‘We are the backbone of the community’ – precarious multiple employment and the complex dynamics of dignity in, out, and between work

Abstract

This paper critically examines the complex dynamics related to dignity at work (DAW) in contemporary precarious employment in the UK. It argues that current DAW frameworks are typically focused on workers with one job, but what about the experiences of those who need to work in multiple jobs to make ends meet? To consider this, the paper focuses on the complex experiences related to dignity when navigating between and participating in different workplaces, presenting the notion of ‘dignity in, out and between work’. It provides a four-dimensional framework to renew DAW debates. The first two reflect original DAW frameworks revealing ‘work intensification’ and ‘poor management, exploitation and abuse’. However, this paper expands these conceptually and empirically by presenting a thematic broadening of work intensification and extensification across a mixture of jobs, with fragmented and complex temporal and spatial aspects of work. The third and fourth dimensions contribute two significant elements to DAW discussions. ‘Stigma, humiliation, and shame’ incorporates issues such as in-work poverty and foodbank use. Finally, we emphasise tensions related to ‘the value of work’, where workers’ contribution was not appreciated even if they held socially significant jobs.

Keywords - Dignity at work, extensification, multiple employment, precarity, stigma, value, work intensification

Introduction

There is long-standing interest in the notion of dignified work (Hodson, 2001; Rayman, 2001; Bolton 2007). However, in the UK, academic interest in the subject of dignity at work has waned, and in the years since those discussions, the contemporary world of work has changed. In the UK this is evident in an increasingly polarised labour market that is marked by low pay, precarity and economic turbulence (Rubery et al., 2018), which raises a number of challenges with existing DAW debates. Firstly, those discussions focus primarily on singular jobs and singular workplaces, yet this paper presents evidence to demonstrate that transformations in the contemporary world of work and the harsh economic realities mean that many people have to work in more than one job. Secondly, this means that there is a pressing need to reconsider and renew current DAW debates, both empirically and conceptually, specifically in relation to those working in low paid precarious multiple employment.

Several scholars have made passing reference to low paid workers with more than one job (see Rubery et al., 2018; Standing, 2011) but no further exploration has been undertaken, and this is our explicit focus. These workers are often part-time, temporary, outsourced or zero hours workers who are (incorrectly) viewed by management as being 'peripheral' to organisations. Whilst many of these workers are already 'invisible' in organisations due to their peripheralisation, having an amalgamation of different lines of employment to attempt to make a living creates even further spatial and temporal complexities to their work, lives and dignity. Low paid workers with multiple jobs have differing line managers, roles and fellow workers across a range of employing organisations, that creates additional layers of complexity regarding DAW. Therefore, our major argument is that DAW discussions need to be renewed and broadened to examine the growth of precarity and the further peripheralisation of work, especially in the context of multiple employment.

There is a substantive body of literature on DAW. This paper critically examines original frameworks of DAW, firstly considering Hodson's (2001) contribution. It then focuses on discussions around the multifaceted and multidimensional aspects of DAW (Bolton 2007) by drawing on the dynamics of dignity (see Thompson and Newsome, 2016). In examining these, we identify gaps in knowledge around precarious low paid multiple employment and the interlocking of the economic, spatial and temporal in those workers' everyday lives. Our empirical findings contribute to this gap in revealing new complexities concerning the dynamics of dignity regarding the lived experiences of 'dignity in, out and between work' – the lived experience being the day-to-day realities of working multiple jobs and the impacts on home life. This is our core contribution in extending traditional DAW frameworks that we argue are now outdated. This reframing empirically and conceptually focuses on challenges *in work* – being multiple jobs and temporalities, *between work* – namely, the navigation and transaction across spatialities, but also discusses challenges *out of work* – where these workers are juggling multiple jobs with familial, domestic and care responsibilities.

These 'lived experience' issues were drawn out through our inductive research methods that involved detailed in depth qualitative interviews with low paid workers who had combinations of up to seven different jobs to earn a living. The findings reveal 'poor management and abuse' of workers across multiple employers, where cumulative burdens are carried from job to job. Extant DAW frameworks do consider work intensification, but what is unique with this research is the amplification of work intensity across an amalgamation of jobs. Furthermore, current DAW concepts do not address working time, and what is distinctive here is the concomitant extensification of work across fragmented, complex, elongated and segmented temporalities and spatialities of work. These findings therefore extend traditional DAW frameworks. Moreover, the paper advances literature and

frameworks of DAW by adding two other significant dimensions to the original frameworks – 'shame, humiliation and the 'triple stigma' of low paid multiple employment' and the importance of 'the value of work' to dignity discussions. These are concepts which have been discussed in various circles, but we argue that they need to be more firmly implanted in the DAW debates. Stigma and humiliation encapsulate in-work poverty, foodbank use and the shame of struggling to make ends meet, despite having a multitude of lines of employment. The concept of value involves some workers not being valued as a person or in their work, together with the contradictions of the social importance of such work and being the 'backbone of the community'.

The cyclical interest and expansion in studies of Dignity at Work

The theme of dignity at work has drawn cyclical interest in academic discussions. Conceptually, it is Hodson's (2001) contribution that has been most utilised in studies of DAW. His analysis of workplace ethnographies attempts to address the complexities of DAW within a framework of four faces of dignity: mismanagement and abuse; exploitation and overwork; limitations on autonomy; and employee involvement and participation.

Hodson's contribution has been acclaimed as a highly salient framework for thinking about workers' experiences of dignity. This is because it moves beyond dignity as a relatively 'free floating' concept, usually associated with work and the economy, and instead places the pursuit for dignity at the heart of workplace experiences and relationships, together with the conditions that shape DAW (Thompson and Newsome 2016; Smith 2016). Thompson and Newsome (2016:83) recognise the value of Hodson's framework but assert that it is incomplete in terms of fully understanding the dynamics of dignity. Smith (2016) argues that dignity needs to be contextualised within the challenges of current times, especially in an era of economic turbulent unpredictability, precarity and job insecurity. She

therefore argues that Hodson's framework requires further contributions to reflect these contemporary challenges. We concur with these authors' critiques and the key intention of this paper is a focus on precarious workers in multiple employment in the contemporary labour market. In doing so the paper adds new complexities and dilemmas pertaining to DAW, which adds further dimensions of analysis to these discussions above.

These additional contextualisations develop earlier arguments by Bolton (2007) that dignity at work must be acknowledged as a multifaceted phenomenon, which we argue here also operate within a multifaceted context of contemporary employment change. Sayer (2011) builds on Bolton's work focusing more on values relating to dignity and the questions workers face in their everyday lives, including how others treat them and how they, therefore, respond (see also McBride and Martinez Lucio 2021). Sayer's analysis reveals that dignity also requires an acknowledgement of vulnerability and is much more dependent on how others interpret and treat us, particularly in terms of relations of equality and difference. This is particularly important to this paper in the specific context of increasingly fragmented work and low-paid multiple employment. Both Bolton and Sayer's work is significant to the aims of this paper, as theirs is different to Hodson's due to the focus on the multi-dimensionalities of DAW and the inclusion of values. This is particularly useful to our findings as we draw out evidence from a broader set of issues including that of how work is valued. Therefore thus far, on an examination of current DAW frameworks and discussions in UK literature, it is suggested that original frameworks are static and require more focus on the dynamics and multidimensionality of the character of dignity. What we also suggest is that what has been written, only relates to a singular workplace and single job. Hence, there is a need to refocus these debates to the contemporary world of work and the increase of multiple employment and therefore further multidimensionalities of DAW.

Attention to the dignity at work agenda in the UK has waned in recent years, in contrast to the US where interest has expanded with newly identified elements that have developed the multi-dimensionalities of this phenomenon. Lucas (2015) argues this has resulted in such a breadth of varying manifestations of DAW (or lack of dignity) that there is now an absence of any clear theory of workplace dignity. Thomas and Lucas (2019), therefore, argued for the development of a scale for the measurement of dignity – 'A Workplace Dignity Scale' (WDS). They focus their development on Lucas' (2017) broad definition of workplace dignity: "the self-recognized and other-recognized worth acquired from (or injured by) engaging in work activity" (p. 2549). They place these terms into a measured scale of parameters and note that workplace dignity is founded on both 'inherent dignity' as recognised by respectful interaction and 'earned dignity' as recognised by messages of competence and contribution (see also Lucas 2015). However, it is their final principle that is most significant to this paper, as they identify the bivalent nature of workplace dignity in that it "tends to be understood and experienced by its absence rather than its presence" (Lucas, 2017 p.2551); therefore, people cannot conceptualise dignity without a presence of 'indignity'. This is, for example, when people are asked to explain what dignity means to them, they often tell a story about their dignity being undermined. We argue that dignity and indignity can be more deeply understood through independent or autonomous self-definition with the individual being the primary authority in describing their own experience of dignity at work. Therefore, we do not use the WDS scale in this paper, although we do acknowledge that indignity identified by Thomas and Lucas (2019) is a significant factor when examining DAW. We will consider workers' lived experience to 'recast' current discussions on DAW and reframe debates to fit the contemporary landscape: hence, responding to a long-standing debate within the sociology of work regarding the importance of placing worker voices more closely at the centre of the debate (Stewart, 2004).

We, therefore, consider other studies that have identified more specific, although less visible, indicators of indignity that are more supportive to some of our findings, such as, 'verbal abuse and humiliation' (Khademi et al., 2012; Stuesse, 2010; McBride and Martinez Lucio, 2021), and 'stigma' attached to certain kinds of work (Chiappetta-Swanson, 2005; McBride and Martinez Lucio, 2021).

