Young Workers’ Experiences of Non-Standard Employment in New Zealand

Tanya Milly Ewertowska

Student Number: 17966798

A thesis submitted to

Auckland University of Technology

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Business

August 2020

Faculty of Business, Economics and Law

Primary Supervisor: Associate Professor Katherine Ravenswood

Secondary Supervisor: Dr Julie Douglas

Abstract

Young workers have been shown to have a significant presence in non-standard employment around the world (Hipp, Bernhardt, & Allmendinger, 2015; Peiró, Sora, & Caballer, 2012; Smith, 2018), and a considerable number of studies have offered explanations for why young workers enter non-standard employment (Baranowska & Gebel, 2010; de Lange, Gesthuizen, & Wolbers, 2014b; Imdorf, Helbling, & Inui, 2017). However, young workers' experiences within non-standard employment are comparatively under-researched. The literature has highlighted that young workers, as with other workers in non-standard employment, experience a lack of control over their working time, impacting on their work-life balance (Moore, Tailby, Antunes, & Newsome, 2018; Woodman, 2012, 2013). Research has also suggested that young workers in non-standard employment experience age-based discrimination (Blackham, 2019; Mooney, 2016), and normalise non-standard employment (Moore et al., 2018; Mrozowicki, 2016). The lack of attention given to young workers' experiences in non-standard employment is typified in New Zealand literature, where research has been limited to student populations, focusing on the interactions of work and study (Beban & Trueman, 2018; Richardson, Kemp, Malinen, & Haultain, 2013).

The purpose of this research is therefore to explore young workers' experiences of non-standard employment in New Zealand. The study was designed using interpretive descriptive methodology (Thorne, Kirkham, & O'Flynn-Magee, 2004). Semi-structured interviews were carried out with 12 young people aged 20 to 24, with interview questions designed to explore their past and current experiences of non-standard employment. Participant metaphors were also elicited during interviews, to gain deeper insights into participants' perceptions about their overall experiences of non-standard employment. The main findings of this study were that young workers in non-standard employment in New Zealand experience: 1) sub-standard relationships with their managers and employers; 2) lack of autonomy and control over their employment and working time; and 3) negative personal life impacts due to poor work conditions. The findings extend knowledge of several aspects of workers' relationships in non-standard employment, including trust, treatment, and social status. Additionally, the research is consistent with findings in the literature that workers in non-standard employment, and specifically young workers, experience a loss of control over their working time (Beban

& Trueman, 2018; McGann, White, & Moss, 2016; Moore et al., 2018; Woodman, 2012, 2013). The research also contributes to the understanding of how young New Zealand workers view non-standard employment, finding that they may normalise *being* in non-standard employment (Moore et al., 2018; Mrozowicki, 2016), but do not normalise non-standard working times, or lack of control over their working times. Overall, this study expands our understanding of what young New Zealand workers experience in non-standard employment, highlighting key areas where management of their experiences can be improved.

Table of Contents

Abstract i

Table of Contents iii

List of Tables vii

Attestation of Authorship viii

Acknowledgements ix

Chapter 1: Introduction 1

1.1 Research Problem and Rationale 1

1.2 Background to the Research Problem 2

1.3 Aim, Research Question and Contribution 4

1.4 Thesis Structure 5

Chapter 2: Literature Review 7

2.1 Introduction 7

2.2 Definition of Non-Standard Employment 7

2.3 Worker Experiences of Non-Standard Employment 9

2.3.1 Employment Conditions 10

2.3.2 Workplace Relationships 11

2.4 Young Workers and Non-Standard Employment 13

2.4.1 Why Young Workers Enter Non-Standard Employment 14

2.4.2 Young Workers' Experiences of Non-Standard Employment 16

2.4.3 Young Workers' Perceptions of Non-Standard Employment 17

2.5 Chapter Summary 18

Chapter 3: Methodology 22

3.1 Introduction 22

3.2 Philosophical Background 23

3.3 Methodology 24

3.4 Methods 26

3.4.1 Sampling and Recruitment 27

3.4.2 Selection Criteria 29

3.4.3 Data Collection 31

3.4.4 Use of Metaphors in Data Collection 33

3.4.5 Participant Summary 35

3.4.6 Data Analysis 39

3.4.7 Analysis of Metaphor Data 41

3.5 Rigour 42

3.6 Chapter Summary 43

Chapter 4: The New Zealand Context 45

4.1 Non-Standard Employment in New Zealand 46

4.1.1 Recent Employment Relations History 49

4.1.2 Unions 51

4.1.3 Statistics on Non-Standard Employment 52

4.2 The Context for Young New Zealand Workers 54

4.2.1 Unemployment and Tertiary Education 56

4.2.2 Negative Perceptions 57

4.2.3 Legislative Barriers 58

4.2.4 Union Representation 59

4.2.5 Employment Rights Education 59

4.3 Chapter Summary 60

Chapter 5: Findings 61

5.1 The Participants 61

5.2 Participant Metaphors 65

5.3 Themes 69
5.3.1 Theme One: Sub-Standard Relationships with Employers and Managers 69
5.3.1.1 Mistreatment 70
5.3.1.2 Lack of Trust 71
5.3.1.3 Perceptions of Lower Status 73
5.3.2 Theme Two: Lack of Autonomy and Control 76
5.3.2.1 Resigned to Being in Non-Standard Employment 77
5.3.2.2 Imbalance of Control over Flexibility 80
5.3.2.3 Taking Back Control 82
5.3.3 Theme Three: Negative Personal Life Impacts of Poor Work Conditions. 84
5.3.3.1 Impacts of Unsocial, Unstable, and Long Working Hours 84
5.3.3.2 Impacts of Low Wages and Unstable Incomes 87
5.4 Chapter Summary 89
Chapter 6: Discussion 91
6.1 Introduction 91
6.2 Relationships in Non-Standard Employment 91
6.2.1 Social Status 92
6.2.2 Mistreatment 93
6.2.3 Trust 95
6.3 Control and Entry into Non-Standard Employment 96
6.3.1 Entry into Non-Standard Employment 97
6.3.2 Employer-Led Flexibility 99
6.3.3 Normalisation of Non-Standard Employment 100
6.4 Chapter Summary 101
Chapter 7: Conclusion 103
7.1 Introduction 103

7.2 Answering the Research Question 103

7.3 Contribution to Knowledge 105

7.4 Research Limitations 107

7.5 Recommendations for Future Research 108

7.6 Suggestions for Improving Practice and Policy 109

7.7 Closing Comments 111

References 113

Appendixes 127

Appendix 1: Ethics Approval 127

Appendix 2: Participant Information Sheet 128

Appendix 3: Participant Consent Form 130

Appendix 4: Transcriber Confidentiality Agreement 131

Appendix 5: Research Advertisements 132

Appendix 6: Interview Questions 133

List of Tables

Table 1: Participant characteristics 36

Table 2: Descriptions of non-standard employment types 47

Table 3: Non-standard employment provisions in New Zealand 48

Table 4: Employee proportions in main industry groups employing temporary workers 54

Table 5: Participants' house metaphors by type 66

Attestation of Authorship

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person (except where explicitly defined in the acknowledgements), nor material which to a substantial extent has been submitted for the award of any other degree or diploma of a university or other institution of higher learning.

Tanya Milly Ewertowska

August 2020

Acknowledgements

The biggest thank you is owed to my supervisors, Associate Professor Katherine Ravenswood and Dr Julie Douglas. You not only helped me re-start this thesis from a difficult place but made it one of the most positive journeys in my life so far. You have always advanced my interests and goals and provided me with many opportunities to develop. I feel incredibly fortunate to have had you backing myself and this thesis.

I would also like to thank the many members of my family and friends who have supported me through completing my masters. Foremost, I am grateful to my husband Bartek, who married me when I was in the second half of my thesis, despite what he witnessed during the first half. Thank you for encouraging me to enrol in the master's programme, and to keep looking forward with you – never down, never behind, not to the sides, always ahead (in the words of your brother Matt). To my sisters Suzy and Riette, my mum Wilna, and my dad Bert, thank you for sharing your thoughts and experience, and taking the time to read many drafts. To Kirsty, thank you for being the best friend anyone could ask for, and supporting me through everything. To my father-in-law Zbigniew, who printed out a page of research with my name on it and put it on his fridge, thank you for helping me to stand a bit taller. To my ouma Susan, who only ever asked one question: when are you going to be done, isn't it time yet? Thank you for driving me to finish in the sweetest way. To my oupa Karel, who didn't make it to see me finish this, and perhaps knowingly, never asked me when I would be done. I felt you with me, providing love and guidance from the start until the very end.

Last, but not least, to the 12 participants of this study, thank you for sharing your experiences:

> A voice is a human gift; it should be cherished and used, to utter fully human speech as possible. Powerlessness and silence go together. (Margaret Atwood)

This study was approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee (AUTEC) on 29 January 2019, AUTEC reference number 19/10.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Research Problem and Rationale

In New Zealand, workers in non-standard employment represent a growing proportion of the workforce, outpacing the growth of standard employment. In the decade from 2008 to 2018, casual and fixed term employment in New Zealand grew by three percent more than permanent employment (Statistics New Zealand, 2008, 2019a). Young workers are overrepresented amongst New Zealand's workers in non-standard employment. Out of workers aged 15 to 24 in New Zealand, 21 percent are in non-standard employment, a rate which is higher than that found in any other age group (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d).

Despite the overrepresentation of young workers in non-standard employment in New Zealand, their experiences are still largely unexplored. Furthermore, research on young workers in non-standard employment in New Zealand in the last decade has been limited to the experiences of student workers, with a narrow focus on the relationships between work and study (Beban & Trueman, 2018; Richardson et al., 2013). Therefore, the purpose of this thesis is to explore young workers' experiences of non-standard employment in New Zealand. It aims to highlight young workers' experiences of and perspectives on non-standard employment. By improving our knowledge of what young workers experience in non-standard employment in New Zealand, we can better understand how non-standard employment may affect our young workers in both their work and personal lives. These early work experiences and their effects are likely to have long term repercussions for young workers. Without knowledge of young New Zealand workers' early work experiences, we cannot work towards answering important practical questions, such as; what can we expect the workforce of the future to look like – what might their expectations, values, and behaviours in the workplace be like, and how can we manage these workers in a way that acknowledges their experiences and perspectives? While this study does not answer these questions, it does provide a starting point from which future research can explore larger issues about youth non-standard employment in New Zealand. In the more immediate term, this study intends to contribute to an understanding of what young workers experience in non-standard

employment, so that we can better manage those experiences, and ensure they are positive.

1.2 Background to the Research Problem

This section describes the background to the research problem, including a brief overview of the historical context which has influenced the growth of non-standard employment and how it is defined, and the gap in the literature that this thesis aims to fill.

The term *non-standard employment* has developed from the standard employment relationship, a dominant employment model in industrialised democracies (such as the United States, Canada, and much of Europe) (Ongley, 2013). The standard employment relationship became an embedded institution following World War Two (Fudge, 2017), as the result of a shift to Fordist work organisation (Ongley, 2013). In Fordist systems, cycles of mass production and mass consumption, supported by full employment, cultivated stable domestic supply and demand (Ongley, 2013). Fordism, therefore, supported permanent and regular employment and employment security, institutionalising the standard employment relationship in industrialised democracies (Ongley, 2013).

The 1970s saw a "crisis of Fordism" (Muller-Jentsch, 2004, p. 10), with global oil shocks and the economic stagflation crisis, during which inflation and unemployment increased while gross domestic product did not (Litonjua, 2008; Ongley, 2013). At the same time, neoliberal ideology took hold and espoused free trade and deregulation to stimulate competition, economic growth and reduced inflation (Litonjua, 2008). This led to economic globalisation – the increasing liberalisation of trade between the economies of various countries over the last 50 years (de Lange et al., 2014b). Globalisation and neoliberalism have exposed domestic markets to global competition, more volatile supply and demand, and differentiated markets (de Lange et al., 2014b; Ongley, 2013).

The exposure of domestic markets to global trade led to increased use of flexible forms of employment which diverge from the standard employment relationship, marking the development of the term *non-standard employment*. Flexible forms of employment allow organisations to adjust the volume of labour employed in response to demand fluctuations, reducing labour costs both on an as-required basis, and overall through

lowered employment entitlements (Ongley, 2013). The growth of flexible forms of employment has been supported by neoliberal economic policies, for example through movement away from full employment targets, and by deregulating labour markets (Ongley, 2013). While the increased use of flexible forms of employment has led to debate over whether we are currently witnessing the downfall of the standard employment relationship (Bosch, 2004; Fudge, 2017), as noted earlier it continues to be a dominant employment model in the developed world (Ongley, 2013). It is this dominance that has led to diverging forms of employment, such as casual and fixed-term employment, being termed *non-standard employment* (De Stefano, 2017). Despite the dominance of standard employment, there is a conspicuous reliance upon non-standard employment in many industrialised economies (International Labour Office, 2016).

A number of studies have investigated the conditions of non-standard employment, and the consequences of these conditions for workers (Kim et al., 2017; Laß & Wooden, 2019; McGann et al., 2016; Moore et al., 2018; Stecy-Hildebrandt, Fuller, & Burns, 2019; Winkler, Mason, Laska, Christoph, & Neumark-Sztainer, 2018). While some studies have found these conditions and their effects are undesirable, other research highlights the complexity of experiences of non-standard employment, with some workers experiencing more positive conditions than others (Kiersztyn, 2016; Laß & Wooden, 2019; Schweder, Quinlan, Bohle, Lamm, & Bin Ang, 2015). Less is known about workers' experiences of relationships in non-standard employment, though taken together, these studies show that workers' workplace relationships with co-workers and employers in non-standard employment have several negative aspects (Bernhard-Oette, De Cuyper, Murphy, & Connelly, 2017; Fleming, 2017; Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; McGann et al., 2016; Williamson, Cooper, & Baird, 2015).

International research has shown that young workers are over-represented in non-standard employment, and much attention has been given to examining why young workers enter non-standard employment (Baranowska & Gebel, 2010; de Lange et al., 2014b; Imdorf et al., 2017; Nunez & Livanos, 2015). However, young workers' experiences and views of non-standard employment have received minimal attention. Some studies have found experiences similar to those in the general literature on workers in non-standard employment, such as workers experiencing a lack of control

over their working time, negatively affecting work-life balance (Moore et al., 2018; Woodman, 2012, 2013). Fewer still have identified youth-specific issues, such as age-based discrimination against young workers in non-standard employment (Blackham, 2019; Mooney, 2016), and how non-standard employment influences young workers' perspectives of employment and adulthood (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016; Moore et al., 2018; Mrozowicki, 2016; Rainsford, Maloney, & Popa, 2019). The findings of those studies suggest that young workers experience mistreatment in non-standard employment that is hidden by the transitory nature of their work (Blackham, 2019; Mooney, 2016), and that they normalise non-standard employment (Moore et al., 2018; Mrozowicki, 2016).

Considering the undesirable conditions and relationship problems found in non-standard employment literature in general, and the troubling findings on young workers' experiences and perspectives, further research on young workers' experiences and youth-specific issues in non-standard employment is needed. As noted earlier, the experiences of young workers in non-standard employment are particularly under-researched in New Zealand. Beyond student populations (Beban & Trueman, 2018; Richardson et al., 2013), we do not have an understanding of what young New Zealand workers' experiences are, and how they compare with the international findings on non-standard employment.

1.3 Aim, Research Question and Contribution

This research explores young workers' experiences of non-standard employment in New Zealand. It aims to highlight young workers' experiences of and perspectives on non-standard employment. The study will address this aim by answering the following research question:

'what are young New Zealand workers' experiences of non-standard employment?'.

The research contributes to academic research by developing wider knowledge of young workers' experiences in non-standard employment in New Zealand, being one of the few New Zealand studies to move beyond student populations. The research also adds to the relatively small body of international literature on young workers' experiences of non-standard employment. However, while the findings on the experiences of young workers in non-standard employment New Zealand may relate to international experiences of young workers, and workers more generally, the New Zealand context

differs and is likely to influence young New Zealand workers' experiences. Therefore, this study also offers a novel description of key contextual challenges which young workers face in New Zealand and how those relate to non-standard employment (Chapter Four).

One of the issues for the developing body of literature on young workers in non-standard employment is the lack of an agreed age range of a young worker. Studies examining smaller age ranges have found that there are differences between the non-standard employment experiences of younger and older young-age groups (Nunez & Livanos, 2015; Rainsford et al., 2019). Despite this, many studies use large age ranges of 10 years or more in research samples (for example Mrozowicki, 2016; Nunez & Livanos, 2015; Peiró et al., 2012; Smith, 2018), hindering comparisons between and understanding of sub-sets of young workers. Data collection in this thesis will focus on a small subset of young workers, aged 20 to 24, developing knowledge about the experiences of this particular age group. The justification for this age range is fully described in the Methodology Chapter (Chapter Three).

1.4 Thesis Structure

The next chapter, the Literature Review, defines standard and non-standard employment. The chapter then reviews relevant literature on workers' experiences of non-standard employment, and specifically literature on young workers' experiences of non-standard employment. Chapter Three, the Methodology, describes the philosophical underpinnings of the research design. The chapter then outlines and justifies the research design for this study, including the interpretive descriptive research methodology, interview data collection and thematic analysis methods, and ethical considerations. Chapter Four describes the New Zealand Context. The chapter provides background information on non-standard employment in New Zealand, including labour market statistics, and factors influencing the growth of non-standard employment in New Zealand in recent decades. It then focuses on youth non-standard employment in New Zealand and highlights several relevant challenges that face young workers in New Zealand. The chapter provides contextual information from which to read and understand the findings of the research, presented in the following chapter.

Chapter Five presents the findings of the study, developed through thematic analysis of the interview data. The chapter first provides a summary description of each

participant's work experiences, and then presents the three main themes, and the sub-themes in the findings. The three main themes described in this chapter are that young workers experience: 1) sub-standard relationships with their managers and employers; 2) lack of autonomy and control over their employment and working time; and 3) negative personal life impacts due to poor work conditions. Chapter Six discusses the main findings of this study in relation to the literature reviewed in Chapter Two, and the New Zealand Context. The purpose of the chapter is to integrate and position the findings within the existing body of research. The chapter highlights the novel findings of this study, including developing knowledge about workers' experiences of workplace relationships in non-standard employment, and that young workers do not normalise non-standard working times or lack of control over their working times.

Chapter Seven summarises the conclusions of this study in answer to the research question. The chapter also describes the contribution to knowledge of the research, which include developing knowledge of how trust is reduced in workplace relationships in non-standard employment, and contributing to the debate on normalisation by arguing that young workers do not normalise non-standard working times or lack of control over their working time in non-standard employment. The limitations of the research are also discussed, including the small sample size and broad research question. Finally, the chapter makes recommendations for further research, such as longitudinal research on young workers, and suggestions for policy improvements including through existing schemes such as the Government's recent youth employment action plan.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The Introduction Chapter (Chapter One) described the research problem, the aims and research question, and background to the research problem. This included describing the historical context of non-standard employment, the development of the term *non-standard employment* from standard employment, and a summary of the gap in the literature which this research aims to fill.

This chapter begins by defining standard and non-standard employment, and then reviews the academic literature on workers', including specifically young workers', experiences of non-standard employment. The literature review first highlights debates around employment conditions, and then discusses literature on workers' experiences of workplace relationships in non-standard employment. It then focuses on research specific to young workers in non-standard employment, discussing their motivations for entering non-standard employment, and experiences and perceptions of non-standard employment. Two key literature gaps described in this chapter are that: 1) research on non-standard employment experiences has predominantly focused on employment conditions, while there is scant research on workplace relationships between workers and their employers, managers and co-workers; 2) there is limited research that focuses specifically on young employees' experiences and perceptions of non-standard employment. This is exemplified in New Zealand research, where research on young workers in non-standard employment has generally been confined to student populations.

2.2 Definition of Non-Standard Employment

Non-standard employment is generally defined in the literature as being the opposite of the standard employment relationship (Hannif & Lamm, 2005; Imdorf et al., 2017; Walker, 2011). The basic features of standard employment relationships are a permanent employment contract with an employer, working hours of 9 am to 5 pm, working days being Monday to Friday, and 40 hours work per week (Spoonley, 2004; Woodman, 2013). Employment that diverges from any of the features of the standard employment relationship is non-standard (Walker, 2011). This means that non-standard employment agreements may include any or all of the following features: work outside

of the standard schedule, an irregular schedule, and temporary or short-term employment.

Types of non-standard employment which align with the definition include part-time, fixed-term, temporary agency, and casual employment (Imdorf et al., 2017; Walker, 2011). There is, however, a variety of possible types of non-standard employment agreement (De Stefano, 2017), as a worker may be in a combination of these types of employment. For example, it is possible to have a fixed-term, part-time employment agreement. Detailed definitions of the main types of non-standard employment agreement are provided in the New Zealand Context Chapter (Chapter Four).

In addition to the types of non-standard employment agreement, there are also non-standard scheduling arrangements or provisions. Examples of non-standard scheduling arrangements include working on weekends or nights, weekly variations in shifts worked, or weekly changes in total hours (Bąk-Grabowska & Jagoda, 2015; Piasna, 2017; Woodman, 2013). These non-standard scheduling arrangements or provisions may be independent of employment agreement type but are more inherent in some types of employment. For example, in fixed-term employment the main feature is that the employment has a specified end date, and scheduling may be standard or non-standard depending on the terms in the employment agreement (Employment New Zealand, n.d.). In contrast, non-standard scheduling is an inherent feature of casual employment, which differs from part-time employment in that it does not have a regular pattern of working times (Employment New Zealand, n.d.). The key types of non-standard scheduling arrangements used in New Zealand are also described in further detail in the New Zealand Context Chapter (Chapter Four). Having defined non-standard employment and identified examples of what it includes, the remainder of this section focuses on distinguishing non-standard employment from other related terms used in the academic literature.

There are several terms that overlap with *non-standard employment* which are sometimes used interchangeably in the academic literature, such as alternative, atypical, contingent, and precarious employment (Bujold & Fournier, 2008; Imdorf et al., 2017; Walker, 2011). Some of those terms are broader than non-standard employment, for example precarious employment focuses on employment characterised by “job insecurity, low income, limited social benefits and statutory entitlements, and high risks

of ill-health" (Vosko, 2008, p. 133), and may cover employment types such as informal, triangular, and self-employment (Vosko, 2008). For clarity on the boundaries of this study, this chapter and discussions throughout this study focus on research that aligns with the definition of non-standard employment and types of non-standard employment contracts and arrangements described above: employment involving work outside of the standard schedule, an irregular schedule, and temporary or short-term employment (Bąk-Grabowska & Jagoda, 2015; Imdorf et al., 2017; Piasna, 2017; Spoonley, 2004; Walker, 2011; Woodman, 2013).

