessary jobs will disappear, at the same time it will be created 133 million new ones, more adapted to the new realities of employment in the era of digitalisation) [24]. On the other hand, according to McKinsey Global Institute's baseline scenario, as a result of automation and other new technologies, there is a risk of reducing to 375 million hired workers worldwide by the year 2030 (14% of the world's workforce), as well as an increase in middle class erosion in most regions of the world [25, p. 2-4, 17].

The final declaration of the G20 leaders (G20) was adopted on 1 December 2018 in Buenos Aires (Argentina). The special attention was drawn to the need to make every effort to ensure that the future of the field of employment became worthwhile and stable work will be accessible to everyone. This item was the result of the adoption in September 2018 by the ministers of labour and employment of the Group of Twenty of a declaration entitled "Expand the opportunities for building a comprehensive, equitable and sustainable future for the employment sector". This declaration confirmed the commitment to innovative approaches to public policy in the field of training, strengthening social protection and formalizing labour markets in order to provide them with a fairer and more inclusive character, as well as adopting by the "Group of Twenty" (The G20) the Strategy for the Elimination of Child Labour, Compulsory Labour, human trafficking and modern slavery in the world of work [26].

The International Labour Organization has traditionally paid particular attention to the contemporary large-scale transformation of work in the field of employment. To effectively respond to significant transformational changes in employment and production through digitalisation, demographic and climate change the ILO (in 2015) officially launched Global Commission on the Future of Work – one of seven initiatives to commemorate the centennial of the ILO in 2019 [27, p. 1-2]. In the framework of the implementation of this Initiative the ILO set up the Global Commission on the Future of Work in August 2017. The ILO also launched the work of this high-level international body and its aim is national dialogues in more than 110 countries the world to analyze the situation regarding the work sphere transformation, to develop appropriate recommendations and present them as a special report at the International Labour Conference in 2019.



In 2017 Global Commission on Future of Work published an interim report where among other things the attention was also focused on the prediction of informal work dynamics. Experts of the Commission stressed that there is now a steady progress in the transition from informal to formal labour relations but unacceptably slowly. The success of this transition is a key to overcoming the shortage of decent work in developing and developed countries. Therefore, these countries should improve national strategies for economic growth, in order to make them more effective in solving the problems of informal work [28, p. 29-30]. In January 2019 Global Commission on Future of Work presented a "Human-centered Policy on Future of Work" which envisages three main lines of actions that will jointly contribute to economic growth, equity and sustainability for the benefit of present and future generations, namely [29, p. 2-5]:

1. the increase of investments in the development of human abilities;
2. the increase of investments in labour market institutions;
3. the increasing investments in decent and stable employment.

Undoubtedly, such strategic initiatives and approaches of the Global Commission on the Future of Work provide a solid basis for increasing the sustainability of employment in the context of global trends. But there are some problems with finding financial resources and the institutional capacity of national governments for their practical implementation.

Investigating the factors of the latest transformations in the sphere of employment, more and more experts and international organisations allow critical role to play in the processes of digital technology. For example, the experts of the World Economic Forum (WEF) during their meeting in January 2018 urged national governments to formulate comprehensive employment promotion strategies that would help to solve the relevant problems during the Fourth Industrial Revolution. They proposed a systematic approach to solving social and labour problems of digitalisation for the medium-term perspective (2018–2022), based on the following five postulates [30]:

- 1) industry needs a consensus-based approach to managing employment transformations, while each industry needs its own work flow chart to manage such transformations, taking into account differences in technology, business models, consumer markets, etc.;
- 2) enterprises and firms should identify strategies to enhance their competitiveness through human capital assets;
- 3) national governments should intensify their labour market development policies, primarily in terms of supporting programs for retraining their labour force. According to the WEF forecasts, more than 70% of the redundant workers in order to get a job with a higher salary will require a full re-training that lasts at least 2 years;
- 4) politicians and investors should develop a new approach to workplace creation during the Fourth Industrial Revolution;
- 5) all related parties – the state, employers, hired workers – need consensus on the definition and assessment of professional skills that are up-to-date.

Obviously, the strategy proposed by the WEF to solve the problems caused by digitalisation of employment problems is not perfect (in particular, it is focused only on the short-term perspective) but it can well be as the basis for developing appropriate approaches to state policy.

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions expresses extreme concern about the social consequences of the rapid spread of Information and communications technology (ICT), noting that digitalisation has led to the emergence of new business models where many workers will subsequently have to abandon labour contracts and social security, as well as forget about a steady work schedule for which work, family and rest can be balanced. Today lots of enterprises and companies of the digital economy work informally, sometimes they are not legally registered, they pay little or no taxes at all in the country where they receive their profits, and in fact they are not responsible for social and labour relations with their employees. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions agrees that this situation is critically unacceptable for the development of society. Just to minimize the increasing risks of digitalisation it is necessary to conclude a new, social agreement, the important element must become compulsory receiving of any business structures with the hired labour "social license" on activities where social and labour obligations for employees will be fixed [31].

