5. EUROPEAN PERFORMANCES REGARDING FLEXICURITY IN THE NEW MEMBER STATES AND THEIR REGIONS[1]

Mihaela-Nona CHILIAN[2]
Lucian-Liviu ALBU[3]
Marioara IORDAN[4]

Abstract

In 2005, the revised Lisbon Strategy decided upon an integrated program of policy reforms envisaging the labor market in the context of globalization, demographic changes and fast technological progress, transposed into integrated guidelines. Such reforms aimed at increasing the employment rates, at improving work quality and labor productivity and social and territorial cohesion; in other words, at updating and upgrading the European labor markets. In order to reach such aims, the flexicurity concept was considered and employed as a key strategic framework.

Flexicurity itself may be defined as an integrated strategy aiming to improve both the labor market flexibility and job security, implying successful switching between educational system and labor market, between jobs, between unemployment and inactivity and employment, and between job and retirement.

We propose a possible assessment of the performances of the flexicurity policies by using certain composite indicators that allow for a multidimensional appraisal of flexicurity in the EU countries, providing also elements for comparison between the EU countries and regions (especially the New Member States and their regions).

Keywords: labor market, flexicurity, composite indices, New Member States

JEL Classification: J08, J20, R23, R28

Introduction

In 2005, the revised Lisbon Strategy decided upon an integrated program of policy reforms envisaging the labor market in the context of globalization, demographic changes and fast technological progress, transposed into integrated guidelines. Such reforms aimed at increasing the employment rates, at improving work quality and labor productivity and social and territorial cohesion; in other words, at updating and upgrading the European labor markets. In order to reach such aims, the flexicurity concept was considered and employed as a key strategic framework. However, the worsening economic conditions throughout Europe during the economic crisis threatened the future of flexicurity policy, due to governments' dwindling trust in flexible labor markets and to the enormous pressures upon the social welfare systems[5].

In the current paper, we present a possible way to assess the flexicurity performance by using certain composite indicators that allow for a multidimensional appraisal of flexicurity in the EU countries, providing also elements for comparison between the EU countries and regions (especially the New Member States and their regions).

1. Flexicurity Definitions

Flexicurity was initially described by the Dutch scholar Ton Wilthagen as "a policy strategy that attempts, synchronically and in a deliberate way, to enhance the flexibility of labor markets, work organization and labor relations, on the one hand, and to enhance security – employment security and social security – notably for weaker groups in and outside the labor market, on the other hand"[6]. Its objective was thus considered to combine employment and income security with flexible labor markets, work organization and labor relations, and the key principles that underpin a flexicurity strategy were that flexibility and security should not be seen as opposites, but could be made mutually supportive[7]. Later on, Wilthagen developed a more complex definition, which included also aspects of gradual development of flexicurity: "Flexicurity is (1) a degree of job, employment, income and 'combination' security that facilitates the labour market careers and biographies of workers with a relatively weak position and allows for enduring and high quality labour market participation and social inclusion, while at the same time providing (2) a degree of numerical (both external and internal), functional and wage flexibility that allows for labour markets' (and individual companies') timely and adequate adjustment to changing conditions in order

---

[5] André Sapir (Ed.), *Bruegel Memos to the New Commission, Europe's economic priorities 2010-2015*, Bruegel, Brussels, 2009.

[6] Per Kongshøj Madsen, *A new perspective on labour markets and welfare states in Europe*, CARMA Research Paper 2006:03, Centre for Labour Market Research Aalborg University, Denmark and *Flexicurity pathways. Turning hurdles into stepping stones*, Report by the European Expert Group on Flexicurity, EC, June 2007.

[7] *Flexicurity pathways. Turning hurdles into stepping stones*, Report by the European Expert Group on Flexicurity, EC, June 2007.

to enhance competitiveness and productivity"[8]. Thus, Wilthagen selected four forms for flexibility and four forms for security to be included in the flexicurity analysis (arranged in the so-called flexicurity matrix): i) flexibility: numerical-external (hiring and firing), numerical-internal (working time flexibility), functional-internal (employability) and wage flexibility and ii) security: job security, work security, income security (social security) and combination security (work and care)[9].

