

Analyzing and Classifying the Implications of Employment Precarization: Individual, Organizational and Social Levels*



Andrei V. Popov

Vologda Research Center of RAS
Vologda, Russian Federation, 56A, Gorky Street, 160014
E-mail: ai.popov@yahoo.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-4803-1354; ResearcherID: I-8785-2016



Tat'yana S. Solov'eva

Vologda Research Center of RAS
Vologda, Russian Federation, 56A, Gorky Street, 160014
E-mail: solo_86@list.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-4803-1354; ResearcherID: I-8785-2016

Abstract. Currently, the concept of employment precarization is one of the most discussed topics in the field of social and labor relations. It is due to the fact that this phenomenon affects more people than unemployment and poses a threat to the provision of decent working conditions in modern economic environment, when flexible forms of employment are coming to the fore. Their use, despite many positive aspects, often leads to the destabilization of labor relations, the effects of which go far beyond the specific workplace. In this regard, the goal of our article is to study and classify the implications of employment precarization at different levels of society organization. We use general scientific methods such as critical analysis, generalization, comparison, and classification, which serve as the basis for the analysis of domestic and foreign scientific literature on the subject. The findings of our study prove that the effects of employment precarization are indeed multifaceted. At the individual level, this is manifested in the deterioration of material well-being, social security and health, and also in the uncertainty of personal/

* The study was supported by the grant of the President of the Russian Federation for providing state support to young Russian scientists – candidates of sciences (no. MK-3571.2019.6).

For citation: Popov A.V., Solov'eva T.S. Analyzing and classifying the implications of employment precarization: individual, organizational and social levels. *Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast*, 2019, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 182–196. DOI: 10.15838/esc.2019.6.66.10

family and professional prospects. There may be benefits in the framework of the organization, but the destabilization of labour relations poses far greater threats, such as reduced productivity, increased staff turnover, and increased costs associated with the health and safety of employees. All this can have a negative impact on the life of society as a whole, affecting the functioning of the labor market, the degree of social cohesion, the stability of the political situation, the scale of social inequality and social exclusion, and the pace of socio-economic development. The prospects for further research are to consider the implications of employment precarization, taking into account the specifics of the social and labor sphere in Russia.

Key words: employment precarization, labor market, unstable employment, non-standard employment, social and labor relations, precariat.

Introduction

Global mobility of capital and labor, the widespread introduction of digital technologies, demographic ageing, and other trends in modern society have a significant impact on the sphere of social and labor relations. This applies not only to the redistribution of labor between economic sectors, but also to the essential foundations of the way in which the labor process is organized; in particular, flexibility has become one of the most important characteristics of this process. As a result, since the mid-1970s, non-standard forms of employment (temporary, part-time, self-employment, contract and agency labor, etc.) have been swiftly developing; they are fundamentally different from full-time employment and the indefinite employment contract with the employer, which is traditional for the industrial era [1, pp. 3-4]. The intensity of the changes can be seen in the data on working hours in OECD countries: in 1970–2018, the average number of hours worked per year decreased¹ from 1,975 to 1,734. At the same time, new forms of employment are emerging (freelance, telework, service types of work, etc.); they significantly expand the opportunities for direct interaction with customers. According to the estimates of Russian scientists, the share of non-standard workers in Russia tends to grow and is approaching 20% [2, p. 343].

¹ Hours worked. OECD Data. Available at: <https://data.oecd.org/emp/hours-worked.htm>

However, the implications of such changes are very contradictory. On the one hand, the spread of non-standard employment increases the economic activity of the population (especially representatives of vulnerable groups) and reduces labor costs, provides favorable conditions for combining work and life, professional self-realization, etc., which has a positive effect on the actors of the labor market. On the other hand, the flexibility of labor relations often leads to a decrease in the stability of employees' position [3], which in the scientific literature is associated with the process of precarization of employment, which characterizes the growth of instability. Despite the lack of conceptual and terminological clarity, many scientists point out an extremely negative impact of this phenomenon on the quality of working life. As a rule, this leads to a situation called precarious employment, when the employee is forced to face unfavorable working conditions, social insecurity, reduced or delayed wages, high risk of job loss², etc., which may ultimately affect the overall stability [4]. Currently, precarization of employment is increasingly seen as a global challenge, the implications of which cover a wide variety of life spheres [5].

² Non-standard employment around the world: Understanding challenges, shaping prospects. ILO. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_534326.pdf

In the framework of the present study, we understand employment precarization as a process of destabilization of labor relations due to their transformation, which is manifested in a decrease in the stability of the position of employees and society as a whole. In contrast to the majority of interpretations, the definition we propose clearly reflects the essence of the phenomenon under consideration, the nature and scope of its consequences; the absence of excessive particularities allows us to address a wide range of problematic issues, which, taking into account cross-country features, is very promising.

In the absence of objective criteria for precarious employment it is difficult to determine the real extent of the problem. Today, precarization processes are usually interpreted through the prism of precarious employment, which is evaluated by indicators of the informal sector [6], various forms of non-standard employment and incomplete unemployment [7], working conditions [8], income level [9], social insecurity [10], and others. In addition, synthetic indicators calculated on the data of sociological surveys [11, 12] are very popular. As a result, depending on the accepted criteria, the involvement in unstable labor relations can vary significantly: 22% in Canada (2015) [13], from 4% to one third of all employees in the United States (2014–2017) [14], from 50 to 76% in Russia (2016) [15].

Employment precarization is characterized as a systemic risk, the study of which requires an approach that takes into account the versatility and scale of its consequences, the complexity and interdisciplinary nature of the study [16, p. 47]. Therefore, the formation of a holistic view of the possible effects caused by the spread of this phenomenon is an urgent scientific task. This is facilitated by the fact that the academic community pays special attention to the quality of employees' working

lives, while the organizational and social levels often remain outside the research focus. However, in the interests of effective labor and employment policies, it is necessary to consider the manifestations of precarization in the “individual–organization–state” complex, since the processes occurring at different levels of the organization of society are interconnected and mutually affect each other. Hence, the goal of this research is to study and classify the implications of employment precarization at the individual, organizational, and social levels.

