

New Forms of Employment as an Obstacle for Human Development

Author Details: Bogatyreva Marina Ruslanovna,

Ph.D., Associate Professor of the Department- "Sociology of Labor and Economics of Entrepreneurship"
FSBEI of HE "Bashkir State University"

Abstract: *This article presents an analysis of new forms of employment of the population, which have recently appeared and radically change the content of labor and the forms of labor relations. Flexible forms of employment and labor relations objectively create prerequisites for reducing the social security of workers and the failure of social efficiency. This problem is particularly acute given the lagging of the institutional infrastructure of the labor market from the real state and movement of social and labor relations, as well as the underdevelopment of the social responsibility of business as a characteristic feature of a mature social market economy. Thus, barriers to human development are possible*

Keywords: *employment, labor resources, human development, new forms of employment, labor market.*

Introduction

From the point of view of the concept of human development, new forms of employment are of interest not only for quantitative analysis of trends in employment and its alternatives - unemployment, and unemployment. New forms and types of employment that have recently appeared and radically change the content of labor and the forms of labor relations need a qualitative analysis.

The extent to which these new forms of work approach the concept of decent work, regardless of whether they contribute to the achievement of the goals of the concept of human development, is the subject of future fundamental research. At the same time, today, on the basis of the work of domestic economists, it is already possible to draw conclusions about the state and trends of employment development in Russia [3].

Studying the processes of formation and manifestation of the objective dependence of the concept of decent work and human development on employment in the realities of modern Russia suggests the following logic: an assessment of the extent of the spread of new forms of employment in Russia, with particular attention to non-standard, distant, secondary employment, borrowing and identifying the causes, benefits and problem areas of these types of employment. In the modern Russian economy, the objective need to bridge the gap of economic relations, the formation of new forms of economic activity, taking into account the main market criterion - economic efficiency - has led to the emergence and widespread of such new forms of employment and, accordingly, labor relations, such as informal employment, remote employment, borrowed labor, secondary employment, etc., while the ratio of "economic" and "social" aspects of labor relations remains practical Ski studied.

For each of these new types of employment there are a number of reasons and prerequisites, sometimes quite diverse. For example, informal labor relations are often explained by the desire to evade taxes, since new forms of information technology are needed for employment, and secondary employment requires that an employee have time and energy for additional employment, etc. But, in general, the development of these flexible forms of employment has one fundamental theoretical explanation: flexibility of labor regimes, forms of participation in labor relations, non-standard jobs initially become economically beneficial for both the employee and the employer. The employee is given the opportunity of a more rational combination of employment with other types of activity - study, work in the family and leisure. In the new environment, an employer can flexibly regulate the number of employees, the intensity of the workload, and labor costs. In this sense, it can be assumed that the possibilities of human development using new forms of employment acquire a new impetus for their realization [4].

However, practice shows that flexible forms of employment and labor relations objectively create prerequisites for reducing the social security of workers and the failure of social efficiency. This problem is particularly acute in the conditions of the lagging of the institutional infrastructure of the labor market (laws and norms) from the real state and movement of social and labor relations, as well as the underdevelopment of social responsibility of business as a characteristic feature of a mature social market economy. Thus, there may be obstacles to human development.

The study of new non-standard types of employment is complicated by the absence or insufficiency of official statistics on non-permanent employees, part-time workers, remote workplaces, part-time workers,

the second time, unpaid family workers working in private farms, as well as temporarily laid-off workers, employees, employees on forced leave, initiated by employers, desperate workers, and so-called other groups “weakly associated with the labor market.” The problems associated with the classification of all the various forms and manifestations of employment, as well as the difficulties in taking into account non-standard types of employment, have led to the emergence of many alternative estimates of the level of employment that are expanding and enrich the modern understanding of the state of the Russian labor market.