Acquiring experience from previous work, the European Commission and the Member States, have reached a consensus on an *operational concept of flexicurity,* which comprises four components[10]: i) *flexible and reliable contractual arrangements and work organizations,* both from the perspective of the employer and the employee, through modern labor laws and modern work organizations; ii) e*ffective Active Labor Market Policies (ALMPs),* which effectively help people to cope with rapid change, unemployment spells, reintegration and, importantly, transitions to new jobs; *comprehensive, reliable and responsive lifelong learning (LLL) systems* to ensure the continuous adaptability and employability of all workers, and to enable firms to keep up productivity levels; and iv) *modern social security systems,* which provide adequate income support and facilitate labor market mobility.

2. Methods to Assess Flexicurity

Over time, based on practical experience and the flexicurity literature, different methods to assess the evolution of the two broad dimensions of flexicurity and the effectiveness of the policies derived from the above-mentioned components, were developed and indicators and groups of indicators were built for such purpose[11].

---

[8] *Taken from Per Kongshøj Madsen,* A new perspective on labour markets and welfare states in Europe*, CARMA Research Paper 2006:03, Centre for Labour Market Research Aalborg University, Denmark.*

[9] *Fabio Bertozzi, Giuliano Bonoli,* Measuring Flexicurity at the Macro Level: Conceptual and Data Availability Challenges*, Working Papers on the Reconciliation of Work and Welfare in Europe 10/2009, RECWOWE Publications, Edinburgh, UK, 2009 and Ton Wilthagen,* Flexicurity in the crisis: The case of short-time working arrangements*, European Employment Observatory, Occasional Workshop on Short-Time Working Arrangements, 13 January 2010.*

[10] *Towards Common Principles of Flexicurity: More and Better Jobs through Flexibility and Security*, European Commission, 2007, *Flexicurity pathways. Turning hurdles into stepping stones*, Report by the European Expert Group on Flexicurity, EC, June 2007.

[11] See L. Frey, A. Janovskaia, G. Pappada, *The concept of flexicurity: Southern and East European Countries compared*, 5th International Research Conference on Social Security "Social security and the labour market: A mismatch?"Warsaw, 5-7 March 2007, *Monitoring and analysis of flexicurity policies*, EMCO Reports, ISSUE 2/July 2009, Iain Begg, Christine Erhel and Jørgen Mortensen, *Medium-term Employment Challenges*, CEPS Special Report, January 2010, Andranik Tangian (Tanguiane), *Six families of flexicurity indicators developed at the Hans Boeckler Foundation*, WSI – Diskussionspapier Nr. 168 November 2009 Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftliches Institut in der Hans Böckler Stiftung , Hans-Böckler-Str. 39, 40476 Düsseldorf, Fabio Bertozzi, Giuliano Bonoli, *Measuring Flexicurity at the Macro Level: Conceptual and Data*

The most used indicator to assess the *flexibility of employment relations* is the *employment protection legislation index* developed by the OECD, which measures three dimensions: difficulty of dismissal, notice and severance pay, and regular procedural inconveniences. The EPL indicator is measured on the scale 1 to 5 with higher values corresponding to a higher degree of protection (Table 1).

Table 1

Country ranking according to the EPL index

Rank	Country	Protection of permanent employees against individual dismissals	Regulation of temporary employment	Specific regulations for collective dismissals	Total
1	United Kingdom	0.46	0.17	0.48	1.11
2	Ireland	0.67	0.25	0.40	1.32
3	Hungary	0.79	0.46	0.48	1.73
4	Denmark	0.63	0.58	0.65	1.86
5	Czech Republic	1.38	0.21	0.35	1.94
6	Slovakia	1.46	0.17	0.42	2.05
7	Finland	0.92	0.79	0.43	2.14
8	Poland	0.92	0.54	0.68	2.14
9	Austria	1.00	0.63	0.55	2.18
10	Netherlands	1.29	0.50	0.50	2.29
11	Italy	0.75	0.88	0.82	2.45
12	Belgium	0.71	1.08	0.68	2.47
13	Germany	1.13	0.75	0.63	2.51
14	Sweden	1.21	0.67	0.75	2.63
15	Romania	0.83	1.20	0.73	2.80
16	France	1.04	1.50	0.35	2.89
17	Greece	1.00	1.38	0.55	2.93
18	Spain	1.08	1.46	0.52	3.06
19	Portugal	1.79	1.17	0.60	3.56

Source: V. Ciucă, D. Paşnicu (coord.), Flexibilitate şi securitate pe piaţa românească a muncii, Editura Agora, Bucureşti, 2009.