The subject of stigma incorporates a huge body of work that is too substantial to include in this paper but too important to neglect per se, as stigma is an important dimension of DAW and is a factor drawn out in our empirical data. Indeed, issues of DAW can be viewed simply in terms of the occupational and pay hierarchy, where there will be inequalities that potentially expose an individual to undignified treatment (Sayer 2011). Research by McBride and Martinez Lucio (2021) also reveals how work classed as unskilled or low-skilled is often undermined, generally demeaned and undervalued. Literature on stigma of types of work has been an important academic and policy intervention into how work that is classed as unskilled or low-skilled has been almost side-lined in debates on work. It is these types of jobs that are the main focus of our empirical research here, and as we argue later, stigma is significant in terms of an individual's dignity – or indeed indignity - but to date has received limited interest in DAW debates. Kreiner et al (2022) draw on Goffman (1963) in terms of the way stigma has been key to sociological analysis and concerned with deviations from the 'norm' but they point to a significant gap when it comes to applying the concept to the study of work systematically. They outline various approaches that have been taken with regards to stigma but emphasise a range of factors relevant to this paper. The first is culture (Ashforth and Kreiner, 2014), and the extent to which more individualised cultures and higher power-distance levels exacerbate the stigma related to certain groups of workers (as we will outline in relation to fragmented and multiple workplaces and jobs). Hence, it would follow that in a more fragmented and hierarchical labour market certain groups might

feel and be more stigmatised. Secondly, the issue of organisational change and developments such as outsourcing (Moran, 2002) may generate a greater level of fragmentation and even a belief that workers choose or belong in certain 'dirty' or stigmatised jobs. Others have also referred back to the seminal work of Goffman (1963) but feel that how stigma is developed, by what actors and for what reasons seems to be sidelined in many studies as they seem to focus on the management of stigma not its broader dynamics and context (Tyler and Slater, 2018). The need to understand how workers, in what could be termed stigmatised roles, view and explain the way they are perceived therefore needs greater attention, e.g. as being lazy, not desiring betterment and resigned to their fate, and rarely seen to have any proactive agency (Reutter et al, 2009). Hence, we need to introduce stigma as a key dimension of DAW issues as it helps us understand, not solely the changing nature of work, but the perceptions and agency of those in stigmatised positions.

Therefore, key elements from those discussions drawn out thus far are: Hodson's (2001) mismanagement and abuse; exploitation and overwork; limitations on autonomy; and employee involvement and participation – the dynamics of dignity (Thompson and Newsome 2016) and how it should be considered as a multifaceted phenomenon (Bolton 2007) and values relating to dignity in everyday lives (Sayer 2011). As pointed out earlier, interest in these discussions have waned in the UK and meanwhile there have been many changes to the world of work that suggest that DAW discussions are out of date for varying reasons. Therefore, we need to refresh and contribute to this area of debate by bringing in the worker's voice in relation to their experiences more clearly to reflect the increasingly fragmented experience of work in multiple employment, as established DAW frameworks assume an almost singular form of dignity.

It is also noted that in terms of the conceptual contributions to DAW to date, there are questions concerning a deeper meaning of 'the dynamics of dignity', as well as the broad

complexity of the 'multi-dimensionalities of dignity' (Bolton 2007; Smith 2016). We have also noted the neglect of 'stigma' in existing frameworks - related to the question of 'humiliation' which is a key factor drawn out of our empirical data. We argue that these are important dimensions to further understand DAW because they undermine the presence, visibility and value attributed to the experience of work, and we will fully address these dimensions of analysis in our paper. However, there is a very significant factor key to this paper that we have identified as not fully addressed in DAW discussions, particularly in the UK where the focus of DAW has, until now, revolved increasingly around questions of management and the single workplace and worker. The emergence of a polarised and precarious labour market brings additional layers of complexity to the dynamics of dignity as outlined in what follows. Therefore, it is our contention that traditional discussions regarding DAW tend, overall, to focus on insecurity or poor working conditions in one particular job and do not address the further challenges that multiple employment brings. The central contribution of this article is to renew DAW debates by critically examining what we term dimensions of dignity between work and not just within it.

Dignity in an era of turbulent unpredictability and change

Smith (2016, 2010) argues that we now live in an era of "turbulent unpredictability", with the upsurge of precarious employment over recent decades and fears over job security, decent pay and guaranteed hours (see also McBride and Smith, 2022). The causal factors are partly explained by the impact of economic globalisation, developments in technology at work, the global financial crisis leading to austerity and downward pressures on terms and conditions of employment, with a rise in insufficient and variable working hours and limited employment protections (O'Sullivan et al., 2020). These have all had a profound effect on work, as the UK labour market has become increasingly polarised, with those on the margins

experiencing low-pay, job instability and precarity as a direct result of neo-liberalism and labour market deregulation (Berry and McDaniel, 2022). Rubery et. al (2018) note how such insecure working is emblematic of the 'new norm' of precarious work.

We argue in this paper that employment precariousness is a crucial contemporary factor for DAW with complex deleterious implications, that have not yet been fully addressed in the literature in a systematic or more transparent manner. In accord with Smith (2016), we argue that in order to fully understand dignity (and indignity) at work, attention needs to increasingly centre on the lived experiences of those in precarity in the contemporary world of work. Therefore, this paper will consider the importance of precarity as a determinative factor in explaining DAW (or lack of it). Furthermore, embedded within our dimensions of analysis will be the importance of considering the value of work, which as a debate is steadily gaining ground (ILO, 2022).

Until recently there has been limited discussion around value of work in the DAW debates. Our focus on *value* relates to the work the employees actually do as well as their contribution, and how that work is (or is not) valued or recognised more generally by the employer, or indeed more widely. This is especially important with work that is socially perceived to be 'low-skilled' or 'unskilled', often on the periphery and margins of an organisation (see McBride and Martinez Lucio 2021). There are additional complexities and challenges around 'value' and dignity at work when we consider low-paid workers with a multitude of jobs, as they have fragmented employment and working times in a fragmented labour market. Furthermore, they have complex experiences of work across a range of employing organisations, with different managers, often on outsourced, temporary or zero hours contracts, and with concomitant complex working lives. Without appreciating manifold issues related to the value of work, the worker and the person, debates remain locked in a narrower focus as to what we mean by dignity at work that is unable to deal with

deeper social challenges. There is also limited literature on DAW that engages with complex and multifaceted issues around value, stigma and precarity. Therefore, what we also aim to add to this discussion are questions of how the impact of the value, or contribution of work is not recognised and how it is stigmatised generally in a context where workers are not just dealing with fragmented and segmented employment, but also multiple jobs which generates further problems and challenges to questions of DAW. Indeed, as mentioned earlier, DAW debates centre on the experiences of work in one job. This raises pertinent questions around the lived realities of DAW for those in precarious low-paid employment who need to have multiple jobs to make ends meet. Hence, here we raise the significance of the need to focus on, what we term, 'the spaces in, out and between multiple jobs/work' and not solely within work and/or one job.

Whilst issues relating to DAW have developed to some extent in recent years, factors regarding a broader combination of issues around DAW have not been fully discussed or recognised in the literature: and, thus, have not mapped the even more fragmented nature of precarious work against DAW. From our findings, we have noted the continued relevance of two original dimensions of DAW by Hodson – firstly 'work intensification' and secondly 'mismanagement, exploitation and abuse' and these are our first two dimensions of analysis in this paper. This is not to suggest that his latter two dimensions are no longer relevant – but were not a significant finding in our research. Therefore, empirically, we develop these further with emphasis on two newly extended dimensions, namely - 'the intensification and extensification of contemporary precarious work' and 'poor management, exploitation and abuse'. Moreover, we then go onto to highlight that we should not discuss dignity without considering indignity at work and add two further dimensions of analysis in thirdly 'shame, humiliation and the 'triple stigma' of low paid multiple employment' and fourthly 'the value of work'. We analyse these within a framework of a contemporary turbulent economic

environment where there have been huge changes to employment in the sense of a rise in precarious work and multiple employment. We then demonstrate our significant identification of the 'dynamics of dignity in, out and between multiple jobs'.

In order to analyse all of these issues, this paper qualitatively examines the lived experiences of low-paid workers in precarious multiple employment and the challenges this brings to their broader experiences. It adds a new and distinctive dimension in that it firstly considers the experiences of workers who are forced into multiple employment to make a living and the specific challenges they face across differing workplaces. The paper adds to understandings of dignity through further consideration of the 'dynamics of dignity' (see Thompson and Newsome 2016) and the multi-dimensionalities of dignity (see Bolton and Sayer). We contribute to these debates with detailed evidence of low-paid multiple employment, the fragmentation of work and hours, and the complex ramifications for dignity in, out and between precarious jobs in terms of value and stigma. We do this by examining the lived experiences, complexities and dynamics of dignity (and indignity), for those in multiple precarious low-paid jobs (something which is becoming more common, but only those with 2 jobs are officially recorded – our research found people with up to 7 jobs). (Noor, 2022; The Work Foundation 2025)

The paper, therefore, raises important research questions that are themed around the four dimensions highlighted above. Firstly, what are the challenges and complexities of dignity at work facing low-paid workers in precarious multiple employment? Secondly, in what ways does multiple low-paid employment qualitatively challenge the narratives of dignified work? Thirdly, what are the lived experiences related to dignity in, out and between work?

In asking these questions we aim to:

1. Expand the notion of dignity at work both empirically and conceptually to incorporate the further fragmentation of work due to multi-employment, together with the complex temporalities and spatialities of work.

2. Demonstrate the need to widen the challenges of dignity in precarious multiple employment, which generate specific problems *in, out and between work*.

