Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SciVerse ScienceDirect

Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 75 (2013) 508 – 517

Procedia
Social and Behavioral Sciences

2nd International Conference on Leadership, Technology and Innovation Management

Flexicurity and employee participation in workplaces during the crisis: Turkey compared to the European Union

Gürol Özcüre[a], Harun Demirkaya[b], Nimet Eryiğit[c], a*

[a] Ordu University, Ordu, 52300, Turkey
[b] Kocaeli University, Kocaeli, 41800, Turkey
[c] Ordu University, Ordu, 52300, Turkey

Abstract

Turkey has a mixture of labour market system which provides some deregulated flexible labour market applications and some strict job protection applications characterising same principles with the European Union countries. In this paper, the EU flexicurity approach and Turkish labour market will be analyzed. Extant research on flexicurity has focused primarily on the macro level of analysis. In this research we have examined flexicurity at company level as connecting human relations management (HRM) and industrial relations (IR). We follow the European Commission's definition and argue that company-level flexicurity in the restructuring process is a specific and extraordinary HRM activity. Furthermore, our unit of analysis is management and labour union and works council representatives' attitudes related to flexicurity applications and employee participation in the EU27 countries and in Turkey as an EU candidate country. This study focuses also on analysis and suggestions for improving restructuring and transition to new employment with the help of company-level flexicurity in the EU27 and in Turkey during the restructuring process of the global crisis with extend to the unification process of Turkey with the EU. As, flexicurity and employee participation applications investigated and compared between Turkey and the EU companies which found that there are a high level of comparability and compliance between Turkish and the EU integral market, at least for leading companies. There are also some characteristic differences between company level practices throughout EU member and candidate countries including Turkey.

Key Words: Flexicurity, Working time and wage flexibility, Workplace social dialogue and employee participation, the European Union and Turkey.

© 2013 Published by Elsevier Ltd.
Selection and peer-review under responsibility of The Second International Conference on Leadership, Technology and Innovation Management

1. Introduction

Improving labour market flexibility is one of the key elements of the European Employment Strategy (Lisbon Strategy) of the European Union (EU), to make Europe more dynamic and competitive. The European Commission uses the terms of flexibility and security as "flexicurity" and defines it as 'an integrated strategy to enhance, at the same time, flexibility and security in the labour market' (European Commission, 2007a).

* Gürol Özcüre. Tel. + 90-452-323-8255 fax. +90-452-323-8256

Email address: gozcure@odu.edu.tr

1877-0428 © 2013 Published by Elsevier Ltd.
Selection and peer-review under responsibility of The Second International Conference on Leadership, Technology and Innovation Management
doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.055

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound) launched first "European Company Survey" in 2005 and second in the years between 2008 and 2009 (the ECS 2009) and issued overview report in 2010. The survey addressed to managers and employee representatives of the companies which contains latest data on flexicurity practices and employee participation at workplace in the EU 27 member and 3 candidate states including Turkey. The 15 year history of flexicurity shows us that its definition has been changed and understood as protection of atypical workers then as a flexibility-security trade-off and as security through flexibility. Macroeconomic situation during the crisis (in 2008-2009) it is shown with statistical certainty that high flexibility is not advantageous throughout Europe (Tangian, 2010).

The ECS 2009 is the second European-wide establishment survey and human resources managers interviewed in 27,160 establisments throughout Europe (EU27) and EU candidate countries including Turkey. For instance, 1.500 companies are surveyed in Turkey by the Eurofound. At the same time, in those establishments where a formal employee representation existed as union and or works council representatives and was available for interview amounting total of 6,569 units. The ECS 2009 covers establishments with 10 or more employees in both the private and public sector from all relevant sectors except agriculture and forestry (Eurofound, 2010).

Eurofound is recently issued also Eurofound's latest cross-national survey (the fifth European Working Conditions Survey) which conducted in 2010. The fieldwork for this survey was implemented by GALLUP Europe. The survey provides insight into the latest information related to working time flexibility, working environment and employment situation and social dialogue at workplace across the EU27 Member States as well as Turkey, Croatia, Norway, FYR of Macedonia, Montenegro, Albania and Kosovo (Eurofound, 2012).The survey findings indicates and points to limitations, important country differences and a proposal which concerns also the dissemination of a model for company-level flexicurity during the restructuring process which promotes: 1-) improved strategic corporate social responsibility (CSR) in the restructuring process, 2-) improved transition to new employment in the local labour market and 3-) improved flexibility, which creates increased efficiency, competitiveness and rapid payback in the course of restructuring (Rydell and Wigblad, 2011).