As a final note on defining non-standard employment, it is also important to distinguish work from employment in the context of this thesis. Work and employment are frequently used interchangeably (Walker, 2011), however, they represent two separate conceptual families (Kelloway, Gallagher, & Barling, 2004). Kelloway et al. (2004) define work as "purposeful activity directed at producing a valued good or service" (p. 109). Employment is defined as "work that is performed under contractual arrangements and that involves material rewards" (Kelloway et al., 2004, p. 109). This means that employment is not the only context for performing work; however, this thesis is concerned only with work occurring within employment.

2.3 Worker Experiences of Non-Standard Employment

Having defined non-standard employment, this section now turns to what is known about workers' experiences of non-standard employment. There are two main streams of research on workers' experiences of non-standard employment. The first stream focuses on employment conditions in non-standard employment, and the effects of these conditions on employees (section 2.3.1). There has been considerable research on employment conditions in non-standard employment, and the impacts of these conditions on workers (Laß & Wooden, 2019; McGann et al., 2016; Moore et al., 2018; Winkler et al., 2018). The second, smaller stream of research explores workers' experiences of workplace relationships with their employers, managers and co-workers in non-standard employment (2.3.2). These two streams of research on workers' experiences are not age-specific or focused on young workers.

2.3.1 Employment Conditions

Non-standard employment has been linked with undesirable employment conditions, such as attracting lower hourly wages than standard employment (Dixon, 2011; Mooi-Reci & Wooden, 2017; Stecy-Hildebrandt et al., 2019), and greater employment insecurity due to employers' use of non-standard employment to meet fluctuations in demand (Ongley, 2013). Dixon (2011) highlights that in New Zealand, the wage gap between temporary and permanent employment is largely explained by the personal characteristics of temporary workers, including being of younger age and having lower qualifications. Furthermore, non-standard employment is associated with income insecurity because of unstable working schedules which may see workers' hours and incomes varying from week to week (Moore et al., 2018).

Researchers have also identified that non-standard employment scheduling may negatively affect work-life balance, as employees' control over their working time is constrained (McGann et al., 2016; Moore et al., 2018). Factors such as financial insecurity and family commitments mean that some workers in non-standard employment have little choice but to accept any work hours offered (McGann et al., 2016; Moore et al., 2018). Venn, Carey, Strazdins, and Burgess (2016) highlight that in Australia, improvements in employees' bargaining power (such as through increased level of education) have led to a decrease in some types of non-standard working times, such as working nights. Thus, employee bargaining power also plays a role in employee control over working times. In line with this, research has found that some employers dictate employees' working times in non-standard employment, utilising flexibility for business needs, rather than to support employees' work life balance (Moore et al., 2018; Piasna, 2017).

One primary outcome associated with different types of non-standard employment agreement and work schedules (such as working evenings, nights, rotating rosters and irregular schedules), is increased risk of depression (Kim et al., 2017; Quesnel-Vallée, DeHaney, & Ciampi, 2010; Rosenthal, Carroll-Scott, Earnshaw, Santilli, & Ickovics, 2012; Winkler et al., 2018). Amongst other factors, increased risk of depression in non-standard employment has been linked to the increased stress caused by factors such as social life disruption (Winkler et al., 2018) and employment insecurity (Kim et al., 2017).

These negative outcomes are exacerbated for workers in non-standard employment by an inability to find union support because non-standard work is often located in industries that have weaker union presence (Leschke & Vandaele, 2018). High staff turnover in non-standard jobs also inhibits the development of sense of community and solidarity needed to support union movements (Murphy & Turner, 2016). Workers in non-standard employment also face other barriers to their freedom of association, including fear of contracts not being renewed or having their hours reduced if it is known that they belong to a union, and the difficulty of organising and sharing information with larger groups whose work schedules are unstable (De Stefano, 2017).

Despite the generally negative conditions described above, conditions in non-standard employment are likely to vary depending on the context. For example, research in some countries has found that some workers in fixed-term employment have similar earnings to workers in standard employment (Laß & Wooden, 2019; Kiersztyn, 2016). Fixed term employees in some occupations may also have greater employment security than other workers in non-standard employment, because they are hired on fixed-term contracts to be screened for permanent employment rather than to facilitate dismissal (Kiersztyn, 2016). There have also been conflicting findings on workers' wellbeing in non-standard employment, for example Schweder et al. (2015) found in New Zealand that the wellbeing of workers in seasonal temporary employment was similar to workers in standard employment. Indeed, the workers in seasonal temporary employment felt less burdened than those in standard employment by responsibilities and demands such as supervision, training, and product quality/quantity (Schweder et al., 2015). As Schweder et al. (2015) argue, research on workers' experiences in non-standard employment requires a more nuanced approach to explore the contextual factors which may cause differences between the experiences of workers in non-standard employment.

2.3.2 Workplace Relationships

Moving beyond research on non-standard employment conditions and the effects of these conditions on employees, there is a comparatively small number of studies examining workplace relationships in non-standard employment. Overall, studies suggest that workers in non-standard employment do not have positive workplace relationships with their managers, employers and co-workers. For example, psychological contract research has generally assumed that workers in non-standard

employment do not seek a relational experience, but prefer transactional employment relationships (Bernhard-Oette et al., 2017; Schalk et al., 2010). This means that workers in non-standard employment are expected to prefer short term, economic exchanges, as opposed to the deeper socio-emotional exchanges involved in long-term workplace relationships, such as trust, loyalty, and training and development (Bernhard-Oette et al., 2017).

There are few studies, if any, that have investigated workers' perspectives about trust or loyalty in workplace relationships in non-standard employment. This aligns with a lack of research on trust in employment relations literature more generally, and particularly on mutual trust (i.e. employer trust in employees, and employees' trust in employer) (Brandl, 2020). In terms of non-standard employment research, Svensson (2011) studied workers' trust in other people generally (not in their employers or co-workers) when they were in non-standard employment. Svensson (2011) suggests that "repeated break-ups and fresh starts" (p. 128) in non-standard employment affect workers' ability to build a sense of identity based on their work, preventing them from building trust in people. Fleming (2017), while not gathering empirical data on trust in non-standard employment, argues that when it is easier to dismiss employees, trust, loyalty and commitment in the employment relationships are harmed. This could mean that as workers in non-standard employment are viewed as uncommitted and lacking loyalty, they are not trusted, encouraging employers to exercise more control and surveillance (Fleming, 2017). Employer control and surveillance could have a negative effect in turn on workers' trust in them: Holland, Cooper, and Hecker (2015) found that for manual workers, electronic monitoring and surveillance reduced workers' trust in managers.

Research has found that workers in non-standard employment perceive that they are lower status or lower in workplace hierarchies compared with their co-workers who are in standard employment (Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; McGann et al., 2016; Williamson et al., 2015). This perceived difference in status has generally been related to how workers in non-standard employment are treated or viewed by their managers and co-workers. Research findings include, for example, that they are viewed as not being on a career path and must therefore work harder to be offered permanent contracts (Williamson et al., 2015); they are viewed as outsiders and treated poorly by co-workers and managers (Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018); and because they receive less training, promotion and

development opportunities, and less involvement in workplace decision-making, non-standard workers are marked as lower status (McGann et al., 2016).

When compared with research on employment conditions, which often includes longitudinal data (Laß & Wooden, 2019; Mooi-Reci & Wooden, 2017; Quesnel-Vallée et al., 2010; Winkler et al., 2018), there is a tendency in research on workplace relationships to focus on a single experience of non-standard employment (Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; McGann et al., 2016; Williamson et al., 2015). Generally, this means that research participants are asked about the job or role they are in at the time of data collection. This is despite recognition that workers, particularly young workers, may become trapped in cycles of non-standard employment (Barbieri, Cutuli, Luijkx, Mari, & Scherer, 2019; de Lange, Gesthuizen, & Wolbers, 2014a; Diamond, 2018). Therefore, including worker's past employment experiences (Moore et al., 2018), or collecting longitudinal data (Laß & Wooden, 2019; Mooi-Reci & Wooden, 2017; Quesnel-Vallée et al., 2010; Winkler et al., 2018), may reveal more complex experiences of non-standard employment.

2.4 Young Workers and Non-Standard Employment

As discussed in the previous section, conditions in non-standard employment are complex, being dependent on context, and with workers' experiences potentially developing over a cycle of multiple non-standard employment engagements. Given this complexity, it is surprising that few studies on non-standard employment have focused specifically on the experiences of young workers, a distinct group of workers who are generally over-represented in non-standard employment statistics (Hipp et al., 2015; Peiró et al., 2012; Smith, 2018).

In the following sections, three key areas of literature on young workers and non-standard employment are reviewed. The largest cluster of literature on young workers focuses on why young people enter non-standard employment (2.4.1). The second, smaller area of literature looks at young workers' experiences in non-standard employment (2.4.2). The third is an emerging area of research which examines young workers' perceptions of non-standard employment (2.4.3).

2.4.1 Why Young Workers Enter Non-Standard Employment

It has been acknowledged that young workers, or labour market entrants, around the world are disproportionately affected by the increasing trend in non-standard employment (Hipp et al., 2015; Peiró et al., 2012; Smith, 2018). Hipp et al. (2015) point out that in Europe, "temporary employment is a youth phenomenon" (p. 354). Smith (2018) notes in a more significant example that in Japan the proportion of young workers in temporary and part-time employment in 2010 was 32 percent of the 15 to 34 age group.

There are several structural factors that may explain this over-representation of young people in non-standard employment. The structural factors discussed here are uncertain economic conditions (de Lange et al., 2014b; Peiró et al., 2012), protection of incumbent workers (Baranowska & Gebel, 2010; de Lange et al., 2014b), education systems (de Lange et al., 2014b; Richardson et al., 2013), and lack of work experience (Bosmans, Hardonk, De Cuyper, & Vanroelen, 2016; de Lange et al., 2014a; Green & Livanos, 2017; Imdorf et al., 2017; Nunez & Livanos, 2015). In contrast with structural analyses, which are positioned to view non-standard employment as involuntary, another body of literature focuses on young workers' agency or preference for non-standard employment (Moore et al., 2018; Smith, 2018). However, there is a third, balanced perspective: Moore et al. (2018) suggest that "preferences may shape choices but do not determine them" (p. 406). Thus, structural factors constrain worker preferences, but do not extinguish them (Moore et al., 2018).

In some economies the trajectory of young workers into non-standard employment is worsened by uncertain economic conditions, such as high unemployment rates (de Lange et al., 2014b; Peiró et al., 2012). Young workers who are new to the labour market are also disadvantaged in obtaining standard employment in environments where unions are stronger or where legislative protection against dismissal is stricter, as the incumbent workforce is better protected (Baranowska & Gebel, 2010; de Lange et al., 2014b). As de Lange et al. (2014b) explain, incumbent workers are better protected because they can ensure that their interests are represented by unions, while the interests of young workers who are trying to enter the labour market are not represented. As a result of incumbent workers' protection, labour market entrants are more likely to be unemployed or in non-standard employment (de Lange et al., 2014b).

Dhakal, Connell, and Burgess (2018) term the difficulty that young workers experience transitioning into the workforce 'the youth labour market failure' (p. 114), whereby young workers experience high levels of unemployment, underemployment and non-standard employment.

In addition to high youth unemployment and protection of incumbent workers, young people's transition difficulties and entry into non-standard employment have been linked to education systems. In New Zealand, as in other countries offering less financial support to students, young people in tertiary education are mainly driven to work in non-standard employment by financial necessity – and non-standard employment offers the scheduling flexibility needed to combine work and study (Beban & Trueman, 2018; Richardson et al., 2013). This contrasts with other possible reasons for working while studying, such as gaining experience relevant to the course of study or career aspirations (Beban & Trueman, 2018; Richardson et al., 2013). Further, de Lange et al. (2014b) note that young students are less likely to be in temporary employment in countries with education systems that are focused on vocational training (non-academic training). This is because vocational education better equips students with occupation-specific skills, and for those students gaining qualifications through academic institutions, academic qualifications are rarer in a vocational-based education system (de Lange et al., 2014b). However, this may be an oversimplification, with Prikshat, Montague, Connell, and Burgess (2019) for example finding that both vocational and higher education (i.e. non-vocational such as university) in Australia fail to equip students with the skills needed to be 'work ready'.

Research on young workers has joined arguments in non-age specific research that non-standard employment may be used as a stepping-stone into permanent employment (Nunez & Livanos, 2015). According to the stepping-stone argument, workers voluntarily enter non-standard employment and are then able to signal their work-readiness or capabilities to employers, after which employers are more willing to offer permanent employment (Green & Livanos, 2017; Nunez & Livanos, 2015). However, for young workers it may be about more than signalling readiness – they may also choose to enter non-standard employment to gain experience or training (Nunez & Livanos, 2015). For some young workers, non-standard employment is seen as the only option to enter the workforce because of their lack of work experience (Bosmans et al., 2016). Despite this,

research has identified that as a result of receiving less training than workers in standard employment it may be more difficult for workers in non-standard employment to gain permanent employment (Barbieri et al., 2019). Further, young workers are more likely to be trapped in persistent non-standard employment (Barbieri et al., 2019; de Lange et al., 2014a; Diamond, 2018). Receiving less training may have a greater impact on young workers because they have less work experience, and reduced opportunity for professional development inhibits their career development (Imdorf et al., 2017). This means that young workers in non-standard employment may have difficulty integrating into the labour market, experiencing reduced job prospects due to their lack of training and experience (Nunez & Livanos, 2015).

2.4.2 Young Workers' Experiences of Non-Standard Employment

Research on young employees' experiences of non-standard employment has shown some similar findings to non-age specific research. For example, research on young workers has also found negative consequences of non-standard employment for their work-life balance. While research has promoted the work-life balance that non-standard employment affords workers, Woodman (2013) points to the negative effects on young workers' personal and social lives. Woodman (2013) found in Australia that young people's friendships are adversely affected by their non-standard work schedules as they struggle to find overlapping free time. Even when free time does overlap, they may be unable to socialise due to differing rhythms in their workload, sleep schedules, and energy levels (Woodman, 2013). Beban and Trueman (2018), focusing on the personal life impacts of combining study and work, found that New Zealand students experience feeling stressed and getting less sleep, exercise, and time to socialise with family and friends. Linking to experiences of work-life imbalance, Beban and Trueman (2018) found that many of their participants had less power than their employers over the flexibility of their work and their employment terms.

Several studies have also identified that young people in non-standard forms of employment lack control over the flexibility of their hours (Moore et al., 2018; Woodman, 2012, 2013; Beban & Trueman, 2018), similar to findings in studies that include older age groups (McGann et al., 2016; Moore et al., 2018). Young workers in non-standard employment may accept work schedules without question including short-notice changes imposed by managers, due to their fears in relation to job security

and disappointing their managers (Woodman, 2012). Woodman (2013) suggests that the workers he studied would likely have preferred not to work 'unsocial' weekend and evening hours, however a lack of availability in weekday hours, low pay rates, and changing university schedules restricted their control over their working time. For the young people that Moore et al. (2018) interviewed, their dependence on their non-standard employment as work which could financially support their education and fit around their study, meant that their employers were able to exercise more control over the hours they worked.

In contrast to concerns such as work-life balance, issues specific to young workers have received minimal attention in the non-standard employment literature. For example, despite negative stereotypes about young workers, such as that they are unreliable and uncommitted (Goosey, 2019), young workers' experiences of age-based discrimination in non-standard employment have received very little direct attention in the literature. Mooney (2016) briefly touches on young temporary employees and discrimination in a study of youth-related privileges and penalties in the hospitality industry, as seen from the perspective of older workers. Mooney (2016) explains that young workers in the New Zealand hospitality industry are expected to be temporary employees, and this expectation conceals age-based discriminatory practices against young workers. Discriminatory practices Mooney (2016) identifies include: low wages that do not recognise skills or experience; restricted opportunities for promotion; and a lack of positive socialization into the industry evidenced by a lack of training, negative attitudes towards young newcomers, and young newcomers being given more routine work. Supporting Mooney (2016), Blackham (2019) argues that because youth non-standard employment is viewed as temporary, and even formative, the imperative for legal challenges to workplace employment practices is reduced, undermining young workers' right to equal treatment.

2.4.3 Young Workers' Perceptions of Non-Standard Employment

One key emerging area of research on young workers and non-standard employment is concerned with how young workers view non-standard employment. In their research on the psychological contract, Lub, Bal, Blomme, and Schalk (2016) highlight that there may be generational differences in values and perceptions due to formative experiences, affecting what workers expect in their employment relationships. For

example, Rainsford et al. (2019) suggest that young workers who place more importance on intrinsic values (such as learning new skills, developing creativity, and self-worth) are more likely to choose to enter non-permanent roles which could be seen as offering more freedom to fulfil those values.

Beyond the effects of young workers' values, further studies have explored the concepts of normalisation of non-standard employment and changes in how adulthood is viewed by young workers. Two decades ago, Loughlin and Barling (2001) suggested that the insecurity experienced by young workers' parents in the 1980s and 1990s would cause cynicism and alienation in young workers. However, instead, recent research has identified that young workers normalise non-standard employment (Moore et al., 2018; Mrozowicki, 2016). Moore et al.'s (2018) young interviewees emphasised that they felt lack of control over working times was normalised among young people in non-standard employment. Mrozowicki (2016) highlight how young workers continue to normalise non-standard employment, despite their experiences of losing control over working time and personal time. In line with the concept of normalisation of non-standard employment, Cuervo and Wyn (2016) argue that young Australian workers are experiencing "a new adulthood" (p. 125), as opposed to delayed adulthood. One of the main characteristics of the 'new adulthood' is a shift away from the concept of life-long career; instead, young people envision options for employment based around lifestyle (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016). Cuervo and Wyn (2016) argue that this has occurred due to shifts in work and education in recent decades, such as the growth of non-standard work and relocation of responsibility for education to individuals.

2.5 Chapter Summary

The growth of non-standard employment, but continuing dominance of standard employment, has meant that non-standard employment is generally defined in literature as the opposite of the standard employment relationship (Hannif & Lamm, 2005; Imdorf et al., 2017; Walker, 2011), or more precisely as employment diverging from any of the features of standard employment (Walker, 2011). It may therefore include any or all of the following aspects: work outside of the standard schedule, an irregular schedule, and temporary or short-term employment.

A considerable body of research, reviewed in this chapter, has debated the conditions of non-standard employment, including wage differentials (Kiersztyn, 2016; Laß &

Wooden, 2019; Mooi-Reci & Wooden, 2017; Stecy-Hildebrandt et al., 2019), employment security (Kiersztyn, 2016; Ongley, 2013), stress and risk of depression (Kim et al., 2017; Quesnel-Vallée et al., 2010; Rosenthal et al., 2012; Schweder et al., 2015; Winkler et al., 2018), and control over working hours (McGann et al., 2016; Moore et al., 2018). The extent these conditions are likely to differ depends on the context of the non-standard employment.

In contrast to the debates on conditions, workers' experiences of workplace relationships in non-standard employment have received less attention in the literature. However, several issues have been identified, including worker expectations of transactional relationships (Bernhard-Oette et al., 2017; Schalk et al., 2010), lower trust in others and employers (Fleming, 2017; Svensson, 2011), and lower status in the workplace (Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; McGann et al., 2016; Williamson et al., 2015). Research on workplace relationships in non-standard employment usually focuses on the employment that participants are in at the time of data collection (Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; McGann et al., 2016; Williamson et al., 2015), overlooking that workers often experience cycles of non-standard employment (Barbieri et al., 2019; de Lange et al., 2014a; Diamond, 2018). Compared to research on workers generally in non-standard employment, fewer studies have focused on young workers. Notwithstanding, young workers are highlighted in literature from across the world as being significantly impacted by the growth of non-standard employment (Hipp et al., 2015; Peiró et al., 2012; Smith, 2018). A considerable number of studies have examined why young workers enter non-standard employment, identifying factors such as education systems (Beban & Trueman, 2018; de Lange et al., 2014b; Richardson et al., 2013), economic conditions (de Lange et al., 2014b; Peiró et al., 2012), protections for incumbent workers (Baranowska & Gebel, 2010; de Lange et al., 2014b), and non-standard employment as a stepping stone (Barbieri et al., 2019; Bosmans et al., 2016; Green & Livanos, 2017; Imdorf et al., 2017; Nunez & Livanos, 2015). Most of this research focuses on structural factors, which positions young worker entry into non-standard employment as largely involuntary. Despite this, Moore et al. (2018) suggest that structural factors may restrict workers' choices, but workers' preferences will still have some influence.

Although a small body of literature, research into young workers' experiences of non-standard employment has found similar negative experiences to general non-standard

employment research, such as negative effects on work-life balance (Woodman, 2013) and lack of control over flexible hours (Moore et al., 2018; Woodman, 2012, 2013). Far less attention has been given to youth-specific issues, though there is some discussion of young-age based discrimination (Blackham, 2019; Mooney, 2016). In terms of youth-specific issues, another key emerging area of literature examines the implications of non-standard employment for young workers' perceptions about work and employment. This includes exploration of how their values influence their choice of work (Rainsford et al., 2019), whether they normalise non-standard employment (Moore et al., 2018; Mrozowicki, 2016), and how they perceive their adulthood in light of the growth of non-standard employment (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016).

This chapter calls attention to several gaps in the non-standard employment literature. First, research on conditions in non-standard employment has received comparably more attention than workplace relationships, with areas such as trust particularly neglected. Research in these areas also highlights the importance of exploring context and considering both workers' past and present experiences of non-standard employment. Second, despite the global impact that non-standard employment growth has had on young workers, literature on their experiences and perspectives of non-standard employment is still limited. In New Zealand, research on young workers in non-standard employment is virtually non-existent, beyond some examination of tertiary students in non-standard employment (Beban & Trueman, 2018; Richardson et al., 2013). Research on young workers' experiences has reflected the literature on workers more generally, examining issues such as work-life balance and control over working time. Correspondingly, research has yet to fully investigate youth specific issues in non-standard employment, such as age-based discrimination, and young workers' changing perspectives about adulthood in relation to non-standard employment.

In response to these gaps in the literature, this thesis aims to highlight young workers' experiences of and perspectives on non-standard employment. Considering the gaps in various research areas, such as workplace relationships, youth-specific issues, and the dearth of New Zealand research on young workers in non-standard employment, this thesis asks the following exploratory research question:

'what are young New Zealand workers' experiences of non-standard employment?'.