Research Methods

Based on a qualitative research strategy, the study centred on Yorkshire and the North-East of England, because at the inception of the study both were in the top three regions for underemployment (ONS, 2012). Furthermore, over 20% of workers in both regions were paid below the Foundation Living Wage (FLW) (Lawton and Pennycook, 2013), being a voluntary hourly-rate based on the Minimum Income Standard which is regarded as a minimum socially acceptable standard of living in the UK. Therefore, our rationale was that due to the prevalence of precarious low-paid jobs and underemployment, either in terms of pay and/or insufficient working hours, many would need a combination of jobs to make ends meet. In terms of the sampling frame inclusion criteria, our major focus was on those workers with more than one legitimate job who were paid below the FLW, as our key aims were to critically examine their experiences of work in multiple organisations, the value of work and their work–life complexities. We had ethical procedure requests covering protocols to manage any potential harm throughout our research checked and authorised by our then University employers prior to data collection.

From the outset of this research project, we recognised that the workers we needed to speak to constitute a 'hard to reach' group; as they were relatively hidden (see Bonevski et al., 2014), because they had multiple jobs, with different employers across varying locations. Hence, this created complex daily lives. Consequently, one of our first challenges was identifying potential participants who were willing, and able, to take part in the study.

We built relationships of trust and developed partnerships through an 'Advisory Group' (AG) of key organisations to facilitate research access. Valerio et al. (2016) report that a community advisory board results in greater representation from hard-to-reach participants. Through the AG, our project was advertised widely and we also met with 'lay stakeholders', who provided unique insights on accessing hard to reach populations (see Kaiser et al., 2017). They offered useful advice on the use of 'down to earth' language for recruitment materials, posters and flyers, so that we presented a more person-centred identity in some locations, such as, foodbanks and trade union meetings.

We built up trust with the AG by attending meetings and explaining our research to their members, for example, we attended ten separate union meetings with seven different trade unions explaining our research aims, handing out flyers and asking people to contact us with ideas. We had meetings with representatives from a community centre hub in the North-East who issued 1,000 flyers with their own regular distributions across deprived communities where precarity and low-paid employment was the norm. Some of the organisations in the AG advertised the project on their social media pages. We maintained regular contact with all these organisations, which led to a continuous snowballing effect. Therefore, we utilised both purposive and snowball sampling techniques to access low-paid workers in multiple employment. In some instances, this led to what is referred to as 'respondent-driven recruitment' (Bonevski et al., 2014), whereby some participants with whom we built trusting relationships handed out recruitment flyers in their own workplaces, which helped to increase the number of volunteers who took part in the research project.

Arranging and scheduling research interviews was challenging due to the complex and changeable daily schedules of these workers; hence, the location and timing of the interaction was important. This was typically via email or telephone conversations. To build trust and confidence, we offered to conduct interviews in familiar locations using private

interview rooms in local libraries, rooms facilitated by members of the AG, and our own work offices. We also offered a £20 supermarket voucher to all interviewees as recompense for taking time out of their busy schedules to participate in the study; such incentives are permissible in ESRC guidelines. We were also aware that we should not present ourselves as 'too academic' or 'formal'. As two of the research team are academics with strong Northern (classed) accents, this helped the workers in the regions relate to us.

Our detailed interviews with the workers focused on issues around routes into employment, their primary and additional jobs, working time schedules, the complexities and challenges of work-life 'balance', and the reasons for engaging in multiple employment. To facilitate the conversations with workers we had open initial questions of "Tell me about the jobs you have" and "Tell me about your typical working day". We then enquired about the pace and duration of work, and working hours across multiple jobs, which are related to the intensification and extensification of work. As the narratives developed, we asked participants about voice, influence and being valued at work, which relate to DAW, but in our case, concern multiple organisations. A set of questions focused on childcare, eldercare and domestic duties, and strategies and supports utilised daily by these workers, which centre on dignity in and between jobs.

Between June 2015 and May 2017, we conducted 50 semi-structured interviews with low-paid workers in multiple employment, along with six senior managers, nine trade union representatives and two foodbank organisers. We acknowledge that this data was collected 8-10 years ago and are claiming to be analysing this within a framework of a 'contemporary' turbulent economic environment. Clarity on the continued relevance of this is as follows. The notion of turbulent unpredictability was introduced by Smith in 2010, 5 years before we collected this data when precarious employment levels, for example zero hours contracts (ZHCs) in the UK were approximately 168,000. By the time we began collecting our data in

2015, the levels were at 746,000 and when we ended data collection, 883,000. In 2025, there are now 1.17m people recorded on ZHCs. Indeed, precarious working becoming the 'new norm' (Rubery 2018) has also been correlated with the risks to growing in-work poverty (IWP) (McBride and Smith 2022; JRF 2025; SVP 2021). The JRF (2025) note how two-thirds of working-age adults in poverty (68%) are in a household where at least one adult works and claim that the types and quality of work available, including the security of employment are crucial in order for workers not to be pulled into poverty. Given the economic necessities of working in precarious contracts, workers will need an amalgamation of jobs to get by, therefore, an analysis of the contemporary turbulent economic environment remains very relevant today.

The worker interviews lasted from 1 hour to 90 minutes in duration and as the conversations flowed, we were surprised how much they were prepared to share with us, later realising this was because it was the only time they were able to talk about these issues in detail. We were interested in the realities of working in more than one job, we did not anticipate finding people working in more than one job experiencing in work poverty, stigma, shame and indignity and how much these issues affected them. During the course of this fieldwork, as academic researchers, we had never experienced such emotive and sensitive interviews. A number of our respondents, both male and female, broke down in tears during the discussion at different times and over different issues.

We concur with those who assert that when conducting in-depth research into the complex realities of peoples' working lives, researchers cannot 'divorce' the emotional relations that develop out of this. As Holland (2007) argues, emotions play an important part, not only in the field, but also in the research process itself. Indeed, our analysis involved various levels of refinement due to the realisation that emotions were a crucial element in

helping us to fully understand the challenges and complexities low-paid workers in multiple employment encountered in their everyday lives.

Therefore, the complex lived realities and emotional triggers were a very important factor of our research process and we reflected on these during our analysis. We had not intended to conduct an emotionally reflexive piece of research, rather it was 'accidental reflexivity' (see Smith and McBride 2019) as the unanticipated findings through their voices and emotions on reflection, became more meaningful and insightful. The interviews were subjected to iterative and manual thematic data analysis, with open coding of transcripts to identify general themes relevant to our research questions. Among these themes were clear issues of dignity in work, out of work and in between work. We realised that these latter 2 themes are not discussed in existing DAW frameworks – and it is stressed here that we do not use the original frameworks to 'test' our findings – rather we use our findings from the voices of our participants to demonstrate that we can no longer capture DAW through utilising the original frameworks. Therefore, we are adding extra dimensions to the original frameworks since contemporary work and employment has changed since these were first published and most of the DAW frameworks are built on one job in the singular workplace.

The narrative below is presented around a series of themes drawn out of the analysis of the participants' experiences, covering the intensification and extensification of contemporary precarious work, poor management and abuse, shame, humiliation and the triple stigma, and the value of work. It should be noted that all respondents' names in the empirical section that follows are pseudonyms.

The Workers

The workers interviewed were employed in cleaning, catering, bar work, the care sector, security, social services, education, retail, DIY, public services, administration, the

entertainment industry, utilities and IT services. These occupations span the private, public and third sectors but a number of public sector jobs were recently outsourced due to austerity cuts. In terms of employment contracts, these combine full-time (FT), part-time (PT), agency, temporary, seasonal, casual and zero hours contracts. The majority of the interviewees were women, and ages range from late teens to 60s. Regarding education, there were a minority with no qualifications, but many had NVQs, GCSEs, 'O' levels, 'A' levels, good quality degrees and even masters' degrees. The research team expected to speak to workers with two or three jobs but were surprised and concerned to interview a number with four, five and even seven different jobs. All the workers interviewed had an amalgamation of jobs due to harsh economic necessities of multiple jobs because they were struggling to make ends meet, and several had to use foodbanks. The causal factors of multiple employment are low-pay, job instability, constrained employment opportunities, insufficient, variable and irregular working hours. Indeed, of the 50 workers we interviewed, 32 had mini jobs of under 16 hours/week, including 27 with more than one mini job. Therefore, the necessities of additional income and working hours results in the intersection of the economic, temporal and spatial. This has ramifications for dignity in, out and between work, and these multidimensionalities are discussed in what follows.

Findings: dimensions of work and the impact of multiple employment

The findings are organised into four sections that highlight the different dimensions and impacts of multiple employment on DAW *in, out of and between work*. We start by examining new complexities of *work intensification* with multiple low paid employment and explain how this contributes to an *extensification of work*, which in our view advances DAW frameworks given their traditional focus on singular spaces of work. Secondly, the *problematic relations with management and mismanagement* and the dynamics of dignity in,

out and between jobs, relating to managerial inflexibility and abuse, where workers with multiple jobs carry these cumulative burdens between jobs are examined. In many senses we highlight how the boundaries of management and their remits of control are challenged by what they typically view as a 'peripheral' workforce stretched across different workplaces and employers leading to significant gaps in various aspects of organisational policies and communications. We then focus on two further sets of issues in terms of *shame, humiliation and the 'triple stigma'* – on the one hand – and how these are further experienced due to the nature of multiple work and – on the other hand – the consequential impact of *how the work is not valued* in any meaningful sense. These two sets of issues bring broader and often less tangible dimensions to the discussion which are often missed or set aside but they impact on a worker's sense of indignity and lack of recognition. These four sets of issues show why we need to consider the experiences of multiple employment in a broader sense beyond the simple focus on tangible or observable employment conditions.