Modern transformations of labour markets as a result of the spread of advanced technologies, including digital, have gained such relevance and scope that the World Bank has devoted this topic to the 2019 World Development Report "The Changing Nature of Work" [32]. The report provides several key points that outline this issue according to World Bank experts. Firstly, new technologies radically change production processes: they make it difficult to review traditional areas of companies, expand global sales and supply chains and change the geographical distribution of workplaces. Secondly, advanced technologies change the skills that are demanded in the labour market, evidenced by the growing demand for cognitive and social behavioral skills, not related to routine work, the demand for related skills is reduced, and the combination of different types of skills are beginning to bring more labour income. Thirdly, the latest wave of technology shifts changes not only the nature of people's work, but also the conditions in which they operate: more and more non-traditional jobs and short-term employment patterns are emerging. Fourthly, the emergence of a new technological level of development does not solve the overwhelming problems, such as informal employment, which in certain developing countries even has a tendency to increase [32, p. 5-9; 23-26; 94-96].

The World Bank notes that in today's transformation of the labour market under the increasing influence of technology it is necessary to have investments in human capital and in particular into the development of lifelong learning process. An integral part of the country's adaptation to these conditions is the strengthening of social protection systems and finding new ways of social support for people, regardless of their employment status. According to the World Bank, national governments must review tax policy – and this problem has long



been over, to ensure that every citizen has the only guaranteed minimum level of social protection [33]. However, it should be noted that this advice is unlikely to be effective in terms of the formalization of illegal employment – because guaranteed social benefits without social and pension insurance systems not only demotivate informal workers, but also create risks for balancing and sustainability of these systems.

Current trends in sector of employment. Transformations caused by the formation of a "New Normality" of socio-economic development, make impact on the *current trends* in the development of employment. The key trends in 2017–2019, according to the ILO survey, were [13, p. 5-10]:

- maintaining a high level of unemployment and a decent work deficit;
- increasing in scaling-up unprotected employment (in the ILO's survey it is represented by self-employed workers and members of their families involved in family work);
- slowdown in the spread of labour poverty.

Thus, the ILO predicts that in the 2018–2019, in the global dimension, the number of unemployed will increase by 1.3 million people, and the unemployment rate will be 5.5% and will be the highest in countries with emerging markets. At the same time, the quantitative coverage of vulnerable groups of employees will increase by 17.4 million people; the level of unprotected employment will increase to 42.7%, and in developing countries, will reach 76.4%. At the same time, the global number of workers covered by moderate poverty will be reduced by 7.8 million people and the level of labour poverty will drop from 15.5 to 15.1%, although in developing countries it will remain at 26.2% (Table 4).

In addition to the mentioned above the ILO review, there are two key global *trends that determine the long-term development* of the employment sector. First – these are the *structural changes* in the labour market (the main factor for the future growth of employment will be workplaces in the service sector, while in agriculture and industry they will continue to decline. As unstable employment prevails in services, this can slow down the deficit of decent work). *The second trend* characterizes *the aging of the population* (potentially can lead to a decrease in labour productivity, handicap the implementation of corrective measures in the labour market, increase the pressure on pension systems) [34]. In the context of the processes of informal work, *the third key trend* should be *the acceleration of labour migration* (in the countries where people move, migrant workers are one of the most numerous categories of informal workers) – according to the ILO, the number of migrant workers in the world increased by 9.3% during 2013–2017, from 150 to 164 million people. The largest concentration nowadays is on three subregions: Northern, Southern and Western Europe (23.9%), North America (23.0%) and Arab countries (13.9%) [35, p. 6, 15].

Table 4

**Global trends in unemployment, unprotected employment and poverty
among employed people in 2017–2019**

The category of countries (economic* / geographical** section)	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019
	%			million people		
Unemployment						
World total	5,6	5,5	5,5	192,7	192,3	193,6
Developed countries	5,7	5,5	5,4	34,1	32,8	32,4
Countries with emerging markets	5,6	5,5	5,5	143,0	143,4	144,6
Developing countries	5,3	5,3	5,3	15,6	16,1	16,6
Countries of Eastern Europe	5,5	5,3	5,1	8,1	7,6	7,3
Vulnerable employment						
World total	42,5	42,6	42,7	1391,3	1409,0	1426,4
Developed countries	10,0	9,9	9,9	56,7	56,5	56,3
Countries with emerging markets	46,2	46,2	46,3	1122,8	1134,0	1144,8
Developing countries	76,5	76,4	76,4	211,8	218,5	225,3
Countries of Eastern Europe	10,6	10,6	10,6	14,6	14,5	14,4
Moderate working poverty						
Developed countries and countries with emerging markets	16,0	15,5	15,1	430,2	421,8	414,0
Countries with emerging markets	14,7	14,1	13,6	357,5	346,9	336,7
Developing countries	26,2	26,2	26,2	72,7	74,9	77,3
Countries of Eastern Europe	0,1***	0,1***	0,1***	0,2***	0,2***	0,2***