The data show that a more flexible employment regulation was a feature of countries such as the United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark, while a more rigid legislation was a feature of countries from the South of Europe (France, Greece, Spain, and Portugal). The New Member States (NMS) were characterized by broad differences regarding employment regulation rigidity: from more flexible rules in Hungary and the Czech Republic to more rigid ones in Romania. However, analyzing by components, one may notice that the highest differences among countries were induced by the

Availability Challenges, Working Papers on the Reconciliation of Work and Welfare in Europe 10/2009, RECWOWE Publications, Edinburgh, UK, 2009.

regulation of temporary employment, and the lowest by the regulation for collective dismissals.

An index that also measures the regulation of employment on the basis of difficulty of hiring and firing workers and the rigidity of working hours is the *rigidity of employment index*, developed by the World Bank. Its values range from 0 (less rigid) to 100 (more rigid). In the case of the European Union countries (Table 2), similar discrepancies were revealed among the "Anglo-Saxon group" (the United Kingdom and Ireland, plus Denmark), the "Southern group" (Spain, Greece, Portugal, plus Romania) and the "Continental group" (Germany, France, Netherlands and Luxembourg), and also wide differences among the NMS: less rigid regulations in the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Slovak Republic and Poland and more rigid ones in Latvia, Romania, Estonia and Slovenia.

Table 2

Rigidity of Employment Index for the EU Countries

Country	2008	2009
Austria	24	24
Belgium	17	17
Bulgaria	19	19
Cyprus	24	24
Czech Republic	11	11
Denmark	**7**	**7**
Estonia	51	51
Finland	41	41
France	52	52
Germany	42	42
Greece	47	50
Hungary	22	22
Ireland	10	10
Italy	38	38
Latvia	43	43
Lithuania	38	38
Luxembourg	*56*	*56*
Netherlands	42	42
Poland	25	25
Portugal	43	43
Romania	46	46
Slovak Republic	22	22
Slovenia	54	54
Spain	49	49
Sweden	38	38
United Kingdom	10	10
UE27	33.7	33.8

Source: World Bank Data Base.

One well-known group of flexicurity indicators is that developed by EMCO, based on a three-element framework: i) *inputs* (quantitative assessments of rules and regulations that, however, must be interpreted with caution, since some relevant information will always be excluded from such a numerical value); ii) *processes* (the shares of particular groups of persons affected by or participating in policy measures; the indicators will thus show and measure the extent to which policy measures are being implemented) and iii) *outputs* (that should be identified for the four components of flexibility). Both the flexibility and the security aspects should be taken into account when defining indicators, if possible flexibility and security aspects for each component. However, the opinion was that it was not appropriate to measure *general outcomes of flexicurity*, since the outcome indicates the broader results achieved after implementation of several policies. Also, it was not advisedable to use a *composite indicator* that included all four dimensions, considered as inappropriate for monitoring the complex issue of flexicurity[12].

However, *composite indicators* were widely used to assess flexicurity (see, for instance, Begg *et al.*, 2010; Tangian, 2009, Ciuca and Pasnicu, 2008; Maselli, 2010); as advantages being cited the easily accessible overall estimate of the level of achievements in this field and the fact that such an indicator facilitates quantitative and econometric analysis of the correlations, both within the set of chosen indicators and between the composite indicator and other indicators of economic performance[13].

In the following, we shall employ a similar methodology, based on the inputs-processes-outputs framework, but using data available at regional level. Though flexicurity is indeed most relevant for the national policies and strategies (not only in what regards the labor market), certain aspects revealed by such an analysis might prove quite useful, especially in the current economic context and considering the serious threats to flexicurity, both as concept and as viable long-term strategy in the EU.

- Following the EMCO approach[14] and considering the available data[15], we decided upon using only *process* indicators as components of the composite index. The chosen indicators were:
- *Share of part-time employment in total employment* – for assessing contractual arrangements and working time arrangements;
- *Participation in lifelong learning* – for assessing the lifelong learning systems;

---

[12] A composite indicator needs to be "decomposed" in order to understand and interpret the results. However, it was considered that, on longer term, a composite indicator or composite indicators for each of the components might be useful at least for analysis with the aim to summarize large quantities of information - *Monitoring and Analysis of Flexicurity Policies*, EMCO Reports, Issue 2/July 2009.

[13] *Iain Begg, Christine Erhel and Jørgen Mortensen,* Medium-term Employment Challenges*, CEPS Special Report, January 2010.*

[14] See *Monitoring and analysis of Flexicurity policies*, EMCO Reports, ISSUE 2/July 2009 and Ilaria Maselli, *Beyond Flexibility and Security – A Composite Indicator on Flexicurity*, Center for European Policy Studies Working Document No. 329/May 2010.