In studies [2,5] various types of non-standard work were presented, which showed that the transitional Russian economy started from a very low level of non-permanent jobs, but then the number of temporary workers grew rapidly and now their share is more than 10% of the total number of employees. The sharp jump that occurred in 2003–2004 was attributed to the adoption of the new Labor Code, which expanded the possibilities of using urgent employment. The underemployment rate in the Russian economy, according to V.Y. and Kapelyushnikova R.I. was and remains more than modest - less than 2%. Not so many “working” workers are employed in it (with a normal working time of fewer than 30 hours per week) - 3%. It is interesting to note that with the beginning of the ascent, both part-time and “low employment” began to decline rapidly, which indicates their mainly forced nature. Excessive employment is workers who work at the standard 40 hours per week. Based on the data on the duration of the usual week, we can conclude that the level of over-employment in the Russian economy is extremely low - about 1.5%. However, the data on the duration of the actual working week does not confirm this: it follows from this that at present approximately one in ten Russian workers can be classified as a superuser.

Separate studies allow us to track the dynamics of such types of employment as casual employment, based on data from the RLMS and a number of other sources. Casual workers [1,6] make up a fairly significant proportion of people working in Russia. In 2000, the share of persons who were engaged in one-time part-time or temporary work was 15%, and in 2015 it reached 32%. In Russia, the share of those who are inadvertently busy gradually increased, as during the economic crisis, amid a decline in permanent employment, and in a period of improving the economic situation, when there was an increase in permanent employment, the growth in casual employment did not stop. Temporary and casual employment, initiated by the employer, is undoubtedly aimed at increasing economic efficiency, for example, by optimizing the number of employees. At the same time, issues of social protection of temporary or casual workers remain unresolved for a number of reasons, among which the leading place is taken by the imperfection of the legislation and the lack of control over its implementation. As a rule, with these types of employment, wages are disproportionately reduced, as employees lose the traditional Russian additional payments at the end of the quarter, half year, year, these employees are not subject to surcharges, bonuses, bonuses, options. In addition, such employees are not involved in professional development, advanced training programs, they are not provided with additional insurance premiums, etc.

All of the above confirms once again that in terms of human development, these types of employment cannot be unambiguously assessed without additional basic research.

References

- i. Bandyukova TS *Random employment in Russia: size, composition, mobility // Problems of the labor market* 2004. M.: ГY BИИЭ. 67c. (Electronic resource) URL: http://new.hse.ru/sites/infospace/podrazd/WP3_2004_05.pdf (date of the application 27.10.2018).
- ii. Gimpelson V.E., Kapelyushnikov R.I. *Precarious work and the Russian labor market // M.: ГY BИИЭ. 2005. 36 c. [Electronic resource] URL: [http:// new. hse.ru/ sites/infospace/podrazd/uvp/id/ preprints/ DocLib/WP3_2005_05.pdf](http://new.hse.ru/sites/infospace/podrazd/uvp/id/preprints/DocLib/WP3_2005_05.pdf) (date of the application 29.10.2018).*
- iii. Kolesov V.P. *Human development: a new dimension of socio-economic progress* 2008 [Electronic resource] - URL: [http:// https://economy-ru.com/ekonomicheskaya-istoriya-rf/novyye-formyi-zanyatosti-chelovecheskoe-41204.html](http://https://economy-ru.com/ekonomicheskaya-istoriya-rf/novyye-formyi-zanyatosti-chelovecheskoe-41204.html) (date of the application 28.10.2018).
- iv. Kolosova R.P., Kamalova Yu.F. *The state as a subject of the electronic labor market. Bulletin of the Voronezh State University // Economics and Management, 2003., № 1, 53c.*
- v. Linda McDowell Susan Christopherson *Transforming work: new forms of employment and their regulation Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, Volume 2, Issue 3, 1 November 2009, Pages 335–342, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsp024>*
- vi. Paul Schoukens, Alberto Barrio, *The changing concept of work: When does typical work become atypical? European Labour Law Journal / First Published December 19, 2017 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2031952517743871>*