Materials and methods

As it was mentioned earlier, in modern scientific literature there is no consolidated point of view on the essence of the process of precarization, which is expressed in the vagueness of the existing conceptual apparatus and methodological pluralism in approaches to the study of precarious labor relations. In most cases, these include such forms of employment as temporary, casual, part-time, seasonal, reserve, informal, self-employment, etc. Although experts from the International Labor organization (ILO) point out that signs of precarization can be observed in standard employment³ as well as in non-standard employment. As a result, when addressing a large number of works in this field, we find it quite difficult to adhere to any one point of view. In this regard, we have tried to look as broadly as possible at the problem of destabilization of labor relations. For this purpose, in the course of the analysis, we considered publications on the implications of employment precarization without taking into account theoretical and methodological differences, which imposes some restrictions on the findings.

³ Non-standard employment around the world: Understanding challenges, shaping prospects. ILO. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_534326.pdf

It should also be noted that precarization trends in the field of labor characterize the situation primarily in the most prosperous countries, where the standard model of employment has been established by law, and it grants employees a certain level of social security. It is very difficult to speak about the stability of labor relations in many poor regions of the world, which is confirmed by the ILO data for 2018, according to which the scale of precarious employment in these territories exceeds⁴ 70%. However, even in developed countries, social security systems differ markedly, so the consequences of employment precarization may have their own specific features in the cross-country context.

The information base of the research was provided by domestic and foreign scientific works on the problem under consideration. The selection of scientific literature, mainly empirical, was made using the keywords from the databases Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science and RSCI. Then, based on the analysis of the abstracts, works were selected that dealt with the topic of the implications of employment precarization. At the last stage, the remaining publications were organized into three groups in accordance with the analytical framework of this study.

We used general scientific methods of critical analysis, generalization, comparison, classification, based on system-logical and interdisciplinary approaches. As a result of the study we developed a classification of the implications of employment precarization at the individual, organizational and social levels.

⁴ Vulnerable employment is not synonymous with unstable employment as a result of the precarization process. Vulnerable employment is contributing family workers and own-account workers as a percentage of total employment (source: Vulnerable employment (modeled ILO estimate). World Bank Open Data. Available at: <https://data.worldbank.org>).

Implications of employment precarization: individual level

Most studies on the subject of precarization of employment focus on the impact of this phenomenon on the quality of working life, which directly affects an individual's ability to work. In this case, the destabilization of labor relations is perceived only from a negative point of view, since the instability of the employee's position is not voluntary (as is the case, for example, with non-standard forms of employment), but is the result of forced circumstances and does not imply any benefits. In addition, practice shows that the consequences of precarization go far beyond the social and labor sphere.

Financial situation and social security. A study conducted on the data from the Russian Monitoring of Economic Situation and Population Health at the National Research University-Higher School of Economics (NRU HSE), revealed the negative impact of precarious employment on the income of workers [17, p. 61]. At the same time, it was proved that in the case of one vulnerability factor, the average income decreases by 13.6%, and in the case of two – by 20.5%. Data from the Canadian PEPSO study confirm differences in income between households and persons in precarious employment compared to guaranteed employment [18, p. 38]. In 2011–2014, the gap was approximately 40,000 USD per year and showed a tendency toward growth (on average by 5%).

The situation is aggravated by the fact that, since the destabilization of labor relations usually leads to the loss of social guarantees, employees do not receive paid sick leave and vacation, and a compensation for unfavorable working conditions [19, pp.18-20]. In turn, employers do not pay insurance premiums to the Pension Fund. In the end, all this can lead to financial distress and affect access to quality

medical care and decent housing [20], the consumption of quality goods and services, and the well-being of children [21]. In particular, studies in Canada have shown that one in ten and one in three precariously employed people from low-income households report, respectively, that they “have no money even to buy food frequently” and “from time to time” [22, pp.67-73]. The same situation was found in relation to the payment of various expenses related to the preparation of children for school and extracurricular activities. In addition, due to limited financial opportunities, such workers simply cannot buy their own housing, so they live with their parents (or other relatives) or are forced to rent low-cost housing, sometimes with flatmates [4, p. 80]. As a result, there is a so-called “instability trap” [10, pp. 48-49], in which the material and time costs of the employee are not compensated by the income received in conditions of unstable employment. On the contrary, employees are often forced to accept an unpaid increase in the workload and in the number of job duties, otherwise they can lose their job [23, p. 40-41].

Health of employees. Our analysis shows that in the scientific literature there is a close relationship between employment precarization and the health of the employee. In such a case, instability is considered as a social factor in health [24]. Due to weak social security, unsettled working conditions, etc. such labor relations expose an individual to a high level of injuries and morbidity in the workplace [25]. According to the Canadian National Population Health Survey, in 1998 compared with the national average, in the situation of precarious employment, respondents assessed their condition significantly worse [26, p. 30]. Some researchers also associate various manifestations of precarization with an increased risk of alcohol and drug use [27, 28]. In addition, some studies have identified the impact of job

insecurity on the risks of sexual harassment and violence. Thus, Australian and Canadian workers who are employed temporarily or part-time, as opposed to permanently employed, are subject to significantly greater threats in this regard [29; 30, p. 10].