[15] *Data were compiled entirely from the Eurostat Labor Force Survey and the regional data series, for EU NUTS 1 and 2 regions.*

- *Labor market performance index[16]* – to assess the labor market policies. Since there were no regional data available to compute ALMP indicators such as *activation rates*, a composite labor market performance index based on three sub-indices was chosen instead. The indicator includes:
    - An *employment index* (1/3 a share in the total index), which comprises two indicators, each of them in equal shares (1/2):
        o Increase in employment (year-to-year basis),
        o Employment rate,
        A *unemployment index* (1/3 a share in the total index), which comprises two indicators, each of them in equal shares (1/2):
        o Unemployment rate,
        o Share of long-term unemployment in total unemployment,
        An *overall labor productivity index* (1/3 a share in the total index), which comprises two indicators, each of them in equal shares (1/2):
        o GDP per capita (percent of the EU average),
        o Average number of usual weekly hours in the main job.
        Share of social benefits other than social transfers in kind in household disposable income – to assess the social security systems (data regarding the beneficiaries of social protection measures were not available at regional level).

All the indices, sub-indices and individual indicators were normalized according to the formulae:

$$I_{Ci} = \frac{V_i - V_{i\text{minim}}}{V_{i\text{maxim}} - V_{i\text{minim}}} \quad (1)$$

where: V_i – value of criterion "i" in the case of a certain region;

$V_{i\text{minim}}$ – minimum value of the "i" criterion for the analyzed regions;

$V_{i\text{maxim}}$ – maximum value of the "i" criterion for the analyzed regions.

and:

$$I_{Ci} = 1 - \frac{V_i - V_{i\text{minim}}}{V_{i\text{maxim}} - V_{i\text{minim}}} \quad (2)$$

In this case, the maximum value of the criterion has a negative economic significance and the minimum a positive one.

The final value of the composite indicator for each country/region is:

$$I_c = (I_{c1} + I_{c2} + I_{c3} + I_{c4})/4 \quad (3)$$

In the case of *share of social benefits in household disposable income*, the indicator was computed both according to (1) and (2), because in our opinion it has a mixed interpretation: a high value may reveal both the presence of a generous welfare system, but also the high resilience of population of a certain region upon the social protection system (and, hence, high poverty level and likely threats due to increased

---

[16] See V. Ciucă, D. Paşnicu (coord.), *Flexibilitate şi securitate pe piaţa românească a muncii*, Editura Agora, Bucureşti, 2009.

pressure upon the social welfare systems generated by drops in budget incomes and unfavorable employment developments[17]). Also, the indicator *average number of usual weekly hours in the main job* was computed according to (2), to emphasize the combination of effects (overall productivity) and efforts (amount of work). The results for the EU15 countries (except for Luxembourg) and for the NMS (except for Cyprus and Malta), as well as for the New Member States regions are presented in Appendices 1 and 2 (all the computations refer to 2007)[18].

3. Flexicurity Results in the EU Countries and Regions

The best positions regarding the implementation of flexicurity policies are not changed as compared to the previously mentioned analyses, Denmark and the Netherlands being the top performers, with good scores for almost all indicators (except for part-time employment for Denmark and lifelong learning for the Netherlands). Very high scores were recorded by Denmark for the share of benefits in household disposable income (which is in line with previous findings, which consider the country as "flexicure" – employing high flexicurity and high security[19]) and participation in lifelong learning, and by the Netherlands for the extent of part-time employment. Medium scores were recorded by Sweden, Austria, Finland and the United Kingdom, followed by Germany, France and Ireland – all countries with functioning labor market policies and mature social welfare systems. It is worth mentioning the high scores for Finland, Sweden, Germany and France in the case of share of social benefits, which may call for attention, considering the above-mentioned likely threats regarding the future sustainability of large social welfare systems. The Southern Europe countries recorded lower scores, that of Greece being even lower than the scores recorded by some of the most advanced NMS. Greece also recorded very low scores on the flexibility components (part-time employment and lifelong learning, and we must keep in mind that the analysis refers to 2007), which may explain some of the current serious difficulties in adapting its labor market to the drastic changes required by the austerity plan the country is pursuing.