The following chapter (Chapter Three) sets out the philosophical background, and the interpretive descriptive research design used to guide data collection and analysis and thereby answer the research question.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The literature review in the previous chapter framed the current state of research on non-standard employment, and young workers in non-standard employment. The literature review identified several gaps in the literature, including a lack of research on workplace relationships in non-standard employment. Furthermore, it illustrated that although research indicates that young workers' experiences may be similar to the general research on non-standard employment there is limited examination of youth-specific experiences such as age-based discrimination. Overall, the review highlighted that young workers' experiences in non-standard employment are globally under-researched, and the research in New Zealand exemplifies this. Additionally, the review highlighted the complexity of workers' experiences of non-standard employment, including the importance of research which considers the context of employment, and both workers' past and present experiences of non-standard employment.

This thesis focuses on addressing the gap in New Zealand research on young workers. Considering the dearth of New Zealand research, the relatively large gaps in what is known about young workers' experiences internationally, and the complexity of non-standard employment experiences, this thesis asks a broad and exploratory research question: 'What are young New Zealand workers' experiences of non-standard employment?'. Korstjen and Moser (2017) highlight that qualitative master's research generally utilises broader research questions, and that such research questions allow collection of more in-depth data, and deeper exploration of the topic studied. Corresponding to the research question, the aim of this thesis is to highlight young workers' experiences of and perspectives on non-standard employment.

This chapter describes the choices made regarding the research design, including methodology and methods, used to guide this study. The next section of this chapter discusses the philosophical background to the research, including the interpretivist research paradigm, relativist ontology, and constructivist epistemology. Following this, the chapter turns to explain the interpretive descriptive methodology, and how the philosophical background directed this choice of methodology. Next, the methods, which were guided by the methodology and used for sampling, data collection, and data

analysis, are detailed. Lastly, the methods that were applied to ensure rigour during the research process are also explained.

3.2 Philosophical Background

After reviewing the literature, the researcher entered a stage of contemplation, "giving further consideration to what is to be studied" based on the chosen topic (Jackson, 2013, p. 50). In this stage, consideration was given to several philosophical research paradigms that could guide the research question, process, and outcomes for the research (Jackson, 2013). For any given research study, the research design is (explicitly or implicitly) situated within a research paradigm that the researcher personally identifies with, or selects as the most appropriate for the research (Davies & Fisher, 2018).

A research paradigm is a system of assumptions and beliefs, which includes an ontology and epistemology (Davies & Fisher, 2018). An ontology consists of a set of beliefs about reality and being; it is concerned with what is "the nature of existence and what constitutes reality" (Gray, 2018, p. 21). An epistemology represents another set of beliefs – about knowledge (Gray, 2018). It explains the "relationship between enquirer and known, what counts as knowledge, and on what basis we can make knowledge claims" (Grant & Giddings, 2002, p. 12).

Interpretivism was identified as being the most appropriate paradigm for this study, and its tenets also fit with the researcher's own beliefs about research. Interpretivism is oriented to seek contextually-based interpretations of the social world (Crotty, 1998). The aims of interpretive research are the "description, exploration and understanding of experience" (Davies & Fisher, 2018, p. 22). Interpretive research seeks to produce a detailed description, and interpretation of individuals' inner subjective realities, with the purpose of sharing and developing understanding of their perspectives and experiences of events (Neuman, 2014). As little is known about the experiences of young New Zealanders in non-standard employment, the aims of interpretivist research provide an appropriate basis for the research approach.

The ontology corresponding with the interpretivist paradigm is relativism (Crotty, 1998). Relativism posits that there can be multiple subjective realities, rather than a single objective reality (Gray, 2018). This is because reality is constructed, subjective, and contextual (Thorne et al., 2004); individuals subjectively construct and interpret reality,

in relation to contexts. Unlike the realist ontology, relativism does not assert that there is one objective reality to be described (Gray, 2018). Relativism fits with the aims of this research, enabling the description and interpretation of individual young workers' subjective, and contextually based, experiences of non-standard employment.

The epistemology that links with interpretivism is constructivism (Crotty, 1998). In constructivism, meaning is constructed by individuals as they interact with objects and other individuals (Crotty, 1998). Within the research process, knowledge is created through interaction and discourse between the researcher and participant; both researcher and participant are part of knowledge creation (Davies & Fisher, 2018). The interpretivist belief that meaning is individually constructed, and co-creation of knowledge by the researcher and participant, has led to criticism that interpretivist research is not generalisable or transferable (Davies & Fisher, 2018). However, in congruence with the principle that meaning is subjective and individually constructed, interpretivist research does not aim to achieve transferability and generalisability. Moreover, interpretivist research recognises that developing knowledge of people's inner realities and social experiences is a desirable end itself, and in contrast with knowledge developed as a means or tool for generalising (Neuman, 2014).

3.3 Methodology

The previous section detailed the choice of a relativist ontology, constructivist epistemology and interpretivist paradigm. This section outlines the appropriate research methodology, which is grounded in the theoretical assumptions made by the chosen research paradigm, ontology and epistemology (Crotty, 1998; Grant & Giddings, 2002). The methodology used for a research project guides the design and execution of the research, including how the research question is framed, which methods are used, and how those methods are used (and therefore the research outcomes) (Crotty, 1998; Grant & Giddings, 2002).

Interpretivist methodologies generally follow a process which involves inductively developing knowledge from data, rather than deductively testing existing knowledge or theories using data (Davies & Fisher, 2018). The interpretivist paradigm is associated with several methodologies, including grounded theory, phenomenology, ethnography, and interpretive description (Gray, 2018; Thorne, Kirkham, & MacDonald-Emes, 1997; Thorne et al., 2004).

The methodology selected for this research was interpretive description (ID), which was originally developed for application in the nursing discipline, by Thorne et al. (1997, 2004). The original aims of interpretive description research design were to develop "understanding of how people experience their health and illness and what nursing can do to make a difference" (Thorne et al., 1997, p. 173). Interpretive description seeks to understand the shared and individual aspects of participants' subjective experiences by producing themes that interpret and describe those experiences (Hunt, 2009; Thorne et al., 1997, 2004). While interpretive description does not aim to achieve transferability (being an interpretive methodology), it acknowledges that there will be shared patterns or themes between individuals' experiences (Thorne et al., 1997, 2004). The recent extension of ID to other disciplines testifies to the applicability of ID to experiences of phenomenon beyond the nursing context (for examples see: Breitkreuz & Colen, 2018; Holt, Kingsley, Tink, & Scherer, 2011; Thananowan, Kaesornsamut, O'Rourke, & Hegadoren, 2018).

Interpretive description aims to understand experiences and improve practice. Thus, the aims of interpretive description link to the aim of this research: to highlight young workers' experiences of and perspectives on non-standard employment. Through this, the thesis will contribute to building a platform from which we can improve young workers' experiences in non-standard employment in New Zealand.

Interpretive description is set apart from many other interpretive methodologies as it does not aim to produce theory, but rather to influence practice based on themes understood from individual's experiences. In comparing interpretive description with other interpretive methodologies, a key question was, 'how far does interpretive description venture beyond description into interpretation?'. Sandelowski and Barroso (2003) provide a scale indicating the level of interpretation involved in producing findings for a range of qualitative descriptive research types. Interpretive description is associated by Hunt (2009) and Thorne (2008) with Sandelowski and Barroso's (2003) thematic description type. Thematic description produces themes interpreted from the data, but does not develop a higher-level or explanatory theory (Sandelowski & Barroso, 2003). More specifically, producing a thematic description means "interpretively integrating portions of data" (Sandelowski & Barroso, 2003, p. 913), going beyond a thematic survey that provides a descriptive survey of the "thematic landscape of events"

(Sandelowski & Barroso, 2003, p. 913). Thorne et al. (2004) explain that while interpretive description does not produce ‘a new truth’ (p. 4) or theory, it does offer ‘tentative truth claims’ (p. 4) about what people commonly experience in relation to a phenomenon. Therefore, while the themes interpretive description produces are not classified as theories, the themes do offer insights about phenomena which contribute to the body of knowledge and understanding of them.

From this point onwards, interpretive description is referred to as ‘interpretive descriptive’. The use of description as a noun (in ‘interpretive description’ and ‘thematic description’) could imply that the research findings are a description, akin to a thematic survey. This use of ‘description’ does not fit well within the interpretivist paradigm, as interpretivism rejects the notion of a single objective reality that can be described without interpretation in relation to the contexts in which it was constructed and in which data was collected (Davies & Fisher, 2018). Using the adjective ‘descriptive’ is a small modification that might prevent this misunderstanding while continuing to acknowledge the descriptive elements of the methodology.

3.4 Methods

Grant and Giddings (2002) succinctly define research methods as “… the practical means, the tools, for collecting and analysing data" (p. 12). These are the techniques for gathering information, selecting and recruiting participants, and analysing the information gathered (Grant & Giddings, 2002). As interpretive descriptive (ID) research findings are not necessarily generalisable (for discussion see section 3.4.1 below), an alternative value of ID research lies in outlining sample characteristics and criteria, data collection tools and materials, and most importantly the analysis process followed, for future research to make use of (Thorne et al., 1997). This can enable replication and case comparisons with other contexts (Evans, Gruba, & Zobel, 2014).

The methods recommended for use in the interpretive descriptive methodology have been acquired from grounded theory, ethnography and phenomenology (Thorne et al., 2004). The interpretive descriptive methodology is associated strongly with certain methods: interviews and participant observation, purposive and theoretical sampling, and thematic analysis (Thorne, 2008). A discussion of these, and the methods chosen for this research, is presented in the following sub-sections.

3.4.1 Sampling and Recruitment

Thorne et al. (2004) recommend purposive and theoretical sampling of participants, a method loaned from grounded theory (Hunt, 2009). In purposive sampling, participants are individually selected based on their "angle of experience" (Thorne, 2008, p. 90). For example, they might be individuals that the researcher knows have more extensive experience, conflicting experiences, or an informed perspective of the phenomenon due to positions they have held (Thorne, 2008). Theoretical sampling is used following initial purposive sampling (Hunt, 2009). This means that in theoretical sampling, analysis and data collection are concurrent, so that additional participants can be selected who have experiences that will contribute to important and underdeveloped themes in the data (Hunt, 2009).

According to Gray (2018), purposive sampling is a method to achieve transferability. Thorne (2008) introduces it as a "more representative sampling technique" (p. 90), with theoretical sampling achieving "maximal variation" (p. 91). Criticisms of interpretive methodologies for producing ungeneralizable findings (Davies & Fisher, 2018), fail to acknowledge the contextuality of interpretive research – favouring scientific concepts of external validity instead (Landers & Behrend, 2015). Descriptive interpretive research might achieve transferability between contexts through replication and case comparison, but not through the application of findings from samples directly to their populations (Cope, 2014; Gray, 2018).

Convenience sampling was chosen for two main reasons. Firstly, transferability was not an aim of this research. Secondly, convenience samples use fewer resources by employing convenient channels to find participants (Landers & Behrend, 2015). Convenience samples are similar to purposive samples in that they are not random (Landers & Behrend, 2015), for example, selection criteria are used to identify participants in both purposive and convenience samples (the selection criteria for this study are described in the next section, 3.4.2). However, in contrast with purposive sampling, Robinson (2014) explains that the selection process for convenience sampling involves selecting participants on a first-come-first-served basis.

The primary type of convenience sampling used was snowball and network sampling (Landers & Behrend, 2015). In this method, the researcher samples participants both from their own personal and professional networks, and from referrals by participants

or individuals in the researcher's network (Landers & Behrend, 2015). Firstly, the research was advertised on the researcher's personal pages on the social media websites LinkedIn and Facebook, with the research asking contacts to share the advertisement with their networks. This was combined with posting physical copies of the advertisement in places the researcher regularly visited, such as local cafés, supermarkets, and AUT University campuses.

To reach a slightly more heterogenous group of potential participants (in terms of demographics and work histories) than would be achievable through the researcher's own networks (Robinson, 2014), the research advertisement was also posted on research-relevant social media groups. Focusing on research-relevant groups ensured that the advertisement was likely to reach participants who would meet the selection criteria. Examples of groups that the research advertisement was posted on include the 'r/Auckland' Reddit group, and the 'Hospo Only' Facebook group.

Interested participants were instructed by the advertisement to email the researcher. Where necessary, participants were asked via email to confirm that they met the selection criteria. Individuals who met the criteria were emailed an invitation to participate, with the participant information sheet and consent form attached. One follow-up email was sent to participants who did not respond to the invitation. Interview times and locations were arranged over email with participants who accepted.

The number of interview participants was 12. Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) identify 12 as the number of interview participants by which the researcher is likely to reach data saturation in research examining people's experiences. Hennink, Marconi, and Kaiser (2017) divide data saturation into code saturation and meaning saturation. Code saturation occurs when no new ideas are found, and codes are no longer being changed, added or removed (Hennink et al., 2017). Meaning saturation is achieved when no further interpretive insights can be found or deeper understandings developed (Hennink et al., 2017). Hennink et al. (2017) argue that at least nine interviews are needed for code saturation, and 16 to 24 for meaning saturation. However, Hennink et al. (2017) also acknowledge that data saturation is liable to differ between coding methods. In this study, open and interpretive coding methods drawn from grounded theory were utilised, and 12 interviews were considered sufficient to reach meaning saturation.

Prior to recruitment, ethical approval was received from the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee for a period of three years from 29 January 2019 to 29 January 2022 (ethics application reference number 19/10). As part of receiving ethical approval, no friends or individuals with direct professional relationships with the researcher were selected for participation in this research (for example co-workers or flatmates). Additionally, participants received a koha (gift) following the interview to acknowledge their time, knowledge and participation in the research. They were not advised of this prior to the interview in order to prevent undue influence. Undue influence occurs when participants are enticed by monetary reward to participate in research and accept risks involved against their preferences or other personal interests (Williams & Walter, 2015). While the risks to participants in this research were low, on the balance it was taken into consideration that participants were in non-standard employment, a generally lower-wage earning group, and therefore monetary reward may have unduly influenced them to participate even if they preferred not to.

3.4.2 Selection Criteria

Selection criteria were based on the research question and aims, with the purpose of ensuring that data collection would provide in-depth information relating to the research question (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The key selection criteria in this research were participants' age, relationship with the New Zealand context, location, and experience with non-standard employment.

The age range of participants in studies on young workers in non-standard employment varies widely (for examples see: de Lange et al., 2014b; Loughlin & Barling, 2001; Mrozowicki, 2016; Nunez & Livanos, 2015; Woodman, 2013), which means that there are no established age ranges defining young workers in non-standard employment research. Many studies have included samples with age ranges upwards of 10 years, such as 18 to 29 (Mrozowicki, 2016; Smith, 2018), 20 to 35 (Nunez & Livanos, 2015) and 16 to 30 (Peiró et al., 2012). Research has, however, highlighted differences in the experiences of younger-young workers and those who are older (Nunez & Livanos, 2015; Rainsford et al., 2019). Therefore, rather than pursuing a comparative study involving sub-sets of young-age workers, a focused age range of 20 to 24 years was used for this study. Although New Zealand does not have a minimum working age (Employment New Zealand, 2020), the minimum school leaving age in New Zealand is 16, or 15 with an

exemption from the Ministry of Education (Ministry of Education, 2020). There are also several limitations on the industries or occupations that workers under certain ages can work in, for example workers under 15 cannot work on construction sites (Employment New Zealand, 2020). This means that participants who were at least 20 years old were likely to have more and varied workforce experience than teen-aged workers. An additional consideration was that participants who were outside of their teenage years, and therefore closer in chronological age and life stage to the researcher, might experience less of a power imbalance with the researcher. This decision therefore reinforced the position of the researcher as an insider within the group studied, allowing more open dialogue between the researcher and participants (Hayfield & Huxley, 2015).

Participants were required to have completed their primary and secondary education in New Zealand, with the aim of recruiting participants who were socialised into the workplace in the New Zealand context. Socialisation, or social learning, into the workplace begins when individuals are young, and school, among other influences, contributes to this (Kelloway & Harvey, 1999). Socialisation influences attitudes, values and beliefs (Kelloway & Harvey, 1999). This criterion meant that participants would have had substantial research-context-specific socialisation influencing their subjective experiences of non-standard work and employment. This was appropriate to the interpretive paradigm, with its epistemological belief in individual's subjective and contextually-based interpretations of the social world (Crotty, 1998).

Participants were also required to be residing in the Auckland region at the time of the interviews, which meant that all interviews took place in-person, in Auckland. There were two justifications for this criterion. Firstly, Auckland is home to over 33 percent of the New Zealand population and has a younger median age than New Zealand as a whole (Statistics New Zealand, n.d.a), and it also hosts a large variety of industries and occupations (Auckland Tourism, Events, and Economic Development, n.d.). Secondly, video-calling through internet technology would have been required to interview participants located outside of Auckland. There are several important downsides to data collection through video-calling. These include that the technology may fail, so that poor image and sound quality disrupt communication (Adams-Hutcheson & Longhurst, 2017); body language is less visible, presenting challenges to rapport building and communication (Dolowitz, Buckler, & Sweeney, 2008); and that individuals are not as

comfortable with, and accustomed to, appearing on Skype (Adams-Hutcheson & Longhurst, 2017). However, since this data was collected in 2019, the 2020 coronavirus pandemic has meant that internet video calls are now more readily used for interviews and may become a more common data collection tool moving forward.

To ensure, without doubt, that all participants had at least some experience in non-standard employment, participants were required to have six months continuous non-standard employment experience in the last two years in New Zealand. Limiting this to the last two years meant that all the participants had some recent experience with non-standard employment, further supporting the collection of in-depth data. This assumed that participants would be able to recall recent experiences in more detail, thereby ensuring that participants would be able to provide in-depth descriptions of at least their most recent non-standard employment experiences.

3.4.3 Data Collection

Document analysis, interviews, and participant observation are commonly used to collect data in the interpretive descriptive methodology (Hunt, 2009; Thorne et al., 2004). Interviews are appropriate for collecting data on individuals' subjective experiences, including their values, attitudes and perspectives (Gray, 2018; Thorne, 2008). In an interpretivist interview, the researcher and participant co-construct information (Gray, 2018), through the process of the researcher asking the participant questions relating to the research question (Kallio, Pietilä, Johnson, & Kangasniemi, 2016). Semi-structured interviews were used in this research, because semi-structured interviews lend themselves more to flexible dialogue than structured interviews (Kallio et al., 2016). This is because semi-structured interview questions include both a small set of primary questions, and either pre-prepared or impromptu follow-up questions, probes or prompts (Kallio et al., 2016). The dialogue this encourages can produce in-depth data (Kallio et al., 2016), which is needed for an interpretive descriptive study of participant experiences (Thorne et al., 2004).

Interview questions and possible follow-up questions were developed prior to the interviews taking place (Kallio et al., 2016). The interview questions were designed around the research question (Kallio et al., 2016), to elicit information about participants' background, and different facets of their experiences in non-standard employment. The questions also linked to insights gained from the literature review

(Kallio et al., 2016). For example, one of the follow-up interview questions asked whether participants felt they were treated differently by their employer, linking to a similar interview question used by McGann et al. (2016) to investigate workers' workplace relationships in non-standard employment, and to literature findings of hierarchies and status effects in non-standard employment (Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; McGann et al., 2016; Williamson et al., 2015). Once drafted, the questions were discussed and critiqued with the researcher's supervisors, to ensure that they were appropriate to the methodology and research question, easy to understand, open-ended, and not leading (Kallio et al., 2016).

The questions and pre-prepared prompts were then field-tested (Kallio et al., 2016). Practice and pilot interviews were conducted to test whether the interview questions produced responses relevant to the research question and were comprehensible and non-leading (Kallio et al., 2016). First, the researcher carried out an informal practice interview with a friend, and wrote field notes reflecting on the interview questions, during and immediately after the interview. Some interview questions were re-worded, removed, or added as a result. Second, two pilot interviews were conducted with participants who fit the sample criteria. The researcher wrote field notes on the interview questions again, both during and immediately after the pilot interviews. Several of the pre-prepared prompts were modified after these pilot interviews. However, no interview questions were changed, and therefore, the data from these were included in data analysis (they are counted in the 12 interviews conducted).

The researcher continued to write field notes during and immediately after each interview, during the entire interviewing phase, as recommended by Thorne et al. (1997). Saldaña (2013) explains that field notes are the researcher's written notes on their subjective responses, observations and interpretations of participant social behaviour during data collection. Thorne et al. (1997) highlight that field notes essentially capture the context of data collection. These observations help the researcher during later analysis to "untangle the shared component of a subjective experience from the narratives that people place them in" (Thorne et al., 1997, p. 174).

The interviews were held in meeting rooms at the Auckland University of Technology city and south campuses. Interview duration ranged from 30 to 60 minutes. The interviews were audio-recorded using a digital audio recording device, to ensure that

the full and accurate dialogue was captured (Gray, 2018). The researcher transcribed the first two pilot interviews to aid reflection on the interview questions, while the other ten recordings were transcribed by a professional transcriber.

Ethical processes were observed during the data collection phase. Key actions include:

- Pseudonyms were assigned to participants in field notes, audio files and transcriptions;
- Participants were given the option to check their transcript for any clearly identifying information, so that it could be removed;
- The researcher reiterated key points in the information sheet to the participant (also sent to the participant prior to scheduling the interview), including that they were welcome to withdraw from the interview at any point and to decline to answer questions;
- Participants signed a consent form prior to the interview starting; and
- The professional transcriber signed a confidentiality agreement.

3.4.4 Use of Metaphors in Data Collection

The interviews also included the use of a metaphor question, which directly elicited metaphors from participants about their experiences. The metaphor question in this study asked 'If your experience of non-standard employment was a house, what sort of house would it be? How would you describe that house?'. The aim of asking this question was to gain insight into participants' implicit perceptions about their overall experience in non-standard employment, by asking for a metaphorical representation of those experiences. Metaphors involve communicating concepts in terms of other concepts (Martínez-de-la-Hidalga & Villardón-Gallego, 2017), offering a way for people to structure and convey their thoughts (Inkson, 2004).

The elicitation of metaphors differs from research studying metaphors *in-use* (Cassell & Lee, 2012); metaphors employed by people without prompting from the researcher. For example, collecting metaphors in-use may involve searching speeches or interview scripts for metaphorical language (Cassell & Lee, 2012). In contrast, Low (2015) defines the elicited metaphor method as "the respondent is prompted (linguistically or visually) by a researcher to produce a metaphorical expression or proposition" (p. 17). Metaphors are a versatile data collection tool and have been elicited using various

techniques. For example, metaphors may be elicited through writing prompts, drawing prompts, written statements or essays, and interview questions (Seung, Park, & Jung, 2015).