Notes: 2017 data are a preliminary estimate, 2018-2019 data are pro forma. The indicators of moderate working poverty characterize the proportion of workers living in households with income per capita at the level of \$1.90 to \$3.10 per day (according to purchasing power parity – PPP); the indicators of extreme poverty – respectively, the share of workers living in households with a per capita income of less than \$ 1.90 per day (according to PPP).

* The distribution of countries is based on the World Bank's classification, given the volume of GNI (Gross National Income) per capita in 2008: the low-income countries (\$975 or less) are classified as developing countries; countries with emerging markets include lower-income countries (between \$976 to \$3855) and higher-income countries (from \$3,856 to \$1,1905); high-income countries (\$ 11,906 or more) are classified as developed countries.

** The Eastern European region includes: Belarus, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Moldova, Poland, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia and Ukraine.

*** Data for the aggregate indicator of extreme and moderate working poverty.

Source: [13, c. 8, 64–65].



Assessing the significance of the above mentioned global trends of current and long-term development of the employment sector for its informal segment, it is worth noting that all of them, with the exception of the trend of reducing labour poverty, "work" on the potential expansion of this segment. Growing unemployment, unprotected employment, labour migration, as well as population aging and industry-specific restructuring of employment in the direction of an increase in services – all these trends create a modern "New Normality" where informal and atypical labour activities actually become an implicit component. This creates appropriate challenges for public policy, especially its social direction, which requires a response from national governments.

Informal and atypical work as a "New Normality" of the socio-economic development of Ukraine. As mentioned above in the survey, the global phenomenon is the establishment of informal and atypical work as characteristic elements of the "New Normality" of social development. Ukraine is not an exception, however, in this case it has its own specificity, which should be taken into account when forming the state employment policy. In our opinion, despite some positive dynamics, the decrease of informally employed population (aged 15-70) in recent years – from 25.1% in 2014 to 21.8% in the first half of 2018 [36, p. 115; 37], – Ukraine has systemic risks for setting up informal work and atypical forms of employment as a "New Normality" of its economic progress. These systemic risks are generally macro-structural and institutional and the main ones are:

- 1) structural degradation of the national economy;
- 2) demographic limitation of the potential of long-term economic growth;
- 3) general institutional weakness and strengthening of destructive institutions;
- 4) high imbalance according to the professional structure of labour supply and demand;
- 5) legislative unregulated non-standard (atypical) forms of employment;
- 6) significant shortage of decent work.

To a wide extent, the existence of the listed systemic risks of the normalization of informal work is due to the fact that in recent years Ukraine has not come close to the European model of development, but acquires the general institutional and structural-organizational features inherent in the theoretical Latin American model. In particular, this model focuses on the exploitation of natural resources, cheap labour, the growth of external borrowings and at the same time is characterized by a weakness of industrial-scientific and technological development, low competitiveness of the economy and its poor quality growth (does not change into social quality), high level corruption and social inequality [38, p. 266]. Unfortunately, this tendency removes Ukraine from European indexes, in particular, the indicators of such countries of the European Union as Slovenia (5% of employees engaged in



informal work), Finland (6.3%), Estonia (6.9%), Sweden (8, 2%), the Czech Republic (9.2%), the Netherlands (9.4%), France (9.8%), Austria (10.0%), Germany (10.2%), Denmark (11.2%) etc. (Table 5).

Table 5

**The level of informal work in general in the economy in Ukraine
and some European countries, 2016**

Eastern Europe		Northern Europe		Southern Europe		Western Europe	
Country	%	Country	%	Country	%	Country	%
Ukraine	22,9*	Denmark	11,2	Spain	27,3	Austria	10,0
Bulgaria	15,9	Estonia	6,9	Slovenia	5,0	Belgium	13,5
Czech Republic	9,2	Finland	6,3	Greece	32,8	France	9,8
Hungary	12,1	Iceland	4,9	Portugal	12,1	Germany	10,2
Moldova	28,9	Lithuania	12,6	Italy	12,0	Netherlands	9,4
Russia	35,9	Ireland	13,5	Malta	8,1	Switzerland	10,4
Slovakia	16,7	Latvia	13,2	Serbia	22,1	Luxembourg	1,2
Poland	38,0	Norway	7,4	Croatia	13,0		
Romania	28,9	Sweden	8,2	Albania	61,0		
		Great Britain	13,6	Bosnia and Herzegovina	30,1		

* Data 2017.