The NMS and their regions recorded mixed performances but, nevertheless, lower scores that the EU15 countries (except for Slovenia, which revealed good labor market performance and a functioning welfare system). However, some grouping may

---

[17] *For instance, the threat of massive layoffs in the public sector of many European economies - for the flexicurity approach in the public sector, see Herma Kuperus, Anita Rode,* Flexicurity Approach and Restructuring: Part of Strategic Management in Public Administration in Europe?*, European Institute of Public Administration, Maastricht, The Netherlands, September, 2009.*

[18] *A shortened presentation, without the analysis for the EU15 regions, was chosen for reasons of space, but the whole set of computations is available upon request.*

[19] See Andranik Tangian (Tanguiane), *Six families of flexicurity indicators developed at the Hans Boeckler Foundation*, WSI – Diskussionspapier Nr. 168 November 2009 Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftliches Institut in der Hans Böckler Stiftung , Düsseldorf, Germany.

be discerned: Slovenia followed by a group of countries with very close scores – the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, then the Baltic States and Slovakia, and the last Romania and Bulgaria. All the NMS generally recorded very low scores on part-time employment and lifelong learning, which calls for attention considering the flexibility needed to adapt to the fast changing economic conditions in Europe and in the whole world. An increased reliance on the social benefits is noticeable, especially in Hungary, Slovenia and the Czech Republic, and also in some of the poorest regions (Nord-Est and Sud-Vest in Romania, for instance). Part-time employment was very low in Bulgaria (and in all its regions), and low in the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary, gaining ground in Poland, the Baltic States, Slovenia, and some regions of Romania, while the labor market performance was generally in the middle range in all the NMS and their regions (signaling - at that time and, among others - improvements regarding the labor market institutions and positive developments regarding unemployment and employment rates).

Meanwhile, the current economic picture of Europe has changed, and the EU countries and regions struggle nowadays to cope with the worst economic crisis at the beginning of the third millennium, which is far from being extinguished. Shorter working hours and increasing part-time jobs were recorded over all Europe; also more extra days off and leave schemes holidays[20]. Among the means employed to such a purpose, the flexicurity policies were not fully employed, but actions were taken by many EU countries. For instance, Bulgaria attempted a better flexicurity approach in its national policies, Belgium employed "flexicurity measures" through a "temporary unemployment" scheme collectively agreed for blue collars and Estonia attempted a flexicurity approach through measures addressing the impacts of the crisis. Some countries adjusted or renewed the short-working time arrangements already in place (Belgium the Netherlands, Germany), others (especially NMS) introduced such schemes for the first time (Hungary, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia)[21]. Thus, the question of consistency of flexicurity policies in times of crisis is relevant, and two major challenges are at stake in flexicurity policies: combining different policy areas and developing social partnerships, at national and regional (and even further) levels[22].

Conclusions

The assessment of flexicurity performance using composite indicators allowing for a multidimensional appraisal of flexicurity in the EU countries revealed very diverse combinations of flexibility and security in the EU countries (results of different policy

---

[20] *Ton Wilthagen,* Flexicurity in the crisis: The case of short-time working arrangements*, European Employment Observatory, Occasional Workshop on Short-Time Working Arrangements, 13 January 2010.*

[21] *Ton Wilthagen,* op cit*.*

[22] Isabella Biletta, "How flexicurity could be used for restructuring against the backdrop of development: An overview of approaches to flexicurity in different Member States", European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) Consultative Commission on Industrial Change (CCMI), Public Hearing 7 July 2009.

mixes), from balanced flexicurity systems in the Nordic countries to low performers in what regards both labor flexibility and security in the Southern European and some NMS countries. Not surprisingly, medium and good performances were obtained by some NMS (Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland), due to the advancement of integration into the EU structures, but all the NMS generally recorded very low scores on part-time employment and lifelong learning, which calls for attention considering the flexibility needed to adapt to the fast and deep changing economic conditions in Europe and in the whole world. This also points towards other important factors on short and medium term, such as educational level, competitiveness, design and intensity of active labor market programs, since flexicurity itself is but a single tool in the broader range of labor market – and, finally, economic – policies[23].