The Intensification and Extensification of Contemporary Precarious Work

The first factor we consider that is detrimental to DAW is that of 'overwork' - or what we refer to as 'work intensification' - being the concentration of extensive work effort (Green, 2006) - which is also a key theme of the original classic works of Hodson (2001) and Bolton (2003). However, as noted, this framing of DAW normally refers to workers in singular jobs, no matter how problematic. Our focus is on low paid workers with a *combination* of jobs, which involves additional layers of complexity across economic, spatial and temporal dimensions. 'Work extensification' refers to the overspill of work across different times and spaces, and the extant literature typically centres on senior managers and professionals (Moen at al., 2013). In focusing on work intensification *and* extensification in

an era of hyper precarity (see Smith, 2016), we attempt to broaden and update DAW debates both conceptually and empirically.

There has been wide recognition of a rising intensity of work in the UK (see Green, 2006), but what is distinctive from our research is an intensification of work across a multitude of combined jobs. To express the day-to-day realities of work intensification, interviewees used the phrases – "very fast", "a mental pace" and "hectic". Evie states, "it's really hectic and all 4 jobs are relentless, as you don't know what you're going to encounter day to day", especially with cleaning schools. Charlotte, who has 1 catering and 2 cleaning jobs, explained,

> It's tiring work and not very good on my back. It's that fast that sometimes I think I'm going dizzy. I'm constantly looking at the clock.

Furthermore, due to austerity cuts and efficiency gains there had been cuts to hours and materials, but managers expected the same level of service, which exacerbates work intensity. Olivia, with 2 outsourced cleaning jobs, did wonder if she "would be able to keep this pace up", as it is "relentless". This frantic pace of work across day-to day multiple jobs culminates in the amplification of work intensification.

Working lives were particularly fraught for those on ZHCs and highly variable hours (HVHs) due to the variability and limited duration of working hours and, therefore, the volatility of earnings. These workers spoke of "panicking" and "scrambling" to acquire enough hours to essentially earn a living. Many were on a financial tightrope with no savings "for a rainy day" and were worried about how they would be able to cover emergency costs, such as, a new fridge or washing machine.

> Many of the interviewees on ZHCs and HVHs described a "relentless", "hectic" and "frantic pace of work and life." For example, Les, with 4 jobs, described a frantic

pace of work in his ZHC jobs, “they [management] want me to work every minute and keep piling more work on me.”

There was no transparency over how zero hours were allocated, and workers stated that they were “pitted against others”. Indeed, many were fearful of turning down shifts, and when offered work, had to “drop everything” as they felt that they would not be offered working hours again. Therefore, these typically short-term demands to accept work created temporal instability and stress, which had implications for the other lines of employment of these workers. There was acute precarity due to irregular employment, a scarcity of working shifts and, therefore, earnings. Issues around job insecurity are also not considered in DAW frameworks and the practicalities of multiple employment with unpredictable working hours was fraught with anxiety and instability.

> It was doing my head in, working manic hours for the worst pay possible … and not get enough hours to make ends meet. But I wanted to have a stable job. You don’t feel in control of your life. You can’t plan anything when you don’t know what pay you’re going to get. I’d end up working like a 55-hour week. But then the next week I might get two hours. It can’t be good for my health. I’ve got cystic fibrosis so there’s a period in the morning and the night when I have to do treatment.

(Thomas, 7 jobs - ZHC library, ZHC Information Technology (IT) support, ZHC retail, ZHC utilities, ZHC IT, Self-employed accountancy and self-employed IT maintenance)

Furthermore, for one of these jobs, Thomas did not receive any wages for over a year and was engaged in a constant dispute with this employer. It is also clearly not conducive to his health condition and exacerbates fears over job insecurity. This demonstrates the intensification of working 7 different jobs, with the additional pressures of seeking unpaid wages from an unscrupulous employer.

For those on ZHCs there was a clear intensification of work as they were offered constrained and specifically numbered hours to make working time as productive as possible. There were similar scenarios of an "unrelenting pace of work" in the retail sector, due to competitive pressures, variations in demand, high labour turnover and stretched staffing levels. Checkout staff had to scan at least 19.6 items per minute and many remained on the tills for five hours without a drink or comfort break. Technically this could be challenged legally, but many of the interviewees were too afraid to speak out, as they were desperate to retain an amalgamation of jobs to make ends meet. This limit to any regulatory reach was common in terms of such rights. Hence, here were see a tightening of the porosity of the working day with very limited breaks and constant work pressures for those on HVHs. This was a similar experience for other workers,

> We don't get any rest breaks at all. We're not even allowed a drink. We're not allowed a smoke. We're not even allowed to talk to anybody. They [management] are really strict. If they catch you sitting down, you are in trouble. They [management] creep up on you when you're not expecting them and tell the security blokes not to let us know they're in the building. She doesn't even trust us. That's how bad it is.

(Les , 4 jobs – PT catering, ZHC cleaning, PT cleaning on a Saturday and PT cleaning on a Sunday)

This climate of low-trust employment relations with micro-management and 'inflexibility' is also evident for many on 'flexible working contracts'. Mia reported that workers had to give '…3 or 4 months' notice if you want a day off'. Some retail managers were even asking employees for 12 months' notice for annual leave and those who questioned management were told, 'Be happy because you've got a job'. This is even more complex for those with multiple jobs across shifting temporalities of work.

The daily reality is that these workers are juggling a multitude of jobs across expansive timeframes. This quote of Anna's typical working week reveals the relentless pace and pressures of precarious multiple employment, which results in the intensification and extensification of everyday life.

> I'm exhausted. I get up at 4:30 in the morning. I leave the house at 5:10 for a 6am start. Then I come here [second job] at 11am and I've got all day here. I finish at 4pm here go to my son's and get a sandwich or something and then go to my next job. That one is five nights a week and it's a very hard job. … It's about midnight when I get to bed. But if I didn't do these jobs I wouldn't be able to live. I wouldn't be able to survive. (Anna, 4 jobs - PT shop assistant, PT catering and 2 PT cleaning jobs)

Those we interviewed often worked the extreme ends of unsocial hours (see Rubery et al., 2015), and with multiple jobs this results in the elasticity of working times. Of the 50 workers we interviewed, 26 worked early mornings, 29 worked evenings and 26 worked weekends. Therefore, this offers unique dimensions of work extensification, as these workers in low paid multiple employment traverse fragmented, complex, elongated and segmented temporalities and spatialities of work.

The daily realities involved frantically dashing from job to job, whilst trying to quickly grab some form of sustenance between shifts. This incorporates impediments to dignity *between* multiple jobs, due to the navigation from job to job. Furthermore, there are accumulated barriers to dignity *out* of work, due to juggling multiple jobs with domestic responsibilities, as 16 workers had childcare duties, 9 had eldercare responsibilities, and 12 cared for grandchildren. The cumulative effects of work intensification and extensification, together with traversing jobs, meant that workers were "physically and mentally shattered", "knackered" and that it "grinds you down". As mentioned earlier, it also affected people's health with the most alarming example being Lily with 3 jobs – "I'm knackered at the end of

the day with backache, and I cough up blood". Indeed, many carry the burden of stress and pressures from one workplace into their next shift, namely indignities in, outside and between workplaces.

Poor management and worker abuse – the dynamics of dignity in, out and between multiple jobs

As highlighted earlier, dignity at work is often associated with issues of mismanagement, exploitation and abuse, and this is the second element we consider as it expands the original DAW frameworks. As our empirical evidence focuses on workers in multiple jobs, there are additional complexities due to the interlocking of economic, temporal and spatial dimensions. In this section we focus on managerial inflexibility, sickness absence as discipline, and abuse by management and customers of workers in so-called low status jobs.

Despite already juggling multiple jobs with familial and care commitments across differing and complex temporal and spatial dimensions, an additional challenge for these workers is that to facilitate any semblance of work-life 'balance', they require approval for 'flexible working' from line managers in more than one organisation. Managers are *supposed* to reasonably consider such requests, but there were inconsistent and arbitrary managerial decisions regarding flexible working. Joanne explains how some of her co-workers were forced to leave their jobs due to managers rejecting requests to change one shift due to childcare issues.

> One woman wanted to change shifts. Her husband was working away, and she has young children, and she asked for a 4 o'clock finish. The manager went, "No, you can't have a 4 o'clock finish, and if you don't like it, you'll have to leave." So she went. (Joanne, 2 jobs - PT cleaning and ZHC cleaning)

Furthermore, one worker had her request to change hours rejected outright, but her sister who does exactly the same job had her request approved. These were not isolated incidents, there were numerous examples of managers rejecting requests to change hours for eldercare, exams, a family funeral and even a bride's wedding. Such a hard-line management attitude was exemplified with one worker being told, "…this is not our problem – look for another job!" Mountney and Reid (2012) also report managerial inflexibility for low paid workers, but what is unique with this study is that the inconsistency has deleterious implications for workers' dignity in terms of reconciling multiple jobs with often competing familial demands, which also has negative repercussions for managers and organisations. Yet, this managerial inflexibility is in stark contrast with requests for workers to be 'flexible' in the contemporary labour market and suggests that the sum total of these management attitudes make working on various jobs even more difficult for the worker.