More commonly, researchers ask participants for metaphors without offering a conceptual basis like the house used in this research (Cassell & Bishop, 2019; Huang & Feng, 2019; Wegner & Nückles, 2015). However, some researchers have asked participants to construct metaphors based on a central organising concept, for example animals (Grünberg & Matei, 2020), or rooms in a house (McCarroll, 2017). McCarroll's (2017) use of the house metaphor offered the central organising concept of the house as used in this study. In McCarroll's (2017) research, the house was identified as an appropriate concept because participants were facilities management professionals, and therefore their work was closely related to built environments. However, McCarroll (2017) also highlights that "the 'house' as a built structure is also familiar in terms of universal imagery, allowing its application to expand to future applications to other organisational disciplines" (p. 294). With houses coming in infinite variations, the house concept offers participants both a structured space to work from, and scope for imagination and freedom of expression.

There appears to have been no previous discussion in the literature of using metaphors as a data collection tool in interpretive descriptive interviews. According to Low (2015), in the education discipline (where metaphor elicitation has been widely used) metaphor elicitation in interviewing is generally linked to case study designs focused on collecting in-depth and contextual information. In one of the papers in which the interpretive descriptive methodology is developed, Thorne et al. (2004) state that "particularly evocative metaphors and images may well be used as a device for articulating the descriptive and interpretive insights that have arisen in the course of research" (p. 4). This study builds on Thorne et al.'s (2004) suggestion that metaphors may be used to articulate research findings to readers; the use of metaphor in this study proposes that metaphors can also be utilised as an effective data collection tool in ID research. Metaphor elicitation can enable participants in ID research to communicate implicit perceptions and beliefs about their experiences to the researcher, thereby aiding the researcher to interpret their experiences.

3.4.5 Participant Summary

The 12 interview participants included five males and seven females, and their ages ranged from 21 to 24 (although the research advertisement invited workers aged 20-24 to register their interest). Five of the participants were not in tertiary education, but four of those had been in the past, while the other seven were in tertiary education at the time of the interviews. As a group, participants had experience in several non-standard employment types, including casual, permanent part-time, full-time and part-time shifts, fixed-term shifts, and part-time fixed term.

Participants generally had between one and four non-standard employment experiences, and the duration of their non-standard employment relationships varied from one week to three and a half years. All of these non-standard employment experiences were in service industries (as opposed to goods production), but they spanned a wide range: accommodation and food; arts and recreation; education and training; healthcare and social assistance; information media and telecommunications; rental, hiring, and real estate services; retail trade; and wholesale trade.

Interpretivism highlights the contextuality of individual’s subjective construction of meaning (Crotty, 1998). For this reason, descriptive information for each participant is listed in Table 1 below, including their age, current work, and past non-standard employment experiences.

Table 1: Participant characteristics

Pseudonym	Age	Student at time of interview	Current job and past non-standard employment	Industry	Occupation	Approximate duration in role (months)
Isla	24	No	Casual	Wholesale Trade	Store Person	6
			Shift work	Accommodation and Food Services	Food and Beverage Attendant	24
Kurt	23	No	Casual	Rental, Hiring and Real Estate Services	Performing Arts Technician	42
Ruby	21	Yes	Fixed-term Part-time	Education and Training	Administrative Worker	1
			Casual	Accommodation and Food Services	Food and Beverage Attendant	6
			Permanent Part-time	(as above)	(as above)	24
			Permanent Part-time	(as above)	(as above)	18-24
Emily	24	No	Permanent Part-time	Retail Trade	Sales Assistant	48
Oliver	23	Yes	Permanent Part-time	Accommodation and Food Services	Food and Beverage Attendant	6
			Casual/Fixed-term	Information Media and Telecommunications	Telecommunications Trade Worker	6
			Permanent Part-time	Retail trade	Rental, Hiring and Real Estate Services	3
			Permanent Part-time	Accommodation and Food Services	Food and Beverage Attendant	24

Pseudonym	Age	Student at time of interview	Current job and past non-standard employment	Industry	Occupation	Approximate duration in role (months)
			Permanent Part-time	Accommodation and Food Services	Food and Beverage Attendant	24
Lily	24	Yes	Part-time Shift Work	Health Care and Social Assistance	Counsellor	18
			Permanent-Part-time	Arts and Recreation Services	Food and Beverage Attendant	12
			Casual	(as above)	Personal Service Worker	12
			Part-time Shift Work	(as above)	Gaming Worker	12
Mia	22	Yes	Permanent Part-time	Retail Trade	Checkout Operator	40
William	22	Yes	Permanent Part-time	Information Media and Telecommunications	Clerical Worker	15
			Casual	(as above)	(as above)	42
Ava	23	No	Shift Work	Health Care and Social Assistance	Nurse	24
			Fixed-term Shift Work	(as above)	(as above)	12
			Casual	(as above)	(as above)	unknown
Charlotte	23	No	Shift Work	Health Care and Social Assistance	Nurse	12
			Shift Work	(as above)	(as above)	24

Pseudonym	Age	Student at time of interview	Current job and past non-standard employment	Industry	Occupation	Approximate duration in role (months)
			Casual	Accommodation and Food Services	Food and Beverage Attendant	unknown
James	21	Yes	Permanent Part-time	Accommodation and Food Services	Food and Beverage Attendant	18
Greg	22	Yes	Permanent Part-time	Information Media and Telecommunications	Clerical Worker	24
			Casual	Accommodation and Food Services	Food and Beverage Attendant	1
			Casual	(as above)	(as above)	unknown

Note. Information on industries, organisations and job titles provided by participants were matched with ANZCO (Employment New Zealand, 2020) and ANZSIC (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2013) classifications. As a result, the industries and occupations listed here are not as they appear in the interview data. This is intended to protect participants from being identified based on their descriptions

3.4.6 Data Analysis

After the interviews were completed and transcribed, thematic analysis was used to analyse the data. Thorne et al. (2004) highlight that the outcome of analysis in ID is "… a coherent conceptual description that taps thematic patterns and commonalities believed to characterize the phenomenon that is being studied and also accounts for the inevitable individual variations within them" (p. 4). Thematic analysis aligns with the desired outcomes of ID, as thematic analysis is used for "identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 79).

The type of thematic analysis applied in this study was Big Q thematic analysis, distinguished by Clarke and Braun (2018) from small q and medium Q thematic analysis. Small q thematic analysis focuses on rigour in the coding process, using highly structured coding methods based in a positivist paradigm (Clarke & Braun, 2018). Medium Q utilises both structured coding methods, such as codebooks, and a more qualitative approach.

Compared with small q and medium Q analysis, Big Q thematic analysis is considered to be a more strictly qualitative form of thematic analysis, following "an organic approach" (Clarke & Braun, 2018, p. 108). Braun and Clarke (2019) explain that utilising Big Q thematic analysis means ensuring that data analysis processes align with the qualitative philosophical background to the research (in this case for example the relativist ontology and constructivist epistemology). This means that Big Q thematic analysis is more flexible in comparison with the positivist emphasis in small q thematic analysis which expects a more rigid application of research procedures (Braun & Clarke, 2019). Instead, the focus during analysis for the researcher should be on deeply engaging with the data and actively developing themes through thought processes and reflection (Braun & Clarke, 2019).

Thematic analysis of the interview data took place after the final interview had been recorded, and included a process of immersion, initial coding, pattern coding, and theme development. Following an inductive approach, codes were not pre-determined prior to data collection based on relevant theory, but instead developed using the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This approach aligns with the Big Q thematic analysis type described by Clarke and Braun (2018).

The first phase in interview data analysis, prior to coding, was immersion (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The researcher re-read the interview transcripts several times, making analytic memos in a notebook on possible meanings and patterns while they read (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Saldaña, 2013). To maintain a focus on participant data, field notes and analytic memos were not coded, but were reflected on and used to aid the researcher's analytic thought processes throughout data analysis (Saldaña, 2013).

Coding of the interview transcripts followed immersion, and the qualitative data analysis software NVIVO 11 was used to manage coding. Saldaña (2013) splits the coding process into a first and second cycle. During the first cycle, codes are developed. The codes are words or phrases assigned to pieces of data; they encapsulate the essence of salient portions of the data, and are the basic building blocks for further more interpretive analysis (Saldaña, 2013). Initial coding, a grounded theory method, was the type of first cycle coding used. This involved comparing different sections of data which appeared to have different topics, exploring similarities and differences between them, and labelling them with codes. Coding was a cyclical process, as the researcher compared "data to data, data to code, code to code" (Saldaña, 2013, p. 58). The researcher started with broader codes for topics, then later re-coded, changed, added and removed, and changed codes (Saldaña, 2013). This process ensures that codes "… most usefully convey the essence of the phenomenon …" (Saldaña, 2013, p. 5).

In the second cycle, categories, themes, concepts or theories are developed (Saldaña, 2013). Pattern coding was the second cycle method used. In pattern coding, the initial codes were categorised by identifying meaningful patterns in their characteristics and on that basis synthesising and grouping them together (Saldaña, 2013).

Latent themes were then developed, transcending the initial codes and categories (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Themes can include underlying ideas, assumptions, ideologies, emotions, and trajectories, and are used to recast and interpret participants' shared and individual experiences (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Hunt, 2009; Sandelowski & Barroso, 2003; Thorne, 2008). Examining the relationships between categories helped to develop themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The themes developed during data analysis are described in detail in the Findings Chapter (Chapter Five).

3.4.7 Analysis of Metaphor Data

As the metaphor interview question provided a different type of data, the metaphor answers were analysed separately. A similar process of thematic analysis was used for analysis of the metaphor data as with the interview data, including immersion, first and second cycle coding, and theme development (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Saldaña, 2013). An additional stage was added to the metaphor thematic analysis where metaphors were categorised by type of house, in line with the common practice of categorising metaphors in metaphor analysis research (Cassell & Bishop, 2019; Huang & Feng, 2019; Turner & Wan, 2018; Wegner & Nückles, 2015).

Few authors have described their processes of incorporating thematic analysis of metaphors into thematic analyses of interview data. Cassell and Bishop (2019) for example offer a brief description of how they categorised metaphors, but not how they combined analysis of metaphor with other data. In this study, the overall data analysis process involved cycling between metaphor and interview data, with the metaphor data providing a counterpoint to the interview data. The first stages of interview data analysis were carried out independently – immersion, first cycle, and second cycle coding. Following this, the same three stages of thematic analysis were applied to the metaphor data. After coding of the metaphor data was completed, the researcher returned to review the interview data coding. The analysis of the metaphor data therefore provided a point of comparison with the interview data. In the final stage, themes were developed based on both the metaphor and interview data coding.

Researchers have noted the ability of metaphors to magnify salient ideas during the data analysis process (Cassell & Bishop, 2019; Moernaut, Mast, & Pauwels, 2020). The house metaphor provided a central concept for identifying and comparing individual and shared features of participants' metaphors, offering deeper insights that allowed the researcher to view the interview data from new perspectives. This proved instrumental to thematic analysis in two ways. Firstly, the findings from the metaphors facilitated new interpretations, and confirmed existing interpretations of the interview data. Secondly, the metaphors provided further indications of which elements of participants' experiences were more significant personally, and amongst the group. This enabled further analysis to focus on more salient elements of participants' experiences, refining codes and enhancing theme development.

3.5 Rigour

While interpretivist research does not aim to achieve generalisability or transferability, other dimensions of rigour can be applied within interpretivist research. Cope (2014) identifies four other overlapping criteria for evaluating the rigour of qualitative research: credibility, dependability, confirmability, and authenticity. Credibility is relevant to the inductive approach in this research, and is defined as the ability of the research to create knowledge that reflects participants' experiences and perspectives (Cope, 2014). Confirmability, similarly, involves reducing researcher bias during analysis (Cope, 2014). Lastly, authenticity relates to the researcher's ability to grasp and empathise with the participants' emotions and experiences (Cope, 2014). Dependability, which means that the findings can reliably be replicated (Cope, 2014), is less relevant to interpretivist research which acknowledges that experiences are subjective and individual. This section describes the methods used to achieve these criteria of credibility, confirmability, and authenticity.

Member checking was used to enhance the credibility of research findings through a more rigorous data-checking process (Cope, 2014). Participants who accepted the option to give feedback on the research were emailed a draft summary of the research findings. Thorne et al. (1997) encourage this as participants may challenge the proposed themes, encouraging the researcher to question their interpretations of participant' experience. Member-checking determines whether the researcher has erroneously – in such a way that they do not reflect the data collected – developed any of the themes (Thorne et al., 1997), enhancing confirmability (Cope, 2014). Five of the 12 participants asked to receive a draft summary of the research findings. Of those five, three read and responded to the draft summary, and none suggested any changes to the findings.

Confirmability can be enhanced by data triangulation (Gray, 2018). Investigator triangulation was achieved, although to a limited extent, through discussions between the researcher and research supervisors. Discussions centred around the research design, interview questions and techniques, codes and coding process, and the themes. This helped to reveal the researcher's biases by exposing alternative interpretations of the data (Gray, 2018). Additionally, methodological within-method triangulation – field notes and analytic memos recorded during interviews and thematic analysis – allowed reflection on the decisions taken during data collection and analysis (Gray, 2018).

Authenticity was enhanced by the researcher's status as an insider in the participants' age group and having shared experiences of non-standard employment (Hayfield & Huxley, 2015). An insider researcher "… personally belongs to the group to which their participants also belong" (Hayfield & Huxley, 2015, p. 91). An insider researcher is more likely to empathise with and understand participant experiences, enhancing data analysis (Hayfield & Huxley, 2015). However, data collection and analysis can be complicated by the acknowledgement that the researcher can be an insider in some ways and an outsider in others (Hayfield & Huxley, 2015).

There are data quality risks to insider research. Firstly, participants might make unconscious assumptions that the researcher has shared knowledge and thereby reduce the depth of the discussion (Hayfield & Huxley, 2015). Similarly, the researcher may take some data for granted during data analysis, failing to assign codes (Hayfield & Huxley, 2015). The researcher countered this by asking naïve probing questions during interviews, and using triangulation methods – including field notes, analytic memos, and discussions with their thesis supervisors. Examples of probing questions include repeating and rephrasing a participant's point as a question, asking the participant to expand on their point, and asking for more information (including asking how, what, why, when, or where) (Kallio et al., 2016).

To further demonstrate the confirmability of this research, the research methods are described above in this chapter, participant quotes are shared in the findings chapter which follows, and research materials (e.g. interview questions and advertisement for participants) are included in the appendixes at the end of the thesis (Cope, 2014).

3.6 Chapter Summary

The philosophical background underpinning this research included an interpretive paradigm, relativist ontology and constructivist epistemology. The interpretive descriptive methodology was used to design this study (Thorne et al., 1997, 2004), focusing the study on describing and understanding the subjective experiences of young New Zealand workers in non-standard employment. This guided the methods used, which included snowball and network sampling (Landers & Behrend, 2015), semi-structured interviews (Kallio et al., 2016), and Big Q thematic analysis (Clarke & Braun, 2018).

The research design included the use of a metaphor question, a technique which few, if any, researchers have included in interpretive descriptive interviews. The question elicited participant metaphors about their experience of non-standard employment, using the concept of a house (Low, 2015; McCarroll, 2017). The purpose of this was to gain deeper insight into participants' implicit perceptions about their overall experience of non-standard employment, complementing the descriptive data gathered through the other interview questions.

There are few, if any, studies which detail processes for combining thematic analysis of interview data with thematic analysis of metaphors. This chapter therefore provided a detailed overview of the process used in this thesis, identifying three general stages. First, interview data and metaphor data were analysed separately using first and second cycle coding processes (Saldaña, 2013), and adhering to Big Q thematic analysis prioritising deep engagement with the data over rigid adherence to coding processes (Braun & Clarke, 2019). Second, following coding there was an iterative process of comparing the metaphor data coding with the interview data coding, and further developing the codes. Third, themes were developed using both the interview and metaphor data coding.

Detailing these processes, as well as the other aspects of the research design such as sampling, selection criteria and interviewing processes is important for demonstrating the rigour of this research (Cope, 2014). Rigour was also enhanced through or discussions between the researcher and research supervisors (investigator triangulation), inviting participants to provide feedback on the draft findings (member checking), and consideration given to the researcher's position as an insider to the group being researched (Cope, 2014; Gray, 2018; Hayfield & Huxley, 2015).

The next chapter, the New Zealand Context (Chapter Four), describes key elements of the context in which the experiences of the participants in this study took place, including New Zealand's employment relations system, labour market statistics, and the unique challenges that young workers face in New Zealand's labour market. This provides a background for reading and understanding the findings (presented in Chapter Five), and basis for discussion of the findings in relation to the context (in Chapter Six).

Chapter 4: The New Zealand Context

Previous chapters provided an overview of the international historical context which led to the growth of non-standard employment (Chapter One) and defined non-standard employment as being the opposite of standard employment (Chapter Two). The Literature Review Chapter (Chapter Two) highlighted the importance of context to workers' experiences of non-standard employment, and the relative lack of research on young workers' experiences in non-standard employment, exemplified by the gap in New Zealand research on young workers. This chapter now provides an overview of non-standard employment in New Zealand and young workers' experiences in New Zealand's labour market, offering a backdrop from which to read and understand the findings presented in the next chapter (Chapter Five).

According to Spoonley (2004), non-standard employment has always been present in New Zealand, with a peripheral workforce sitting alongside the core standard workforce. This peripheral workforce included part-time and seasonal workers, with conditions such as non-standard working times, low wages and employment insecurity (Spoonley, 2004). However, the standard and non-standard divide has deepened and fragmented in the last three decades. There is now a continuum of non-standard employment types existing in both core and peripheral workforces, and ranging in security, income and status (Spoonley, 2004). The core-periphery analogy is now unable to capture the complex array of employment arrangements extending throughout the workforce (Spoonley, 2004).

In addition to the fragmentation and extension of non-standard employment types in New Zealand, employment relationships have also fragmented. Legislative changes in the last few decades have resulted in collective employment agreements between unions and employers giving way to individual agreements between employer and employee (Ongley, 2013). Employer power and control over employment relationships has increased, as union density and statutory protections for employees declined (Rasmussen, Foster, & Farr, 2016).

Young workers face unique challenges in New Zealand's current labour market. This chapter identifies and discusses several of these core challenges, which are: comparatively high unemployment rates, the user-pays tertiary education system,

negative perceptions of young workers, discriminatory legislation including youth minimum wages and trial periods, underrepresentation in unions, and a lack of employment rights education.

This chapter first describes non-standard employment types in New Zealand, the recent history of New Zealand's employment policy development in relation to non-standard employment, and the current status of unions in New Zealand. This is followed by an outline of key statistics on non-standard employment in New Zealand. The second half of the chapter begins by highlighting statistics on young people's non-standard employment in New Zealand. It then describes each of the core challenges that young workers face in New Zealand, and where relevant how these relate to youth non-standard employment.

4.1 Non-Standard Employment in New Zealand

As discussed in the Introduction Chapter (Chapter One), the standard employment relationship (SER) is a labour market institution which developed in the early 20th century with industrialisation (Fudge, 2017), and which remains dominant today (De Stefano, 2017). Standard employment is described as: full-time with a schedule of 8 am-5 pm from Monday to Friday, permanent and long term, and stable and secure (Ongley, 2013; Spoonley, 2004). Due to the dominance of the SER, employment that diverges from the key features of the SER has been termed '*non*-standard employment' (De Stefano, 2017).

Table 2 below describes the main types of non-standard employment used in New Zealand, using information from the Employment Relations Act 2000, relevant case law, and the Employment New Zealand government website. Some of these employment types may be combined in practice – for example, an employee may be on fixed term part-time employment. It is clear from the descriptions that some of these employment types also overlap – causing confusion for some employers and employees. Wilson (2014) points out that there have been several Employment Court cases involving clarification of whether an employment agreement was permanent, casual, or fixed term.

Table 2: Descriptions of non-standard employment types

Employment type	Statute or Case	Description
Part-time permanent	Not defined in statutory or common law	Employment New Zealand describes it as employment which has a regular pattern or schedule that is not full time and involves fewer than 30 hours per week.
Fixed term	Employment Relations Act 2000, s66	Fixed term employment has a specified end point which may be a date or the conclusion of a project or event. There must be a genuine reason based on reasonable grounds for the employment having a specified end point – and this cannot be to establish whether an employee is suitable for permanent employment.
Casual employment	Employment Court in Lee v Minor Developments Ltd t/a Before Six Childcare Centre in 2008 Jinkinson v Oceana Gold (NZ) Ltd [2009] ERNZ 255	Casual employment involves short periods of employment for specific purposes or based on work demands. It does not have a regular pattern of work hours or days. The employer is not obligated to offer work, and the employee is not obligated to accept work. Casual employment also has no expectation or guarantee of ongoing work. Each period of work is a separate employment engagement – employment obligations only exist during periods of work. While not explicitly stated in legislation or case law, it is generally accepted each new period of engagement does not require a new employment agreement to be signed.
Temporary agency (a type of triangular employment)	Employment Relations (Triangular Employment) Amendment Act 2019	While not defined in the Employment Relations Act, temporary agency work is a type of triangular employment. Temporary agency workers are employed by an agency, and work in temporary assignments for other employers (who are external to the agency). The worker's employment is with the agency, rather than any third parties they work for. For example, wages are paid by the agency. Their work may be intermittent and involve multiple assignments over the period of employment. According to the legislation, in triangular employment the employee is employed by one party but works for a controlling third party who has an agreement or arrangement with the employee's employer.
Shift work	Employment Relations Act 2000, s67G(9)	Shift work is a system that involves periods of work that are continuous. Shifts may be at different times on different days of the week. While not explained further in the legislation, shift work in practice means that employees are rostered to work certain shifts, and these may be the same or different shifts from day to day or week to week.
Seasonal (a type of fixed term employment)	Turner v Talley's Group Ltd (2013)	Seasonal employment is a type of fixed term employment – it must meet the legislative requirements of fixed term employment.

Employment type	Statute or Case	Description
	Employment Relations Act 2000, s66	Seasonal employment is not defined separately in the legislation but is explained by Employment New Zealand as being a type of fixed-term employment which occurs at a specific period which is reoccurring (e.g. annually, biannually). Employment is not continuous between seasons, but a seasonal employee may be re-employed each season.

Note. Information from Employment New Zealand (n.d.), and Employment Relations Act 2000.

There are also non-standard arrangements permitted by New Zealand legislation that may be included in employment contracts, but which are not generally distinguished as types of employment on their own. For example, the 90-day trial is a trial period at the start of an employment relationship, during which an employee can be dismissed, and which removes their right to bring a personal grievance against their employer (Employment Relations Act 2000). The 90-day trial period is a non-standard arrangement because it removes the guarantee of permanent employment and dismissal protections linked with standard employment. Table 3 below identifies and describes employment provisions enabled by New Zealand legislation, which address non-standard arrangements, but which are not classified as non-standard employment types.