As today, more and more temporary workers fill in for regular employees who are absent in order to achieve stability in the organization. Employers are using also increasing level of temporary staffing arrangements in different projects for example, during restructuring to provide necessary assistance in adjusting staffing levels to fluctuations. Nowadays, companies using different flexibility practices categorized as external numerical flexibility referring to the number of workers employed from external labour market on temporary basis, be it through the employment of temporary personel or relaxed hiring and firing practices. Internal numerical flexibility aiming to adapt work organisation to changes and new challenges by transferring employees to different activities and tasks within the company. Wage flexibility defined as the degree of responsiveness of wage costs to economic conditions and as an incentive to motivate workers to reward them good work or to share the profits of a company with the employees.

Turkish labour law and management practices were heavily affected by the Continental European legal system and currently by the European Union (EU) policies as a negotiating country for full membership. The main considiration on the Turkish labour market over the post-2001 crisis era which is the most severe crisis in Turkish Republic history has been to combat slow performance of the employment generation capacity of the economy by flexi-time and flexible work de-regulations entered to Turkish labour law with 2003 new labour act. Despite this policies and rapid growth, Turkish economy which gross domestic product (GBP) has increased by a cumulative 30% could not generate enough jobs at the desired rate. The open unemployment rate which stood at 6,5% in 2000, has increased to 10.3% in 2002 after 2000/2001 financial crisis in Turkey. Today, unemployment rate is calculated 8.2 % in Turkey on May, 2012 which is lover than EU27 avarage rate of 10% at same period and indicates a good level for Turkey again after rapid increase to 16.1% on February, 2009 during 2008/2009 global crisis.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The European Union Flexicurity Approach

Flexicurity has been a key issue in European employment and social policy discussion and action for last two decades. The Lisbon Strategy of the EU aims to create more and better jobs, modernize labour markets and promote

good work through new forms of flexibility and security to increase adaptability, employment and social cohesion. Flexicurity should be tailored to the specific circumstances of each country. Internal (within the enterprise) as well as external flexicurity are equally important and should be promoted. Social protection should provide incentives and support for job transitions and for access to new employment by promoting equal access to quality employment for women and men and offering measures to reconcile work, family and private life. Flexicurity requires a climate of trust and social dialogue among all stakeholders and a cost&benefit effective allocation of resources (European Commission, 2011).

Over the last two decades, flexibility has been one of the major issues related to labor market. At the same time, concerns over the economic and social impacts of flexibility in the labor markets have increased. The primary aim of flexicurity models is to balance the employers' need for flexibility and the employees' need for security. Although flexibility and security stand as two opposite consepts, but we think these strategies supports and completes the each other. A flexible labour market makes it possible to adjust workforce size in a recession or when other changes in demand ocur. Consequently, a flexible labour market creates a more dynamic labour market compared to a more strictly regulated labour market. The main argument on flexicurity is that it is only acceptable insofar as it improves the living and working conditions. Because, the flexibilisation of the labor market has led to a significant erosion of workers' rights which concern their employment and income security. So, to make the flexibilization strategy acceptable for Europeans, the concept of flexicurity has been introduced. For that reason the issue is related to macrolevel doctrine of "sustainabile development" and sustainable company at micro level.

European stakeholder model corporate sustainability system is the capacity of a firm to continue operating over a long period of time, depends on the sustainability of its stakeholder relationships and presence of the employee participation system. In the 1970s and the 1980s the stakeholder seemed to be superior due to GDP growth rates were lover in the Anglo-Saxon countries. Since the early 1990s, concept of Anglo-Saxon shareholder value as the central guiding principle for companies has spread beyond the Anglo-Saxon countries to Europe and Asia. European perspective of the last crisis especially labour market developments clearly indicate that over the period since the initiation of Lisbon Strategy in 2000, Europe had seen rising rates of employment and falling rates of unemployment. However, the economic crisis has reversed this trend, The EU average employment rate is back to its 2006 level as 64.8% and unemployment has increased two percent and the rate was 8.9% in 2009 and almost 3 percent in 2010 and the rate reached approximately to 10 % (Süral, 2007).

