

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

EMPLOYMENT PRECARIOUSNESS TAXONOMIES – DEFINITION, DIMENSIONS, INFLUENCING FACTORS AND CONSEQUENCES

Hamad Atiah J Alsulami¹, Zafir Khan Mohamed Makhbul²

¹Graduate School of Business, University Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia

²College of Business Administration, Albaha University, Albaha, Saudi Arabia

Corresponding Author¹hamad_alsulami@hotmail.com

Hamad Atiah J Alsulami, Zafir Khan Mohamed Makhbul. Employment Precariousness Taxonomies – Definition, Dimensions, Influencing Factors and Consequences – PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17(9) (2020), ISSN 1567-214X.

Keywords: Employment Precariousness, Snowballing Approach, Taxonomic Scheme, Standard Employment, None Standard Employment

ABSTRACT:

Surprisingly, taxonomies of Precarious Employment in all facets remain a debatable and unresolved issue in the literature, and this will always matter. The present paper explains the core aspects and boundaries of Precarious Employment in terms of definition, dimensions, influencing factors and the consequences of this phenomenon. Several scholarly scientific databases were searched with certain keywords for scholarly peer-reviewed articles reporting results about employment precariousness, conducted between Jan 2019 and Jan 2020. Following the Snowballing Guidelines for systematic literature studies, further qualitative analysis was used to develop the taxonomies of employment precariousness. The paper found no universal definition or boundaries of precarious employment, yet, with some intersections toward the standard and nonstandard employments; the precariousness phenomenon is reported by hundreds of studies and can be identified in terms of certain dimensions. The paper also found that precariousness in employment can be influenced by many factors including, but not limited to, globalization and global unevenness, markets and work reforms, financial crisis, and economic recession, neoliberalism and liberalization, technological evolution, the role of unions and market deregulation, as well as, organizational restructuring, downsizing, and outsourcing. The paper then identified several consequences of this phenomenon with positive and/or negative impact on flexibility, employability, social aspects, economic inequalities, as well as, the attitudes wellbeing and performance of employees. The application of the taxonomic scheme in this paper provides a systematic organization of employment precariousness and contributes to the classification of knowledge in the area of interest. Therefore, this paper attempted to deepen and bring further insights into the boundaries of precariousness in employment, yet, recommends that our understanding in this area must be widened.

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of Precarious Employment has increased during the last three to four decades. According to Kalleberg (2009, 2011), Smith (2013), Benach et al. (2016) and Moscone, Tosetti, and Vittadini (2016), this phenomenon has

spread across several professional and occupational spectrums, causing labor market volatility, job insecurity, and other consequences related to the employee, employer or both. Based on Virtanen et al. (2005), the rapid changes in the workplace have led to the appearance of various forms of precarious employment, including self-employment, casual work, temporary, on-call or zero-hours contracts, fixed-term contract, and part-time employment.

As reported by Arnold and Bongiovi (2012), Smith (2013), Schwab (2016) and Benach et al. (2016), there are many unavoidable drivers cause the phenomenon of employment precariousness including the involuntary layoffs, globalization, declining influence of unions, degradation of social protection and the need for organizational restructuring. Such drivers even can facilitate a further unpleasant reshaping of “market” and “hierarchy” patterns (Gilson et al., 2009), make “hierarchical outsourcing” (Williamson, 1981; Weil, 2014) with “fissured workplace”, and consequently, leading to serious economic, organizational, health-related, societal and other challenges (Kalleberg, 2011). In a recent study by Imhof and Andresen (2017), it has been reported that “While temporary workers’ specific employment circumstances strongly suggest negative consequences for their well-being, research on temporary workers’ well-being shows serious inconsistencies”.

However, earlier research conducted by Lewchuk, Clarke, and Wolff (2011) has shown that the spread of Precarious Employment is even reshaping how households and individuals are living, how the nature of community participation work, and how negative health outcomes appear. Therefore, there is a need to understand this new trend in the labor market in more detail. This paper attempts to focus on the issues of conceptualization of this term, the influencing factors causing its increase, and its dimensions and consequences, through the development of taxonomies.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Taxonomic Scheme

Taxonomy is the science of classification where concepts are classified from general to the particular, or from the central to the substitute; almost vents, objects, places, data, information, knowledge, terms, as well as, anything can be classified using a taxonomic scheme. Therefore, taxonomy is not only a classification method or system in the area of biodiversity and living planet but also a hierarchical classification system for naming and organizing things (Webster & Watson, 2002; Greenhalgh & Peacock, 2005; Serrat, 2017). Many scholars have recommended and deployed the technique of taxonomy as a research methodology, and taxonomies of things will always matter as a classification or categorization system of such things.