Source: [12, c. 89–90; 37].

Below is a brief description of these system-related factors.

Structural degradation of the national economy. In recent years, significant changes in the structure of industry production and employment have taken place in Ukraine – the "industrial" component is significantly reduced and the "agrarian" (Table 6) is growing.

Table 6

**Separate indicators of structural changes in the Ukrainian economy
during 2010–2017**

Indicator	2010	2017
The share of processing industry in the structure of gross value added (at market prices),%	13,2	12,4
The share of agriculture in the structure of gross value added (at market prices),%	7,4	10,2
The share of the processing industry in the structure of output of goods and services (at market prices),%	31,6	26,9*
The share of agriculture in the structure of output of goods and services (at market prices),%	7,6	12,1*
The share of employed in industry,% of total number of employed	17,1	15,1
The share of employed in agriculture,% of total number of employment	15,2	17,7

* Data 2016.

Source: [39; 40, c. 17–19; 41].



Ukrainian scientists rightly point out that Ukraine today is characterized by a significant structural degradation of the economy, including the rapid decline of industrial production (especially manufacturing, machinery and equipment) and the disproportionate growth of the agrarian sector and food production sector. Ukraine is seriously lagging behind in terms of labour productivity to the developed countries and it causes the inevitable degradation of national competitiveness and is a direct consequence of the long-term ignoring the key factors of modern social and economic development, such as: education, science and innovation [42, p. 82, 108, 130]. Ukrainian employers share the same opinion as Ukrainian scientists, noting that the state has now entered a very negative and dangerous trend of de-industrialization, losing the scientific and technological industries and changing of the national economy into agrarian-raw materials [43]. Finally, this reflects the ominous trend to increase the proportion of such a large industry as agriculture from the standpoint of informal work.

The demographic limitation of the potential of long-term economic growth.

One of the basic conditions for the formalization of illegal employment is to ensure a significant positive balance between the creation and reduction of workplaces. This process takes place only in the context of macroeconomic growth and presupposes an increase the total number of workforce. Today the cardinal demographic barriers have been formed in Ukraine for such a scenario.

As a state with a "life-cycle deficit" according to the definition of the ILO it appears when the number of elderly people increases in comparison with the working age population. Ukraine has the risks of slowing down or ending economic growth in the long run. Indeed, as the population ages, the number of labour force is decreasing and the country will have to rely on labour productivity growth than new labour market participants (although their number may be increased, in particular, by stimulating the flow of labour migrants) [44, p. 37–38].

Unfortunately, labour productivity remains low in Ukraine and the outflow of brain drain has become catastrophic. In fact, this makes it impossible to overcome the "shortage of life cycle", taking into account those negative demographic trends that have emerged in the last three decades. According to the forecast of Ukrainian scholars, the demoeconomic loading (population aged 65 and older in relation to the population aged 15–64) in Ukraine will increase from 22% in 2013 to 45% in 2061. The rate of potential support (the population aged 15–64 in relation to the population aged 65 and older) will respectively decrease from 4.6 to 2.3 [45, p. 33].

General institutional weakness and strengthening of destructive institutes.

A limiting factor for the development of the Ukrainian state is the significant institutional deformation that led to the rooting of so-called destructive institutions (antonyms of development institutes). These destructive institutions are high corruption and politically corrupt business, as well as large shadow economy.

According to the World Bank estimates, dated March 2018, modern Ukraine suffers from "kum's capitalism" – a specific model of economic governance

where the merger of power (politicians) and large business owners ("oligarchs") gives both these groups the opportunity to gain a very significant economic and corrupt rent. According to this model, the state inefficiently distributes resources, restricts competition, increases costs and promotes the growth of social inequality in society. Today in Ukraine, the share of "kum's capitalism" in the economy in terms of employment and turnover is at least 15–20%. If this destructive model is overcome, its economic growth could accelerate by 1–2% [46, p. 2, 11–12].

A significant share of the shadow economy and the weakness of the institutions of the national labour market cause an increase in its shadowing and later it leads to the establishment of a destructive institution of informal work as a "New Normality".

High imbalance in the professional structure of workforce supply and demand. As the practice of many countries proves, undeclared employment is often observed in labour markets with significant disparities in supply and demand by professional groups. Structural surpluses of the workforce in certain professions are a potential source of employment shadowing. The "unnecessary" labour market workers are motivated to replenish the ranks of labour migrants or to find job in another degree field or with worse employment conditions. Chronic imbalances in the professional structure of the Ukrainian labour market should be considered as a risk factor for the spread of undeclared labour relations.