The EU acquis related to social policy and employment evaluates Turkish Labour Law and thus Turkish company compliance with EU labour law and flexicurity issues related to employee protection (chapters 22 and 23), promoting of fair competition (chapter 6) and combating corruption are basic criteria for EU membership for Turkey. Increasing number of Turkish companies has already demonstrated leadership in some areas of flexicurity and are willing to engage in a number of flexicurity activities. Compliance with international conventions of the OECD Guidelines, the UN Global Compact and ILO declerations and conventions are also necessary. Employment creation and production increase is also a must for recovering of negative effects of the 2008/2009 global crisis and foreign direct investment found useful for Turkey (Özcüre, Demirkaya and Eryiğit, 2011).

The post 2001 crisis macroeconomic trajectory of Turkey, during the 2000s, despite rapid growth of Turkish economy could not generate enough jobs at the desired rate. According to the "Medium Term Economic Program, 2011-2012", chartered by the Turkish State Planning Organization (DPT) unemployment is expected to remain approximately 13% and Turkish labour market is suffering from informalization and marginalization with low labour participation rates. The flexitime and flexible work de-regulations entered the Turkish labour scene for the first time with the Turkish Labour Act No 4857 in 2003 (Yeldan, 2011)**.** Turkish Labour Act regulates temporary work (article no.7), fixed-term contract (article no.11), part-time work (article no.13), tele-work (article no. 14), flexible working hours arrangements (article no. 63-64), short-time working schemes (article no.64-65)…etc. under the principle of flexicurity (Büyükuslu, 2004).

2.2.Contractual Flexibility in Working Time

Flexibility in working time is a central aspect of ongoing debates regarding boosting employment in the EU. Enabling employees to better balance their working time and domestic responsibilities is seen as a key way of encouraging more citizens to enter and remain in the workforce. At the same time, greater working time flexibility on the part of companies – and hence, employees – can enable European enterprises to be more responsive to market demands, so boosting the Union's competitiveness (Özcüre, 2010b). As belove Table 1 shows us that companies with

night and Saturday workers and shift workers are found lower level while Turkish companies have much more higher levels. But, companies with flexi-time calculated found much more higher level than Turkey.

Table 1. Contractual Flexibility in Working Time

Contractual Flexibility in Working Time	EU27 average (%)	Turkey (%)
Companies with night workers (11 pm to 6 pm)	18,1	36,1
Companies with Saturday workers	40,3	73,3
Companies with Sunday workers	50,2	35,4
Companies with shift workers	31,3	36,5
Companies with more than 20% part-timers	28,1	10,0
Companies with part-time: fixed hours every day	78,4	75,1
Companies with part-time: combining full-time days with days off	44,5	53,3
Companies with part-time: flexi-time at demand of the company	35,2	56,8
Companies with flexi-time calculated as; for small companies	54,9	39,2
Companies with flexi-time calculated as; for medium companies	60,7	28,1
Companies with flexi-time calculated as; for large companies	71,2	13,7
Companies offering flexi-time to all employees	44,5	26,5
Companies allowing employees to accumulate hours (working longer on some days and less on other days)	67,1	59,3
Companies with part-time: combining full-time days with days off	75,9	76,5
Companies allowing employees to accumulate hours on long term time accounts (for more than 1 year)	19,7	32,3
Companies with more than 20% of workers working overtime in the past 12 months	48,2	31,1
Companies with temporary agency workers, staff with fixes term contracts or freelancers (last 12 months)	67,5	35,5
Companies with employees covered by a collective wage agreement (establishment or any higher level)	63,8	17,6
Companies with employees received individual performance related pay	90,0	96,9
Companies with a share ownership scheme	4,1	4,0

Source: Eurofound, 2010.