Also, an increased reliance on the social benefits was noticeable in Finland, Sweden, Germany, France, Hungary, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, but also in some of the poorest regions of the NMS, which may call for attention considering the likely threats regarding the future sustainability of large social welfare systems. In connection with the above-mentioned, one may notice the low performance regarding the flexibility components (part-time employment and lifelong learning) in the Southern European countries (especially in Greece) and in some NMS and their regions. Part-time employment was gaining ground in Poland, the Baltic States, Slovenia, and some regions of Romania, but also for different reasons than increased labor market flexibility; for instance, in Romania it might have been the case of low development level and/or sectoral structure (agriculture and constructions accounting for large shares in the economic activity of the regions with higher scores on such a component). Additional research (and data) is thus needed in order to better assess the performance of flexicurity policies, and further analysis of what they really translate into at regional, sub-regional and even local levels, and of the actors and partners involved. As stated above, the major challenges faced by the flexicurity policies require to combine different policy fields and to develop social partnerships, both at *national* and at *regional* (and further) levels.

References

Iain Begg, Christine Erhel and Jørgen Mortensen, 2010. *Medium-term Employment Challenges*. CEPS Special Report, January 2010.

Fabio Bertozzi, Giuliano Bonoli, 2009. *Measuring Flexicurity at the Macro Level: Conceptual and Data Availability Challenges*. Working Papers on the Reconciliation of Work and Welfare in Europe 10/2009, Edinburgh: RECWOWE Publications.

Isabella Biletta, 2009. *How flexicurity could be used for restructuring against the backdrop of development: An overview of approaches to flexicurity in different Member States*. European Economic and Social Committee

---

[23] *Ilaria Maselli,* Beyond Flexibility and Security – A Composite Indicator on Flexicurity*, Center for European Policy Studies Working Document No. 329/May 2010.*

(EESC) Consultative Commission on Industrial Change (CCMI), Public Hearing 7 July 2009.

V. Ciuca, D. Pasnicu et al., 2009. *Flexibilitate şi securitate pe piaţa românească a muncii*. Bucureşti: Editura Agora.

Per Kongshøj Madsen, 2006. *A new perspective on labour markets and welfare states in Europe*. CARMA Research Paper 2006:03, Centre for Labour Market Research Aalborg University, Denmark.

L. Frey, A. Janovskaia, G. Pappada, 2007. *The concept of flexicurity: Southern and East European countries compared*. 5th International Research Conference on Social Security "Social security and the labour market: A mismatch?"Warsaw, 5-7 March 2007.

Herma Kuperus, Anita Rode, 2009. *Flexicurity Approach and Restructuring: Part of Strategic Management in Public Administration in Europe?*. European Institute of Public Administration, Maastricht, The Netherlands, September, 2009.

Ilaria Maselli, 2010. *Beyond Flexibility and Security – A Composite Indicator on Flexicurity*. Center for European Policy Studies, No. 329.

André Sapir (Ed.), 2009. *Bruegel Memos to the New Commission, Europe's economic priorities 2010-2015*. Brussels: Bruegel,.

Andranik Tangian (Tanguiane), 2009. *Six families of flexicurity indicators developed at the Hans Boeckler Foundation*. WSI – Diskussionspapier Nr. 168 November 2009 Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftliches Institut in der Hans Böckler Stiftung , Düsseldorf.

Elke Viebrock, Jochen Clasen, 2009. *Flexicurity – A State-of-the-art Review*. Working Papers on the Reconciliation of Work and Welfare in Europe 01/2009, Edinburgh: RECWOWE Publications,.

Ton Wilthagen, 2002. *The Flexibility-Security Nexus: New Approaches to Regulating Employment and Labor Markets*. OSA/Institute for Labor Studies, Tilburg University, The Netherlands, Working paper 2002-18.

Ton Wilthagen, 2004. *Flexibility and Social Protection*. AIAS, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Working paper 2003-15,.

Ton Wilthagen, 2010. *Flexicurity in the crisis: The case of short-time working arrangements*, European Employment Observatory. Occasional Workshop on Short-Time Working Arrangements, 13 January 2010.

EMCO, 2009a. *Employment Guidelines 2009: Indicators for Monitoring and Analysis in the NRPs 2009*. EMCO Reports, Issue 1.

EMCO, 2009b. *Monitoring and analysis of Flexicurity policies*. EMCO Reports, Issue 2.

European Commission, *2010. Europe 2020 - A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*. Brussels, March 2010.

European Commission, 2009. *Council Conclusions on Flexicurity in Times of Crisis*. 2947th Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council meeting, Luxembourg, 8 June 2009.

European Commission, 2007a. *Towards Common Principles of Flexicurity: More and Better Jobs through Flexibility and Security*.

European Commission, 2007b. *Flexicurity pathways. Turning hurdles into stepping stones*, Report by the European Expert Group on Flexicurity, EC, June 2007.