Scientists have argued reasonably: in Ukraine, there are diverse trends of structural changes in supply and demand of workforce according to professional composition. It is due to the lack of efficiency and disadvantages of vocational education systems and long-term socio-economic forecasting, which prevents the training of specialists and workers in line with needs the labour market [47].

Today, the domestic labour market is characterized by a critical level of inconsistency of the professional qualification level of the educational qualifications and the profession occupied. In 2016 in Ukraine, the share of employed, pursuing a profession according to the received diploma was: workers on servicing, operation and control over the work of technological equipment, assembly of equipment – 53.6%; skilled workers with advanced tools – 51.4%; specialists – 39.6%; technical staff – 29.0%; skilled workers in agriculture and forestry, fish breeding and fishing – only 22.0%. At the same time, there is an increase in the imbalances of the Ukrainian labour market: in 2017 compared to 2010, the structural deficit of workers on servicing, operation and control of the work of technological equipment increased by 42.7%, technical staff – by 29.4%, and skilled workers with advanced tools – by 13.0% [47, p. 81–84].

Thus, the structural imbalance in the Ukrainian labour market according to professional composition, as well as a clear tendency for its strengthening in 2010–2017, indicate the risks of employment shadowing which are related to the inadequate use of the vocational and educational potential of employees.



Legislative unregulated non-standard (atypical) forms of employment. An urgent task for the development of the domestic labour market is the legislative definition and regulation of the application of flexible employment, which manifests itself in at least 15 forms of atypical work. Although today in Ukraine different forms of non-standard labour contracts are used, in particular, they are connected with dependent "self-employment", leasing of labour force, agency contract work and other practices of non-standard employment. In the domestic labour legislation there are significant gaps in their regulation. For example, the current Employment Law of Ukraine as one of the measures of active labour market policy (counteraction to unemployment) provides for the use of so-called "other types of temporary work". At the same time, the normative-legal field does not contain a definition of the procedure for such application, in particular, the number and duration of the relevant employment contracts between the employer and the officially registered unemployed. The absence of a legal response of atypical and very atypical forms of employment in Ukraine leads to massive abuses and violations of workers' social and labour rights and their displacement from the official segment of the labour market into informal work.

Significant deficit of decent work. The ILO's 2002 decent work and informal economy resolution clearly demonstrates the necessity to resolve the problems of decent working conditions deficit in the informal economy. The resolution is the basis for a broad strategy by national governments and an appropriate set of measures based on the four principles of the Decent Work Country Programme such as: employment, rights, social dialogue and social protection. The ultimate goal of their implementation is to facilitate the workers engaged in the informal work to the formal economy, gradually directing the informal economy to the official channels of social protection and support [48, p. 3, 11–12]. These tasks still remain relevant in Ukraine (as well as many other countries), which at the same time suffers from a significant deficit in decent work and a high level of informal work. The experts believe that limiting or eliminating the risks of fulfilling the requirements of decent work in Ukraine requires the development and implementation of priority measures of the state policy in the field of the labour market development. These measures are the institutionalization of employment; balanced policies for the creation and preservation of decent workplaces; promotion of entrepreneurship; active opposition to all forms of violation of labour legislation; progressive employment technologies released, etc. [49, p. 157, 162].

Thus, one of the priorities of the national policy of state regulation is the development and implementation of mechanisms for counteracting and minimizing the impact of the six systemic factors outlined above. It causes the transformation of informal and atypical work in Ukraine into a "New Normality" of its socio-economic dynamics.

At the same time, even taking into account the advances in the legalization of informal hired labour, approved by Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated September 5, 2018, No. 649-r "Measures aimed at reducing shadowing relations in the sec-

tor of employment" do not reduce the relevance of tasks for the modernization and development of institutions of the domestic labour market. Due to the concerted actions of the State Employment Service, State Fiscal Service of Ukraine and State Service of Ukraine on Labour more than 1.13 million workers [50] were officially employed in September–October 2018 [50], by 2019 additional UAH 1.3 billion taxes were charged to the budget from former shadow wages [51]. The role and importance of the State Employment Service in eradicating the shadow employment is particularly high, while the attention of State Service of Ukraine on Labour focuses primarily on employment services. In general, this corresponds to the practice of the European Union, which focuses exclusively on the employment of the population at official workplaces, especially only 8% of all official vacancies are into the employment services in the EU (between 5 to 20% between participating countries) [52].

Conclusions

Summarizing all the above mentioned, one should note the scientific and practical significance of the category of the "New Normality" which is considered in a narrow and wide interpretation. In a narrow interpretation, it characterizes the specifics of the development of the western industrialized countries after the global financial crisis of 2009–2010. In a broad interpretation "New Normality" reflects new phenomena, factors and institutional norms in the socio-economic sphere, including employment, due to modern trends of global development. At the same time, in the economic discourse of informal work problems the category of "New Normality" is used in two meanings: first, it describes informal employment as a new objective norm (in the sense of a characteristic, quite common, established phenomenon) of present and future; secondly, the transformation of the sphere of employment, for example, undeclared employment, in the process of creating a "New Normality" under the influence of demographic changes, globalization, digitalisation and other global trends.