Different combinations of flexicurity with income, job and employment securities with serious models such as internal, external, quantitative and functual flexibility forms are implemented in the EU (Çakır, 2009). The ECS 2009 finds that working time flexibility is the most common type of flexibility in European companies which showing a substantial increase. Approximately two thirds of surveyed establishments use some form of contractual flexibility such as temporary agency work and fixed-term employment or freelance work. According to the Survey Mapping Tool, some of the working time flexibility findings summarized such as; more than half (56%) of companies in the EU offer some kind of flexitime arrangements, About two-thirds of the establishments surveyed offer its employees employment on a part-time basis; During the 12 months prior to the survey, workload peaks were handled by overtime work for its employees in just over two thirds (68%) of establishments. In about 44% of the establishments within the EU, there are employees who regularly have to work at unusual hours, mostly on Saturdays (40%). There has been an ongoing decline in the number of hours worked per week in Europe. The average working week in the EU27 in 2010

found 37.5 hours long. In 1991, the average working week in the then 12 Member States (former EC12) was 40.5 hours long. Furthermore, reductions in working hours in response to the current recession will have already resulted in the shortening of working hours in many countries (Eurofound, 2012). The traditional open-ended 'permanent' contract is still the most common form of employment contract (being held by around 80% of employees). While 10% of employees in the EC12 were on a fixed term contract in 1991, by 2007 this percentage had risen to over 14% of employees in the EU27. However it dropped again, to 13.5% in 2009.

2.3. Human Resources Practices and Work Organisation: Functional Flexibility

The majority of companies regularly check the need for further training of employees which is a crucial aspects of functional flexibility and innovation. According to the findings of the ECS 2009 Survey, three out of four establishments check the need for further training in the EU. Turkish companies need to increase HR practices and work organisation for functional flexibility (Glassner and Galgoczi, 2009).

Table 2. Human Resources Practices and Work Organisation: Functional Flexibility

H R Practices and Work Organisation:Functional Flexibility	EU27 average (%)	Turkey (%)
Companies using temporary agency workers in the last 12 months	22,7	2,6
Companies using staff with fixed-term contracts in the last 12 months	54,3	27,9
Companies using freelancers in last 12 months	20,7	9,8
Companies with temporary agency workers, staff with fixed term contracts of freelancers (last 12 months)	67,5	35,5
Companies with autonomous team work; team members decided among themselves	26,7	16,7
Companies checking training needs regularly	72,5	59,9
Companies checking training needs of permanent employees in low skilled or unskilled positions	88,0	79,4
Companies checking training needs of permanent employees with fixed-term contracts	44,1	36,4
Companies checking training needs of older employees	70,3	32,3
Companies giving time off for training	61,6	46,2

Source: Eurofound, 2010.

2.4. Wage Flexibility

Wage flexibility through variable pay elements such as performance-related pay and financial participation gains importance during the global economic crisis. Attitudes to wage flexibility through variable pay elements (performance-related pay and financial participation); global economic crisis is likely to cast such schemes in a new light (Europa, 2010a; Europa, 2010b). As below Table 3 shows us that wage flexibility level of Turkish companies found almost same level with the EU27 average except companies with employees covered by a collective wage agrrement.

Table 3. Wage Flexibility

Wage Flexibility	EU27 average (%)	Turkey (%)
Companies with employees covered by a collective wage agreement (establishment or any higher level)	63,8	17,6
Companies with employees receiving individual performance related pay	90,0	96,9
Companies with employees receiving group performance related pay	51,5	65,3
Companies with a share ownership scheme	4,1	4,0

Source: Eurofound, 2010.

2.5. Workplace social dialogue

Workplace social dialogue defined as employee representatives are involved in management decisions concerning the employment relationship (Özcüre and Eryiğit, 2006; Özcüre et al., 2009).