The processes embedded in this approach or scheme may include several activities such as listing concepts, creating categories, identifying terms, classifying expressions, discovering vocabularies, etc. (Lambe, 2007; Serrat, 2017). This paper applies this approach to understand the notion of employment precariousness in terms of definition, dimensions, influencing factors, and the consequences; as the precariousness of employment is relatively considered as a new concept, the anonymization of those terms or concerns remain matters.

Snowballing Procedure

To conduct a reliable search and analysis of the existing literature related to the concept of employment precariousness, Snowballing sampling was used as the main method to find and identify the key existing literature (Goodman, 1961). In the context of this work, this sampling technique works based on creating a citation network of earlier studies using relevant keywords starting by identifying a seed paper (s) through ordinary search, and then, collecting the studies citing the seed article(s) as a first step.

Therefore, Google Scholar search was used as a first step to search for general terms related to precarious employment and work. Google Scholar search service is freely available and accessible from anywhere, for anyone at any time, and provides indexing for most of the academic databases and scientific journals with no restrictions to a specific publisher, as well as, allows the user to track and tap-into citation links of the comprehensive set of search results (Lecy & Beatty, 2012). After exploring the results of several searches using much employment and work-related terms, a set of key and specific terms were identified as the most commonly used in the literature as in Table 1, and then those terms were used as keywords for conducting two times search. Based on the results, three key articles were identified as seed articles, Table 1; those seed articles were widely cited as a key reference by researchers in the domain. Also, the three seed articles were published in scholarly journals and of around one decade old so that the exposure to different audiences is broad and has been cited in scholarly journals.

Table 1: First Search for Seed Article

<i>Used Items for the search</i>	<i>Precarious Employment, Employment Precariousness, Vulnerable Workers, Vulnerable Work, Precarious Workers, Precarious Work, Non-standard employment, Contingent work, Peripheral work, Flexible employment, Non-traditional Employment, Atypical employment, etc.</i>
<i>Selected seed articles</i>	<i>(Kalleberg, 2009), (Vives et al., 2010) (Benach et al., 2010)</i>

During the first step, just the titles and abstracts have been reviewed, and the extensive full review and reading were conducted in the third step. In the second step, the reference list of the three seed articles was used to conduct a Backward Snowballing (BSB) search, and the list of articles citing the three seed articles was used to conduct a Forward Snowballing (FSB) search. Based on a qualitative analysis of the abstract section of the listed articles in the second step search, the further selection was made. The inclusion or exclusion of articles listed in the search results was based on a double brief reading of the abstract section, and some times the introduction section, and then applying the criteria as in Table 2.

Table 2: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Case	Decision
<i>Both readings recommend acceptance</i>	<i>Include the paper for further analysis</i>
<i>Both readings recommend rejection</i>	<i>Exclude the paper</i>
<i>None of the above</i>	<i>Iterate the second step</i>

The second step was repeated until no new articles were found, and a final list of articles is generated to be included in the third step for further analysis. In the third step, comprehensive text reading of the selected articles for inclusion was conducted to identify those articles that can be included for content analysis, and those to be excluded. In the fourth step, the selected articles in the third step for inclusion were qualitatively analyzed to identify the terms and concepts needed for the development of taxonomies. Figure 1 illustrates the steps conducted using the Snowball procedure.




Figure 1: Sampling Procedure

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Employment Precariousness Conceptualization Taxonomy

According to the literature in this domain, it has been demonstrated that by the end of the twentieth century, there was general and worldwide agreement that the labor markets were in clear transition, and employment was becoming less secure and instable. This transition was confirmed, mentioned and investigated by many scholars such as Standing (1999), Benach et al. (2000), Cranford, Vosko and Zukewich (2003), Vosko (2006), De Witte et al. (2008), De Cuyper et al. (2008), Kalleberg (2009), Muntaner et al. (2010), Kalleberg (2011), Standing (2011), Arnold and Bongiovi (2012), Wagenaar et al. (2012), Smith (2013), Weil (2014), Lewchuk et al. (2014), Benach et al. (2014), Adams and

Deakin (2014), Behling and Harvey (2015), Dawson et al. (2015), Schonfeld and Mazzola (2015), Benach et al. (2016), Moscone, Tosetti and Vittadini (2016), Campbell and Price (2016), Lewchuk (2017), Van Aerden, Gadeyne and Vanroelen (2017), Imhof and Andresen (2017), Shoss (2017), Jiang (2018), Rudolph and Zacher (2018), Fischmann et al. (2018), Baffoe-Bonnie and Gyapong (2018).