Advocates of labour market 'flexibility' argue that zero hours contracts are mutually beneficial to employers and employees as there is 'choice' over the hours worked (Beatson, 2021). However, the notion of 'flexibility' is one-sided, as the number, duration and pattern of working hours is indeterminate and controlled by management. For those on ZHCs, working hours could vary from 0, 2 or 4 hours up to 60 hours/week. Similarly, those employed in retail on highly variable hours (HVH) contracts, could work as few as 4, 6 or 8 guaranteed hours up to 40 hours/week. Employers demanded "full flexibility" and workers had to indicate all their 'availability', but managers were under no obligation to offer any additional hours of employment. Managers were attempting to match staffing levels to the fluctuations in demand and often had a pool of available workers to draw from. However, there were instances of some workers being called into cover extensive unsocial hours, such as James who had 5 jobs and would cover weekend care residentials and Abigail who sometimes worked all night in security. These shifts had detrimental implications for both

family life and recuperation. Hence, there were key commonalities between ZHCs and HVHs in that working hours, and therefore earnings, were even more variable and precarious, which has implications for the nature of dignity in and between multiple jobs and how people coped working across multiple organisations.

Many of the workers we interviewed provided detailed accounts of poor management and abuse by line managers as well as customers. These workers often had what were deemed to be 'low status' and 'peripheral' roles in a number of employing organisations and experienced very stressful daily lives of dashing from job to job to "*keep their heads above water*". This is exemplified by Lily, who had 3 part time jobs, and after her second shift, she returned to her workplace to change out of her uniform and clock out and noted that the visiting window cleaners had parked in reserved spaces without authorisation,

> I told some window cleaners they couldn't park in the reserved parking and their boss complained. And then my boss came in and made me feel *that* little. She shouted, 'They've got more authority in this building than you have!' And she actually told me to 'best get up those stairs and apologise'. She treated me like a piece a dirt. *(Lily, 3 jobs – PT care, PT catering, PT cleaning)*

Terms such as making her feel 'little' and being 'treated like a piece of dirt' were damaging to Lily's dignity, not only in her catering role, but it must be noted that she also has to carry this burden and psychological impact onto her third job.

Many of these workers were excluded from main communications, organisational policies and practices due their precarious or limited presence in each position: and in part management were themselves caught by the tensions and challenges related to a workforce with multiple sites of employment. For example, Annie had 2 part time jobs, one as a cleaner in the morning and one as a checkout operator in a large supermarket. In the quote below, she

relays examples of abuse from customers, where she has been in tears due to insults to her self-respect:

> Some of the customers that come in are disgusting the way they speak to you -talk to you like stuff on the bottom of their feet but you've just got to sit there and take it. They [management] just say the customer is right, so you've got to keep your cool. Sometimes you're in tears the way they speak to you. I've had ginger cow, slut, this, that and the other. I just say, "Excuse me, but don't talk to me like that. I don't get paid enough to be sat there and spoken to like that. (Annie, 2 jobs – PT retail and PT cleaning)

Another example of poor management and abuse is one that Abigail described as a typical scenario at work. These two examples were from her ZHC job working in security -

> They (the team) picked me up at 9pm and said “We’re taking you to Gateshead Cemetery” There’s a lot of vandalism around there you see. They had me working on patrols from 10pm with this other bloke - he finished at 2am and I finished at 6, I thought, “Well, I’m not going round the cemetery on my own”, so I was just sitting in this flipping hut on my own with a radio, no toilet, just a kettle until I got picked up at 6 o’clock. It was so eerie, awful.

This was not the first time Abigail had been left on her own working during the night in the open as a sole woman,

> Another time they put me on this field with some industrial huts to look after, and the security head says, “You’ve just go over there where that hut is”. No toilet at all. So, when I went on the radio to ask, all the other security officers were listening, I said to the lad on the control, I said, “I need the toilet, there’s no toilets”, I could hear other security guards laughing on the other side of the phone…on the radio. He said, “Oh,

> right, okay we'll get somebody out". (Abigail, 2 jobs - ZHC security and PT bar work)

It should also be noted Abigail was in her 60s, carer of her 80-year-old mother and needed these two jobs as she was in debt recovery and using a foodbank to survive. Furthermore, with the zero hours security job the locations and hours of work frequently changed depending upon the subcontractors. It should be noted that this account also highlights other indignities around safety and well-being for women working in typically male-dominated jobs.

Another major concern that was raised by several participants across differing sectors was the stringent managerial practice of viewing sick leave as a disciplinary matter (see Taylor et al., 2010). For example, Amelia a cleaner with 2 part time jobs explained,

> You've only got to be off seven or eight days before they [management] call you...and you start getting the disciplinary letter. So nobody will take time off.

Lily also revealed undignified treatment by managers in one of her outsourced jobs as a cleaner. She has underlying health issues and was hospitalised with a serious illness.

> I had a laparoscopy and my lung collapsed – I only have one lung but from that first day in hospital, I was told by my manager that I had to go in for a meeting because I'd been off for more than eight days.

Lily told us that she received a phone call every day from her line manager to ask when she was returning to work. Here we can see how management regarded sick leave as a cost to be minimised and, overall, we discovered a range of poor management practices related to ill health and 'flexible' working, which are detrimental to dignity both in and out of the workplace. Moreover, such negative organisational transactions mean that these workers carry cumulative burdens between jobs. Indeed, Lily illuminated on how she found the whole

process to be intimidating and humiliating, the latter of which we further investigated through our third dimension.

Shame, humiliation and the 'triple stigma' of low paid multiple employment

This third dimension is one tends to receive less interest in the DAW debates, that of stigma, and related to that, humiliation and shame. Earlier we noted how dignity also requires an acknowledgement of vulnerability and is dependent on how others interpret and treat us as individuals (see Sayer 2011). Furthermore, other studies draw on specific indicators of 'indignity' at work, such as, *verbal abuse* and *humiliation* (Khademi et al., 2012; Stuesse, 2010) and *stigma* attached to certain kinds of work (Chiappetta-Swanson, 2005). We provide empirical evidence of such internalised emotions that were drawn out through our in-depth interviews of the impact of working in multiple precarious employment, and the deleterious effects this has on worker's dignity within as well as outside and between work. This is in our view, is a more complex feature of employment to study, as it is not easily picked up in any quantifiable sense, but should be integrated within relevant discussions on DAW.

Therefore, the otherwise hidden emotions of humiliation and shame were drawn out in varying ways in our interviews. It should be noted that this factor was not part of the interview schedule, but where it was raised, we allowed the interviewee to continue to elaborate on their feelings and experiences. One of the most intense interviews that demonstrates elements of shame was with Alfie who had been made redundant from a well-paid job. As a direct consequence, he had lost his car and family home due to negative equity and was renting a smaller house. He was led to having to take multiple part-time low-paid jobs. In his interview, in reference to himself, he stated the word '*ashamed'* four times, '*worthless'* three times and '*embarrassed'* twice. This interview was emotionally draining,

and Alfie broke down in tears during it. Initially, he said he felt ashamed due to losing his well-paid and, therefore, high status job and then explained how the experience of looking for work that has a stigma attached to it, and only being offered low paid, temporary, insecure work was dehumanising:

> It was soul destroying. I was applying for at least ten jobs a day, and if you didn't do a minimum of so many jobs you got treated [by Jobcentre Plus] like a total idiot. They were saying to me, "How come you can't get a job?" I said because they are all zero hour contracts! I said, "you don't live in the real world". If you've got children and you've got to run a family on a zero hour contract, it doesn't work. It knocked my confidence, I was totally ashamed. You just feel worthless, absolutely worthless.

Alfie also told us that on one occasion when he had a job interview, he turned up and no-one arrived to interview him and he stated, "I honestly felt like crying, I was that ashamed." Here we see other examples of dignity 'in between and out of work' as Alfie is desperately searching for more work in between jobs. Furthermore, we see the humiliation of all his efforts leading only to opportunities of precarious jobs and the realisation they are all low status, low paid jobs.

Other feelings of shame were related to constant financial struggles, despite having a multitude of lines of employment. Indeed, some of the workers we interviewed stated that there was a perception that they were, ironically, in a reasonable financial situation because they were working across different jobs. Yet the reality was that many were working in multiple low-paid jobs and struggling to make ends meet,

> I wouldn't be able to manage, if I didn't have these 4 jobs. I mean, some of them at work will say, "Surely, you should be quids-in?". I think, "But I'm not, because you

don't know my situation." (Bridie, 4 jobs – three PT cleaning jobs and one PT catering job)

Several of the workers we interviewed were using foodbanks to survive and did not want anyone to know that they needed this help, therefore associating this hardship with notions of shame – despite having more than one job.

I don't go to the foodbank every week. I don't tell anybody that I go. I mean, it's only now and again, it just helps me out a little bit. I wouldn't like to tell my friends I go there, do you know what I mean? (Fern, two jobs – FT support worker and ZHC care worker)

I just go like, once a month, or once every three weeks. It's just, like, to help me out just that tiny little bit. I don't dare tell anybody I go to the foodbank. (Abigail, two jobs – ZHC security and PT bar work).

Similar feelings of humiliation, stigma and shame were also uncovered by Garthwaite (2016) in her study of foodbank use. She argues that there is a powerful political, media and public discourse where those who use foodbanks are seen as 'undeserving' and personally responsible for their plight. This indicates a hardening of social attitudes as in the recent past those who were financially struggling but working were viewed as the 'deserving poor' (Toynbee, 2015). Indeed, Shildrick (2018) argues that there is a stigmatisation of foodbanks and stereotypical views of those experiencing poverty.

From our findings, we argue that there is a 'triple stigma'. Firstly, there is the 'shame' in having to use a foodbank. Secondly, this sense of 'shame' is exacerbated with having to make use of a foodbank whilst having a job. Thirdly, these workers have multiple lines of employment and are still struggling financially to make ends meet and internalise this and feel shame.