Table 4. Workplace social dialogue

Workplace social dialogue	EU27 average (%)	Turkey (%)
Companies with employee participation	41,2	16,1
Companies who changed the work organisation in the past 3 years	34,9	29,5
Companies who changed working time in the past 3 years	20,4	19,9
Companies who have restructured in the past 3 years	26,2	44,3
Companies consulting employees before introducing major changes in the remuneration system	67,9	62,3
Companies consulting employees before introducing changes in the organisation of the work process	81,4	76,4
Companies consulting employees before introducing changes in the working time arrangements	85,8	80,1
Companies consulting employees before introducing restructuring measures	80,1	83,2
Employee representatives receiving relevant data on the economic and financial situation of the company	84,2	70,5
Employee representatives with training for this function	66,2	34,0
Employee representatives with sufficient time for fulfilling the representative duties	76,5	46,6
Employee representatives receiving information on the employment situation	86,0	56,7
Employee representatives receiving information on overtime hours	58,9	35,9
Employee representatives receiving timely and unrequested information	69,1	61,9
Employee representatives with strong influence on employment and human resources planning	49,7	28,5
Employee representatives with strong influence on opportunities policies and diversity	53,4	32,6

management		
Employee representatives with strong influence on changes in working time regulations	61,8	30,9
Employee representatives with strong influence on pay determination	36,1	22,4
Employee representatives with strong influence on work organisation	55,4	29,1
Employee representatives with strong influence on structural changes (restructuring, relocation, takeover)	36,9	28,2
Employee representatives with strong influence on career management	45,7	37,5
Employee representatives who were consulted/negotiated on working time	58,5	33,2
Employee representatives who were consulted/negotiated on overtime rules	55,9	35,0
Employee representatives who were consulted/negotiated on the organisation of part-time work	42,2	17,7
Employee representatives who were consulted/negotiated on rules/procedures (flexi-time, working time accounts)	47,6	15,1
Employee representatives who were consulted/negotiated in the establishment of rules for shift work	35,2	15,4
Employee representatives who were consulted/negotiated in the establishment of rules for night work	29,1	14,6
Employee representatives who were consulted/negotiated in the establishment of rules for weekend work	39,5	23,3
Employee representatives who were consulted/negotiated in the establishment of rules for using temporary agency workers	22,3	14,9
Employee representatives who were consulted/negotiated in the establishment of rules for using flexi-time	40,9	17,3
Employee representatives who were consulted/negotiated in the establishment of rules for access to training	69,2	38,3

Source: Eurofound, 2010.

Some of social dialogue at workplace findings of the ECS 2009 Survey is given at above Table 4, as in summary; almost four out of ten companies (41,7%) in the survey reported an institutional form of employee representation, in the EU which covers more than 60% of the employees, but this level is very low in Turkey (16,1%); more than two

out of three workers in the EU are covered by a collective pay agreement and employee representatives with strong influence on pay determination found 36,1% in the EU27 and 22,4% in Turkey. Employee representatives in the EU27 seem to be generally satisfied that a rather good cooperative culture of interaction exists between them and the management of establishments; European management is, in general, rather positive about the effect of social dialogue and employee representation at the workplace; some 80% of the interviewed representatives claim that the employees support their work. The ECS 2009 survey findings show also rebust practices of workplace social dialogue in the EU27 on the other hand which is social dialogue atmosphere is less progressed inTurkey.

2.6. Company Performance

According to the European Council providing the right balance between flexibility and security will support the competitiveness of firms, increase quality and productivity at work and help firms and workers to adapt to economic change which Turkey has both a flexible (informal) segment and secure (formal) segment application at workplace practices in its labour market. Some of company performance findings of the ECS 2009 Survey; an increase in labour productivity was reported by more than 20% of establishments in the EU; Just less than one third of all establishments show an increase in their workforce over the previous three year period (2005-2008), while less than one quarter of all establishments report a decrease in workforce numbers; Cyprus, Bulgaria, Luxembourg, Belgium and Malta all report an excess of 50% of establishments citing a shortage of skilled staff.