The profound effects that will influence on global employment trends are clearly understood and are on the agenda of leading international institutions. For example, in the final declaration of the Group of Twenty (The G20) which was adopted on 1 December 2018 in Buenos Aires was mentioned about the need to make every effort to ensure that the future of the employment sector becomes such that decent and stable work is accessible to everybody. The International Labour Organization has officially launched the Century Initiative on the future of the workforce in 2015 in order to respond effectively to significant transformational changes in employment and production, through exposure to digitalization, demographic and climate change.

Today we can state that informal and atypical work actually became an element of the "New Normality" of the socio-economic development of Ukraine. The share of the informally employed population (aged 15–70) decreased in recent years – from 25.1% in 2014 to 21.8% in the first half of 2018. Despite this positive dynamics there are systemic risks in Ukraine informal and atypical work



as a "New Normality" such as: structural degradation of the national economy; demographic limitation of the potential long-term economic growth; general institutional weakness and strengthening of destructive institutions; high imbalance in the professional structure of labour supply and demand; legislative unregulated non-standard (atypical) forms of employment; significant shortage of decent work. To a large extent, the presence of the above mentioned systemic risks is due to the fact that in recent years Ukraine has acquired the general institutional and structural-organizational features that are inherent in a non-European and Latin American conditional development model. One of the national policy priorities of state regulation is the development and implementation of mechanisms for counteracting and minimizing the impact of the six systemic factors that characterizes the actual preservation of informal and unregulated atypical work in Ukraine as a "New Normality" of its socio-economic progress. The lack of such an approach will further exacerbate the existing challenges for Ukraine's labour market as a whole, retain significant risks for the loss of the country's labour potential, as well as financial instability and further deformation of the social welfare system of the population.

References

1. Krumplytem, J., Samulevicius, J. (2010). Complex Research on Undeclared Work: Theoretical Aspects and Empirical Application in Lithuania. *Engineering Economics*, 21(3), 283-294.
2. 17th International Conference of Labor Statisticians (ICLS) (2003). Recommendations on the statistical definition of informal employment. Retrieved from www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/download/guidelines/russian/defempl.pdf [in Russian].
3. State Statistics Service of Ukraine (2019). Employment and unemployment. Methodological explanations. Retrieved from <http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/> [in Ukrainian].
4. Revision of the 15th ICLS resolution concerning statistics of employment in the informal sector and the 17th ICLS guidelines regarding the statistical definition of informal employment. ICLS/20/2018/Room document 17 (2018, October 10-19). Geneva, 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians.
5. European Platform Undeclared Work (2019). Key Results and Achievements of the European Platform Tackling Undeclared Work: 2017-2018.
6. European Commission (1998, April 7). Communication from the Commission "On undeclared work". COM (1998) 219 final. Commission of the European Communities.
7. El-Erian, M.A. (2010, October 10). Navigating the New Normality in Industrial Countries (Per Jacobsson Foundation Lecture). International Monetary Fund. Retrieved from <https://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2015/09/28/04/53/sp101010>
8. Enste, D.H. (2018, November). The shadow economy in industrial countries. *IZA World of Labor*. Bonn: Institute of Labor Economics (IZA).

9. Benjamin, N., Beegle, K., Recanatini, F., Santini, M. (2014, May). Informal Economy and the World Bank. *World Bank' Policy Research Working Paper*, 6888.
10. Jutting, J., de Laiglesia, J. (Eds.) (2009). *Is Informal Normal? Towards More and Better Jobs in Developing Countries*. OECD Development Centre. Paris: OECD.
11. OECD (2009, April, 8). Rising informal employment will increase poverty. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/development/risinginformalemploymentwillincreasepoverty.htm>
12. ILO (2018a). *Women and Men in the Informal Economy: a Statistical Picture* (third edition). Geneva: International Labour Office.
13. ILO (2018b). *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2018*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
14. Rani, U. (2017, November 10-12). Old and New Forms of Informal Labour. Paper presented at the WIEGO 20th Anniversary Research Conference on "Informal Economy". USA, Harvard University.
15. Tawab, G.A. (2017, June 21). Informal is the new normal: Why informal employment is here to stay. Ford Foundation Center for Social Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.fordfoundation.org/ideas/equals-change-blog/posts/informal-is-the-new-normal-why-informal-employment-is-here-to-stay/>
16. Stuart, E., Samman, E., Hunt, A. (2018, January). Informal is the new normal. Improving the lives of workers at risk of being left behind. *Overseas Development Institute' Working Paper*, 530. London: Overseas Development Institute.
17. Albrecht, Th. (2019, January 22). A human-centred agenda for the future of work. Retrieved from <https://www.socialeurope.eu/author/thorben-albrecht>
18. Chen, M. (2018, October 18). The Future of Informal Work, the Future of Statistics on Informal Work. WIEGO Network Harvard University. ILO High-Level Panel on the Future of Work at the 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians.
19. Vedernikova, S.V. (2017). Modern trends of globalization. *Problemy systemnoho pidkhodu v ekonomitsi – Problems of a systemic approach in economics*, 5(61), 16-22 [in Ukrainian].
20. UNDP (2018, July). What does it mean to leave no one behind? A UNDP discussion paper and framework for implementation.
21. OECD, UN Environment (2018, May 3-4). The New Normal. An expert dialogue on shaping decisions, attitudes and behaviour to achieve Sustainable Development Goals. Key messages and summary of discussion.
22. OECD (2018). OECD Social Policy Forum: The Future of Social Policy. Remarks by Angel Gurría, OECD Secretary-General on 14 May 2018, Montreal, Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/about/secretary-general/oecd-social-policy-forum-future-of-social-policy-canada-may-2018.htm>
23. OECD (2016, May). New Forms of Work in the Digital Economy. 2016 Ministerial Meeting on the Digital Economy. Technical Report. *OECD Digital Economy Papers*, 260