Table 3: Non-standard employment provisions in New Zealand

Employment provision	Statute or Case	Description
90-day trial	Employment Relations Act 2000, s67A, B	The 90-day trial is a 90-day period, starting at the beginning of the employment, during which an employee can be dismissed without having the right to bring a personal grievance against their employer in relation to their dismissal. Employers with less than 20 employees can use the 90-day trial provision. When initially introduced in 2008, the 90-day trial was limited to employers with fewer than 20 employees but was then expanded in 2010 to allow use by all employers. It was amended again in 2018, reducing its use again to employers with fewer than 20 employees from May 2019.
Availability	Employment Relations Act 2000, s67D	An availability provision requires an employee to be available for specific periods of time to accept work made available by their employer, while the employer is not required to provide work during those periods. There must be genuine reasons based on reasonable grounds for the availability provision, and compensation must be paid to the employee for the availability periods.

Employment provision	Statute or Case	Description
		The provision can only be included in employment agreements that have guaranteed hours. Guaranteed hours are not defined in the legislation, but refer to a minimum number of hours per week for which an employee will be paid (Public Service Association & E tū, n.d.).
Hours of work	Employment Relations Act 2000, s67C	Hours of work must be specified in an employee's employment agreement and can include any or all of: the number of guaranteed hours, days of the week, start and finish times, and any flexibility in the days or start/finish times. The phrase 'any or all' means that not all of these are required to be included in an employment agreement. For example, an employment agreement may state that an employee is guaranteed 15 hours of work per week, but not specify the days or times those hours will be scheduled. This provision can therefore be used to create a non-standard arrangement.
Shift cancellation	Employment Relations Act 2000, s67G	A shift cancellation provision in an employment agreement specifies a reasonable period of notice the employer will give when cancelling a shift. It also specifies reasonable compensation to be paid if a shift is cancelled without the specified period of notice.

Note. Information from Employment Relations Act 2000.

4.1.1 Recent Employment Relations History

Prior to the early 1990s, New Zealand's employment relations system was based on centralised collective bargaining and strong statutory protections for employees (Anderson, Gahan, Mitchell, & Stewart, 2011; Ongley, 2013). However, the introduction of the neoliberal Employment Contracts Act 1991 (ECA) heralded a shift to individual employment agreements and flexible employment arrangements, with weak statutory protections (Anderson et al., 2011; Ongley, 2013). The Employment Contracts Act 1991 brought an end to compulsory arbitration, removed the Award system, and reduced unions' and workers' rights to access unions in the workplace, for example making compulsory unionism unlawful (Anderson et al., 2011). The spread of neoliberalism and globalisation in the 1980s resulted in this swing in New Zealand's economic policy focus (Ongley, 2013). As neoliberalism and globalisation saw trade barriers reduced and global markets opened up, New Zealand focused on low inflation as a way to compete on the global stage (Ongley, 2013). Maintaining low inflation meant focusing on low cost and

demand responsive production, requiring a shift in New Zealand's labour market policy (Ongley, 2013).

Following this, in 2000, the ECA was replaced with the Employment Relations Act 2000 (ERA) – which continues to be the primary statute governing employment relationships in New Zealand (Rasmussen, Foster, & Farr, 2016). While the ERA takes a more moderate approach to individualised employment – expanding individual employment rights and enabling limited collective bargaining (Rasmussen, Bray, & Stewart, 2019) – the individualistic approach at the heart of the ECA beats on in the ERA (Ongley, 2013). For example, Toulson and Foster (2013) describe that individual employment agreements are "now firmly embedded in New Zealand" (p.34), and note that the ERA did not return compulsory unionism – preventing a return to the strong position that unions held in New Zealand prior to the reforms of the 1980s and 1990s. Neoliberal reform has also had a long-lasting impact on public acceptance of neoliberal policy (Skilling, 2016).

During the neoliberal reform, the shift in employment relations was touted as being the ideal solution to boost economic growth and create jobs (Wilson, 2014). Employment relations reforms have, in reality, had little effect in the long term, for example, poor labour productivity growth has persisted for the last three to four decades (Rasmussen & Fletcher, 2018). At the time of data collection for this thesis, in March 2019, the unemployment rate sat at 4.1 percent (Statistics New Zealand, n.d.-d), matching mid-1980s unemployment rates (Ongley, 2014). There was minimal change in the unemployment rate between data collection and the time of writing, with unemployment at 4.2 percent in March 2020 (Statistics New Zealand, n.d.-d).

Employment policy reform did, however, achieve growth in non-standard employment (Spoonley, 2004). From 1991 to 2001, the number of employees in part-time employment increased 34.6 percent (Spoonley, 2004). Deregulation and the individualisation of employment relationships have also allowed employers to increase flexibility in the workplace using non-standard contractual arrangements, such as 90-day trials (Rasmussen et al., 2016). The OECD Employment Outlook reported in 2013 that New Zealand had the fourth lowest level of legislative employment protections in fixed term and temporary agency contracts in the OECD. The rhetorical question now asked about neoliberal job-creation is 'what type of jobs?' (Wilson, 2014).

4.1.2 Unions

Anderson (2007) argues that collective organisation is "the most effective protection for employees" (p. 434), explaining that collective organisation gives employees influence over their employment arrangements and day-to-day work, and the "resources to enforce their rights" (p. 434).

The ECA discontinued New Zealand's long-standing compulsory conciliation and arbitration system, industry/occupation-wide awards system, union's exclusive rights to negotiate collective agreements, and striking for multiple-employer collective agreements (Rasmussen et al., 2016). Union density plummeted following the introduction of the ECA, and it has not recovered under the ERA, despite more favourable provisions compared with the ECA (Rasmussen et al., 2016). Union density in New Zealand sat at 42.9 percent in 1991, decreasing until 1998, after which it hovered around 21 to 22 percent until 2010 (Ryall & Blumenfeld, 2019). Since 2010, union density has declined each year, and in 2017 it sat at 17.3 percent (Ryall & Blumenfeld, 2019). This continuing decline may have been due to the series of neoliberal employment law reforms made by the last National-led government during their term (2008 to 2017), including reducing unions' access to workplaces, and allowing employers to opt out of multiple-employer collective agreement bargaining (Rasmussen et al., 2016). However, following the election of a Labour-led government in 2017, union density continued its downward trend, reaching a new low of 15.7 percent in 2018 (Companies Office, 2019). More recent union membership information is not yet available, and research has yet to examine whether 2018 amendments to the Employment Relations Act 2000, which reinstated several protections for unions (Employment New Zealand, 2019), have had an impact.

Being in non-standard employment is an additional barrier to union access; most union members are in full-time employment (86.9 percent) and in a permanent job (92.1 percent) (Statistics New Zealand, 2016). In 2018, 12.7 percent of temporary employees (casual, fixed term and temporary agency) were union members, compared with 20 percent of permanent employees (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d). One of the consequences for workers in non-standard employment is weaker enforcement of their employment rights. For example, the law that written employment agreements are mandatory for all employees in New Zealand is more frequently breached with workers

in non-standard employment. In 2016, 17.4 percent of part-time employees reported not having a written employment agreement, compared with 6.4 percent of full-time workers – while for casual employees the rate was 33.7 percent, compared with 6.8 percent of permanent employees (Statistics New Zealand, 2016).

Support for unions, and stronger protection of employment conditions in New Zealand could soon come from the introduction of industry wide Fair Pay Agreements (FPA). In 2018, the Fair Pay Agreement Working Group was set up by the Government to make recommendations for a legislative system of bargaining for agreements across industries or occupations that would set minimum floors for employment terms and conditions (Fair Pay Agreements Working Group, 2018). The FPA Working Group recommended that workers and their unions should be able to initiate a Fair Pay Agreement covering all workers in their industry/occupation, if representing the lower of either 1000 or 10 percent of workers (not just employees) in their industry/occupation, or if the industry/occupation has "harmful labour market conditions" (Fair Pay Agreements Working Group, 2018, p. 5). Some of the Group members recommended that Agreements should be compulsory for all employers (Fair Pay Agreements Working Group, 2018). Although Fair Pay Agreements would represent a significant development for workers in New Zealand, the recommendations are still subject to Government action on the report recommendations. While the government released a report on the recommendations for feedback closing in November 2019, at the time of writing no further decisions had been made (Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment, 2020).

4.1.3 Statistics on Non-Standard Employment

Statistics on non-standard employment are scarce, compared with standard employment. Prior to Statistics New Zealand's March 2008 Survey of Working Life (SOWL), which provides data on temporary employment, there was no official data on non-standard employment other than part-time employment (Statistics New Zealand, 2014). As noted above, the number of employees in part-time employment increased 34.6 percent from 1991 to 2001 (Spoonley, 2004). Since 2008, the SOWL was repeated in December 2012, and then discontinued until December 2018 (the most recent SOWL is therefore the December 2018 Survey). Comparing the 2008 and 2018 SOWL statistics, employment growth was highest for fixed term and temporary agency employment at

28.5 percent, second highest for casual employment which has seen similar growth at 27.6 percent, and lowest for permanent employment at 24.5 percent (Statistics New Zealand, 2008, 2019a). In 2018, permanent and fixed term employees had comparative median hourly earnings, at $26 and $24 respectively, while casual employees had much lower earnings of $17 per hour (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d). As expected, permanent employees also had a higher average tenure of one to three years, and casual and fixed term employees both sat at six months to one year (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d).

Workers in non-standard employment are more likely to be underemployed, with underemployment being defined as working fewer than 30 hours per week, and being willing and able to increase hours (Statistics New Zealand, 2018). In 2017, casual employees had the highest underemployment rate at 20.9 percent, followed by 20.3 percent for permanent part-time, and 8.2 percent for fixed-term employees (Statistics New Zealand, 2018). In the June 2017 quarter, those part-time employees who reported being underemployed earned an average hourly wage of $19.12, or $302.30 a week, while part-time workers who did not report being underemployed had an average hourly wage of $30.22, or $440.36 a week (Statistics New Zealand, 2018). Their average hours worked per week were similar: 15 hours per week for underemployed part-timers, and 16 hours for non-underemployed part-timers (Statistics New Zealand, 2018).

Ongley (2013) links the growth of non-standard employment to a structural economic shift from goods production industries to service industries, such as hospitality, retail, and tourism. The contribution of service industries (for industry classifications see Statistics New Zealand, n.d.b) to New Zealand's GDP grew 7.2 percent between 1988 and 2018, while the GDP contribution of goods producing industries declined 8.2 percent (Statistics New Zealand, 2019b). Currently, service industries employ 75.7 percent of New Zealand's paid employees (Statistics New Zealand, 2019a) and contribute 65.6 percent of our national GDP (Statistics New Zealand, 2019b).

In 2018, the three main industry groups employing workers in temporary forms of non-standard employment (i.e. casual, seasonal, fixed-term, temporary agency) were services industries: retail trade, accommodation, and food services; education and training; and professional, scientific, technical, administrative, and support services (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d). Table 4 below shows the proportion of temporary employees within each industry and out of all temporary employees across all

industries, and the size of each industry in terms of their proportion of the total employees across all industries.

Table 4: Employee proportions in main industry groups employing temporary workers

	Retail trade, accommodation, and food services	**Education and training**	**Professional, scientific, technical, administrative, and support services**
Proportion of total temporary employees across all industries (percent)	17.1	15.4	11.2
Proportion of industry group's temporary employees (percent)	10.3	13.8	9.1
Industry Group Size (proportion of total employees out of all industries (percent)	15.4	10.4	11.5

Note. Information from Statistics New Zealand (2019c).

Ongley (2013) explains that it is the volatility of demand for labour in service industries which links service industries to growth in non-standard employment. The primary reasons given by retail trade, accommodation and food services businesses for using casual and fixed term employment are fluctuating demand, and covering staff absences (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, 2019). On the part of employees, the three most frequent reasons given for being in temporary employment are that it was the only type of work the person could find or that their employer could offer, being in education, and the nature of the work (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d).

4.2 The Context for Young New Zealand Workers

At the time of data collection for this thesis, of employees aged 15 to 24 in New Zealand, 20.9 percent were in temporary non-standard employment (fixed-term, temporary agency, and casual employment) – a higher proportion than any other age group (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d). This figure increased from 17 percent in 2008 (Statistics New Zealand, 2008) to 20.8 percent in 2012 (Statistics New Zealand, 2012), but slightly decreased from 23 percent in 2016 (Statistics New Zealand, 2017). Most temporary employees aged 15 to 24 were in casual employment: 66.5 percent of young temporary employees are in casual employment, and they made up 48 percent of all casual

employees (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d). The SOWL (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d) also found that non-standard working hours were pervasive amongst young employees. Nearly 72 percent of employees aged 15 to 24 across all job types had worked non-standard times in the last four weeks – including on Saturdays and/or Sundays, evenings, nights and early mornings (Statistics New Zealand, 2019c).

Dixon (2011) reported that age was the most significant factor in the temporary-permanent employee wage gap in the 2008 SOWL. Young employees are the lowest paid age group (Statistics New Zealand, n.d.a), dominating the lowest paid employment types in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d). Some young workers are also subject to special youth minimum wages, contributing to their lower pay (described at 2.2.3 below). In 2018, the average hourly earnings for 15 to 19 year olds was the lowest of all age groups at $17.46 (slightly above 2018 minimum wage of $16.50), while 20 to 24 year olds sat at the second lowest with average hourly earnings of $21.40 (Statistics New Zealand, n.d.a). In line with young workers' lower wages, and in combination with increasing living costs, there is a trend in young adults living in their parents' homes for longer after completing secondary school (Stephenson, 2019). In addition to lower wages, the temporary, irregular and less than full-time characteristics of non-standard employment mean that young workers in non-standard employment are further disadvantaged in terms of financial security.

The retail trade, accommodation and food service industries – identified above as a key employer of workers in temporary non-standard employment – employed the highest number of 15 to 24 year olds in jobs out of all industries at the time of data collection for this thesis (Statistics New Zealand, 2019a). They provided 46.4 percent of jobs in the 15 to 19 age group and 28.8 percent of jobs in the 20 to 24 age group (Statistics New Zealand, 2019a). These industries were dominated by young workers, with 34.4 percent of their employees aged 19 to 24 (Statistics New Zealand, 2019a). With high rates of both non-standard employment and young workers in retail trade, accommodation and food services, it is reasonable to expect that they have high rates of young workers in non-standard employment. However, there are no recent publicly available statistics that combine age, industry, and non-standard employment together to confirm this.

4.2.1 Unemployment and Tertiary Education

Key employment indicators suggest that young workers face poorer employment outcomes than the general working population.

The unemployment rate for 20 to 24 year olds was 8.3 percent in March 2019 (at the time of data collection for this thesis) compared with the national unemployment rate of 4.2 percent (Statistics New Zealand, 2020). The Household Labour Force survey showed that 15.7 percent of youth aged 20 to 24 were Not in Education, Employment, or Training (NEET) – compared with 10 percent of 15 to 19 year olds (Statistics New Zealand, 2019e). In March 2020, at the time of writing, unemployment of 20 to 24 year olds has increased to 8.8 percent, while the percentage of youth aged 20 to 24 who are NEET is 15.1 percent, down from the same time last year (Statistics New Zealand, 2020). Further indicators also highlight the comparatively poor situation of young workers. For example, in 2019, employment confidence among younger workers experienced a decrease that was particularly large compared with other age groups (Ranchhod, 2019). In 2017, 28 percent of 20 to 24 year olds in part-time employment were underemployed, the highest proportion of underemployed part-time workers of any age group (Statistics New Zealand, 2018).

It is possible that these factors – comparatively high rates of underemployment, unemployed and NEET youth, and falling employment confidence – are pressuring young workers to enter non-standard employment involuntarily. In response to high youth unemployment and NEET rates, the Government recently developed a youth employment action plan (New Zealand Government, 2019). The plan includes aims such as reducing youth unemployment and NEET rates, improving career guidance, and improving youth employment opportunities (New Zealand Government, 2019). It does not, however, discuss or aim to address high youth non-standard employment. For young people who are in education, the economic situation is not necessarily better than their NEET counterparts. Neoliberalism has transformed tertiary education in New Zealand, resulting in a user-pays tertiary education system (Rowe-Williams, 2018). This has individualised the responsibility of paying for post-secondary school training and education (Rowe-Williams, 2018), shifting financial responsibility away from government and employers (Roper, 2018; Rowe-Williams, 2018). The dominant narrative surrounding employed tertiary students is that their non-standard

employment is normal, and an opportunity which allows them to support themselves financially while gaining the work experience needed to enter the workforce (Casey & Williamson, 2007). The reality is that this work may be involuntary, as inadequate living cost allowances and loans necessitate combining non-standard employment with full-time study (Beban & Trueman, 2018; Richardson et al., 2013). Additional restrictions were introduced between 2011 and 2016, limiting access to student loans and allowances, for example preventing postgraduate students from accessing allowances (Roper, 2018).

Concurrently, young people in New Zealand are driven into tertiary education as government and employers demand skilled work-ready labour (Casey & Williamson, 2007; Roper, 2018). The proportion of people with a bachelor's degree increased from 6.3 percent in 1986 to 29.8 percent in 2014 (Ministry of Social Development, 2016), and currently 26 percent of 20 to 24 year olds are in education (Statistics New Zealand, 2019e). However, it is evident from job advertisements and media commentary that even after young people complete tertiary education, they frequently face requirements of three to four years' experience to gain employment in entry-level roles (Eisley, 2017).

4.2.2 Negative Perceptions

Negative employer perceptions about young workers appear to limit their job prospects. Ominously, the Human Rights Commission (2011) reported that "there is a worrying level of employer bias about hiring young people" (p. 1). Young workers are viewed as missing the skills needed for work (Higgins & Nairn, 2006), or as being lazy (Fenton, 2013; Scott, 2019), and organisations are turning away young people who are inexperienced and untrained from 'entry-level' jobs (Auckland Co-design Lab, 2016). Mooney's (2016) research provides unique insight into manager perceptions about young workers in the hospitality industry in New Zealand, including that young workers are viewed as being irresponsible and undependable.

In response to the difficulties that young workers face in entering the workforce, the State endorses non-standard employment as a stepping-stone for young people to gain experience and skills. For example, Careers New Zealand, a government agency for career and employment advice, actively suggests that young job seekers enter the workforce via non-standard employment (Careers New Zealand, n.d.a, n.d.c, n.d.b).

4.2.3 Legislative Barriers

In addition to the State encouraging non-standard employment as a stepping-stone for young people, minimum wage legislation was reformed in 2013 to "encourage employers to take on young workers" (Bridges, 2013). Under the Minimum Wage Act 1983 s4A, a starting-out wage which is 80 percent of the adult minimum wage, can be paid for an employees' first six months of employment, if they are:

- 16 to 17 years old
- 18 to 19 years old and have been on a benefit while unemployed for six months or more and have not been employed for six months continuously since starting their benefit
- 16 to 19 years old and doing industry training

For workers who are 16 to 17, should they change employers, the new employer can pay them the starting-out wage for six months again. Under s4B of the Minimum Wage Act 1983, workers who are aged 20 years or older and completing an industry training programme (usually apprenticeships) can also be paid 80 percent of the minimum wage, for the duration of their training.

The starting-out wage and training wage directly discriminates against young workers. Section 30(2) of the Human Rights Act 1993 makes these youth wages an exception to the anti-age discrimination provisions contained in the Human Rights Act 1993 and the Employment Relations Act (2000). Indeed, it was pointed out in the committee debate on the Starting-Out Wage Amendment Bill that the wage would not only affect 16 to 19 year old workers, but also indirectly older-young workers, as employers would choose to employ cheaper 16 to 19 year olds over 20 plus year old workers (Beaumont, 2013). Overall, because these legislative minimum wages are exclusive to young workers, they may buttress ideas that young workers are less valuable and less preferable employees.

Blackham (2019) argues that laws which create exceptions to anti-age discrimination legislation, with the aim of promoting youth workforce participation, such as lower youth wages, are not only ineffective in reducing youth unemployment but support the growth of low paid non-standard work among young workers (Blackham, 2019). The six-month starting-out wage and 90-day trial period are also problematic, having the potential to create cycles of temporary employment for young workers (Beaumont, 2013).

4.2.4 Union Representation

The previous sections described the barriers that young workers face in terms of economic conditions such as unemployment, negative perceptions about them, and legislated youth minimum wages. In addition to these barriers, employees under 30 are underrepresented in New Zealand unions. Statistics New Zealand reported in 2016 that employees aged under 30 represented 29.1 percent of all employees, but made up only 15.4 percent of union members (Statistics New Zealand, 2016). In 2017, the retail trade, accommodation and food services industries, identified above as the key employer of young workers, had a union density of 6 percent, compared with the national union density rate of 17.3 percent (Ryall & Blumenfeld, 2019). Haynes, Vowles, and Boxall (2005) identified key barriers for youth union membership as being higher youth labour turnover and that young workers were more likely to work in small workplaces and in industries with low union reach.

Unions have attempted in recent years to fill the youth representation gap, for example by establishing youth divisions, such as Stand Up (New Zealand Council of Trade Unions), E tū Youth (E tū union), and PSA Youth (New Zealand Public Service Association). One union that has had particular success in representing young employees is Unite Union, who in 2003 began to target young and casual workers in non-unionised industries, including call centres, cinemas, fast food, and casinos (Treen, 2014). Some young workers have also initiated their own collective organisation. In 2019 a group of young legal workers founded a union for all workers in the legal profession: the Aotearoa Legal Workers' Union (Aotearoa Legal Workers' Union, n.d.).

4.2.5 Employment Rights Education

In addition to less union protection, formal employment rights education prior to workforce entry appears to be lacking (Carr, 2015). The New Zealand Qualifications Authority, the body which administers New Zealand's secondary school qualifications, offers eight standards (courses) between levels one and three (years 11 to 13) relating to topics such as employee rights and obligations, employment agreements, collective agreement negotiation, and employment relationship problem resolution (New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), n.d.). In 2019, out of a total of 590 secondary, composite, and special schools, 176 offered one or more of these NCEA employment relations standards as optional courses (Psychometrics, Reporting and Statistics, 2019).

This lack of employment rights education may leave some young workers entering the workforce vulnerable to illegal employment practices. For example, in 2016, 10.7 percent of employees aged under 30 did not have a written employment agreement, compared with 7.7 percent of employees aged 30 and over (Statistics New Zealand, 2016). McDonald, Price, and Bailey (2013), in their study of young Australian workers' knowledge of employment rights, note that where young workers lack knowledge of their employment rights, this is likely to prevent them from enacting those rights.

4.3 Chapter Summary

This chapter has highlighted that employees in non-standard employment and with non-standard employment provisions in New Zealand have poorer employment outcomes, including lower earnings (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d), job tenure (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d), union representation (Ryall & Blumenfeld, 2019), and higher underemployment (Statistics New Zealand, 2018). This disadvantages young workers, with young employees aged 15 to 24 having the highest rate of non-standard employment of any age group in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2019d).