Ministerul Muncii, Familiei si Egalității de Sanse, Directia programe si strategii forta de munca, 2007. *Flexicuritate – Raport*. Observatorul national al ocuparii si formarii profesionale a fortei de munca, Bucuresti, septembrie 2007.

Appendix 1

Country/Region	Ic_Part-time employment	Ic_Lifelong learning	Ic_Labor market performance	Ic_Benefits	Ic_1*	Ic_2**
Belgium	0.421	0.210	0.514	0.692	0.459	0.363
Bulgaria	0.007	0.031	0.441	0.407	0.222	0.268
Czech Republic	0.075	0.164	0.436	0.550	0.306	0.281
Denmark	0.461	0.878	0.694	0.960	0.748	0.518
Germany	0.500	0.228	0.557	0.625	0.478	0.415
Estonia	0.139	0.205	0.409	0.337	0.272	0.354
Ireland	0.249	0.221	0.643	0.516	0.407	0.399
Greece	0.087	0.056	0.440	0.543	0.282	0.260
Spain	0.212	0.307	0.560	0.428	0.377	0.413
France	0.321	0.213	0.489	0.649	0.418	0.343
Italy	0.249	0.180	0.449	0.623	0.375	0.314
Latvia	0.104	0.206	0.495	0.228	0.258	0.394
Lithuania	0.147	0.151	0.492	0.303	0.273	0.372
Hungary	0.058	0.100	0.437	0.641	0.309	0.239
Netherlands	0.919	0.495	0.694	0.771	0.720	0.584
Austria	0.429	0.381	0.621	0.676	0.527	0.439
Poland	0.160	0.145	0.471	0.458	0.308	0.329
Portugal	0.218	0.111	0.455	0.586	0.343	0.300
Romania	0.171	0.029	0.435	0.281	0.229	0.338
Slovenia	0.162	0.440	0.487	0.570	0.415	0.380
Slovakia	0.026	0.108	0.398	0.426	0.240	0.276
Finland	0.258	0.700	0.627	0.721	0.577	0.466
Sweden	0.465	0.549	0.693	0.781	0.622	0.481
United Kingdom	0.481	0.596	0.619	0.575	0.568	0.530

* Overall index with share of social benefits in household disposable income computed according to formula (1).
** Overall index with share of social benefits in household disposable income computed according to formula (2).
Source: Authors' computations and estimates based on Eurostat data.

Appendix 2

Country/Region	Ic_Part-time employment	Ic_Lifelong learning	Ic_Labor market performance	Ic_Benefits	Ic_1*	Ic_2**
Bulgaria	0.007	0.031	0.441	0.407	0.222	0.268
Severna i iztochna Bulgaria	0.006	0.016	0.358	0.458	0.210	0.231
Severozapaden	0.007	0.000	0.382	0.540	0.232	0.212
Severen tsentralen	0.017	0.018	0.336	0.444	0.204	0.232
Severoiztochen	0.001	0.023	0.361	0.396	0.195	0.247
Yugoiztochen	0.002	0.020	0.395	0.459	0.219	0.240
Yugozapadna i yuzhna centralna Bulgaria	0.009	0.048	0.431	0.364	0.213	0.281
Yugozapaden	0.009	0.072	0.474	0.315	0.217	0.310
Yuzhen tsentralen	0.007	0.014	0.386	0.464	0.218	0.236
Czech Republic	0.075	0.164	0.436	0.550	0.306	0.281
Praha	0.117	0.286	0.479	0.386	0.317	0.374
Strední Cechy	0.060	0.135	0.487	0.479	0.290	0.301
Jihozápad	0.069	0.135	0.494	0.552	0.313	0.287
Severozápad	0.034	0.125	0.426	0.634	0.305	0.238
Severovýchod	0.076	0.165	0.456	0.591	0.322	0.277
Jihovýchod	0.087	0.169	0.473	0.582	0.328	0.287
Strední Morava	0.063	0.171	0.449	0.589	0.318	0.274
Moravskoslezsko	0.082	0.122	0.474	0.655	0.333	0.256
Estonia	0.139	0.205	0.409	0.337	0.272	0.354
Latvia	0.104	0.206	0.495	0.228	0.258	0.394
Lithuania	0.147	0.151	0.492	0.303	0.273	0.372
Hungary	0.058	0.100	0.437	0.641	0.309	0.239
Közép-Magyarország	0.049	0.154	0.447	0.541	0.298	0.277
Dunántúl	0.045	0.073	0.429	0.654	0.300	0.224
Közép-Dunántúl	0.042	0.073	0.466	0.615	0.299	0.242
Nyugat-Dunántúl	0.037	0.066	0.475	0.614	0.298	0.241
Dél-Dunántúl	0.059	0.082	0.376	0.751	0.317	0.192
Alföld és Észak	0.076	0.081	0.385	0.783	0.331	0.190
Észak-Magyarország	0.062	0.071	0.401	0.814	0.337	0.180
Észak-Alföld	0.098	0.082	0.391	0.786	0.339	0.196
Dél-Alföld	0.065	0.087	0.413	0.752	0.329	0.203
Poland	0.160	0.145	0.471	0.458	0.308	0.329
Centralny	0.135	0.190	0.517	0.368	0.302	0.369
Lódzkie	0.142	0.097	0.506	0.470	0.304	0.319
Mazowieckie	0.131	0.243	0.529	0.327	0.307	0.394
Poludniowy	0.178	0.138	0.432	0.527	0.319	0.305
Malopolskie	0.208	0.127	0.411	0.505	0.313	0.310
Slaskie	0.156	0.146	0.448	0.540	0.322	0.302
Wschodni	0.234	0.130	0.461	0.525	0.337	0.325
Lubelskie	0.275	0.172	0.477	0.542	0.367	0.346