24. World Economic Forum (2018, September 17). Machines will do more tasks than humans by 2025 but Robot Revolution will still create 58 million net new jobs in next five years. Retrieved from <http://reports.weforum.org/future-of-jobs-2018/press-releases/>
25. McKinsey Global Institute (2017, December). Jobs Lost, Jobs Gained: Workforce Transitions in a Time of Automation.
26. Decent Work Technical Support Group and ILO Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia (2018). G20 Summit: Declaration of Heads of State and Government: to build the future of the world of work, thinking first and foremost about people. Press release dated December 1, 2018. Retrieved from https://www.ilo.org/moscow/news/WCMS_652197/lang--ru/index.htm [in Russian].
27. International Labor Office (2015). Initiative of the century concerning the future of the world of work. Report by ILO Director-General G. Ryder. International Labor Conference, 104th Session. Geneva [in Russian].
28. ILO (2017). Future of Work. Inception Report for the Global Commission. Geneva.
29. ILO (2019). Working for a better future is the Global Commission on the Future of the World of Work. Resume [in Russian].
30. Zahidi, S. (2018, September 17). Here are 5 Ways for Workers to win in the Robot Age. World Economic Forum. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/09/ways-to-win-as-a-worker-in-the-robot-age>
31. Burrow, Sh. (2018, November 16). Globalization 4.0 must build a better world for working people. International Trade Union Confederation. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/globalization-must-build-better-world-working-people/>
32. World Bank (2018a). World Development Report 2019: The Changing Nature of Work. 139 pp.
33. World Bank (2018b). The jobs of tomorrow require more investment in people. Press release number 2019/052 / DEC of October 11, 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.vsemirnyjbank.org/.../jobs-of-the-future-require-more-investment-in-people> [in Russian].
34. ILO (2018, January 22). Unemployment and decent work deficits in 2018 will remain high, according to the ILO. Retrieved from https://www.ilo.org/moscow/news/WCMS_616001/lang--ru/index.htm [in Russian].
35. ILO (2018). ILO Global Estimates on International Migrant Workers – Results and Methodology. 2nd ed. (reference year 2017). Geneva.
36. State Statistics Service of Ukraine (2015). Economic activity of the population of Ukraine - 2014 [in Ukrainian].
37. State Statistics Service of Ukraine (2018a). Unofficially employed population by sex, place of residence and employment status. Retrieved from <http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/> [in Ukrainian].
38. Kudrov, V.M. (2011). International economic comparisons and problems of innovative development. Moscow: Justicinform [in Russian].



39. State Statistics Service of Ukraine (2018b). Statistical Yearbook of Ukraine for 2017 [in Ukrainian].
40. State Statistics Service of Ukraine (2018c). Quarterly calculations of gross domestic product of Ukraine for 2010-2017 years [in Ukrainian].
41. State Statistics Service of Ukraine (2019). Gross domestic product by production method and gross value added by types of economic activity (2010-2016). Retrieved from <http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/> [in Ukrainian].