Studies show that the destabilization of labor relations has particularly negative effects on the psychological well-being of individuals [31]. Many works in this area that according to a number of experts originate in the Job Demand-Control model of R. Karasek [32] associate a decrease in job satisfaction, exhaustion and depression with a low level of control on the part of employees and high costs of psychosocial efforts, which in the long term can lead to diseases caused by stress [26, p. 30]. Based on data on more than 2.7 million workers, F. Moscone and colleagues found a causal relationship between employment precarization and the appointment of psychotropic drugs [33]. At the same time, it was found that the transition from permanent to temporary work increases the risks of mental health deterioration. Similar results obtained in South Korea proved the relationship between the occurrence of severe symptoms of depression (including suicidal thoughts) and precarious employment [34, 35]. Data from in-depth interviews with Swedish residents who have experience of such labor relations indicate that they experienced continuous stress due to the uncertainty of maintaining their job, its schedule and prospects, and the desire to find a permanent job [22]. Moreover, this may affect the health of the spouse [36]. As a result, the increased instability of the employee’s position leads to the fear of being “locked up” in such jobs, which is interpreted as a “loss of control” with corresponding negative consequences for health, in particular the deterioration of mental health, especially among youth and middle-aged people [37]. It should be noted

that some researchers attribute the anxiety and negative emotions of an individual concerning their work to subjective factors contributing to the precarization of labor relations [38]. In addition, the occurrence of abnormalities in mental health can affect the physical condition. Those workers who are more likely to experience anxiety are more likely to suffer from common psychosomatic complications, including insomnia, headaches, and decreased overall self-esteem [39].

Although many studies have not revealed significant gender differences in the subjective perception of health among precariously employed workers [40, 41], there is an opinion that due to a number of factors (gender segregation, greater exposure to labor discrimination, the need to combine labor and domestic responsibilities, etc.), precarization of employment can cause more harm to the health of women than men [42]. At the same time, in the framework of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey in South Korea, results were obtained indicating that non-standard working conditions for men are more often associated with diseases of the musculoskeletal system and liver, and for women – with mental disorders [43]. However, according to experts, studies of employment precarization as a new social determinant of the health of workers and their families are in the initial stage and require further assessments [44, p. 233].

Future planning and family well-being. The lack of job security imposes uncertainty on the personal life of employees and their plans for the future [45], hinders the ability to make key decisions about personal life and family formation [46, 47]. For example, older people who are in unstable labor relations, although they plan to retire later than those who are engaged in more stable work, decide to retire early due to unfavorable working conditions

[48]. The instability of employment can negatively affect the reproductive attitudes of employees, since there are no guarantees of parental leave, and the risk of job loss increases [49, p. 86]. Data from the longitudinal study Swiss Household Panel show that job instability in general reduces the implementation of intentions in men and women with regard to childbirth [50, p. 19]. There is a delay in the implementation of such important personal events as the creation of serious relationships and raising children [51]. In addition, individuals involved in precarious employment cannot spend as much time with their family as they would like, because of the inconvenient work schedule and the need to find additional sources of income [22]. As a result, the work-life balance is disturbed, the probability of stressful situations increases, which negatively affects the family well-being and life satisfaction in general.

Opportunities for professional development and professional experience. Precarization of employment has a negative impact on human capital; in particular, employers in such conditions limit investment in the education of employees. Sometimes they have to pay for their own training in order to maintain a job or increase the chances of getting a job with more favorable conditions [18, p. 57]. In addition, in cases where an individual does not have an employment contract, the accumulation of work experience is not officially recorded, which may become an obstacle to employment for more worthy vacancies in the future. According to a study conducted in The Netherlands, the unstable nature of work at the beginning of a working career leads, as a rule, to an unfavorable employment situation in the future (for example, workers who started their work with temporary employment are likely to be employed for temporary work after reaching 35 years as well) [52, p. 16]. In addition,

uncertainty and short-term employment relationships negatively affect the satisfaction with their professional experience; such employees can even feel its absence [53, p. 47]. The situation may be aggravated if an employee who has a precarious job holds a position in which they cannot fully use their knowledge and skills and therefore do not implement their potential to the fullest extent. As a result, their connection with the profession is destroyed [54, pp. 59-62], i.e., deprofessionalization develops.

Implications of employment precarization: organizational level

The effects of precarization of labor relations go far beyond the activity of specific

individuals. This sooner or later affects those organizational structures that create such conditions for their employees [55]. Although the number of studies on the individual level of manifestations of employment precarization is much greater than on the organizational and social levels, it can be noted that there are both benefits and risks for employers who resort to destabilization of labor relations (*Table*).

Among the main “incentives” to use the forms of employment that are most susceptible to volatility we can highlight the following: problems with the financial situation, changes in the needs of the organization, tax obligations, opportunities, personnel rotation, etc. At the

Expected benefits and risks of precarious employment relationship for the employer

Benefit/risk	Essence
<i>Expected benefits</i>	
Short-term cost savings and reducing long-term obligations	Short-term cost savings are achieved due to the fact that some categories of workers, characterized by part-time, temporary or fixed-term employment, earn less than their “permanent” colleagues, do not receive social guarantees and, as a rule, do not have a severance package. Long-term obligations are also reduced or absent, since, for example, temporary employment relationships mean that employers are not required to pay pensions or provide long-term benefits.
Flexibility of personnel	Precarious labor relations increase the flexibility of the workforce and enable employers to respond quickly to market changes. Under standard employment relations, it is more difficult to move, hire, or release personnel.
Ability to satisfy the demand	Increasing demand often leads to the need for additional resources. In this case, there are fewer barriers to hiring temporary labor that can allow organizations to meet this demand.
Attraction of employees	Some employees, especially those who can expect a market premium for having unique skills, are not interested in long-term cooperation. In addition, individuals simply prefer the flexibility that is achieved in temporary employment relationships.
Definition of resources	Hiring an employee on a temporary basis is an effective way to reduce the risk associated with the selection of permanent staff. In this case, if the employee meets the requirements, they may be provided with more favorable conditions.
<i>Expected risks</i>	
Higher staff turnover	Hiring temporary workers increases the risk of staff turnover because they are more likely to quit. This can lead to increased costs for career guidance and training.
Reduced activity and consistency of actions	Employees under precarious employment work less than full-time employees and are less likely to invest more time and effort in fulfilling their responsibilities. In addition, the activities of these employees are less aligned with the goals of the organization, which reduces the return on investment in personnel.
Reduced performance	As a rule, employees involved in stable labor relations have a higher level of professional skills and knowledge compared to those under the precarious employment scheme, whose work is less productive, which reduces the overall performance of the organization.
Health and safety risks	Employees under precarious employment relationships create additional health and safety risks to the organization because they do not have the same knowledge and experience as their full-time colleagues.
Decline in customer satisfaction	Poor customer engagement can have significant negative consequences; as a result, some employers believe that having non-permanent employees in positions, especially those related to work in the service sector, is an unacceptable risk.
Source: Precarious employment employer’s perspective: report. KPMG. Available at: https://pepso.ca/documents/kpmg-uw-report-precarious-employment-may-2014.pdf	