2.7. Predictions of the EU and Turkey Future Relations Related to Employment and Social Policy

Social dialogue mechanisms have become one of the preconditions for EU accession for Turkey and a sort of Europeanisation of Turkish social policy and industrial relations (IR) is taking place in the course of preparing for accession. In particular, the new Labur law accepted in 2003 has become to symbolise the process of change in the instituonal structure and it is likely to be continued in other areas in near future. During the EU-Turkey full membership negotiations process which was started on 3 October 2005, some Turkish companies gained the position of Union-scale undertaking after the EU and Turkey custom union which underway since 1 January 1996 and some of them fall into the scope of the EU legislation.The custom union between Turkey and the EU since 1996 have increased concentration on the undertakings and companies of both sides such as cross-border mergers, takeovers and joint ventures and consequently the trans-nationalisation of undertakings and groups of undertakings are increasing between companies operating in two or more EU member states and also in Turkey. For example, banking and insurance companies operating in Turkey belonging to foreign-owned MNCs had a 63% capital share at the end of 2008. The EU regualtions related to employee participation are important for Turkish undertakings in two circumstances before the period of full membership to the EU: firstly, a multinational based in the EU countries and having a subsidiary in Turkey and secondly, a Turkish multinational having subsidiaries within the EU countires (Özcüre at al, 2009).

Turkish labor market indicators can be summarized as follows: Labor supply has been increasing due to high population growth rate (1.01% in 2008).Turkey has a large informal economy and almost half of workers are not registered with the social security institutions. One fourth of total employment in Turkey is in agriculture. Women participation in the labor market is very low level (27% in 2008). Half of all women are unpaid family workers and 59% of women work in agriculture. Employment status of the paid employees in the EU27 are about 80%, but in Turkey is just 50%. The employment problem created by unpaid family workers is very serious. Unemployment insurance system did not exist in Turkey until 2001. The migration flow from rural to urban areas and also abroad is areality. The law on Employment Protection No. 4773 reduced the covarage of employment protection by excluding establishments employing less than 30 workers. Therefore, the new law has legally provided extensive flexibility to small establishments. Severance pay regulation is a labour market rigidity in Turkey. Severance pay in Turkey is higher than the EU average. A major issue is the limited access of Turkey's workers to formal protection, including labour laws, collective bargaining, and social security (Koray and Çelik, 2007; Hekimler, 2006; Gundogan, 2009).

Nowadays, the EU enlargement process which is ongoing to the Union's South East. As Croatia is becoming a full member in the EU in 2013, Turkey and FYR of Macedonia are the other current candidates with Iceland. The importance of the relationship from its strategic, economic and political side has grown and needed solid foundations to base further cooperation on company level. Turkey as having accession perspective with the EU is encouraged to align with EU policies. For this purpose the EU and Turkey have concluded a framework agreement on participation of Turkey in Union programmes (Kabaalioğlu, Ott and Tatham, 2011).

3.Methodology

The survey was conducted by computer assisted telephone interviews (CATI) by Eurofound. The companies to be interviewed were selected at random among those with 10 or more employees in each country. A management representative and, where possible, employee representative was interviewed in each company. The duration of the interviews was on avarage 20 minutes for management representatives and 15 minutes for employee representatives. The survey did not include the agriculture and fishing sector, private households and extra-territorial organizations. Public administration was covered in the sample. The 2009 European Company Survey was used to assess workplace flexicurity climate in the sample countries which was carried out in 30 countries: the 27 EU Member States, plus Croatia, Turkey and Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM).

3.1. Research Goal

The main goal of this paper is to test the relation and links between the concept of the actual workplace flexicurity climate based on micro data of Turkey with comparison of the EU. In order to assess the workplace flexicurity climate in the EU 27 member and 3 candidate countries including Turkey. This study makes use of the 2009 European Company Survey results conducted by Eurofound which provides data with several questions touching on the six areas of workplace flexicurity climate. Both the managers and employee representatives of the respective firms responded to the survey, making it possible to compare responses from the different parties.

3.2. Sample and Data Collection

The sample is representative in terms of company size, sector of operation and type of activity. The ECS questionnaires contain questions each assessing one of the six dimensions of the workplace flexicurity climate. The questions refer to the frequency of providing information to the employee representation (ER). There is reason to believe that this type of action is, to a certain degree, regulated by national legislature. For instance, in Turkey, the labour law not guarantees employees seats in the supervisory boards of companies. The labour code also provides some detailed list of issues that must be consulted with and approved by the ER. On the other hand, Turkish legal system does not guarantee any positions for employee representatives in the supervisory boards of companies. Also, Turkish labour law lists only areas of interest for which the ER must be consulted and stipulates that the ER "should" be informed about some issues, thus creating a non-obligatory statute for employers**.**