Other participants spoke of their reluctance to use a foodbank despite finding themselves and their families in financial difficulties.

> My partner won't let us go to a foodbank because she is too proud, but I'm amazed we survive. Thankfully we've got a really big freezer, so occasionally we go to Iceland or Jack Fultons or something. But we really struggle to survive. (Jack, two jobs – ZHC care worker and PT bar work)

Others did not own or rent a house and said they were 'ashamed' to tell their work colleagues. For instance, Anna with 4 part time jobs, said, "If I didn't do all these jobs I wouldn't be able to live. I live in a caravan now." She told us that her colleagues were unaware of this living situation. Regarding the volatility of insecure working hours and incomes with multiple jobs, some did receive financial support from family and friends. Others made use of credit unions or sought advice from debt management charities. Indeed, many respondents were in debt and in a "dire situation" where the choice was whether "do you pay your rent or do you eat?" Some were unable to buy clothes or take their family out, for example, Alfie explained,

> That's how bad it is. Look, £10 these jeans were. That's all I've spent on myself for about nine months….and we haven't been out for something to eat for at least two or three years. We simply can't afford it - even McDonalds.

He was also concerned about how others would perceive his employment status, "…just little things like seeing my in-laws - I was totally ashamed." He was also worried about how others in the community would perceive his employment 'status' whilst constantly looking for more work,

> You can imagine how embarrassing it was for me. I was going in ASDA on the weekend with the kids and there's people coming up to me, "Oh are you alright, Alfie,

what are you doing now?" I felt so ashamed and so embarrassed, and I thought, 'I haven't got a proper job'.

Evident here is the volatility of precarious work, insecure working hours and incomes, and because of this 'hyperturbulence', which exacerbates the shame and stigma. These spatial and temporal dimensions are an important contribution to the DAW literature. What it also tends to ignore is the value that people place on their employment – whether that be the type of work that they do – or more importantly 'how' they and the work that they do are not valued and are invisible in some cases.

The Value of work

Sayer's (2011) conceptualisation of DAW focuses on values relating to dignity and the questions workers face in their everyday lives, including how others treat them and how they respond. With reference to 'work', he moves to a more fundamental matter of concern for people - their dignity in the broadest sense of the term. As highlighted earlier, his analysis reveals that dignity also requires an acknowledgement of vulnerability and is much more dependent on how others interpret and treat us, particularly in terms of relations of equality and difference. This is particularly pertinent to those in precarious multiple employment, and we explicitly asked about their experiences and feelings of being valued.

A key dimension of DAW relates to being appreciated and valued by organisations, not only as a person, but also in the work that you do and the perceived social value of that work. We found that, no matter how many jobs you have, it was predominantly cleaners who felt their work was not valued by managers as well as some staff. It is this feeling of *not* being valued that undermines the possibility of developing a sense of inclusion or belonging which is an important part of DAW (although rarely discussed as we pointed out earlier in the

related literature). When Ivy, with two part-time cleaning jobs, was asked if she felt valued in her jobs she stated,

> No, they don't care. I don't talk to them [management) unless I have to, because they're all two-faced and they don't support you – they're not interested in you. Us ground workers, we don't get treated with respect. We're just cleaners. It'd be nice if somebody would just say 'thank you'.

Others reiterated the same feeling and Anna, who had four jobs, described condescending attitudes and not feeling valued, particularly in her cleaning role,

> Management and other people look down on you because you are a cleaner. For some reason, cleaning is the worst job in the world and you are classed as a second-class citizen. A cleaner is like a nothing. I have learned that you are a nothing.

Amelia also had part time cleaning jobs and had not been in this type of employment for long, but had taken on two jobs to 'get by' whilst looking for more secure work,

> I never saw this before I started cleaning - they do think that you are beneath them because you are a cleaner. In this building, only about four or five of them actually speak to me and that's just "Hello." The rest of them - is if they've got a complaint about their cleaning. It's not a job where anybody really feels valuable. We see ourselves as important but a lot of people don't, so that way we feel undervalued. you think, "Why am I doing this?" Because it was one of the only jobs I could get, so that's why.

Other interviews also highlighted how being a cleaner was socially perceived as being of low value and the fact that they had multiple cleaning jobs meant that they were having to cope with the lack of consideration and negative view of their work across more than one site. For example, Molly has a degree qualification and works in two jobs as a part-time cleaner, whilst doing further studies, and described how people perceive her 'value' through the work

she is currently engaged in, rather than her qualification or studies, “At work they just think I’m a cleaner. I’ve got initials after my name and everything, me. It’s mad isn’t it?” There were exceptions. Some of the workers we interviewed had, in some cases, felt appreciated by colleagues, together with some service users and customers. Indeed, there was a contrast with those who had cleaning and catering jobs in schools, who were valued and praised by staff and pupils as their work was more visible in the school and community. Yet, the majority did not feel respected by their managers across various points of their employment. For example, Isabelle who had two part-time jobs as a checkout operator and cleaner, stated that she was, “Valued by the people I work with, not by the people I work for.”

Moreover, as mentioned earlier, many were excluded from central communications, organisational policies and practices and did not feel that managers listened to or acted upon their views. Indeed, the absence of any such involvement across multiple workplaces exacerbates feelings of being unvalued and unappreciated. This was particularly the case for outsourced workers who felt marginalised and under-valued by the outsourcing company and core organisation. Several stated that they were “*just a number*” and not valued by the organisations or managers. Indeed, Barley and Kunda (2004) in their study, note how high-tech outsourced workers were disconnected from the organisation. In our research, Ella with three ZHC jobs, one of which was outsourced, stated that these jobs were “isolating” and there was “not the same interaction”, as these workers experience further peripheralisation across multiple workplaces. In one instance, several cleaners had their work outsourced 4 times within a 6-year period and did not even meet any of the new management team for a considerable while or not at all.

> Oh God, no. I've never even met them, not even met a person from the outsourcing company. Most jobs I've been in, when the people have taken over, have come down, they've introduced themselves, said who they are, what maybe changes are going to

> take effect. We never got anything like that… No, we don't feel valued by the company at all. (Amelia, two jobs – PT cleaning on a morning and PT cleaning on an evening).

Others highlighted the notion of dignity in, out of and in between work. For example, Jack had two jobs, one ZHC in the care sector and the other part-time bar work in the evening. He explained how despite having A levels, a good quality degree and training in care, he still experienced the indignities of precarity.

> I get up really early five days a week. To do two hours in a morning, then nothing … rest of the day, waiting for a phone call. And I can't afford to do anything … I'd only get a call about once or twice a week if I were lucky. And if you did get calls, It might be "You've got to get here now, can you do it?" And … well, you have to pay your own transport …, so sometimes you can't do the job because you can't afford your transport. I can't drive because I have epilepsy.

He also explained that despite having worked hard from an early age, having qualifications and training he felt undervalued by those he reached out to for work,

> I've worked from like when I were a teenager. And when you go to Jobcentre they treat you as if you're absolute dirt and that you're a Dole scrounger. You might get a couple of nice ones, but most of them were really horrible to me I felt.

Hence, again, here are indications of indignities in, out and between jobs: of, in effect, not being recognised as someone who is contributing. Those related to employment are the insecurities of ZHCs and the need to immediately accept any work offered. The indignities out of work are the pressures from Jobcentre Plus to constantly apply for work, with Jack and Alfie's continual search for one good quality full-time job yet having to take what was on offer and try to accumulate extra hours and jobs to try to earn a living. Moreover, there were dangers in certain jobs, such as support work and security.

> In one of my jobs, I was a support worker in challenging behaviour. It was probably the worst job I've ever done, because I just used to get punched every day. Literally, just punched every single day I went in. It was horrible there. (Jack, two jobs – ZHC social care and PT bar work)

Most of these workers held an array of occupations with a social or organisational significance and took pride in "doing a good job", even if it was not always appreciated. These are the workers who clean schools and workplaces, provide catering and security, and as one interviewee succinctly put it "we are the backbone of the community". Yet as this section demonstrates, these workers were being devalued even further due to their peripheralisation, leading to their invisibility being accelerated further due to the nature of multiple, low paid jobs. Furthermore, they were aware of this process of devaluation and marginalisation in clear and concise manners.

Discussion

From the outset, this paper had two key aims, firstly, to expand the notion of dignity at work both empirically and conceptually to incorporate the further fragmentation of work due to multi-employment, together with the complex temporalities and spatialities of work. Secondly, to demonstrate the need to widen the understanding of the challenges of dignity in precarious multiple employment, which generate specific problems in, out and between work.

In doing so, this article has critically examined the complex dynamics of DAW in contemporary precarious multiple employment in the UK. It builds on Bolton's (2007) argument that workplace dignity is multifaceted and multidimensional, as well as Thompson and Newsome's (2016) note that DAW is not a static social phenomenon, and researchers must examine its increasingly broader dynamics. Indeed, there are fresh challenges around DAW because of an ever-polarised labour market, low pay and - what Smith (2016) terms –

turbulent unpredictability, which in the cases discussed above are intensified by engaging in precarious multiple employment. Within this context, this research is unique as the explicit focus is on the lived experiences of low paid workers in multiple legitimate employment who have an amalgamation of jobs to attempt to earn a living: a development that is increasing (see Noor 2022; The Work Foundation 2025). As Lucas (2017) also argues, dignity is understood and experienced in its absence, rather than presence. This is particularly important in this context for this study reveals new dimensions of dignity (and indignity), as these workers live and work increasingly complex and fragmented lives. It also reveals a triple fragmentation, namely of the occupation/work, working time and the labour market. Therefore, as a result of this fragmentation, the overall contribution extends established DAW frameworks, as this research centres on *dignity in, out and between work* especially given the challenges of organisationally and spatially balancing the triple fragmentation across multiple forms of employment.