same time there are certain risks that, in the opinion of employers, outweigh the benefits [56, p. 8]. Let us consider the main ones.

Labor productivity. Precarious employment is closely related to motivation and productivity. At the same time, employees feel less satisfied with the work they have performed; their motivation and labor activity decrease [57, 58]. A fairly large number of publications show that in the companies that use less stable forms of labor relations labor productivity declines [59, 60]. However, according to a different point of view, employees who are afraid of the risk of dismissal can start working more intensively to increase their value to the organization [61]. However, research shows that the creativity and ability of an individual to solve problems are reduced if their work has signs of instability [62].

Staff turnover. Social insecurity, lack of certainty and other negative characteristics of unstable labor relations can have a decisive impact on the desire to continue working for the company; it is manifested in a high level of staff turnover [63, p. 43]. In this case, there is a risk of loss of qualified employees who can find a more decent job, the risk of the employer's costs for finding and training new employees, and the risk of a general change in personnel policy. At the same time, if signs of precarious employment affect the majority of jobs, this may lead to a gradual loss of specific corporate skills acquired during work in the company, which may limit the ability of the latter to respond to market changes [64, p. 6].

Risks to the health and safety of employees. As mentioned above, precarious employment has a significant negative impact on the health and safety of employees. Moreover, the employer runs the risk of facing problems of occupational injuries and occupational diseases, as well as the need to cover losses due to the absence of an employee at work and payment

of compensation for temporary disability. In addition, the inconvenient work schedule associated with the need to return home in the evening and night hours is accompanied by security problems, especially for women [65, p. 85].

Implications of employment precariousness: social level

Processes occurring at the individual and organizational levels are interrelated and can have an impact on the life of society as a whole. According to an ILO report published on the results of the Workers' Symposium on Policies and Regulations to combat Precarious Employment, which took place in 2011, the impact of precariousness of labor relations on society is most discouraging⁵. This is manifested in many disorienting and divisive practices.

Labor market. Employment precariousness processes directly affect the functioning of the labor market. For example, the popularity of temporary contracts in times of economic crisis may result in their use on a systematic basis, which will lead to even greater economic uncertainty, since the costs of the firm associated with the dismissal of full-time employees, and its flexibility with respect to personnel policy only reinforce each other⁶. At the same time, the coexistence of standard and non-standard jobs can contribute to further segmentation of the labor market, when workers in one sector have favorable working conditions and job security, and in the other – face uncertainty and social vulnerability (even when performing the same types of work). It is also known that involvement in

⁵ From precarious work to decent work. Outcome Document to the Workers' Symposium on Policies and Regulations to combat Precarious Employment. ILO. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_dialogue/---actrav/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_179787.pdf

⁶ Non-standard employment around the world: Understanding challenges, shaping prospects. ILO. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_534326.pdf

precarious labor relations reduces the chances of permanent employment, which leads to an increase in unemployment and employment in the secondary labor market [66, p. 4].

Public participation. There is a lower level of social cohesion and neighborhood participation among the precariously employed population. Studies show that precarization of labor relations has a negative impact on people's participation in social activities, in particular in volunteering [65]. There is also an opposite view, according to which individuals who, for example, are involved in part-time or temporary employment are more likely to participate in social activities. However, this is more typical for high-income households [18, pp. 121-123]. Employees exposed to instability in the workplace are less likely to be members of the trade union movement [18, p. 63], which significantly reduces the range of ways to protect their labor rights. Because of this situation, many employees do not feel confident enough to start defending their rights, and therefore are at risk of being fired. This in turn provokes a crisis of civic participation in the trade union movement. At the same time, it has been found that the transition from precarious to stable employment increases the intensity of social interactions by 13% and the probability of participation in elections by 20% [18, pp. 128-136]. In-depth interviews with precariously employed Canadians have shown that this type of work hinders cohesion and collective action: workers view each other as competitors for future jobs, which leads to a sense of isolation and alienation [67, p. 147].

Political stability. Social insecurity is always at the heart of any political force [68, p. 122]. Precarization processes (in the sphere of employment as well) undermine the social foundations necessary for building a democratic society, giving priority to individual

responsibility [69]. Vulnerability in its various forms is the cause of discontent and social conflict. RAS Corresponding Member Zh.T. Toshchenko emphasizes that this resentment is the reaction of unsettled people rather than poor people; the unsettled hope for a fair solution to the existing problems [70, p. 245]. In general, as G. Standing points out, the uncertainty of the situation can make workers more susceptible to the formation of radical views [10]. Employees stop demanding something from a specific management and turn to the authorities. For example, the EuroMayDay movement, which has become an expression of protest against the growth of unprotected employment, appeals to governments to improve working conditions [10, pp. 1-3]. At the same time, research carried out by the Federal Research Sociological Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences shows a decrease in interest in politics among people exposed to instability in the workplace (in 2003, the lack of interest in politics was expressed by 36% of respondents, in 2013 – by 63%) [70, p. 235].