Those scholars provided findings on that the prevalence of secure and stable SER full-time employment with firm contracts and benefits was in decline, while some alternative forms of NonSER work grow, most of which are temporary, part-time, self-employed, insecure, unstable, etc. The SER and NonSER were then classified according to the Labour Market Segmentation Theory. However, due to the ongoing evolution of worldwide labor markets, the set of employment conditions described by those scholars were identified as precarious employment; and will bound to continue for the foreseeable future (Muntaner, 2016).

Regarding the precarious employment term, the literature can be divided into three distinct camps: precarious employment is universally interchangeable with “non-standard” employment such as in case of Markey et al. (2002); precarious employment is attached to certain types or categories of non-standard employment, or precarious employment is a multidimensional and complex concept affecting the standard or non-standard employment as in case of Rodgers (1989), Cranford, Vosko and Zukewich, 2003, and Campbell and Burgess (2001). Therefore, several scholars with extensive ongoing research efforts recommend developing measures of employment precariousness that can go beyond simply measuring the form of employee-employer relationship (Vosko, 2006; Vives et al., 2010; Lewchuk, Clarke & de Wolff, 2011; Goldring and Joly, 2014; Lewchuk et al., 2014; Puig-Barrachina et al., 2014; Benach et al., 2014; Bohle et al., 2015; Gallie et al., 2017; Benach et al., 2016; Callea & Chirumbolo, 2016; Moscone, Tosetti & Vittadini, 2016; Van Aerden, Gadeyne & Vanroelen, 2017; Imhof & Andresen, 2017; Shoes, 2017; Lewchuk, 2017; Fu et al., 2017; Fischmann et al., 2018; Jiang, 2018). In other words, rather than simply identifying certain forms under the SER or NonSER employments as precarious employment, the task in this study involves examining the precariousness level in different employment forms. This can help in determining the extent to which a certain job or employment work is precarious. Figure 2 illustrates the taxonomy of employment precariousness conceptualization.




Figure 2: Taxonomy of Employment Precariousness Conceptualization

Employment Precariousness Dimensional Taxonomy

As explained by Amable, Benach, and González (2001), precarious employment is not a precarious job; as the later means just an unstable job, while precarious employment can be identified through certain dimensions as explained earlier. Despite several studies reported different dimensions of employment precariousness, the construct encompasses and can be comprehensively identified by six main dimensions: Job Insecurity and Temporariness, levels of Empowerment and Disempowerment, Vulnerability and Risks, Income and Wages, Employment Rights and Exercising those Rights (Vives et al., 2010; Benach et al., 2010; Amable, Benach and González, 2001). This work will make the use of those factors and their sub-components to assess the level of employment precariousness. Figure 3 illustrates the taxonomy of employment precariousness dimensions.




Figure 3: Taxonomy of Employment Precariousness Dimensions

Employment Precariousness Factors Taxonomy

The literature reported an increase in the prevalence of precarious employment as a worldwide phenomenon with a focus on different relevant aspects. For

example, Kalleberg (2009) and Lewchuk (2017) explained that the quality of employment conditions and relations has changed considerably in the last four decades due to the extensive focus on labor market competitiveness and flexibility. Indeed, there was also a good body of literature arguing that there has been a decline in the prevalence of the SER due to many reasons. As argued by Standing (2011), there is a new emerging class of workers known as the “Precariat”; those workers are in insecure jobs with few employment benefits or social protections as organizations started since looking for strategies to cut down costs and level commitments towards employees. Many scholars in this domain including Gilson et al. (2009), Kalleberg (2011), Arnold and Bongiovi (2012), Smith (2013), Weil (2014), Schwab (2016), Benach et al. (2016), Imhof and Andresen (2017), Lain et al. (2018), as well as Fischmann et al. (2018) reported several factors causing this transition such as globalization and global unevenness, markets and work reforms, financial crisis and economic recession, neoliberalism and liberalization, technological developments, the role of unions and market deregulation, and organizational restructuring, downsizing or outsourcing. Figure 4 illustrates the taxonomy of factors influencing the employment precariousness.