1. <u>New complexities of work intensification with multiple low paid employment and how this contributes to an extensification of work and intensification of everyday life.</u>

In drawing on original frameworks of DAW around 'exploitation and overwork' (Hodson, 2001), this study advances our understanding as it moves beyond a focus regarding dignity in one standard job. This research reveals the consequence of new dynamics of dignity in low paid and multiple employment in the precarisation and fragmentation of work. Firstly, it reveals new dimensions of overwork (Hodson, 2001), which we refer to as work intensification. As the findings show, workers explained that their work was "very fast", "a mental pace" and "hectic" with Charlotte stating that, "It's that fast that sometimes I think I'm going dizzy." We note the importance of understanding the multifaceted dynamics of

dignity (Bolton, 2007; Thompson and Newsome, 2016), which are drawn out in this study, as there is work intensification across multiple jobs in varying locations. We further add to Hodson's notion of 'overwork' as our empirical research of multiple employment and precarisation also creates an 'extensification of work'. All of the workers we interviewed had frantic and frenetic daily routines of constantly moving from job to job, which underlies the economic necessities of contemporary precarious work. This incorporated fragmented timescales spanning unsocial hours, where workers were frantically juggling competing work and domestic demands. Anna's example demonstrates the extremities of this, as her working day spans from waking up to begin her working day at 4.30am and not getting to bed until midnight – therefore having only 4 ½ hours of sleep every working night. What is also key from our findings is that there is also a concomitant 'intensification of everyday life' as these workers traverse complex and expansive temporalities with issues of spatiality. Thus, the porous nature of low paid multiple employment demonstrates complexities related to *dignity between* jobs which exacerbate the dilemmas within them.

2. Problematic relations with management, poor management and mismanagement

As highlighted earlier, dignity at work is often associated with issues of mismanagement, exploitation and abuse (Hodson 2001) and this is the second element we examine. In doing so, we reflect on previous debates of DAW on the need for further understanding from a more multidimensional and dynamic perspective (Bolton, 2007; Thompson and Newsome, 2016). Therefore, this study highlights poor management and abuse across multiple workplaces with differing managerial regimes. These involved workers not just being spoken to in a condescending manner by managers but also being excluded from organisational policies and events and typically being the last to be informed about workplace matters and changes, leading to their further peripheralisation. Moreover, there were several examples of

one-sided ‘flexibility’ on managerial terms, to the detriment of their lives outside of work and family life – and in relation to their other essential jobs. For example, as these workers had multiple jobs, they needed flexible working requests to be approved in more than one organisation. As our findings show, for some, asking to change shifts or times met with comments such as “No, you can’t have a 4 o'clock finish, and if you don’t like it, you’ll have to leave.” For those on ZHCs some employers demanded ‘full flexibility’ with instances of some workers being called in to cover extensive unsocial hours, such as James who had 5 jobs and would cover weekend care residentials, and Abigail who could work all night in security, sometimes alone. As we highlighted in the findings section, these so called ‘flexible’ shifts had detrimental implications for both family life and a dignified life. Furthermore, for some workers, impacts of poor management such as Lily being bullied and humiliated in one organisation meant that she had to carry that psychological impact onto her third job. This demonstrates that as these workers have multiple lines of employment, they then have to carry the consequences of poor or idiosyncratic management from one workplace to their second, third and possibly fourth shifts, which further undermines the possibility of establishing a level of dignity within other jobs and in their community (in effect - *in, out and between work*). Again, this extends DAW frameworks, as it moves beyond a focus regarding dignity in one standard job.

3. Shame, humiliation and stigma - introducing a triple stigma

Thirdly, this research contributes to the advancement of our understanding of DAW by highlighting two new dimensions - ‘shame, humiliation and a ‘triple stigma’’, and the ‘value of work’ related to holding multiple jobs. Firstly, with regards to shame and humiliation, this was emblematic in the use of foodbanks and the experiences of IWP, despite having these multiple jobs. For example, Abigail was using a foodbank despite having 2 jobs

and stated, 'I don't dare tell anybody I go to the foodbank'. Fern, who also had multiple jobs also said she felt humiliation and shame needing to use a foodbank. Whereas Jack, with two jobs claimed, "My partner won't let us go to a foodbank because she is too proud, but I'm amazed we survive." There was also a sense of shame in not having one clearly identifiable job or identity and not being able to actually earn a decent living. This is evident in Alfie's own internal shame as well as his concern about how others, within his family and community, would perceive his employment status. This all incorporates a triple stigma: firstly, the 'shame' of having to periodically use foodbanks, secondly, this is exacerbated with being in what was considered poor employment and, thirdly, having a range of jobs yet were still not earning a decent income.

4. <u>The value of the work – the value in the person, the work they do and the social value of that work</u>

Fourthly, the value of the work relates to behaviours and how workers are treated in employment. Sayer's (2011) conceptualisation of DAW focuses on values relating to dignity and the questions workers face in their everyday lives, including how others treat them. His analysis reveals that dignity also requires an acknowledgement of vulnerability and is much more dependent on how others interpret and treat us. A key dimension of DAW also relates to being appreciated and valued by organisations, not only as a person, but also in the work that you do and the perceived social value of that work (McBride and Martínez Lucio, 2021). This study supports these discussions in that many of the workers we interviewed did not feel valued or appreciated – using words and phrases such as "we don't get treated with respect. We're just cleaners."; "A cleaner is like a nothing. I have learned that you are a nothing"; "I feel undervalued. You think, "Why am I doing this?" Because it was one of the only jobs I could get, so that's why." Furthermore, in our study of individuals in multiple employment,

the sense of not feeling valued was also reinforced because of the way fellow colleagues or managers did not appreciate the challenge of balancing the demands and cultures of different jobs with different organisational and management demands. Hence, these additional third and fourth dimensions impel us to look beyond purely 'economic' and 'organisational' features of work and integrate a more social and personal dimension.

Summary of discussion

Overall, we have discovered that we need to view the impact of multiple employment of those on the margins of the labour market as there are an array of significant challenges to workers, especially with regards to DAW. This development, which is increasingly common, intensifies a range of problems related to precarious work with regards to work intensification and management bullying, for example. Furthermore, issues such as being stigmatised and humiliated – questions that are slowly emerging in work related academic debates – are compounded due to workers dealing with a tenuous relation with their multiple workplaces and their internal relations.

Multiple employment thus exacerbates the precarious and uneven experience of DAW. The invisibility of multiple precarious work creates problems regarding coping with and competing in different spaces, routines and cultures. Therefore, we argue that spatial and social issues should also be considered in DAW discussions. In particular, the effort needed in moving between and engaging with different workplaces and their idiosyncrasies needs much more attention in the DAW debate. The issue is that those workers that are not fully present or visible, who face distinct challenges logistically and in terms of negative treatment for being across different work sites, and whose contribution is unlikely to be acknowledged, present a challenge to the way dignity related narratives and practices are constructed and even acted on, especially in terms of policy responses.

Conclusion: extending the research lens to new dimensions of DAW that are less visible

This paper, therefore, contributes to the debate in conceptual, analytical and empirical terms in the following manner. In the first instance a weakness of many traditional DAW debates is that work intensification and indignity are still framed in singular workplace terms (the static view of the relation between an employer and an employee). This misses many of the sources of tensions for workers in multiple jobs - and even managers - as multiple sites have to be accessed, and worked within, coherently by a vulnerable and marginalised workforce. Secondly, we feel that looking at multiple employment within this group of workers allows us to broaden the debate on DAW and introduce new dimensions of work which are often less visible. We are not the first to talk about the value of work and stigma within it, but we do feel that the nature of the work we have studied has allowed us to rethink and draw attention to the broader challenges of generating work related dignity. Much of this emerges from the *space between* work and the *movements between* it. Third, this has broader ramifications for the way the state and other actors, such as, employers and trade unions may have to respond, as it is simply not a case of dealing with *in work* issues of an immediate economic nature but issues *between work* in terms of broader worker rights, welfare and labour market logistics. This is an area we see as needing further research in the future and attention based on the broadening of the DAW remit and debate, especially as the legitimacy of debates to resolve these issues requires a much broader appreciation of worker contribution and value. Fourthly, we have placed the importance of worker voice and experience at the centre of debate and have systematically reintroduced this here, building on a range of academic voices and interventions that ask us to broaden how we understand voice so that we capture the real and often obscure sources of exploitation and hardship which workers are increasingly experiencing within fragmented labour markets and jobs.

The paper argues that established DAW frameworks may consider questions of work intensification, but what is unique with this research is the focus on the amplification of work intensity due to an amalgamation of jobs in relation to issues of management, internal job changes, emergent stigma related issues, and the absence of workers being valued as workers and citizens. DAW concepts rarely emphasise or address working time and spatial dimensions, and how these impact in quantitative, economic but also social, symbolic ways at work and on the worker. Hence what is distinctive in this paper, is that we focus on the extensification of work across fragmented temporal and spatial dimensions of work and introduce new issues around *dignity in, out and between work.* This means we need to extend the DAW framework towards what may appear in the first instance to be less tangible factors but which are the outcome of organisational and regulatory failings in terms of forms of work, its management, and the social evaluation of that work and its contribution. In many ways we now need to go beyond the 'workplace' and seek how fragmented or segmented labour markets may have longer term effects and make generating a dignified workplace much more difficult. The regulatory lens also needs to be broadened to cover contemporary precarity, the fragmentation of work and multiple employment, and not just focus on the internal and singular space of work and employment.