Social inequality and exclusion. The unstable nature of employment and its manifestations often lead to an increase in social inequality (both general inequality and in the context of individual components: material, educational, housing, etc.), exclusion from the social security system and from society as a whole. Social exclusion may result from the threat of reduced financial independence and social insecurity. In this case, the primary consequence is income inequality, which gives rise to other types of inequality. For example, research shows that the widespread use of temporary employment contributes to the aggravation of wage inequality in OECD countries and Latin America [71]. An unstable financial situation can lead to inequality in access to various goods and services, and to certain changes in

consumption patterns. For example, temporary workers and crowdworkers face significant difficulties in obtaining a housing loan [72]. The generalizing result of these processes can be the transformation of the social structure of society and the formation of a new class – the precariat [10, 70].

Socio-economic development. As we have mentioned above, employment precarization has a negative impact on labor productivity; such a situation directly affects economic development indicators. This may be reflected in the growth of shadow employment and “gray” wages, and in the decrease in tax and insurance premiums [73]. According to the findings of a research on the materials of individual entities of the Northwestern Federal District, the spread of unstable employment leads to losses from underutilization of human capital in the amount of 1% (Kaliningrad Oblast) to 7% (Republic of Karelia) of GRP [74, p. 286]. Along with this, the pace of innovation is decreasing [75]. Due to the fact that in conditions of precarious employment, individuals tend to postpone the birth of children, this can negatively affect the birth rate among the population as a whole. Similar conclusions were reached by scientists who analyzed the situation on the labor market in Italy and Spain [76]. The lack of guarantees for sick pay and the lack of access to quality healthcare can also have a significant impact on public health; besides, limited opportunities for professional development hinder the accumulation of human capital.

Conclusion

Thus, our analysis has shown a truly multifaceted nature of the implications of employment precarization manifested at the individual, organizational and social levels. We have tried to take into account this fact in our classification of these implications (*Figure*). Since the phenomenon under consideration is

the object of close attention of scientists from various fields of knowledge, we can assume that the list of negative effects caused by it will only expand. In the framework of this study, we tried to focus on the representation of how the process of destabilization of labor relations goes beyond the working life of employees and extends to society as a whole, creating threats to the stability of the socio-economic situation of territories. Against the background of the rapid development of non-standard forms of employment, these issues are seen as particularly relevant and require detailed study in relation to specific environmental conditions, since cross-country features can have a serious impact on the functioning of the social and labor sphere.

At the same time, the scale of the implications of the process of employment precarization dictates the need to improve the theoretical and methodological foundations of its research. At present, there is a situation where the same concepts are often interpreted quite differently. Therefore, the introduction of conceptual and terminological clarity in this area should be the starting point for the formation of a complete picture that reflects the essence of employment precarization and its manifestations at various levels of the organization of society, which will serve as the basis for the development of appropriate methodological tools.

Our research contributes to the development of ideas about the possible effects of employment precarization in the context of the theoretical and methodological pluralism prevailing in the scientific literature. Scientific novelty of our research lies in the fact that our classification of the implications of the phenomenon under consideration by the levels of society organization clearly reflects the risks for various subjects of social and labor relations. The results we have obtained can provoke a

Classification of implications of employment precarization according to the level of organization of the society

Socio-economic implications of employment precarization	
Social level	<p><i>Violation of the functioning of the labor market.</i> Precarization of employment contributes to increasing uncertainty about the situation in the labor market, which can provoke, for example, an increase in its segmentation and a growth of unemployment.</p> <p><i>Decline in social cohesion and the refusal of the population to participate in public life.</i> Precarization of employment can lead to an increase in the atomization of society, since the uncertainty of working life negatively affects social interaction and creates isolation and alienation.</p> <p><i>Destabilization of the political situation.</i> The instability of employment is the cause of discontent and social conflicts, which in the absence of an effective dialogue with the employer not only become a political agenda, but also make employees more susceptible to radical moods.</p> <p><i>Aggravation of social inequality and an increase in social exclusion.</i> The spread of precarious employment produces a transformation of the social structure of society, resulting in the formation of a new class – the precariat that has limited access to various goods and services.</p> <p><i>Slowing down the pace of socio-economic development.</i> The multiplicity of negative implications of employment precarization ultimately has a destructive impact on the socio-economic development of territories.</p>
Organizational level	<p><i>Decrease in labor productivity.</i> Destabilization of labor relations usually results in a decrease in labor productivity, as employees become less interested in the results of their work.</p> <p><i>Increase in staff turnover.</i> The use of less stable forms of employment may encourage employees to find other jobs, which will increase the costs of hiring/firing employees and the risks of losing specific corporate skills.</p> <p><i>Increased risks related to the health and safety of employees.</i> The negative impact of employment precarization on the health of employees creates prerequisites for increasing staff costs.</p>
Individual level	<p><i>Deterioration of material well-being and social security.</i> Precarization of employment has a negative impact on employees' incomes and, as a rule, leads to the loss of social guarantees, which in total affects people's well-being.</p> <p><i>Deterioration of health status.</i> Adverse working conditions as one of the characteristic manifestations of precarization of employment cause serious harm to the physical and mental health of employees.</p> <p><i>Uncertainty of personal and family future.</i> The lack of job security in case of destabilization of labor relations prevents the formation and implementation of life plans.</p> <p><i>Limitation of opportunities for professional development and professional experience.</i> Precarious employment significantly narrows the professional prospects of employees; as a result, they are forced to work in the current conditions.</p>

Source: own compilation.

substantive discussion of the relevance of these implications for Russia; because, despite the close attention of domestic scientists to the topic of employment precarization, specific empirical studies are extremely rare. All this helps better understand the prospects for the development of social and labor relations in the perspective of global challenges and threats. However, it is already possible to speak with confidence about the need to create legal

conditions for the introduction of more flexible forms of employment and expanding the use of non-standard employment contracts, which will require bringing Russian labor legislation in line with the challenges of our time. In addition, we should note the importance of improving public policy aimed at implementing real actions to create high-performance jobs, consistent legalization of the informal sector of the economy, modernization of employment

services, etc. Otherwise, we may face further destabilization of labor relations, which will bring into question the possibility of ensuring not only decent working conditions, but also the sustainability of the socio-economic development of the country as a whole.