4. Conclusion and Concluding Remarks

According to the ECS 2009 Survey results, key trends in the EU and Turkey discovered as; the pattern of employment continues to change with an ongoing shift from agriculture and manufacturing into services (employment rates by sector in the EU27 calculated in agriculture 6.3%, services 68.6% and manufacturing 25% and calculated in Turkey as agriculture 23.2%, services 50. %3 and manufacturing 21.4% in 2008). Increased participation of women in employment, while the employment rate for men remained at over 75% during the period of 1990 and 2010 (rising at times up to 80%), the rate for women rose from 50% to around 63% in the EU27. Comparing to the EU 27 women participation rate with Turkey found very low and calculated as 27,2% in 2010 in Turkey, while the rate calculated as 70,3% for men in the EU. Meanwhile, the proportion of older people (those aged between 50 and 64 years) in work rose from around 49% in 2000 to more than 56% in 2009 in the EU. More women are moving into supervisory roles, the proportion of women who hold supervisory position has increased steadily over past 20 years, rising from 26% of all supervisors in 1991 (in the then 12 Member States) to 33% in the EU27 in 2010.

The traditional open-ended "permanent" contract is still the most common form of employment contract (being held by around 80% of employees) and the proportion of workers with a temporary contract has been rising while 10% of employees in the EC12 were on a fixed term contract in 1991, by 2007 this percentage had risen to over 14% of employees in the EU27. However it dropped again to 13.5% in 2009. The number of hours worked per week continues to drift downwards. Standard working time arrangements as a five day week of 40 hours, worked Monday to Friday is still the norm, approximately one fifth of workers are having difficulties achieving a satisfactory work-life balance, a slight decrease since 2000 due to flexible working arrangements, the level of training paid for by the employer over the last 12 months rose notably between 2005 and 2010, substantial numbers of employees do not feel confident about being able to remain in their current job until the age of 60 (Eurofound, 2012b; Özcüre, 2010a).

The EU currently trying to solve the problem between European social model which protecting to employees and flexicurity which trying to protect atypical workers and security through flexibility after the 2008/2009 economic crisis era. The EU approach of flexibility-security combinations are not advantageous either, the pure effect of the crisis is not softened by normalization of employment relations which the EU policies advice that not only employees are protected, also, at the same time the employer and employment security are aimed. Turkish companies shows almost same level flexibility practices with the European companies in some areas with some diferences in some other areas but long operating hours are overrepresented and 'social dialogue' and 'employees covered by a collective wage agreement' levels found lover in Turkey. Generaly, 'low flexibility' companies are also found less often in the northern parts of the EU and 'high flexibility' organisations are underrepresented in the Mediterranean countries.

References

Büyükuslu, A. R. (2004), Avrupa Birliği Perspektifinden ve Endüstri İlişkileri boyutuyla Yeni İş Kanunu: Esneklik ve İş Güvencesi, İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.

Çakır, Ö. (2009), Avrupa Birliği'nde Güvenceli Esneklik ve Eğilimler, Sosyo Ekonomi, Temmuz-Aralık 2009-2, s. 77-94.

Eurofound (2012a), Working Time in the EU, Foundation Findings, European Foundation for Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Brussels, accessed on 20.01.2012.

Eurofound (2012b), Changes over time – First findings from the fifth European Working Conditions Survey, European Foundation for Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Brussels, accessed on 20.01.2012.

Eurofound (2010), European Company Survey 2009 Overview, Authors: Arnold Riedmann, Guy van Gyes, Amelia Roman, Marcel Kerkhofs and Sebastian Bechmann, Dublin.

Europa (2010a), New Skills for New Jobs Anticipating and matching labour market and skills needs", Brussels, 16.12.2008, COM(2008)868 final, http://ec.europa.eu/ archives/growthandjobs/pdf/european-dimension-2008annual-progressreport/COM 2008868EN.pdf.

Europa (2010b), A European Economic Recovery Plan", Commission Communication COM (2008) 800 final, 26.11.2008, Brussels, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/ LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0800:FIN:EN:PDF.