Figure 4: Taxonomy of Factors Influencing the Employment Precariousness

Precariousness Consequences Taxonomy

Scholars like Supiot (1999), Kalleberg (2000), De Cuyper and De Witte (2008), De Cuyper et al. (2008), Kalleberg (2009), Puig-Barrachina et al. (2014), Benach et al. (2016), Lewchuk (2017), as well as, Lain et al. (2018) among others, reported that there is a wide range of findings with debates on the potential benefits and consequences of precarious employment. The issue of advantages and disadvantages can be contextual (i.e., varying according to gender, country, situation, employment form, etc.), and may vary according to the perspectives of the employee, employer, society, healthcare, and economy. As discussed by De Cuyper and De Witte (2008), some of those attributes can be negative for some employees, but not for others, and some jobs can be advantageous in some contexts but not in others.

For example, Kalleberg (2009) explained that flexibility and employability with social gains are to be advantageous outcomes of this employment trend, while some of the disadvantageous attributes included flexibility, negative attitudes, and low levels of well-being for the employee, as well as, some negative behavioral intentions and health results. Other examples were given by Kalleberg (2000), De Cuyper et al. (2008), as well as, Imhof and Andresen (2017), showing that temporary employment in case of low-skilled workers

face real risks, while the experienced workers with high levels of skills prefer temporary employment for financial profitability, more flexibility and personal controls. As a result, there is no clear cut-off decision or appraisal regarding certain attributes of given precarious employment to be with positive or negative effects. Figure 5 illustrates the taxonomy of the employment precariousness consequences.




Figure 5: Taxonomy of Employment Precariousness Consequences.

CONCLUSION

This article attempted to develop taxonomies of precarious employment in terms of definition, dimensions, influencing factors and consequences. The snowballing technique has been used to conduct a review of literature in the domain. Based on the findings, there is an outstanding need to develop a universal definition of the precariousness of employment with a unified agreement of the concept or term to be in use by scientists and market professionals. The suggested taxonomies have been developed, definition taxonomy (three items), dimensions taxonomy (six items), influencing taxonomy (seven items), and consequences taxonomy (six items). Those taxonomies are expected to provide further insights into understanding the phenomenon of employment precariousness, yet, more research is needed in this domain.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Z. and Deakin, S. (2014). "Institutional Solutions to Inequality and Precariousness in Labour Markets," 52, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, pp. 779-809.
- Amable, M., Benach, J., & González, S. (2001). La precariedad laboral y su repercusión sobre la salud: Conceptos y resultados preliminares de un estudio multimétodos. *Archivos de Prevención de Riesgos Laborales*, 4(4), 169-184.
- Arnold, D., and Bongiovi (2012) 'Precarious, Informalizing and Flexible Work: Transforming Concepts and Understandings', *American Behavioral Scientist* 57 (3): 289-308.
- Baffoe-Bonnie, J., & Gyapong, A. O. (2018). Definition of full-time and part-time employment, and distributional assumptions: the implications for the estimated full-time and part-time wage equations. *International Review of Applied Economics*, 32(2), 259-279.