Young people in New Zealand also face titanic challenges in relation to their employment – including comparatively high unemployment and underemployment rates (Statistics New Zealand, 2018, 2020), an unsupportive tertiary education system (Roper, 2018; Rowe-Williams, 2018), negative state and employer perceptions about young workers (Fenton, 2013; Higgins & Nairn, 2006; Scott, 2019), legislated discriminatory youth wage rates (Beaumont, 2013; Blackham, 2018; Bridges, 2013), and underrepresentation in unions (Statistics New Zealand, 2016). Considering these challenges, and strong relationships between these challenges and non-standard employment, research on the experiences of young workers in non-standard employment is well overdue.

The context of non-standard employment in New Zealand, particularly for young workers, and the challenges that young workers face in New Zealand's labour market, provide background for understanding this thesis' findings about what young workers' experience in non-standard employment in New Zealand. As described in the methodology chapter, data was collected through semi-structured interviews with 12 young New Zealand workers, with questions exploring their past and present experiences of non-standard employment. The following chapter (Chapter Five) presents the findings of thematic analysis of the interview data.

Chapter 5: Findings

The previous chapter outlined the New Zealand context within which this study and participants' experiences took place. This chapter presents the findings of the interviews carried out with participants. Three main themes and nine sub-themes were developed during thematic analysis, and the chapter will present each in turn. The three themes in participants' experiences are; 1) sub-standard relationships with employers and managers; 2) lack of autonomy and control; and 3) negative personal life impacts of poor work conditions.

This chapter begins with a summary of each participant, and then introduces the metaphor data, using a table. The chapter then presents each theme and sub-theme of the findings. Findings from the metaphor data analysis are integrated into each theme, providing insight into the contribution of the metaphors to theme development.

5.1 The Participants

As outlined in the Methodology Chapter (Chapter Three), semi-structured interviews were carried out with 12 young people aged 20 to 24, including seven tertiary students and five non-students; seven females and five males. Participants were recruited through snowball and network sampling, and posts advertising the research on relevant social media pages. Participants had experience in a variety of industries, including accommodation and food; education and training; and healthcare and social assistance. Additionally, participants had experienced several non-standard employment types, such as casual, permanent part-time, and part-time fixed term. As an addition to the participant summary table provided in the Methodology Chapter section 3.4.5, the following paragraphs summarise each participant's work history, and employment situation at the time of the interview, to provide context for understanding the research findings. These descriptions are intended to provide a background to each participant which is easier to comprehend and recall than the details in the summary table. Participants are introduced and referred to throughout this chapter using pseudonyms created by the researcher.

Kurt

Kurt was a 23-year-old musician who had been in casual employment as a sound technician for three years with the same employer. After graduating from university with a degree in music, he used his casual employment to pay his bills while also earning income as a gigging musician. Kurt planned to save up money from gigs so that he could further his music career, travelling overseas and post-producing music.

Isla

Isla was 24 years old and employed as a store-person on a casual contract in the wholesale trade industry. She had been in and out of employment a few times since finishing high school; at times taking time out of the workforce due to mental health difficulties. She took up her casual job to transition back into the workforce after one such period of unemployment. She had some difficulty finding employment and got the casual job after being referred to her employer by a family friend. Isla expressed her desire to study and to start a family with her partner, but at the time of the interview was not in a financial position to move forward with either of these plans.

Emily

Emily was 24 years old, and at the time of the interview, an independent contractor in her chosen profession in the information media and telecommunications industry. Emily's previous experience in non-standard employment involved part-time work in retail trade while she completed her tertiary education.

James

James was a 21-year-old student who had recently come out of a fixed-term independent contracting role in the IT industry. At the time of the interview he was unemployed but had chosen to focus on his study rather than look for another job. Our interview centred on his previous part-time employment in the fast food industry, which he refers to in his metaphor as job ‘one’.

Lily

Lily had been employed as a shift worker for three years with the same employer in the entertainment industry, before starting postgraduate studies and seeking work related to her chosen career. She found work in a part-time night-shift position in health care and social assistance. At the time of the interview she had been in this role for 1.5 years, and had recently graduated with her postgraduate qualification, aged 24.

Ruby

At the time of the interview, Ruby was 21 years old and in her last year of university. She had recently started a fixed-term part-time role as an administrative worker. She applied for the role as it was part-time, a limited number of hours, and had some links to her degree. Prior to that, Ruby worked in hospitality for approximately four years. Her first two hospitality roles were permanent part-time, while her last hospitality role was casual.

Charlotte

Charlotte was 23 years old and had been in shift work for one year, in her chosen profession within the healthcare industry. Prior to graduating and starting her current role, she had casual shift work in the healthcare industry, and repeated casual employment in hospitality during university breaks.

Mia

Mia was a 22-year-old tertiary student working part-time in retail trade as a checkout operator. She started this job while taking a gap year between high school and university, entering the role part-time with her future tertiary study in mind. Mia was in a highly competitive degree programme, and therefore had chosen to study part-time as well, so that she could focus on her studies.

William

William found his job in the information media industry while taking time off after high school. The role was initially casual, but then shifted to permanent part-time. At the time of the interview he was 22 years old and had been with this same employer for over four and a half years. He was also a union delegate in his workplace. During the four years, William had entered university and left after two years, but returned again after deciding that he did not want to pursue a career within his organisation.

Ava

Ava was a 23-year-old shift worker in her chosen profession within the healthcare industry. After graduating from tertiary study, Ava entered a one-year fixed term role in her chosen profession. She then found her current permanent role and had been in this role for two years. Before graduating, Ava had a casual position that was also in the healthcare industry.

Oliver

Oliver was 23 years old and had a variety of different employment experiences. He initially worked permanent part-time in hospitality while in high school, and then shifted to full-time for a year after finishing school. He then worked as a casual in the information media industry while in university. He left university after receiving an offer of full-time employment from his employer. After working full time for three years, he returned to university and found permanent part-time employment in hospitality again. At the time of the interview he had been back in university for a year, had left his hospitality role and was providing ICT support as independent contractor.

Greg

Greg was 22 years old and had entered university after finishing high school. After starting university, he initially worked as a casual employee in hospitality for just over a year. He then found employment in the information media industry, and at the time of the interview had been in this role for two years. Initially the role was casual, but it later changed to permanent part-time.

5.2 Participant Metaphors

As explained in the Methodology Chapter (Chapter Three), participants were asked to identify and describe what sort of house they would identify their experience of non-standard employment with. A metaphor question was asked to gain deeper insight into participants' implicit perceptions and beliefs about their experience in non-standard employment. A house was chosen as the central concept for the metaphor because it is a universally understood concept while also providing scope for participant imagination (McCarroll, 2017).

Participant metaphors were categorised and analysed by type of house. The house types were: state house, meth house, middle-class suburban, temporary apartment, DIY do-up, and slum. A definition of each house type and the metaphors relating to each type are provided in Table 5 below. There was a clear continuum in the house types described, from negative to more neutral or positive; from state houses to middle class suburban houses. It appears that the specific type of non-standard employment did not create different perceptions of their experiences across the participants. This is apparent because where there were shared house types, they were suggested by participants who had experienced different types of non-standard employment to each other. One possible exception is the state house metaphor, with both participants who described state house metaphors being in casual employment. The state house metaphor was on the extreme negative end of the continuum, and one possible explanation for this finding is the extreme circumstances of casual employment. It has the highest underemployment, most unstable and lowest pay of non-standard employment types in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2018; Statistics New Zealand, 2019d).

In relation to the three main themes in the findings, participants' deeper perceptions of their experiences related most significantly to their sub-standard relationships with managers and employers, and the lack of control they had in their employment. The metaphors were less strongly related to the impacts of non-standard employment on their personal lives. This is reflected in the interview data, with participants placing more emphasis on issues in their workplace relationships and control over their employment, compared with conditions such as pay and long working hours.

Table 5: Participants' house metaphors by type

Type	Definition	Participant metaphors		
State house	Housing owned by the government and rented at restricted rates. These are allocated to individuals or families based on income and need.	Isla: "It'd be like a state house, but not a good state house. Not a new one. The one where Housing New Zealand never come check on it. And the grass is 20 feet tall. And they honestly just don't care anymore. That's exactly how I picture it. And they just get to it sometimes. And they're – Yeah, we'll fix that pipe. But it's not like we have a landlord that you can make come. It's Housing New Zealand and they suck, sometimes. I'd go with that."	Kurt: "Oh wow, my immediate first thought was like one of those state houses that you get. But like the newer state houses. It's the ones that you look at and you're just like – Oh, that could be really nice, except there's 30 of them that will look exactly the same. And I know that in five years they're going to be run down as all hell. And you're looking at it going – Yeah. But you're making it through. You're kind of nice, so far. That's my first thought. I don't know quite how that relates. But I feel like it would probably be that. It starts off quite nice. And then as you go into it, you get drained, and dragged, and beaten."	
Meth house	A house occupied by people addicted to methamphetamines (meth).	Ava: "Working shift work's kind of like… it sounds bad, but like a meth house probably, 'cos just everything's going off. You don't know what's going to happen, no sleep at nights or like all the sleep at nights. Like during the day you're just out of it."	Kurt: "I am like a six or seven-year state house now. I am beaten. There's probably meth addicts living in me. It's a problem."	
Middle-class suburban	A house owned by people who are in the middle class, usually located	Ruby: "My current job, so [workplace name], it's a very stereotypical like the American dream house, white picket fence and all of that."	Lily: "I think it's just like a really standard nice little middle-class house in the suburbs, but then there will be like a huge basement with lots of cosy beds underneath. I think that'd be it. The basement would be bigger than the house, if that makes sense. So, on the outside	Charlotte: "It's just not like a typical, standard pitch perfect house. It would just be yeah, pretty much like three different levels, night shift, morning shift,

Type	Definition	Participant metaphors		
	in a suburban area.	"I think [workplace name] would be like a typical two-storey house in Epsom or wherever"	it'd look kind of normal, but then inside there's like a huge basement and it's very dark and that's where everything happens."	afternoon shift, and just like a twisted stairs of just like going from one to another."
Temporary apartment	An apartment which is rented from an owner, usually located in or near the city centre.	Ruby: "[workplace name] would be like an apartment in New Market. Like a really dark, boring apartment. I have no good feelings towards them. It's kind of sad."	Mia: "I would say an apartment just because apartments are somewhere that you live in temporarily. Somewhere where you pay the rent and maybe it's a bit more expensive, but it's mine because at the end of the day you're not going to be there for a long time. Apartments can be pretty nice, but you don't necessarily make big changes to it, you don't renovate it, you don't buy expensive furniture that you know you won't be able to move around easily."	
DIY do-up	A house which is in a state of disrepair, purchased by the owner with the intention of repairing and on-selling it.	Emily: "The old house would be very cheap, it would be kind of like DIY fix ups and patches. Where like the managers are the owners of the house, just wanted to do something that was easy to fix it up and not want to do the most effective or most efficient method of fixing that leaky ceiling. They just put a few buckets there, y'know. They don't really care about the quality of the house, they just want it to function. They just want people to come and see the house, a lot. They don't really care about the people who are actually maintaining, or actually living in the house. Yeah, retail, I feel the struggle. Yeah they very much cared	James: "One would be very cold and very damp and quite not pleasant to be in. Just old, everything bad, nothing works or whatever. It's all falling apart."	

Type	Definition	Participant metaphors
		about just, they don't care about the house. They don't care about the people who live there, that much. If people in the house had a good idea, they don't, like if someone wanted to fix the house, they'd be like no. It's easier to not fix it, it's easier to not be effective."
Slum	An area of housing which is run down, overcrowded, and characterised by a very low-income population.	William: "Like a tenement, it'd be terrible. It's God-awful. They screw up about as much as they can without the Labour Department being called in." "Yeah, just a slum. I mean, I'm pretty resigned to it at this point, which is why I'm back at uni, 'cos I want to claw my way out, but it's not pleasant."

5.3 Themes

The following sections present the themes and sub-themes developed through thematic analysis of the interview and metaphor data. Metaphor analyses, which describe how participants' metaphors were interpreted in relation to the sub-themes, are presented at the end of each sub-theme.

These themes and sub-themes are:

1. Sub-standard relationships with employers and managers
    i. Mistreatment
    ii. Lack of trust
    iii. Perceptions of lower status
2. Lack of autonomy and control
    i. Resigned to being in non-standard employment
    ii. Imbalance of control over flexibility
    iii. Taking back control
3. Negative personal life impacts of poor work conditions
    i. Impacts of unsocial, unstable, and long working hours
    ii. Impacts of low wages and unstable incomes

5.3.1 Theme One: Sub-Standard Relationships with Employers and Managers

The first theme comprises the symptoms of participants' poor relationships with their employers and managers. Participants' experiences with employers and managers did not live up to their expectations and participants recounted many grievances with their employers and managers. In contrast, there was a noticeable absence of positive interaction or personal connection in participants' descriptions of employers and managers. The theme of sub-standard relationships was pronounced in participants' metaphors, which typically conveyed their managers and employers as uncaring or inattentive. As noted in the previous section, detailed metaphor analyses are presented at the end of each sub-theme.

The theme of sub-standard relationships encompasses three sub-themes, representing symptoms of participants' poor relationships with their employers and managers – mistreatment, lack of trust, and perceptions of lower status. The first sub-theme describes how trust between the young workers their employers was eroded. The

second sub-theme, linking closely with the first, describes the poor treatment that participants were subjected to in their workplaces. The third sub-theme addresses how participants perceive their status in the workplace, influenced by their experiences of negative views about them and the devaluation of their work.

5.3.1.1 Mistreatment

Some participants experienced abusive, aggressive, and illegal treatment in connection with their non-standard employment. These experiences magnified the power imbalance between participants and their employers and demonstrated that participants' managers and employers were not attentive toward participants' wellbeing or relationships with them. Examples of abuse and aggression included being screamed at, subtle aggression, and verbal insults. Greg described a short-lived work experience at a café, where soon after starting he was screamed at – through no fault of his own:

> Then after that I went to another café for about a week where I was on a casual contract again and then they forgot to send me my roster one week because they hadn't given me specific hours. Then they called me up one day screaming at me because I hadn't turned up for work, even though I didn't know that I was working. (Greg)

James explained how his employer attempted to manipulate him into not resigning:

> He called me up on the phone and he just started saying – this is a couple of months later – he called me up and he said, "I don't want you telling other people that you're leaving because it shows them that the grass is greener on the other side, when you know very well the grass isn't greener on the other side." It was emotional sort of battery to keep you there. (James)

Participants highlighted that their employers often flouted their legal obligations in mistreating them, and abused their power over participants' employment. Such practices experienced by participants included being constructively dismissed or 'pushed out'. For example, Ruby shared an experience where she was asked to switch off her depression while at work – and was given fewer and fewer shifts until she was forced to leave. Other participants described: being threatened that their final pay

would be withheld if they informed co-workers that they had resigned, not being paid promised wage increases on time, and being assigned fewer than five days' sick leave. Many of the participants had experiences of incorrect payment of wages and therefore described being vigilant in checking their pay slips. For most participants this may have been due to negligence or poor management of workers in non-standard employment – for example their employer would fail to pay for hours worked on top of their roster, or calculations or systems and policies would be incorrect. James, however, described an employer who purposefully altered his timesheets so that it looked as though he had worked fewer hours.

Participants' metaphors strongly emphasised their experiences of mistreatment. William's use of a slum or tenement metaphor painted a vivid picture of neglect and lack of care, and William shared "it's god-awful". William's metaphor also indicated a strong sense of injustice in his employment conditions and treatment – he viewed his employers as irresponsible: "they screw up about as much as they can". James' house being "very cold and very damp" implied that his employment conditions were not healthy and secure. Ruby described her employer as "really dark" and explained "I have no good feelings towards them". This description distanced Ruby from her employer and hinted at her experiences of mistreatment. Both Isla and Kurt related that their state houses – in other words, their employment – could have been nice, new or good, while highlighting that due to a lack of attention and care, they were run down instead: "they honestly just don't care anymore" and they "never come check on it" (Isla). That some participants' houses were "very stereotypical", "typical", and "middle class" could suggest a monotonous, and less personal and meaningful experience of employment. Both Ruby and Mia also conveyed that their employment was impersonal and distant, showing a lack of personal connection – they were not at home with their employers.

5.3.1.2 Lack of Trust

Relationships between participants and their managers and employers demonstrated a strong lack of trust. Participants' trust in their managers and employers was eroded by their mistreatment, and behaviours that violated their employment rights, such as the regular incorrect payment of wages described earlier.

Some participants conveyed that when employers or managers did things that were in the participants' interests, this was generally due to a legal requirement – not out of caring. Isla explained this in describing how she received holiday pay:

> They give me the 8 percent holiday pay. Even though you're not getting annual [annual leave], you do get an extra little bit of money which is good 'cos it definitely wouldn't be worth it without that. It's not a huge amount but at least it's something. I think they legally have to do that though, not by choice. (Isla)

Participants also did not trust verbal arrangements made in their favour – pointing out that they had to repeatedly remind their employers or managers of such agreements, and fight to ensure they got what was agreed. William explained: "Yeah. Ideally they will, that's the agreement, but I don't put a whole lot of stock in agreements until I see them in place."

Further, participants perceived that their employers did not trust them. In the most blatant examples, participants described being under surveillance. Examples included not being allowed to work in the storeroom at other branches of their company, and being called and told off by their boss who regularly watched them using security cameras. Isla described not being given the keys to their workplace – despite working in a supervisory position in a small workplace of 4 people. James described his experience of surveillance:

> But yeah, he wasn't... he was present in the fact he was watching us on security cameras. He had security cameras out the back to see what we were doing, and you'd get a phone call and half the time it wouldn't be a phone order for a burger, it'll be Kevin calling up to, what are you doing, mate? It was Big Brother. (James)

The metaphors showed participants' lack of trust in their employer's willingness and ability to provide good work conditions. William's slum house description strongly conveyed this lack of trust in his employer: "like a tenement, it'd be terrible. It's God-awful. they screw up about as much as they can without the Labour Department being called in". Emily also perceived that "they don't really care about the people who are actually maintaining, or actually living in the house".

5.3.1.3 Perceptions of Lower Status

Some participants related how they were treated, and their employers' lack of caring for them, with being lower status as workers in non-standard employment. These participants felt that they did not matter – and shared experiences of being pushed around. Isla, for example, explained that because she was cheap to employ, and employed on a non-standard contract, her employers did not care about her:

> I think you're treated – or at least I feel like as a casual I'm treated like a casual. But not in the sense of the contract, just as in someone you can just kind of push, like she's here – do this, do that. I think that if it was someone that was working on a normal contract, I just feel like they'd probably treat you a bit better because they're paying you to be there, and they're paying you more. (Isla)

In relation to being lower status, participants also experienced differential treatment than their co-workers who were in standard employment. Ruby raised that in her experiences of non-standard employment, full-time permanent co-workers were seen as more stable and dependable, as a result of being at work consistently and for more hours. This meant that full-time employees had more positive relationships with managers. William stressed the injustice of the difference in treatment:

> If the job is awful or if the conditions are awful…I'm not too fussed, it's just when it's so obvious that there's different standards for different people that it really bothers me. I mean, the rosters can get pretty bad but I can live with it, I can live with most of the stuff. It's just when it's so overt that we don't really matter, that's the real issue, at least for me and most of my team. (William)

Participants also described witnessing and experiencing negative bias by co-workers and managers towards themselves and other workers in non-standard employment. Greg highlighted that this bias was subtle:

> So the other day there was like four of us permanent staff there and one casual and we were like someone is going to have to do three desk shifts, that's just the way it's going to work out and the rest of us, we'd figured it out, we were all gonna balance it. I forget how they did it but

> everyone just went instantly, oh yeah, [co-worker name], the casual guy, they were like so he'll just do the three. I was like why does... technically we all have stuff we need to do so we would expect him to do the generic thing, but none of us were actually doing any work. (Greg)

As noted in the sub-theme of mistreatment, participants also frequently experienced incorrect wage payments. In relation to being lower status and experiencing differential treatment, William contrasted his difficulties having incorrect wage payments fixed with the experience of employees higher up in their organisation – who would have any pay issues fixed immediately:

> There's all sorts of problems, especially it's pretty obvious that you're the lowest on the ladder, and most of the time if anything comes up, you're going to get kicked around, you don't even need to ask. If there's problems with money, they're going to be on hourly, we don't have any say in that. (William)

Some participants experienced being undervalued, feeling that they were not paid the full value of what their work was worth. For these participants, pay was typically around minimum wage – and pay increases were based on legal minimum wage increases, rather than in acknowledgment of their skills development or performance. For example, Emily explained:

> Minimum. Minimum at first for about a year, and then they gave a great $1 increase and 2 months later the minimum wage went up to about 30 cents less than my pay. And it kind of just kept up with that. I was either, we would technically be above minimum, but like less than 50 cents over the minimum by the time the wage increased. So yeah that was not good. (Emily)

Participants also experienced their work being devalued as they took on the tasks or even role of manager or supervisor, with no pay increase – while working for minimum wage. Participants shared experiences of their managers and employers not investing in their training or development. Ruby suggested that this lack of training was because she was viewed as being a short-term employee. James highlighted that they were

easily replaceable and disposable because they received less training – and therefore were treated as though they were worth less. William highlighted the undervaluation of non-standard employment by arguing that workers in non-standard employment should be paid additional allowances or wages based on the inconsistencies they deal with:

> Obviously you're a lot more skilled if you're a consultant – we don't do a whole lot that most people can't do. But it's something that's just accepted where you're going to get a stupid rate because you've got to deal with the screw arounds and non-standard hours and non-standard whatever. But for us, it's infallible for a lot of people that when we get a different rate based on all the oddities that we have to deal with. (William)

Some participants described the work that they did in non-standard employment as meaningless to others. They explained that the outcomes of their work were not long-lasting, that they were not required to think at work, and were even discouraged from thinking. Greg explained how his suggestions for improvements were ignored:

> I feel like, not necessarily with it being a casual position, but just there's not much satisfaction I feel like. I never really feel like I'm doing anything that means anything and when I try to I feel like other staff don't take me seriously. It could just be being in such a low position rather than... like a casual position, but when I've brought up like legitimate criticisms with senior staff they never really take notice. (Greg)

Linking to this, some participants shared their own negative perceptions about non-standard employment. Non-standard employment was viewed as young people's employment – and not employment that 'real adults' would be in. They believed that people past their early to mid-20s were generally in standard employment and had prototypical adult lives – a house, car, and children. James pointed out that even where standard work hours were available, these were given to the 'adult' employees in their workplaces. On the other hand, participants referred to standard employment as 'real' jobs with 'real' careers attached. William described his own progression within the same job, from casual employment with weekend work to permanent part-time with regular hours and weekends off, as a progression from being less professional to more

professional. Isla shared her experience of hiding her non-standard status from others, as she felt embarrassed by it:

> I don’t even like telling people I’m a casual worker. I swear to God I’ve told everyone that I’m an Acting Warehouse Manager at this point, because there’s no point in saying I’m a casual friggin warehouse worker that happens to be doing the job... You know what I mean? It’s just embarrassing, if anything, to even say. And that’s no shame to people that need a casual job and all that sort of thing. But I just think it’s not ever... People just look at you weird, I’ve found. It’s not even nice to say that... Casual for some reason sounds like not as good of a job as a normal job. It makes you feel like s***. (Isla)

Participants experiences of workers in non-standard employment being lower status and negatively perceived were visible in their metaphors. In particular, the meth house and state house metaphors evoked negative stereotypes about their ‘inhabitants’ – the participants – as being unreliable, of a lower socioeconomic status, and dependent on others. The state and meth houses also implied being uncared for and neglected, thus providing a link between negative perceptions about the participants, and their mistreatment. Emily brought up the concept of her managers not caring about her employment (the DIY project house), and herself as an individual (the people in the house): “they don’t care about the people who live there, that much”. Lily’s description of how she was in a dark place, ‘unseen’ by the world, also highlighted not being cared about. This highlighted her perception that she was viewed as less important and was less ‘seen’ or invisible because of her employment.