Podkarpackie	0.290	0.108	0.498	0.546	0.361	0.337
Swietokrzyskie	0.137	0.101	0.424	0.527	0.297	0.284
Podlaskie	0.167	0.119	0.441	0.461	0.297	0.317
Pólnocno-Zachodni	0.135	0.124	0.404	0.425	0.272	0.309
Wielkopolskie	0.150	0.116	0.401	0.406	0.268	0.315
Zachodniopomorskie	0.106	0.152	0.348	0.438	0.261	0.292
Lubuskie	0.124	0.112	0.465	0.470	0.293	0.307
Poludniowo-Zachodni	0.131	0.156	0.425	0.476	0.297	0.309
Dolnoslaskie	0.114	0.165	0.402	0.472	0.288	0.302
Opolskie	0.185	0.127	0.452	0.486	0.313	0.319
Pólnocny	0.125	0.119	0.422	0.463	0.282	0.301
Kujawsko-Pomorskie	0.135	0.111	0.385	0.469	0.275	0.290
Warminsko-Mazurskie	0.095	0.103	0.378	0.505	0.270	0.268
Pomorskie	0.137	0.140	0.486	0.434	0.299	0.332
Romania	0.171	0.029	0.435	0.281	0.229	0.338
Macroregiunea unu	0.136	0.028	0.398	0.219	0.195	0.336
Nord-Vest	0.167	0.030	0.419	0.251	0.217	0.341
Centru	0.101	0.026	0.414	0.184	0.181	0.339
Macroregiunea doi	0.284	0.027	0.441	0.448	0.300	0.326
Nord-Est	0.321	0.032	0.460	0.524	0.334	0.322
Sud-Est	0.231	0.022	0.373	0.360	0.246	0.316
Macroregiunea trei	0.161	0.032	0.446	0.176	0.204	0.366
Sud - Muntenia	0.272	0.024	0.460	0.424	0.295	0.333
Bucuresti - Ilfov	0.000	0.042	0.447	0.000	0.122	0.372
Macroregiunea patru	0.049	0.028	0.415	0.312	0.201	0.295
Sud-Vest Oltenia	0.028	0.023	0.424	0.483	0.240	0.248
Vest	0.076	0.035	0.447	0.148	0.176	0.353
Slovenia	0.162	0.440	0.487	0.570	0.415	0.380
Vzhodna Slovenija	0.169	0.395	0.484	0.570	0.404	0.369
Zahodna Slovenija	0.155	0.492	0.526	0.569	0.436	0.401
Slovakia	0.026	0.108	0.398	0.426	0.240	0.276
Bratislavský kraj	0.050	0.378	0.511	0.196	0.284	0.436
Západné Slovensko	0.026	0.066	0.420	0.391	0.226	0.280
Stredné Slovensko	0.035	0.106	0.385	0.489	0.254	0.259
Východné Slovensko	0.006	0.047	0.388	0.579	0.255	0.215

* *Overall index with share of social benefits in household disposable income computed according to formula (1).*

** *Overall index with share of social benefits in household disposable income computed according to formula (2).*

Source: Authors' computations and estimates based on Eurostat data.