References

1. Gimpel'son V.E., Kapelyushnikov R.I. *Nestandartnaya zanyatost' i rossiiskii rynek truda* [Non-standard employment and the Russian labor market]. Moscow: GU VShE, 2005. 36 p.
2. Maslova E.V. *Regulirovanie nestandartnoi zanyatosti naseleniya v Rossiiskoi Federatsii: teoretiko-metodologicheskie i prakticheskie voprosy: dis. ... d.e.n.* [Regulation of non-standard employment in the Russian Federation: theoretical, methodological and practical issues: Doctor of Sciences (Economics) dissertation]. Moscow, 2018. 414 p.
3. Tangian A.S. Is flexible work precarious? A study based on the 4th European survey of working conditions 2005. *WSI-Diskussionspapier*, 2004, vol. 153, 77 p.
4. Pembroke S. *Precarious work precarious lives: how policy can create more security*. Dublin: TASC, 2018. 122 p.
5. Kalleberg A.L. Precarious work, insecure workers: employment relations in transition. *American Sociological Review*, 2009, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 1–22. DOI: 10.1177/000312240907400101
6. Agarwala R., Chun J. Gendering struggles against informal and precarious work. *Political Power and Social Theory*, 2018, vol. 35, pp. 1–28. DOI: 10.1108/S0198-871920180000035001
7. Barbier J.-C. Employment precariousness in a European cross-national perspective. A sociological review of thirty years of research. *CES working papers*, 2011, vol. 78. 40 p.
8. Letourneux V. *Precarious Employment and Working Conditions in Europe*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1998. 108 p.
9. Veredyuk O.V. Instability of employment: theoretical framework and the assessment of the scale in Russia. *Vestnik SPbGU. Ekonomika = Herald of Saint Petersburg State University. Economy*, 2013, no. 1, pp. 25–32.
10. Standing G. *The Precariat. The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011. 198 p.
11. Puig-Barrachina V., Levecque K., Muntaner C. Measuring employment precariousness in the European Working Conditions Survey: the social distribution in Europe. *Work*, 2014, vol. 49, pp. 143–161. DOI: 10.3233/WOR-131645
12. Vivesa A., González F., Moncadae S., Llorense C., Benach J. Measuring precarious employment in times of crisis: the revised Employment Precariousness Scale (EPRES) in Spain. *Gaceta Sanitaria*, 2015, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 379–382. DOI: 10.1016/j.gaceta.2015.06.008
13. Lewchuk W. Precarious jobs: Where are they, and how do they affect well-being? *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 2017, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 402–419. DOI:10.1177/1035304617722943
14. Chan J., Nair M., Rhomberg C. Precarization and labor resistance: Canada, the USA, India and China. *Critical Sociology*, 2019, vol. 45, no. 4–5, pp. 469–483. DOI:10.1177/0896920519827634
15. Bobkov V.N. Precarious employment in the Russian Federation: state and direction of decline. *Narodonaselenie = Population*, 2019, no. 2, pp. 91–104. DOI: 10.24411/1561-7785-2019-00018
16. Sankova L.V. Precarization of employment in the modern economy: systemic risk or a “special” form of flexibilization. *Uroven' zhizni naseleniya regionov Rossii = Standard of Living of the Population of Russian Regions*, 2014, no. 4 (194), pp. 44–53. DOI: 10.12737/7400
17. Matveeva T.A. Influence of employment instability on the labor income of Russian workers and their satisfaction with work. *Uroven' zhizni naseleniya regionov Rossii = Standard of Living of the Population of Russian Regions*, 2014, no. 3 (193), pp. 56–68. DOI: 10.12737/5645
18. Lewchuk W., Lafleche M., Procyk S., Cook S., Dyson D., Goldring L., Lior K., Meisner A., Shields J., Tambureno A., Viducis P. *The Precarity Penalty. The impact of employment precarity on individuals, households and communities – and what to do about it*. Toronto: PEPSO, 2015. 200 p.
19. Bobkov V.N., Chernykh E.A., Aliev U.T., Kuril'chenko E.I. Precarious employment: negative aspects of modern social and labor relations. *Uroven' zhizni naseleniya regionov Rossii = Standard of Living of the Population of Russian Regions*, 2011, no. 5, pp. 13–26.