5.3.2 Theme Two: Lack of Autonomy and Control

The second main finding was that participants experienced a lack of control and autonomy in non-standard employment. This theme illuminates how participants had minimal perceived power to influence their employers’ behaviours or decisions, when it came to their own work and employment. This lack of control resulted in employment conditions that were less than optimal for participants. Participants also did not have full self-determination over being in non-standard employment – there were limitations

in their freedom to make choices about their employment. The theme of lack of autonomy and control was strongly represented across participants' house metaphors.

The sub-themes under lack of autonomy and control relate to three aspects of participants experiences of autonomy and control – being resigned to being in non-standard employment, experiencing an imbalance of control over flexibility, and taking back control. The first sub-theme, resigned to being in non-standard employment, shows how participants came to be in non-standard employment, what kept them there, and how they view being in it. The second sub-theme, imbalance of control over flexibility, addresses how participants' control over their flexible working hours was diminished. The third sub-theme describes how some participants were able to regain some autonomy or control through self-development and by questioning aspects of their employment.

5.3.2.1 Resigned to Being in Non-Standard Employment

Participants were resigned to being in their jobs, and to the challenging aspects of working in non-standard employment. Participants' acceptance was primarily due to the necessity of their non-standard employment. Their employment was necessary for a variety of reasons: income while they engaged in tertiary study or pursued careers in the arts, work hours that fit around their studies or career pursuits, relevant work experience that would be needed to compete for employment once they graduated tertiary study, or to transition into (or back into) the workforce after experiencing health issues. Participants also pointed out that non-standard jobs were the easiest jobs to get with minimal work experience, and that those jobs were primarily where they saw other young people working so that was what they applied for. Generally, participants felt non-standard employment was necessary in order to reach for better prospects – and they did not want to be permanently trapped in non-standard employment. Kurt explained: "But as I said, I'm just trudging through it. Just saving. Using it to pay my bills so I can go to better prospects, hopefully. So, just grit your teeth and get through it at the moment".

However, some participants felt obligated to stay in their employment for other reasons: not wanting to abandon their work friends who were in the same situations as them, being pressured by their employer to stay, and feeling that they were needed at work

due to high workloads, and for one participant even fear of standard employment – perceived as a relentless routine.

For those participants who were nurses, their early non-standard jobs provided necessary work experience for their career development:

> Yeah we so we were kinda told that if you had experience then you're more likely to get a job when you first apply for your nursing job. Because obviously someone with experience who's good with manual handling, good with like those kind of patients, cause they were similar to the ones in the hospital. Yeah you're more likely to get the job, so definitely did that just for experience as well as yeah. (Charlotte)

Therefore, despite several participants expressing unhappiness with their non-standard employment and with life in non-standard employment, they were reluctantly accepting of these conditions. Many of them had worked in several non-standard jobs consecutively, or for long periods of time. They became used to working at non-standard times, on non-standard rosters, at short notice, and not being able to get enough hours at work.

Some participants also experienced being trapped in the type of non-standard employment they were in, with no control over their contract type. Despite wanting to, they did not have the option of shifting within their job from part-time to full-time, from casual to permanent part-time, or from fixed-term to permanent. Ava, who was working in her chosen career as a nurse, described being on a fixed-term contract and not wanting to leave her workplace: "So I was like – S***, I don't have a job for next year, or I can do this for a year but I know I want to stay here but I don't know how to stay here 'cos there's not going to be any room for me". Isla explained feeling trapped – that she would feel guilty if she resigned, but that she also wasn't being offered a better contract:

> But now I feel stuck… not stuck, but I feel bad leaving until they get someone else, but I don't think they're going to get someone else like a manager. And they won't hire me either and they won't give me part-time, even though I've been there for ages. (Isla)

Some argued that it would have been viable to change contract; that there was enough work for their hours to increase, and their positions were necessary to their

organisations. Some of those participants who had been in fixed-term employment did not know the reason for their employment being fixed-term and could not come up with one. This may have been a contravention of New Zealand legislation, which states that employers must provide a genuine reason based on reasonable grounds for fixed term employment, and that this reason must be communicated to the employee (Employment Relations Act 2000).

Those participants who were in their chosen careers in the healthcare industry did not always share the same experiences of being trapped in non-standard employment – in their case generally being shift work. This may be because shift work in the healthcare industry is normalised – there are fewer conceivable options to avoid it while building a career in healthcare. These participants prioritised their career over more standard working hours:

> It would've been more of a consideration if I had kids and I had commitment and I had family then I, cause I know a lot of my colleagues who were, had families and kids and really needed that sort of stable hours, then I probably would've considered community. But the fact that I don't have kids, I don't really have commitments, and I feel like hospital you can get more experience and you're more likely to go further in your career than you would be in the community. So that's why it wasn't too much of a consideration. (Charlotte)

Participants' metaphors pertinently showed the lack of autonomy and control overarching participants' experiences of being in non-standard employment. Participants' 'houses' were universally not owned by them, signifying their lack of autonomy over their employment. The lack of control felt by William was evident in his choice of slum/tenement housing – a situation that would generally not be chosen. He described that he needed to "claw" his way out, emphasising that he was trapped in his employment. Charlotte and Lily contrasted the appearance of 'perfection' and niceness of their middle-income houses with a sinister interior (the twisted stairs, the huge dark basement). This showed a sense of having been deceived into entering, followed by a lack of control over the lived experience of their employment. Mia's lack of autonomy was more subtle and shown by her emphasis that her employment was temporary –

exaggerating that she was only there because she needed to be in the short term and was making a trade-off for her future.

5.3.2.2 Imbalance of Control over Flexibility

Participants experienced a loss of autonomy and control over their time. Participants were unable to take advantage of being in 'flexible' employment to arrange work around their own commitments, wellbeing, or social lives. This was referred to as "technically" having flexibility (Isla) or having "flexibility in theory" (Greg). Partly, their autonomy was removed by their financial insecurity – this was because they were on low wages and working unstable or insufficient hours, and therefore could not afford to turn down work.

For many participants, their employers and managers had more control over the flexibility of their hours. Participants were at the mercy of their employer or managers to accommodate and prioritise their commitments. Some had workplaces that accommodated their studies or other plans and would roster around those or find other employees to cover their shifts. Others worked in organisations where you needed to be friendly with those people organising the rosters, to be able to get more hours. James had one employer that ignored the availability that he put forward – rostering over times he said he would not be available.

This lack of control over their flexibility was also due to an imbalance of power between participants and their managers or employers. Isla, who was in casual employment, pointed out that she was expected to be at work when there was work, and not when there was not – she did not have a say in this arrangement. She explained how her initial expectations compared with reality: "I used to think – Oh yeah, casual, that sounds good. Lucky you, you don't have to go to work. That's kind of what I thought this would be about, what I pictured it to be" (Isla).

Kurt worked in an industry that operated 24 hours, and pointed out that any of his time was fair game:

> So, you mark out when you cannot work, and then they go through and they try to find jobs that'll line up with your schedule. That's essentially what they do. And if you've got a lot of time free, then

> yeah you will get 19-hour days, that sort of thing. It's just what happens. It's partly your fault for leaving that time available. (Kurt)

Further, pressures such as understaffing and other staff frequently being sick, along with high workloads and busy seasons, meant that participants felt they had no option but to work when requested by their employer or manager. Lead times also reduced participant control over their work times. Rosters were frequently received a week before, and in one case a day before, the roster started. Participants felt obligated to accept these requests – Oliver explains that he 'had' to cover for his co-workers:

> It was, they were under-staffed and it was really difficult to maintain a work life balance, because y'know, your roster changed week to week, and you couldn't really plan stuff a week ahead. And quite often people were sick so you'd have to be in there covering 'cause there was no one else. (Oliver)

Some participants also described being pressured to accept. For example, they described being pressured by their managers or employers – while they were at work already – to stay past the end of their shift, or to work double shifts. Some participants had worked 10 to 15 hour shifts without prior notice, as a result. The opposite also occurred – Isla described often having to leave work an hour after arriving, as she could not be seen doing nothing, and there was no work to do on those days.

The participants who were nurses working in hospitals had more control over their hours. While they still did not have much say in their rostering, they did feel comfortable saying no to working additional shifts when their workplace was understaffed. Ava explained that she generally said no to extra shifts to protect her time and wellbeing: "Very rarely. I feel if they need staff it's just going to be too busy… or like, I don't have a decent amount of days off so I don't want to come in and be exhausted for five days in a row". This may have been due to the more structured environment of shift work in the hospital – rosters were released further in advance, and participants were contracted to work a certain number of shifts. For example, Ava was contracted for 0.9 FTE (full-time equivalent), equating to three shifts per week, each 12 hours long.

Participants' metaphors emphasised their lack of control over their conditions, such as working hours, by describing how their 'landlords' neglected or failed to properly

maintain their homes. Emily's metaphor of the DIY house where the owner decided to do things the "easy" way emphasised the control that her manager, as the homeowner, had over her employment. Emily also highlighted that things could be better – that there was potential for a good quality house – but she had no say in making improvements "like if someone wanted to fix the house, they'd be like no". James' description of his house as "falling apart" signified helplessness, and his sense of lack of control over his work conditions. Ava and Kurt's meth house metaphors depicted the experience of an addict – out of control and with no autonomy over their experience. Their metaphors demonstrate the power that their employers had over their employment conditions. Their conditions of their work and employment – like the house – were out of their control: "it's not like we have a landlord that you can make come" (Isla). Ava vividly described being overwhelmed by her lack of control: "just everything's going off. You don't know what's going to happen". Kurt's metaphor of meth addicts was equally illuminating of a strong sense of dependence on his employer; meth addicts represent people who do not have control and are dependent, and even desperate.

5.3.2.3 Taking Back Control

Some participants brought up experiences of taking back control – and had a sense of pride in themselves – while sticking it out in non-standard employment. Some participants learned to manage challenges through patience, while others learnt to fight for themselves and others when challenges arose. A few, for example, noted that they had armed themselves with the knowledge to protect themselves and their co-workers – learning about employment law for the first time as they suspected unethical and illegal behaviour by their employers. William's life course was changed – as a result of his experiences he returned to university to study human resource management. Isla experienced leadership for the first time, as she was assigned managerial tasks – and an employee to supervise – after her manager left. She did not receive support or training for this and was proud to have learned to lead herself and her employee.

James described a small moment of rebellion after resigning from his job:

> He called me out of the blue on a Tuesday and told me that Sunday would be my last shift because he couldn't have my negative energy going around. I went into work and I worked with a smile on my face for the first time in like six or seven months that I'd been there. On the Sunday

> at the end when we were leaving, I waved at the camera to say goodbye. (James)

Participants also questioned norms around non-standard employment. Isla pointed out that she did not need to be on a non-standard contract, and that it meant that while doing the same work as workers in standard employment, she missed out on the benefits of standard employment. Greg questioned that he and his co-workers had their rosters changed regularly, when they had stable availabilities and made those clear to their employer.

Lily suggested that workers in non-standard employment are neglected in how the business or social world is organised, which is arranged around 9-5 standard employment:

> It’s not nice that everything is revolved around this 9 to 5 because it’s not anyone’s fault if they’re working shift work. It’s just that this country or this world hasn’t developed yet to suit these kinds of things. Maybe it will, but for now, I feel like it’s still relatively a new thing or they expect adjusted adults to do 9 to 5 because most 9 to 5 jobs are the typical job that you would expect an adult to work. (Lily)

William, a union delegate in his workplace, was openly fighting norms with his union around the low payment of workers in non-standard employment:

> There was an uproar when we suggested that we get extra money for not having a fixed workplace and not having fixed hours, and not getting fixed days off, which if you’re higher up obviously you get extra money ‘cos you deal with more problems, but because we’re on the bottom, and we’re on the very bottom, then nobody wants to give us any money for anything. (William)

Participants’ metaphors imply that rather than normalising the conditions of non-standard employment, they recognised the abnormality of their experiences. Mia’s metaphor indicates a recouping of autonomy in some senses, in having decided not to invest or commit: “you don’t renovate it, you don’t buy expensive furniture”. William trying to “claw” his way out illustrates the personal struggle he experiences as he tries

to change his situation. He explains that “it’s not pleasant”. Lily’s basement was cosy, but also dark – implying cognitive dissonance in her acceptance of her work conditions.

5.3.3 Theme Three: Negative Personal Life Impacts of Poor Work Conditions.

The third main finding in this research was that non-standard work conditions had several negative impacts on participants’ personal lives. Participants acknowledged how some characteristics or arrangements of their employment, while accepted as being implicit in non-standard employment, affected them outside of work. Their work conditions flowed into participants’ personal time, health, happiness, relationships, and decision-making. Participants’ descriptions of their metaphorical houses signified the direct toll that their employment had on them personally.

The sub-themes delineate the sub-standard work conditions participants experienced, and the ways these conditions impacted negatively in different spheres of their personal lives. The first sub-theme highlights the nature of the hours that participants worked and the effects on participants lives, such as difficulty maintaining relationships. The second sub-theme outlines the implications of low wages and unstable incomes in participants’ lives in both the short and longer term.

5.3.3.1 Impacts of Unsocial, Unstable, and Long Working Hours

Schedule instability meant that participants’ lives revolved around work – including their mental and physical health, energy levels, and relationships with friends and family. Kurt explained that life is planned week to week, around ever-changing work schedules. He described the effect on his life:

> The hours are erratic at the best of times. It’s been… I’ve worked there for three and a half years. And when I first started it was really quite difficult, almost. Just because it’s like you’d have, for example a seven-hour job on a Monday, and then there would be two days with nothing. And then another four-hour job on Thursday or something. And it was very difficult to find any way you can sort of build your life around this kind of erratic. ‘Cos you have a responsibility to be at the job in order to get it done, and then you try to manage your life around that. (Kurt)

Isla highlighted how this instability affected her mental health:

> But personally, I think there's unstable in terms of shift work, and then there's just really you don't know what you're getting into until you go that day. And it screws with your head in the sense that… it's just not good for the soul. You really don't know what you're getting into. (Isla)

Not having regular hours or shifts meant participants were unable to adjust to any routine, and therefore caused participants to be consistently tired. Participants constantly had to manage their schedule around changing work hours – this presented a challenge that working more regular hours would not have carried. Time off was often spent recuperating from, or preparing for, working irregular schedules. Participants were also tired as a result of insufficient sleep, due to overscheduling and working nights. Lily shared her experience of relying on strong sleeping pills to cope.

Participants were unable to take care of their physical health as a result of their irregular schedules. Experiences included being unable to commit to organised sports, being unable to get into a regularly timed routine at the gym, or being too tired due to go to the gym due to the instability of their hours.

Participants worked unsocial hours that clashed with their family and friends free time. This was worsened by unstable and short-notice rostering; many participants could not plan social events more than a week in advance. They missed out on weekend and evening social events and were unable to join spontaneous events. For some participants, their partners or friends were also in non-standard employment, making it even more difficult to match up time. This put a strain on their relationships with friends, flatmates, family, and partners – affecting their social support networks. Some participants had not seen their friends for months at a time.

Participants found working night and weekends encroached more on their own time – extending beyond the actual hours worked. Greg described feeling pressured to be productive on days off because they were during the working week, as opposed to weekends when people are expected by social norms to relax. Participants who worked in the evenings or at night described sleeping on their days off and feeling they had wasted productive time. They also took longer to wake up and go to sleep, and spent more time trying to sleep both before work to prepare for work, and also after work.

Some participants worked extensive hours – either regularly or occasionally. Ava worked in a hospital ward where 12-hour shifts were standard. For Kurt it was normal to work several 19-hour days consecutively during his organisation's industry peak season. For other participants it was when co-workers called in sick that their hours would be extended at short notice – so that they sometimes worked double shifts. Working hours were also intensive. Lily shared experiences of working night shift, then day shift the next day, then another shift that night, and another early morning shift the same week – due to understaffing at her workplace.

Other participants emphasised that they had minimal breaks, or sometimes no breaks, during their shifts. Shifts described by some participants ranged from 7 hours with no breaks, to 18 or 19 hours with very minimal breaks. They linked this to both the immediate nature of working in service industries, and to understaffing in their workplaces.

Participants did however point out some positive aspects of working non-standard hours. Ava shared that she was under less pressure at work, as she had a longer time (12 hours) in which to complete her tasks. For some participants, there were also sometimes benefits in their time off work. For example, those participants who were working in hospitals sometimes got more time off than workers in standard employment would, e.g. three days off in a week. A few participants pointed out that having time off during weekdays meant that it was easier to be productive and run errands, with fewer people and less traffic. Isla described enjoying being able to go to the beach during daylight hours. Kurt also pointed out the benefit of having more earning potential with work available 24/7, so that he could earn income even if he had other commitments during the daytime.

Several participants referenced the personal effects of their working hours in their metaphors. As Kurt described, "you get drained, and dragged, and beaten". Emily and James' experiences conveyed suffering as a result of the conditions in their old DIY houses. Emily shared "I feel the struggle", and James described the house as "not pleasant to be in". The meth house metaphor was imbued with a sense of not being able, or present enough to take care of oneself, highlighting the effects of non-standard working hours on participants' wellbeing and personal time. Ava's vivid description of the extreme variability and unpredictability in the meth house, "you don't know what's

going to happen, no sleep at nights", demonstrated her strong discomfort with her work conditions. She explained some of the costs to her personal life "like during the day you're just out of it". For the middle-class suburban house participants, the impacts of their employment conditions in their personal lives were more subtle. For Charlotte there were twisted stairs that she had to move between – which conveyed constant movement and unrest.

5.3.3.2 Impacts of Low Wages and Unstable Incomes

Most participants worked for low wages around the adult minimum wage – though a few had worked in organisations that paid much higher wages, between $20 and $28 per hour. Those in casual employment appreciated receiving an additional eight percent holiday pay in lieu of paid holidays, but as their income was low and days off would be unpaid, this meant they were unable to take days off. For some participants, Christmas was a particularly difficult time financially – as they would lose out on wages during that time because they did not have paid holidays.

Oliver highlighted the differences between earning a standard income, as opposed to income from non-standard employment: "You get paid more obviously which is nice and it's easier to buy nice things and actually eat properly and live properly, which is cool" (Oliver). Earnings were particularly low for those participants who were university students and could not work as many days or hours as they needed. A few of these participants had lost their independence, as they lived with their families to avoid taking on student loan debt and would not be able to earn enough money to pay for rent on their own. Emily, for example, earned as little as $200 in a fortnight, and used this to pay for university expenses, while living with her family. Mia used her earnings to pay board to her family. Mia was studying part-time in order to focus on her education while working part-time and noted that this meant she lost out on normal student benefits, such as cheaper public transport travel, and access to a student living costs loan.

A few participants worked in organisations where the number and length of their shifts were regular, e.g. hotels, hospitals – and therefore they earned a more stable income. For other participants, however, unstable and uncertain income exacerbated the effects of low earnings, causing stress for participants. Participants received rosters at short notice or might be sent home from work at short notice, and therefore would receive less income than expected and planned for. Sometimes participants' income for a shift

barely covered their immediate travel expenses. Kurt was appreciative that his organisation had a three-hour minimum payment, so that even short assignments provided enough income to cover travel expenses. Some participants were uncertain what their pay would be from one week to the next, and therefore struggled to plan for expenses:

> If I lost any of those hours I wouldn't have been able to pay rent – or I would have been able to pay rent, but I wouldn't be able to spend any money outside of rent. So there's that uncertainty too. (Greg)

Another factor causing income uncertainty was paying additional taxes for pay-checks that fell into higher tax brackets – despite annual earnings not falling into that higher tax bracket. Incorrect wages paid by managers or employers also heightened income uncertainty.

Participants struggled to get by on low wages and earnings. Many participants regularly signed up for every extra available shift – in order to earn enough income to get by week-to-week. Large purchases were an issue, for example William had to take on a large debt to pay for dental expenses. Some participants' long-term life plans were on hold as well, as a result of their low earnings. This was particularly acute for participants approaching their mid-20s. These participants did not yet have 'normal' adult lives – not having a house, or family, or car. Isla, for example, was ready to start having children, and to start working towards a career, but could not afford tertiary study or afford to support a family. For Kurt, however, his work enabled him to continue his music career while saving up money to pursue his career overseas.

It is interesting to note that the participants whose metaphors were middle-class suburban houses typically earned more income and had more regular and consistent hours. For example, Ruby's metaphors were more positive, and did not indicate any negative personal impacts. This may explain why they saw their employment as more 'typical'. Mia did point out the 'expensive' nature of non-standard employment, as her income was too small to build towards her future. Overall, both Mia and Ruby provided minimal detail about the personal impacts of their experiences, choosing to focus instead on the experience as temporary and distancing themselves from their lived experiences. In other participants metaphors, a theme of being poor, or part of a lower

socio-economic demographic, was consistently present – for example the metaphors of state house, the slum, meth house, and DIY do-up.

5.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented participants' metaphors and findings of thematic analysis of the interview data, including three overarching themes, with eight subthemes. The houses and participants' vivid descriptions of them enhanced interpretation of participants' experiences, aiding the identification and development of the themes.

The first theme in participants' experiences was having sub-standard relationships with employers and managers, evident in experiences of mistreatment, distrust, and perceptions of being lower status. Participants' experiences of mistreatment included aggression, abuse, and illegal practices, with their employers misusing their power over participants and their employment. Related to this, participants did not trust their employers, and perceived that their employers did not trust them. Participants also perceived being lower status, evident in their differential treatment and negative biases towards them.