References

Ashforth BE, Kreiner GE. (2014). Dirty work and dirtier work: differences in countering physical, social, and moral stigma. Manag. Organ. Rev. 10(1):81–108

Barley, S. and Kunda, G. (2004) *Gurus, Hired Guns, and Warm Bodies: Itinerant Experts in a Knowledge Economy*, Princeton.

Beatson, M. (2021) Let's go round again: Should we abolish zero-hours contracts. *CIPD Voice*, 30.

Berry, C. and McDaniel, S. (2022) Post-crisis precarity: Understanding attitudes to work and industrial relations among young people in the UK. Economic and Industrial Democracy, 43 (1): 322-343.

Bolton, S. (2007) (Ed) Dimensions of Dignity at Work. London: Butterworth Heinemann.

Bonevski, B. Randell, M., Paul, C., Chapman, K., Twyman, l., Bryant, J., Brozek, I and Hughes, C. (2014) Reaching the hard-to-reach: a systematic review of strategies for improving health and medical research with socially disadvantaged groups. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 14 (42): 1-29.

Brill, L. (2021) 'What is Decent Work? A Review of the Literature' in Christie, F., Antoniadou, M., Albertson, K., & Crowder, M. (Eds.) *Decent Work: Opportunities and Challenges*. Emerald Publishing Limited. 11-26

Chase, E. and Walker, R. (2012) 'The Co-construction of Shame in the Context of Poverty: Beyond a Threat to the Social Bond'. Sociology, 47(4), 739–754.

Chiappetta-Swanson, C. (2005). Dignity and dirty work: Nurses' experiences in managing genetic termination for fetal anomaly. Qualitative Sociology, 28, 93-116.

Clark, D. (2025) Number of employees on zero-hours contracts UK 2000-2025. Statista 2025. https://www.statista.com/statistics/414896/employees-with-zero-hours-contracts-number/

Garthwaite, K. (2016) Hunger pains: inside foodbank Britain, Bristol: Policy Press.

Goffman E.1963. Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Green F (2006), *Demanding Work*, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gibb, S., & Ishaq, M. (2020). Decent work: what matters most and who can make a difference? *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, *42*(4), 845-861.

Hodson, R. (2001). *Dignity at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

International Labour Organisation (ILO) (2022) *World Employment and Social Outlook* 2022 Geneva ILO

Johnson, M., Martínez Lucio, M., Grimshaw, D., & Watt, L. (2023). Swimming against the tide? Street-level bureaucrats and the limits to inclusive active labour market programmes in the UK. *Human Relations, 76*(5), 689-714

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) (2025) UK Poverty 2025: UK Poverty 2025
The essential guide to understanding poverty in the UK. https://www.jrf.org.uk/uk-poverty-2025-the-essential-guide-to-understanding-poverty-in-the-uk

Kaiser, B.L., Thomas, G.R. and Bowers, B.J. (2017) 'A Case Study of Engaging Hard-to-Reach Participants in the Research Process: Community Advisors on Research Design and Strategies (CARDS)', Research in Nursing and Health, 40, 70–79.

Khademi, M., Mohammadi, E., & Vanaki, Z. (2012). Nurses' experiences of violation of their dignity. Nursing Ethics, 19, (3): 328-340.

Kreiner, G., Mihelcic, C. A., & Mikolon, S. (2022). Stigmatized work and stigmatized workers. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 9(1), 95-120.

Kreinin, H., & Aigner, E. (2022). From "Decent work and economic growth" to "Sustainable work and economic degrowth": a new framework for SDG 8. *Empirica*, *49*(2), 281-311.

Lucas, K. (2017). “Workplace dignity,” in *The International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication*, Vol. 4, eds C. R. Scott, and L. Lewis, (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell), 2549–2562.

Lucas, K. (2015) *Workplace Dignity: Communicating Inherent, Earned, and Remediated Dignity.* Journal of Management Studies, 52 (5): 621 – 646.

Lawton, K. and Pennycook, M. (2013) *Beyond the Bottom Line. The Challenges and Opportunities of a Living Wage*, London: Resolution Foundation.

MacKenzie, R. and Martinez Lucio, M. (2022) Regulating work and employment internationally: a complex tapestry in Martínez Lucio, M. and MacKenzie, R. (Eds.) *International Human Resource Management: The transformation of work in a global context* London: Sage 317-336

McBride, J., & Martínez Lucio, M. (2021). Beyond work intensification: The contradictions and ironies of the changing nature of ‘unskilled’ work in a context of austerity and organisational change. *Capital & Class*, *45*(1), 145-164.

McBride, J. and Smith, A. (2022) ‘’I feel like I’m in poverty. I don’t do much outside of work other than survive’: In-work poverty and multiple employment in the UK’, *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 43, 3: 1440-1466

Moen P, Lam J, Ammons S and Kelly E (2013) ‘Time work by overworked professionals: Strategies in response to the stress of higher status’, *Work and Occupations*, 40, 2: 79-114.

Moran TH. 2002. Beyond Sweatshops: Foreign Direct Investment and Globalization in Developing Countries. Washington, DC: Brookings Inst. Press

Mountney K and Reid K (2012) *Parenting on a Low Income*. Edinburgh: Centre for Research on Families and Relationships.

Noor, N. (2022) Workers rush to take second jobs: 'I felt I had no choice' BBC News Business. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-63036425#:~:text=Royal%20London's%20figures%20are%20higher,over%20the%20past%20two%20years.

O'Sullivan M., Turner, T., Lavelle, J. et al. (2020) The role of the state in shaping zero hours work in an atypical liberal market economy. Economic and Industrial Democracy, 41 (3): 652-671.

Office for National Statistics (2012) Volume of Under-employment and Over-employment in the UK, London: ONS.

Rayman, P. (2001) Beyond the Bottom Line: The Search for Dignity at Work. New York: Palgrave.

Reutter, L. I., Stewart, M. J., Veenstra, G., Love, R., Raphael, D., & Makwarimba, E. (2009). "Who do they think we are, anyway?": Perceptions of and responses to poverty stigma. Qualitative health research, 19(3), 297-311.

Royle, T. (2010). The ILO's shift to promotional principles and the 'privatization'of labour rights: An analysis of labour standards, voluntary self-regulation and social clauses. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, *26*(3): 249-271

Rubery, J., Grimshaw, D., Keizer, A. and Johnson, M. (2018) Challenges and contradictions in the 'normalising' of precarious work. *Work, Employment and Society*, 32 (3): 509-527.

St Vincent de Paul Society (SVP) (2021) Stealing Futures: In-work Poverty and its impact on children and young people.
https://www.svp.org.uk/sites/default/files/content/In-work%20poverty%20and%20its%20impact%20on%20children%20and%20young%20people%20-%20report%20Dec%202021.pdf

Sayer, A. (2011) *Why Things Matter to People: Social Science, Values and Ethical Life*. Cambridge: CUP

Shildrick, T. (2018) 'Lessons from Grenfell: Poverty propaganda, stigma and class power' *The Sociological Review*, 66, 4: 783-798.

Smith, A., & McBride, J. (2019). Accessing 'Hard to Reach Groups' and Emotions in the Research Process: 'Work an Honest Day and Get the Usual Raw Deal'. In D. Wheatley (Ed.), Handbook of research methods on the quality of working lives. (pp. 95-108). Edward Elgar.

Smith V. (2016) A Gedenkschrift to Randy Hodson: Working with Dignity, Research in the Sociology of Work, Volume 28, 31-55 ISSN: 0277-2833/doi:10.1108/S0277-283320160000028006

Smith, V. (2010). Enhancing employability: Human, social, and cultural capital in an era of turbulent unpredictability. Human Relations, 63(2), 279-303.

Spooner, D., & Waterman, P. (2015). The future and praxis of decent work. *Global Labour Journal*, *6*(2).

Standing, G. (2011) *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*, London: Bloomsbury.

Stewart, P. (2004). Work, Employment & Society Today. *Work, Employment and Society*, *18*(4), 653-662.

Stuesse, A. C. (2010). What's "justice and dignity" got to do with it? Migrant vulnerability, corporate complicity, and the state. Human Organization, 69, (1): 19-30.

Taylor, P., Cunningham, I., Newsome, K. and Scholarios D. (2010) 'Too scared to go sick' – reformulating the research agenda on sickness absence. Industrial Relations Journal, 41 (4): 270-288.

The Work Foundation (2025) Workers with second jobs at highest level since records began as one in six employees struggle to pay their bills. Lancaster University Business School, July https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/lums/news/workers-with-second-jobs-at-highest-level-since-records-began-as-one-in-six-employees-struggle-to-pay-their-bills

Thomas, B. and Lucas, K. (2019) Development and Validation of the Workplace Dignity Scale. Group & Organization Management 44(1): 72 –111

Thompson, P. and Newsome, K. (2016), "The Dynamics of Dignity at Work", *A Gedenkschrift to Randy Hodson: Working with Dignity* (*Research in the Sociology of Work, Vol. 28*), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 79-100.

Toynbee P (2003) Hard Work: Life in Low-pay Britain. London: Bloomsbury

Tyler, I., & Slater, T. (2018). Rethinking the sociology of stigma. The Sociological Review, 66(4), 721-743.

Valerio, M.A., Rodriguez, N., Winkler, P., Lopez, J., Dennison, M., Liang, Y. and Turner, B. (2016) 'Comparing Two Sampling Methods to Engage Hard-to-reach Communities in Research Priority Setting', BMC Medical Research Methodology, 16(146), 1–11.

Warhurst, C., & Knox, A. (2022). Manifesto for a new Quality of Working Life. Human Relations, 75(2), 304-321.