20. Vives A., Amable M., Ferrer M., Moncada S., Llorens C., Muntaner C., Benavides F.G., Benach J. Employment precariousness and poor mental health: evidence from Spain on a new social determinant of health. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2013, vol. 97865. DOI: 10.1155/2013/978656
21. Macassa G., Bergström H., Malstam E., Hiswåls A.S., Soares J., Ahmadi N., Marttila A. Experiences of employment precariousness and psychological well-being in East Central Sweden. *Health Science Journal*, 2017, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 491–497. DOI:10.21767/1791-809X.1000491
22. Lewchuk W., Lafleche M., Dyson D. *It's More Than Poverty. Employment Precarity and Household Well-being*. Toronto: PEPSO, 2013. 120 p.
23. Lyapin A., Noinkeffer G., Shershukova L., Bizyukov P. Precarious Employment and Its Implications for Workers. Moscow: Tsentr sotsial'no-trudovyykh prav, 2007. 48 p.
24. 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, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 229–253. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-publhealth-032013-182500
25. Quinlan M., Mayhew C., Bohle P. The global expansion of precarious employment, work disorganization, and consequences for occupational health: a review of recent research. *International Journal of Health Services*, 2001, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 335–414. DOI: 10.2190/607H-TTV0-QCN6-YLT4
26. Lewchuk W., de Wolff A., King A., Polanyi M. From job strain to employment strain: Health effects of precarious employment. *Just Labour*, 2003, vol. 3, pp. 23–35. DOI: 10.25071/1705-1436.165
27. Cheng W., Cheng Y. Alcohol drinking behaviours and alcohol management policies under outsourced work conditions: a qualitative study of construction workers in Taiwan. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 2016, vol. 28, pp. 43–47. DOI: 10.1016/j.drugpo.2015.08.011
28. Bachman J., Schulenberg J. How part-time work intensity relates to drug use, problem behaviour, time use and satisfaction among high school seniors: Are these consequences merely correlates? *Developmental Psychiatry*, 1993, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 220–235. DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.29.2.220
29. Lamontagne A., Smith P., Louie A., Quinlan M., Shoveller J., Ostry A. Unwanted sexual advances at work: variations by employment arrangement in a sample of working Australians. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 2009, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 173–179. DOI: 10.1111/j.1753-6405.2009.00366.x
30. Vézina M.E., Cloutier E., Stock S., Lippel K., Fortin E. *Québec survey on working and employment conditions and occupational health and safety: summary report*. Quebec: EQCOTESST, 2011. 49 p.
31. Chuikova T.S., Sotnikova D.I. Features of the attitude toward work in conditions of non-guaranteed employment. *Organizatsionnaya psikhologiya=Organizational Psychology*, 2016, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 6–19.
32. Karasek R. Job decision latitude, job demands and mental strain: implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1979, vol. 24, pp. 285–308. DOI:10.2307/2392498
33. Moscone F., Tosetti E., Vittadini G. The impact of precarious employment on mental health: the case of Italy. *Social Science & Medicine*, 2016, vol. 158, pp. 86–95. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.03.008
34. Jang S.-Y., Jang S.-I., Bae H.-C., Shin J., Park E.-C. Precarious employment and new-onset severe depressive symptoms: a population-based prospective study in South Korea. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 2015, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 329–337. DOI: 10.5271/sjweh.3498
35. Han K.-M., Chang J., Won E., Lee M.-S., Ham B.-J. Precarious employment associated with depressive symptoms and suicidal ideation in adult wage workers. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 2017, vol. 218, pp. 201–209. DOI: 10.1016/j.jad.2017.04.049
36. Marcus J. The effect of unemployment on the mental health of spouses – Evidence from plant closures in Germany. *Journal of Health Economics*, 2013, vol. 32, pp. 546–558. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhealeco.2013.02.004
37. Canivet C., Aronsson G., Bernhard-Oettel C., Leineweber C., Moghaddassi M., Stengård J., Westerlund H., Östergren, P.O. The negative effects on mental health of being in a non-desired occupation in an increasingly precarious labour market. *SSM–Population Health*, 2017, vol. 3, pp. 516–524. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssmph.2017.05.009
38. Fedorova A.E., Katashinskikh V.S., Dvorzhakova Z. Precarisation of labour relations as a factor in social pollution. *Ekonomika regiona=Economy of Region*, 2016, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 802–814. DOI: 10.17059/2016-3-16
39. Rocha C., Crowell J.H., McCarter A.K. The effects of prolonged job insecurity on the psychological well-being of workers. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 2006, vol. 33, pp. 9–28.

40. Virtanen M., Kivimaki M., Joensuu M., Virtanen P., Elovainio M., Vahtera J. Temporary employment and health: a review. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 2005, vol. 34, pp. 610–622. DOI: 10.1093/ije/dyi024
41. Ferrie J.E., Shipley M.J., Stansfeld S.A., Marmot M.G. Effects of chronic job insecurity and change in job security on self reported health, minor psychiatry morbidity, physiological measures, and health related behaviours in British civil servants: The Whitehall II study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 2002, vol. 56, pp. 450–454. DOI: 10.1136/jech.56.6.450
42. Menéndez M., Benach J., Muntaner C., Amable M., O'Campo P. Is precarious employment more damaging to women's health than men's? *Social Science & Medicine*, 2007, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 776–781. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.10.035
43. Kim I.H., Khang Y.H., Muntaner C., Chun H., Cho S.I. Gender, precarious work, and chronic diseases in South Korea. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 2008, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 748–757. DOI: 10.1002/ajim.20626
44. Benach J, Vives A, Tarafa G, Delclos C, Muntaner C. What should we know about precarious employment and health in 2025? Framing the agenda for the next decade of research. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 2016, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 232–238. DOI: 10.1093/ije/dyv342
45. Clarke M., Lewchuk W., de Wolff A., King A. This just isn't sustainable: precarious employment, stress and workers' health. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 2007, vol. 30, pp. 311–326. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2007.06.005
46. Green F. Unpacking the misery multiplier: how employability modifies the impacts of unemployment and job insecurity on life satisfaction and mental health. *Journal of Health Economics*, 2011, vol. 30, pp. 265–276. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhealeco.2010.12.005
47. Popov A.V. Precarious employment: prevalence and socio-demographic characteristics of employees. *Gosudarstvennoe upravlenie. Elektronnyi vestnik= Public Administration. Electronic Bulletin*, 2017, no. 63, pp. 264–279.
48. Livanos I., Nuñez I. Early exit or longer stay? The effect of precarious employment on planned age of retirement. *Personnel Review*, 2017, vol. 46, no. 8, pp. 1571–1589. DOI: 10.1108/PR-04-2015-0110
49. Modena F., Sabatini F. I would if I could: Precarious employment and childbearing intentions in Italy. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 2012, vol. 10, pp. 77–97.
50. Hanappi D., Ryser V-A., Bernardi L., Le Goff J-M. Precarious work and the fertility intention-behavior link: An analysis based on the Swiss Household Panel data. *LIVES Working Papers*, 2012, vol. 17, pp. 1–27. DOI:10.12682/lives.2296-1658.2012.17
51. Golsch K. *The impact of labour market insecurity on the work and family life of men and women: a comparison of Germany, Great Britain, and Spain*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2005. 286 p.
52. Luijkx A.R.C.M., Wolbers M.H.J. The impact of employment precarity on early labour market careers and family formation in the Netherlands. In: Barbieri P. (Ed.). *Flexible Employment and the Welfare State in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2018. pp. 1–33.
53. Szczygiel I. *The impact of precarious employment on social work skill engagement and career satisfaction for women: a master thesis*. Hamilton: McMaster University, 2016. 79 p.
54. Druzhilov S.A. Profession, professional activity, actor in the system “Individual-Profession-Society”. *Organizatsionnaya psikhologiya i psikhologiya truda=Organizational Psychology and Labor Psychology*, 2018, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 39–66. (In Russian).
55. Procyk S., Lewchuk W., Shields J. *Precarious Employment: Causes, Consequences and Remedies*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2017. 160 p.
56. Blecher L., Younger T., MacDougall A., Hunter P., Powdrill T. *Precarious Work*. London: Local Authority Pension Fund Forum, 2018. 24 p.
57. Battisti M., Vallanti G. Flexible wage contracts, temporary jobs, and firm performance: Evidence from Italian firms. *Industrial Relations*, 2013, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 737–764. DOI: 10.1111/irel.12031
58. Leonidova G.V., Rossoshanskaya E.A. Precarious employment as a barrier to effective implementation of employment potential. *Problemy razvitiya territorii=Problems of Territory's Development*, 2018, no. 1 (93), pp. 7–21. DOI: 10.15838/ptd/2018.2.93.1