European Commission (2011), European Social Dialogue 2009-2011: Social Partners and Flexibility in Contemporary Labour Markets Synthesis Report, Joint Study of the Implementation of Flexicurity and the Role of the Social Partners" National Fiche: Turkey", European Social Partners "The Turkey Integrated Programme of the EU Social Dialogue 2009-2011, Prepared by: Eckhard Voss, Project of the European Social Partners with the financial support of the European Commission, Brussels. Luxembourg: Official Publications of the European Communities.

European Commission (2007a) Towards Common Principles of Flexicurity: More and better jobs through flexibility and security, 27.6.2007, COM (2007)359 final, Brussels.

Glassner, V. and Galgoczi, B. (2009), Plant-Level responses to economic crisis in Europe, European Trade Union Institute for Research, Education and Health and Safety, WP 2009.01, Brussels.

Gundogan, N. (2009), Can Denmark's Flexicurity System Be Replicated In Developing Countries? The Case Of Turkey Online at http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/17470/MPRA Paper No. 17470.

Hekimler, A. (2006), Sosyal Politika Boyutunda Federal Almanya'da Esnek Çalışma Modelleri Avrupa Birliği ve Federal Almanya Mevzuatı Işığında Türkiye İçin Perspektifler, Ankara: Türkiye İşveren Sendikaları Federasyonu.

Kabaalioğlu, H., Ott, A. and Tatham, A. (2011), EU and Turkey: Bridging the differences, İstanbul: Economic Development Foundation, Publication No:250.

Koray, M. and Çelik, A. (2007), Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye'de Sosyal Diyalog, AB'ye Sosyal uyum Dizisi, Ankara:Belediya-İş Sendikası Yayınları.

Özcüre, G., Demirkaya H. and Eryiğit, N. (2011), The sustainable company and employee participation as a part of the solution to triple crisis in the European Union And Turkey: Example of OMV Samsun Elektrik, The Proceedings 7th International Strategic Management Conference, "Investigating Strategies of Recovery from the Recession", June 30- July 02, 2011, Paris, France, Beykent University, Gebze Institute of Technology, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Paris, France, pp. 1241-1252.

Özcüre, G. (2010a), Avrupa Birliği'nin Sosyal Politikası ve Türkiye, İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.

Özcüre, G. (2010b), Avrupa İstihdam Stratejisi Hedeflerinin Karşılaştırmalı Sonuçları ve Türkiye'nin Uyumu, 12. Çalışma Ekonomisi ve Endüstri İlişkileri Kongresi, 7-10 Ekim 2010, Belconti Resort Hotel, Belek-Antalya: TÜRK-İŞ, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Yayınları, 183-225.

Özcüre, G., Demirkaya, H., Eryigit, N., and Yüce, G. (2009), The influence of the European Union employee participation system and related acquis on companies operating in Turkey, South East Europe Review for Labour and Social Affairs - SEER, 'The economic crisis: impacts and policy responses in south-east Europe', Number 1/2009, Volume 12. Number 1, Quarterly of the Hans-Böckler- Stiftung, Dusseldorf and The European Trade Union Institute, Brussels, Production: Nomos Verlag, Baden-Baden, Germany, ISSN 1435-2869, pp. 95-114.

Özcüre, G., Eryiğit, N. (2006), AB'de Çalışanların Yönetime Katılma Yönergesinin KOBİ'ler Düzeyinde Uygulanması ve Türkiye Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme, İktisat Fakültesi Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları, 51 Kitap, İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayın No: 4637, İktisat Fakültesi Yayın No:590, ISSN: 1304-0103, İstanbul, ss. 144-176.

Rydell A. and Wigblad, R. (2011), "Company-level flexicurity during the restructuring process: a model"Transfer, 17(4) 547–562.

Süral, N. (2007), Economic Implications of Employment Protection Legislation in Turkey: Has Turkey Found Its Juste Millieu?, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi, İzmir, Cilt: 9, Özel Sayı, s. 75-113.

Tangian, A. (2010), Not for bad weather: macroanalaysis of flexicurity with regard to the crisis, Working Paper 2010.06, European Trade Union Institute, Brussels.

Yeldan, E. (2011), Macroeconomic of growth and employment: The case of Turkey, International Labour Organization, Genova, Switzerland.