- Behling, F. and Harvey, M. (2015) The evolution of false self-employment in the British construction industry: a neo-Polanyian account of labour market formation, *Work, employment and society*, Vol. 29(6), pp. 969-988.
- Benach J, Benavides FG, Platt S, Diez-Roux A, Muntaner C. The health-damaging potential of new types of flexible employment: a challenge for public health researchers. *American Journal of Public Health* 2000; 90: 1316–17.
- Benach J, Vives A, Amable M, Vanroelen C, Tarafa G, Muntaner C. Precarious employment: understanding an emerging social determinant of health. *Annual Review of Public Health* 2014; 35:229–53.
- Benach J., Vives A., Tarafa G., Delclos C. and Muntaner C. (2016) ‘What should we know about precarious employment and health for 2015? Framing the agenda for the next decade of research’, *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 61(4), pp276-277.
- Benach, J., Solar, O., Santana, V., Castedo, A., Chung, H., Muntaner, C. et al. (2010). A micro-level model of employment relations and health inequalities. *International Journal of Health Services: Planning, Administration, Evaluation*, 40(2), 223-227.
- Bohle P, Quinlan M, McNamara M, et al. (2015) Health and wellbeing of older workers: comparing their associations with effort, reward imbalance and pressure, disorganisation and regulatory failure. *Work and Stress* 29(2): 114–127.
- Callea, A., Urbini, F. & Chirumbolo, A. (2016). The mediating role of organizational identification in the relationship between qualitative job insecurity, OCB and job performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(6), 735–746.
- Campbell, I. and Burgess, J. (2001): A new estimate of casual employment? . In: *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 27 (1): 85–109.
- Campbell, I., & Price, R. (2016). Precarious work and precarious workers: Towards an improved conceptualisation. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 27(3), 314–332.
- Cranford, Cynthia J and Vosko, Leah F. and Zukewich, Nancy, *The Gender of Precarious Employment in Canada* (September 15, 2003). *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations*, Vol. 58, No. 3, 2003.
- Dawson, C., Veliziotis, M., Pacheco, G., Webber, D.J., 2015. Is temporary employment a cause or consequence of poor mental health? A panel data analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*. 134, 50e58.
- De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2008). Volition and reasons for accepting temporary employment: Associations with attitudes, well-being, and behavioural intentions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(3), 363-387.
- De Cuyper, N., De Jong, J., De Witte, H., Isaksson, K., Rigotti, T., & Schalk, R. (2008). Literature review of theory and research on the psychological impact of temporary employment: Towards a conceptual model. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10, 25-51.
- Fischmann, Gabriel, De Witte, Hans, Sulea, Coralia and Iliescu, Dragos . (2018), Qualitative job insecurity and in-role performance: a bidirectional longitudinal relationship?, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 27, issue 5, 603-615.
- Fu H, Kleinberg RD, Lavi R, Smorodinsky R(2017) Job security, stability, and production efficiency. *Theoret. Econom.*12(1):1–24.
- Gallie D, Felstead A, Green F, et al. (2017) The hidden face of job insecurity. *Work, Employment & Society* 31(1): 36–53.
- Gilson, R.J. et al. 2009. “Contracting for Innovation: Vertical Disintegration and Interfirm Collaboration”, *Columbia Law Review*, Vol. 109, No. 3, pp. 431-502.
- Goldring, L., & Joly, M.-P. (2014). Immigration, citizenship and racialization at Work: Unpacking employment precarity in Southwestern Ontario. *Just Labour: A Canadian Journal of Work and Society*, 22, 94–121.

- Goodman, L.A. (1961). "Snowball sampling". *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*. 32 (1): 148–170.
- Greenhalgh, T. & Peacock, R., (2005). Effectiveness and efficiency of search methods in systematic reviews of complex evidence: audit of primary sources. *Bmj*, 331(7524):1064–1065.
- Imhof, Susanne and Andresen, Maïke. (2017). Unhappy with well-being research in the temporary work context: mapping review and research agenda, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 29(1):1-37.
- Jiang, Lixin and Johnson, Matthew J. (2018). Meaningful Work and Affective Commitment: A Moderated Mediation Model of Positive Work Reflection and Work Centrality. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33, 4, pp 545–558
- Kalleberg, A.L. (2011). *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs: The Rise of Polarized and Precarious Employment Systems in the United States, 1970s-2000s*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, American Sociological Association Rose Series in Sociology.
- Kalleberg, Arne L. 2009. "Precarious Work, Insecure Workers: Employment Relations in Transition." *American Sociological Review* 74:1–22.
- Kalleberg, Arne L., 2000, Nonstandard Employment Relations: Part-time, Temporary and Contract Work, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26:1, 341-365.
- Lain, D., Airey, L., Loretto, W., & Vickerstaff, S. (2018). Understanding older worker precarity: The intersecting domains of jobs, households and the welfare state. *Ageing and Society*, 1-23.
- Lambe P (2007) *Organizing knowledge taxonomies, knowledge, and organizational effectiveness*, Chandos Publishing
- Lecy, Jesse & Beatty, Kate. (2012). Representative Literature Reviews Using Constrained Snowball Sampling and Citation Network Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 10.2139
- Lewchuk, W. (2017). Precarious jobs: Where are they, and how do they affect well-being? *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 28(3), 402–419.
- Lewchuk, W., Laflèche, M., Dyson, D., Goldring, L., Meisner, A., Procyk, S., Rosen, D., Shields, J., Viducis, P., & Vrankulj, S. (2014). Is Precarious Employment Low Income Employment? *The Changing Labour Market in Southern Ontario*. *Just Labour*, 22, 51-73.
- Lewchuk, Wayne, Marlea Clarke and Alice de Wolff. 2011. *Working Without Commitments: Precarious Employment and Health*. Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press.
- Markey, R., Hodgkinson, A. and Kowalczyk, J. (2002): Gender, Part-time Employment and Employee Participation in Australian Workplaces. In: *Employee Relations*, 24 (2): 129-150.
- Moscone, F., Tosetti, E. and Vittadini, G. (2016). The impact of precarious employment on mental health: The case of Italy, *Social Science & Medicine*. 158 (2016) 86–95.
- Muntaner C, Solar O, Vanroelen C, Martínez JM, Vergara M, et al. 2010. Unemployment, informal work, precarious employment, child labor, slavery, and health inequalities: pathways and mechanisms. *Int. J. Health Serv.* 40(2):281–95
- Muntaner, Carles. (2016). Global precarious employment and health inequalities: working conditions, social class, or precariat?. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública*, 32(6), e00162215.
- Puig-Barrachina V, Vanroelen C, Vivesb A, et al. (2014) Measuring employment precariousness in the European Working Conditions Survey: the social distribution in Europe. *Work* 49(1): 143–161.
- Rodgers, G. 1989. "Precarious Employment in Western Europe: The State of the Debate". Pp. 1-16 in *Precarious Jobs in Labour Market Regulation: The Growth of Atypical Employment in Western Europe*, edited by G. Rodgers and J. Rodgers. Belgium: International Institute for Labour Studies.