59. Lisi D. The impact of temporary employment and employment protection on labour productivity: Evidence from an industry-level panel of EU countries. *Journal for Labour Market Research*, 2013, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 119–144. DOI: 10.1007/s12651-013-0127-0
60. Lucidi F., Kleinknecht A. Little innovation, many jobs: an econometric analysis of the Italian labour productivity crisis. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 2010, vol. 34, no. 3. pp. 525–546. DOI: 10.1093/cje/bep011
61. Sverke M., Hellgren J. Exit, voice, and loyalty reactions to job insecurity: do unionized and non-unionized employees differ? *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 2001, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 167–182. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8543.00195
62. Probst T.M., Stewart S.M., Gruys M.L., Tierney B.W. Productivity, counterproductivity and creativity: the ups and downs of job insecurity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 2007, vol. 80, no. 3, pp. 479–497. DOI: 10.1348/096317906X159103
63. Rasmussen S., Refslund B., Sørensen O.H., Larsen T.P. *Reducing Precarious Work in Europe through Social Dialogue: the Case of Denmark*. Aalborg: Aalborg University, 2016. 109 p.
64. Berg J. Non-standard employment: challenges and solutions. *IUSLabor*, 2016, vol. 3. pp. 1–9.
65. Premji S. Precarious employment and difficult daily commutes. *Relations industrielles*, 2017, vol. 72, no. 1, pp. 77–98. DOI: 10.7202/1039591
66. Li J. Precarious work and labor market segmentation: a comparative study on mainland China and Hong Kong. *The Journal of Chinese Sociology*, 2019, vol. 6, no. 17, pp. 1–22. DOI:10.1186/s40711-019-0105-1
67. Lewchuk W., Dassinger J. Precarious employment and precarious resistance: “we are people still”. *Studies in Political Economy*, 2016, vol. 97, no. 2, pp. 143–158. DOI: 10.1080/07078552.2016.1211397
68. Bauman Z. *Collateral Damage: Social Inequalities in a Global Age*. London: Polity Press, 2011. 188 p.
69. Näsström S., Kalm S. A democratic critique of precarity. *Global Discourse*, 2015, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 556–573. DOI: 10.1080/23269995.2014.992119
70. Toshchenko Zh.T. *Prekariat: ot protoklassa k novomu klassu* [Precariat: from a protoclass to a new class]. Moscow: Nauka, 2018. 350 p.
71. Cazes S., de Laiglesia J. Temporary contracts and wage inequality. In: Berg J. (Ed.). *Labour Markets, Institutions and Inequality: Building Just Societies in the 21st Century*. Geneva: ILO, 2015. pp. 147–184.
72. Berg J. Income security in the on-demand economy: findings and policy lessons from a survey of crowdworkers. *Comparative Labour Law and Policy Journal*, 2016, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 543–576.
73. Bobkov V.N. Precarious employment – a global problem of our time. In: Yasin E. (Ed.). *XVII April'skaya mezhdunarodnaya nauchnaya konferentsiya po problemam razvitiya ekonomiki i obshchestva. Kniga 4* [17th April international scientific conference on the problems of economic and social development. Book 4]. Moscow: NIU VShE, 2017. Pp. 41–49.
74. Popov A.V. The spread of precarious employment as a barrier to economic growth in Russia. *Nauchnye trudy Vol'nogo ekonomicheskogo obshchestva Rossii=Scientific Works of the Free Economic Society of Russia*, 2018, vol. 212, no. 4, pp. 270–293. (In Russian).
75. Kleinknecht A., van Schaik F.N., Zhou H. Is flexible labour good for innovation? *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 2014, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 1207–1219. DOI: 10.1093/cje/bet077
76. Bonet R., Cruz C., Fernández-Kranz D., Justo R. Temporary contracts and work–family balance in a dual labor market. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 2013, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 55–87. DOI: 10.1177/001979391306600103

Information about the Authors

Tat'yana S. Solov'eva – Researcher, Vologda Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences (56A, Gorky Street, Vologda, 160014, Russian Federation; e-mail: solo_86@list.ru)

Andrei V. Popov – Candidate of Sciences (Economics), Researcher, Vologda Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences (56A, Gorky Street, Vologda, 160014, Russian Federation; e-mail: ai.popov@yahoo.com)

Received October 28, 2019.