Received 24.01.19

Костриця, Василь Іванович

професор кафедри управління персоналом та економіки праці
Інститут підготовки кадрів державної служби зайнятості України
вул. Нововокзальна, 17, Київ, 03038
kostrytsya2@gmail.com

Бурлай, Тетяна Вікторівна

канд. екон. наук, старший науковий співробітник
ДУ "Інститут економіки та прогнозування НАН України"
вул. Панаса Мирного, 26, Київ, 01011
btv2008@ukr.net

**НЕФОРМАЛЬНА ТА АТИПОВА ЗАЙНЯТІСТЬ
ЯК "НОВА НОРМАЛЬНІСТЬ" У СВІТІ ТА УКРАЇНІ**

Охарактеризовано сучасне розуміння категорії "нової нормальності" у сфері зайнятості, у тому числі неформальної. Розглянуто два значення категорії "нова нормальність" в економічному дискурсі проблем неформальної зайнятості: перше характеризує неформальну зайнятість як нову об'єктивну норму (як характерне, широко поширене, стійке явище) сьогодення і майбутнього; другий відображає трансформацію сфери зайнятості, в тому числі недекларованої, у процесі створення "нової нормальності" під впливом демографічних змін, глобалізації, цифровізації та інших глобальних трендів. Проаналізовано основні глобальні тенденції, що сприяють унормуванню неформальної та атипової зайнятості у сучасному макроекономічному розвитку, особливу увагу приділено тренду цифровізації та основним соціальним викликам унаслідок його поширення, насамперед звуження регуляторного поля соціально-трудова відносин, зростання безробіття, поширення неформальної зайнятості. Встановлено чинники, які обумовлюють неформальну трудову діяльність як нову норму функціонування глобального ринку праці. Обґрунтовано ключові системні ризики перетворення неформальної зайнятості на "нову нормальність" соціально-економічного розвитку України, а саме такі: структурна деградація національної економіки; демографічна обмеженість потенціалу довгострокового економічного зростання; загальна інституційна слабкість і посилення інститутів деструкції; висока розбалансованість за



професійною структурою попиту та пропозиції робочої сили; законодавча неврегульованість нестандартних (атипових) форм зайнятості; значний дефіцит гідної праці. Зазначено, що одним із пріоритетних завдань вітчизняної політики державного регулювання постає розроблення механізмів протидії і мінімізації впливу охарактеризованих шести системних чинників, який веде до перетворення неформальної та атипової зайнятості в Україні на "нову нормальність" її соціально-економічного поступу.

Ключові слова: *"нова нормальність", неформальна зайнятість, атипова зайнятість, державна політика зайнятості, системні ризики, Україна*

Кострица, Василий Иванович

профессор кафедры управления персоналом и экономики труда
Институт подготовки кадров государственной службы занятости Украины
ул. Нововокзальная, 17, Киев, 03038
kostrytsya2@gmail.com

Бурлай, Татьяна Викторовна

канд. экон. наук, старший научный сотрудник
ГУ "Институт экономики и прогнозирования НАН Украины"
ул. Панаса Мирного, 26, Киев, 01011
btv2008@ukr.net

**НЕФОРМАЛЬНАЯ И АТИПИЧНАЯ ЗАНЯТОСТЬ
КАК "НОВАЯ НОРМАЛЬНОСТЬ" В МИРЕ И УКРАИНЕ**

Охарактеризовано современное понимание категории "новой нормальности" в сфере занятости, в том числе неформальной. Рассматриваются два значения категории "новая нормальность" в экономическом дискурсе проблем неформальной занятости: первое характеризует неформальную занятость как новую объективную норму (как характерное, широко распространенное, устойчивое явление) настоящего и будущего; второе отображает трансформацию сферы занятости, в том числе недеklarированной, в процессе создания "новой нормальности" под влиянием демографических изменений, глобализации, цифровизации и других глобальных трендов. Проанализированы основные глобальные тенденции, способствующие унормированию неформальной и атипичной занятости в современном макроэкономическом развитии. Особое внимание уделено тренду цифровизации и значительным социальным вызовам вследствие его распространения, прежде всего сужению регуляторного поля социально-трудовых отношений, росту безработицы, распространению неформальной занятости. Установлены факторы, которые обуславливают неформальную трудовую деятельность как новую норму функционирования глобального рынка труда. Обоснованы ключевые систем-

ные риски трансформации неформальной и атипичной занятости в "новую нормальность" социально-экономического развития Украины, а именно такие, как: структурная деградация национальной экономики; демографическая ограниченность потенциала долгосрочного экономического роста; общая институциональная слабость и усиление институтов деструкции; высокая разбалансированность по профессиональной структуре спроса и предложения рабочей силы; законодательная неурегулированность нестандартных (атипичных) форм занятости; значительный дефицит достойного труда. Акцентируется, что одной из приоритетных задач отечественной политики государственного регулирования является разработка механизмов противодействия и минимизации влияния охарактеризованных шести системных факторов, которое ведет к становлению неформальной и атипичной занятости в Украине как "новой нормальности" ее социально-экономического продвижения.

Ключевые слова: "новая нормальность", неформальная занятость, атипичная занятость, государственная политика занятости, системные риски, Украина