- Rudolph, C. W., & Zacher, H. (2018). What are the mechanisms? The black box of neoliberalism. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(5), 556-557.
- Schonfeld, I. S., & Mazzola, J. J. (2015). A qualitative study of stress in individuals self-employed in solo businesses. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(4), 501-513.
- Schwab, K. (2016). *The Forth Industrial Revolution* (Geneva: World Economic Forum).
- Serrat O. (2017) *Taxonomies for Development*. In: *Knowledge Solutions*. Springer, Singapore
- Shoss, M. K. (2017). Job insecurity: An integrative review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 43, 1911–1939
- Smith, V. (2013). Good Jobs, Bad Jobs: The Rise of Polarized and Precarious Employment Systems in the United States, 1970s to 2000s by Arne L. Kalleberg; Good Jobs America: Making Work Better for Everyone by Paul Osterman, Beth Shulman (review) , *Social Forces*, 91(3), 1105-1109.
- Standing, G (2011), *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London UK: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Standing, Guy. 1999. *Global Labour Flexibility: Seeking Distributive Justice*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Supiot, A., (1999) 'The transformation of work and the future of labour law in Europe: A multi-disciplinary perspective' 138 (1) *International Labour Review* 31, 33.
- Van Aerden, K., Gadeyne, S., & Vanroelen, C. (2017). Is any job better than no job at all? Studying the relations between employment types, unemployment and subjective health in Belgium. *Archives of Public Health*, 75, 55. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s13690-017-0225-5>
- Vives A, Amable M, Ferrer M, Moncada S, Llorens C, Muntaner C, Benavides FG, Benach J., 2010, The Employment Precariousness Scale (EPRES): psychometric properties of a new tool for epidemiological studies among waged and salaried workers *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*;67:548-555.
- Vosko, L. (2006) 'Precarious employment: towards an improved understanding of labour market insecurity', in L. Vosko (ed.) *Precarious Employment: understanding labour market insecurity in Canada*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Wagenaar, A. F., Kompier, M. A. J., Houtman, I. L. D., van den Bossche, S., Smulders, P., & Taris, T. W. (2012). Can labour contract differences in health and work-related attitudes be explained by quality of working life and job insecurity? *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 85(7), 763–773. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-011-0718-4>
- Webster, J. & Watson, R.T., (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 26(2):3.
- Weil, D. 2014. *The Fissured Workplace: Why Work Became So Bad for So Many and What Can Be Done to Improve It*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, Harvard University Press.
- Williamson, O.E. 1981. "The economics of organizations: The transaction cost approach", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 87, No. 3, pp. 548–577.