The second theme, lack of autonomy and control, revealed participants' experiences of not having autonomy and control over their employment. Participants were in non-standard employment out of necessity, and had become resigned to being in non-standard employment, and to their employment conditions. Their managers and employers had more control over the flexibility of their employment than they did – and so their experiences of flexibility were one-sided. However, some participants shared experiences of reclaiming some autonomy and control in their employment.

The third theme, feeling the impacts of poor work conditions in personal life, demonstrated the effect of participants' employment on their personal lives. Participants work encroached on their time – and they felt the effects of these hours even when they were not at work. The instability of their schedules affected participants' work-life balance as they had to plan their lives week to week around their work – affecting their health and wellbeing, and relationships with family and friends. They also struggled to get by on low and unstable incomes, which affected their day-to-day life, larger purchases, and long-term life plans.

The next chapter, Chapter Six, will discuss the meaning, significance, and contribution of the main findings of this research, in the context of the existing academic literature.

Chapter 6: Discussion

6.1 Introduction

The discussion in this chapter follows Thorne's (2016) approach to discussing research findings, which is aligned with the interpretive descriptive research methodology used in this study. Consistent with that approach, the discussion reflects on, in relation to the literature, how the findings deepen and expand understanding of experiences of non-standard employment (Thorne, 2016). This method aims to offer deeper information than a discussion focused on identifying similarities and differences between findings and literature (Thorne, 2016). Accordant with Thorne's (2016) approach, the New Zealand context is also incorporated in the discussion. This is done in order to develop understanding of the role of the context in participants' experiences, as well as the implications of their experiences for the context.

The discussion aims to position the findings in the broader landscape of the literature, following Thorne's (2016) recommendation to "… consider the weight of the body of literature as it would have oriented you toward various emphases …" (p. 185). The chapter is structured as follows, according to key areas of the literature: 1) relationships in non-standard employment, including social status, mistreatment, and trust; and 2) entry into non-standard employment, employer-led flexibility, and the normalisation of non-standard employment.

6.2 Relationships in Non-Standard Employment

Participants were heavily concerned with relational elements of their non-standard employment, emphasising deficits in their relationships with employers and managers, including being viewed as lower status workers, mistreatment, and reciprocated lack of trust. The next section integrates these findings with three key areas of literature on relationships in non-standard employment: social status (6.2.1), mistreatment (6.2.2.), and trust (6.2.3). Research on young workers' changing conceptions of adulthood are also drawn into the discussion of social status, with links made between perceived social status and how young workers' view their adulthood and non-standard employment.

6.2.1 Social Status

Many of the participants perceived that they had lower status at work than those in standard employment. This is similar to research that has found that non-standard employment can drive social stratification in the workplace (Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; McGann et al., 2016; Williamson et al., 2015). Research has found that there are hierarchies in workplaces employing both temporary and permanent employees, with temporary employees forming a lower class (Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; Williamson et al., 2015). Participants' experiences of workers in non-standard employment being viewed as lower status workers included, for example, avoiding telling others they were a casual employee, and managers being quicker and more willing to resolve payroll problems for other employees. One participant described a young manager's angry reaction when the participant inadvertently asked whether the manager was a casual.

Consistent with being lower status employees, participants shared experiences of differential treatment compared with co-workers who were in standard employment (McGann et al., 2016). Examples included being assigned supervisors' tasks without receiving wage increases, development meetings not being used for planning their development, casual workers being given tasks that permanent workers preferred not to do, and wage growth based on minimum wage increases rather than experience or skill development. These findings confirm earlier research findings of discriminatory practices against young employees in the hospitality industry in New Zealand, including low wages that do not consider skills or experience, receiving less training, being given more routine work, and negative attitudes towards them (Mooney, 2016). Receiving fewer training and promotion opportunities is a key practice recognised as lowering the status of workers in non-standard employment (McGann et al., 2016; Moore et al., 2018). One participant in this study explained that supervisory training was seen as a significant investment and so supervisors were less disposable, therefore received better treatment from the company owner; reinforcing their higher perceived value and therefore better treatment. In contrast, some participants believed that their employers did not see their training as being worth spending resources on because they were not permanent. It has also been argued that stereotypes about young workers as being unreliable and uncommitted can affect how young workers are viewed, and therefore prevent them from receiving promotions (Goosey, 2019).

McGann et al. (2016) highlight that such experiences of being lower status can also lower the self-esteem of workers in non-standard employment. This may explain why some participants self-labelled their employment as not being “real” or “adult”, themselves conferring a lower status on their work. It is also possible that young people are cognisant of the lower workplace status of workers in non-standard employment, *because* they view non-standard employment as an indication of delayed ‘adulthood’. Participants’ perceptions of their jobs as not ‘real’ or ‘adult’ convey their non-standard employment as preventing their social (and therefore social status) progression into traditional adulthood attached to a life-long career (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016). In contrast to this ‘delayed adulthood’, it has been argued that there is now a ‘new adulthood’ in which young people plan employment options around preferred lifestyles, rather than preparing for and entering lifelong careers (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016). However, with participants viewing their employment as not ‘real’ or ‘adult’, the expectation of a lifelong career, while potentially no longer realistic or even preferred, appears to have continuing influence.

Few participants were working in their chosen career path, but those who were not tended to view their non-standard employment as a bi-product of another primary pursuit (such as tertiary study), as opposed to being part of a constructed lifestyle (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016). This implies that, at least for young workers in New Zealand, their presence in non-standard employment is more likely to be influenced by barriers to their transition into the labour force (Dhakal et al., 2018; Imdorf et al., 2017) rather than as part of building a lifestyle. Indeed, participants’ constant mobility, with many having been in several consecutive non-standard roles, likely heightened their awareness of their work as a delayed adulthood – being antithetical to the immobility of a traditional adult career trajectory.

6.2.2 Mistreatment

In addition to the experiences of differential treatment described in the previous section (such as being assigned supervisory tasks without recognition), participants experienced several other forms of more serious mistreatment. These included illegal practices, verbal abuse and verbal aggression. For example, participants experienced wage underpayment and constructive dismissal, being screamed at, and being told that they would not be able to find a better job if they resigned. These experiences are not unlike

more serious experiences found by Mooney (2016), which included bullying and a lack of respect for young hospitality workers. As with participants' experiences of differential treatment, these experiences of mistreatment may be linked to discriminatory views about young workers in New Zealand (Mooney, 2016). For example, discourses in New Zealand often demonise young workers, labelling them as lazy and entitled (Fenton, 2013; Scott, 2019). In contrast, young workers' experiences of mistreatment in non-standard employment are conspicuously absent from public discourse in New Zealand – one participant remarked that it was nice to have someone asking young workers about their experiences in non-standard employment, suggesting this was a rare occurrence. The findings of mistreatment were therefore relatively unexpected, and comparable experiences have not been highlighted in international literature.

There are several plausible explanations for why these practices have remained relatively hidden in New Zealand. First, Mooney (2016) explains that in the case of young hospitality workers in New Zealand, the frequently short-term or casual nature of their employment may hide discriminatory practices. Second, there could be a lack of practical avenues for young workers who are in non-standard employment to raise their concerns; low union membership rates in New Zealand amongst young workers and workers in non-standard employment (Statistics New Zealand, 2016, 2019d) would support this argument. Third, non-standard employment is often viewed as formative for young workers (Blackham, 2019), a view supported to some extent by some participants in this study. Those participants had learned to cope with their unequal treatment, for example by learning to be more patient or by taking pride in their ability to develop without organisational support. However, the findings do not support that this was the experience for all participants. Some participants shared experiences of actively seeking to learn about their employment rights so that they could take legal action or threaten to take action to protect themselves and their co-workers from mistreatment.

This means that for some participants in this study, self-education on their employment rights allowed them to reclaim some control, as they were able to distinguish illegal practices and had justification to support challenging them. Minimal research has been carried out to investigate young people's knowledge of local employment laws, though research on young Australian workers has found that they have limited knowledge about

their employment rights (McDonald et al., 2013). In New Zealand, as discussed in the context chapter, employment rights courses are generally not offered in secondary schools (Psychometrics, Reporting and Statistics, 2019). However, participants generally did not have clarity on their employment rights prior to entering non-standard employment and were not informed of their employment rights by their employers. Many participants demonstrated confusion about their employment rights and employment agreements – for example, participants who did not know the reasons for their employment being fixed term (which should have been recorded in their written employment agreement). Other examples included a casual employee who did not know her leave entitlements, and a participant who – unknowingly –appeared to have been constructively dismissed. These findings illustrate that differences in employment knowledge can create a difference in control and outcomes for young workers in non-standard employment, highlighting a need to expand delivery of youth employment rights education in New Zealand. As McDonald et al. (2013) explain, without knowledge of their employment rights, young people cannot enact them.

6.2.3 Trust

Participants' trust in their employers and managers was eroded by experiences of mistreatment and differential treatment. Experiences that negatively affected participants' trust included having to argue with managers to actuate verbal agreements; repeatedly being paid incorrect wages; and having shifts reduced when suspected of being depressed. While Svensson (2011) highlights that workers in non-standard employment have lower levels of trust in other people generally, there is little or no empirical research which has examined trust *within* non-standard employment relationships. Svensson (2011) explains that "trust is about confidence in an uncertain interaction with someone or something else" (p. 127) – this means that trust is needed in situations where individuals are uncertain about what might happen. In other words, participants' lack of trust in their employers and managers can be related to their uncertainty over whether their employers would enact verbal agreements, pay wages correctly, and provide shifts.

Some participants also perceived that they were distrusted by their managers and employers, based on experiences such as being watched on surveillance cameras, being denied building access, and not being allowed to work unsupervised. In terms of

explaining why participants may not have been trusted by their employers, it has been argued that high turnover and easy dismissal negatively affect trust in workers who are in non-standard employment (Fleming, 2017). Workers in non-standard employment are not trusted because they are viewed as less loyal, committed and trusting, and therefore less happy (Fleming, 2017).

Building on this argument, one participant in this study explained, from their managers' perspective, that their permanent co-workers were more dependable and stable. This was, in reality, a result of having more consistent work schedules, in other words a result of their standard employment. As a consequence of workers in non-standard employment not being trusted, non-standard employment creates prerogative for managerial control and policing, and surveillance (Fleming, 2017). The relationship between suspected lack of commitment and managerial policing was blatant in the case of one participant who was punished by having their shifts reduced, because they were suspected of intending to resign.

In addition to developing knowledge about mutual trust in non-standard employment between workers and their employers, an area of research lacking in employment relations research generally (Brandl, 2020), the findings about trust add to debate in the psychological contract literature. The lack of trust experienced by participants was of greater importance to them than issues such as low wage rates. Trust is a socio-emotional concern linked to relational employment relationships (Bernhard-Oette et al., 2017). Therefore, the findings differ from the dominant view in psychological contract research that workers in non-standard employment primarily expect transactional relationships, focused on short-term, economic exchanges (Bernhard-Oette et al., 2017; Schalk et al., 2010).

6.3 Control and Entry into Non-Standard Employment

This thesis found that participants experienced a lack of control and autonomy over their non-standard employment and conditions, but also that participants were able to take back some control. The following section (6.3.1) discusses how participants entered non-standard employment, integrating this with literature on why young workers enter non-standard employment, and young workers' perceptions of non-standard employment. Sections 6.3.2 and 6.3.3 relate participants experiences of having a lack of control over

their working hours to similar experiences found in the literature and discuss whether participants had normalised this lack of control.

6.3.1 Entry into Non-Standard Employment

The findings align with Statistics New Zealand (2019b) data indicating that the three main reasons temporary employees in New Zealand provided for being in temporary employment were that it was the only type of work available (either that the person could find or that their employer could offer), being in education, and the nature of the work. First, the participants who were in tertiary education entered non-standard employment for financial reasons. Students in New Zealand frequently enter non-standard employment because of financial necessity, as New Zealand has a user-pays tertiary education that provides insufficient living-cost support (Richardson et al., 2013). Second, a few participants were in non-standard employment as a result of the nature of their chosen industry; these participants were primarily in healthcare where shift work is well-established. Third, in relation to the reason that it was the only type of work that workers could get, two participants who had spent periods out of the workforce applied for non-standard employment to re-enter the labour market. Gaps in their resumés rendered them 'weaker' job candidates as they were viewed as having less experience. This fits with research showing that young workers use non-standard employment as a stepping-stone to gain experience, in order to more easily find permanent employment (Bosmans et al., 2016; Nunez & Livanos, 2015). Similarly to Bosmans et al.'s (2016) findings, participants viewed non-standard employment as their only option due to their lack of work experience.

Despite this, most of the participants did not raise the issue of non-standard employment being their only alternative to unemployment, similarly to findings by Smith (2018) in Japan. This contrasts with international research that identified that high youth unemployment drives non-standard employment in European countries (de Lange et al., 2014b; Peiró et al., 2012). It also contradicts arguments in the Context Chapter (Chapter Four) of this thesis, which highlighted high youth unemployment in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2019c) as a potential factor pressuring young people into non-standard employment. However, because the participants in this research were located in New Zealand's largest city, Auckland; with comparatively high job growth (Careers New Zealand, 2020) and more job opportunities available there may

have been less threat of long-term or structural unemployment. Further, some participants lived with their parents and therefore did not need to pay normal rent or other bills, reducing the financial consequences of unemployment. This aligns with a trend towards young adults living at home for longer due to increasing living costs and stagnating wage growth in New Zealand (Stephenson, 2019).

The findings lend support to views that while structural factors determine worker entry into non-standard employment, preferences and values may still influence workers' choices (Moore et al., 2018; Smith, 2018). Two participants provided distinct examples of how young workers' preferences can play a role in their entry into non-standard employment. For the first participant, part-time night shift work was preferable over the relentless routine of standard employment, discouraging her from applying for standard full-time positions. This is consistent with findings in Japan that some young graduates choose non-standard employment because it is preferable to salaried work that is viewed as demanding or unrewarding (Smith, 2018). The second example is a participant who chose to return to university to study human resource management because of his negative experiences in non-standard employment, so that he could join the profession and play a role in improving workplace practices. While the participant's part-time employment was driven by financial necessity because of structural factors, primarily New Zealand's user-pays tertiary education system, his decision to study was shaped by his personal values and in response to his work experiences.

While some participants' views appeared to be guided by traditional career-based adulthood (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016), most of those who were in temporary employment generally did not express a desire to be offered permanent employment by their employer, as stepping-stone arguments would suggest (Nunez & Livanos, 2015). There are two apparent explanations for this difference: firstly, participants' poor relationships with their managers and employers likely discouraged them from desiring permanent employment with their employers; Secondly, for many of the participants in this study, non-standard employment was rationalised as unavoidable or temporary, and subsequently a normalised outcome of the process of working towards or being in their careers (Mrozowicki, 2016). As noted in the findings, many participants were resigned to being in non-standard employment. For example, participants working shifts in healthcare had fewer complaints about shift-work, possibly as a result of such practices

being entrenched in the industry, and participants who were studying viewed their non-standard employment as temporary.

6.3.2 Employer-Led Flexibility

Participants' non-standard working times included working unsocial hours (at night, on weekends, or days longer than 10 hours) outside of standard business hours, and some had also worked long weekly hours (41 or more hours in a week) (Piasna, 2017). An additional type of non-standard working times not highlighted in the literature, present for some participants, was working combinations of different shifts within a week. For example, one participant (Lily) described consecutively working a night shift, a day shift the next day, and then another night shift. Participants generally did not have control over their schedules, consistent with research showing that managers and employers have greater control than workers over working times in non-standard employment (McGann et al., 2016; Moore et al., 2018). In large part, this was because *changes* in participants' working times were employer-led and unpredictable, being used by their employers to support organisational requirements (Moore et al., 2018; Piasna, 2017). For example, participants experienced working times which differed between rosters, being called in to cover shifts they were not rostered for or being asked to work an additional shift when already at work. Some participants labelled this situation as 'technical flexibility' – they did not experience the autonomy implied in the concept of non-standard employment as a means for flexibility and improved work-life balance for workers (Moore et al., 2018).

This thesis' findings further develop understanding of the mechanisms by which young workers lose control over the flexibility of their hours in non-standard employment. Firstly, some participants were aware that they were replaceable, and that their employment was necessary. As with previous findings in the literature, it is implied that refusing scheduling requests would probably have endangered their jobs (McGann et al., 2016). Secondly, participants acquiesced under conditions of short staffing, high workloads, and short-lead times on rosters, as they felt a personal responsibility to support their co-workers, managers, and the business generally. These findings expand on previous research with young workers in Australia, in which one participant shared that they accepted rosters, including at short notice, because they felt obliged to support their managers (Woodman, 2012). In line with this, some participants in this

study expressed a sense of responsibility to put work first, before other things in life – contradicting employer and manager perceptions about young workers being irresponsible and unreliable (Mooney, 2016). Thirdly, a few participants indicated that their employers held strong expectations that they would accept work schedules without complaint. One participant, for example, on nearing the end of a shift was called and told "you're staying, mate". This explains why some young workers in non-standard employment may feel obligated to accept rosters; while it may be in part due to a sense of personal responsibility, they could also experience pressure from employers' expectations.

6.3.3 Normalisation of Non-Standard Employment

As discussed earlier, some participants expressed views that their non-standard employment was not 'real' or 'adult' employment. Despite this, it appears that many participants normalised non-standard employment agreements (Mrozowicki, 2016), rather than being cynical and alienated as earlier research suggested might be a consequence of growth in non-standard employment (Loughlin & Barling, 2001). For example, most participants did not question their employers' motives for using non-standard employment and most did not raise job security as a concern. Despite indications that *being* in non-standard employment was normalised by participants, it does not appear that *non-standard working times*, or their *employers' control* over their working time, were normalised by participants. Some participants, for example, demonstrated experiences of taking back control, or recouping their autonomy. This contrasts with some suggestions that young people normalise flexible working hours (Moore et al., 2018) but finds some support in arguments that there is both normalisation *and* disenchantment amongst young workers (Mrozowicki, 2016). Mrozowicki (2016) notes that while flexible employment may be normalised, young workers still feel the effects of the problems it creates, such as reduced control over working time. For example, while participants working shifts in healthcare had fewer complaints about shift-work, their metaphors revealed disquiet with their working times. One participant, who was a nurse, described their metaphorical house as a typical middle-class suburban home with a distinctly a-typical massive and twisting staircase which represented constant movement between different shift times.

Participants' lack of normalisation of their working times and lack of control over working times is understandable, when considering the significant effects that these had in their personal lives (Mrozowicki, 2016). In accordance with previous research, scheduling uncertainty created both economic and temporal uncertainty in participants' lives (McGann et al., 2016). Some participants considered that their personal lives centred around their jobs, restricting their autonomy in their personal lives. Supporting Woodman's (2013) findings with young Australian workers, participants struggled to maintain relationships with family and friends, as their availability was erratic, unpredictable, and did not match up with others'. Further, some participants' differing patterns in sleep and energy levels meant they were not always able to take advantage of times when their availability did match with friends and family (Woodman, 2013). These findings align with research showing that workers in non-standard employment have reduced work-life balance (Moore et al., 2018; McGann et al., 2016), and likely prefer not to work during unsocial hours (Woodman, 2013). Participants' personal time and financial choices were both restricted by their non-standard employment.

6.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the findings of this study in relation to the existing literature on non-standard employment. First, it discussed participants' experiences of relationships in non-standard employment, including experiences around trust, social status, and mistreatment. Participants' experiences of not being trusted, and not trusting their employers, provided empirical support for Fleming's (2017) suggestions about trust dynamics in non-standard employment relationships. Findings that participants perceived being lower status than their co-workers in standard employment were supported by research highlighting the lower social status of workers in non-standard employment (Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; McGann et al., 2016; Williamson et al., 2015). These perceptions that they were lower status contributed to participants' own views that their work was not 'adult', and related to conceptualisations of a 'delayed adulthood' (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016). Explanations were offered for the relatively unexpected findings of participants' serious mistreatment, including discriminatory views about young workers in New Zealand (Fenton, 2013; Mooney, 2016; Scott, 2019), along with several other potential causes.

The chapter then turned to discuss how participants' entry into non-standard employment related to both viewpoints of non-standard employment entry as structurally determined (Bosmans et al., 2016; de Lange et al., 2014b; Nunez & Livanos, 2015; Peiró et al., 2012; Smith, 2018), and as influenced by individual preferences (Moore et al., 2018; Smith, 2018). In terms of working times, the discussion positioned participants' lack of autonomy and control over their working times as consistent with employer-led flexibility (McGann et al., 2016; Moore et al., 2018; Piasna, 2017). In line with some studies, participants normalised being in non-standard employment (Moore et al., 2018; Mrozowicki, 2016). However, noting the negative effects of unsocial working times and employer-led flexibility on participants' lives, it was argued that participants had not normalised their non-standard working times or lack of control over their working times.

The following and final chapter will summarise the findings of this study in answer to the research question, and make recommendations for future research, and how policy and practice could be improved for young workers in non-standard employment. The chapter will also reflect on how this study could be improved on, identifying the limitations of the research design.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

This final chapter provides a summary of the research and its findings, and makes recommendations for how research can move forward, based on these. The chapter begins by outlining how the findings answer the research question. It then outlines the original contribution and limitations of the research. The final sections of the chapter make recommendations for future research and discuss the implications of the research for policy and practice.

7.2 Answering the Research Question

The research question in this study asked, 'what are young New Zealand workers' experiences of non-standard employment?'. In approaching this question, the research was situated within the interpretive paradigm, honouring the notion that developing knowledge of people's inner realities and experiences is a valuable end itself, in contrast with knowledge developed to achieve transferability or generalisability (Neuman, 2014). The study was designed using interpretive descriptive methodology, setting out to describe and understand participants' individual and shared experiences of non-standard employment, by developing themes through use of thematic analysis (Hunt, 2009; Thorne et al., 1997, 2004). Data was collected through semi-structured interviews with 12 participants aged 20 to 24, eliciting information on their experiences in a range of types of non-standard employment, across several industries and occupations.

In answer to the research question – what young workers experience in non-standard employment in New Zealand – the findings of the research were that participants experienced: 1) sub-standard employee-employer relationships; 2) a lack of autonomy and control; and 3) negative impacts of work conditions in their personal lives. Sub-standard employee-employer relationships were evident in experiences such as the mistreatment of participants; eroded trust between participants and their employers and managers; and participants' perceptions of their lower social status. Following this, lack of autonomy and control was exemplified by participants experiencing less control over the flexibility of their hours than their employers and managers. Participants' work schedules were generally dictated by their employers, who did not consistently take into

account participants' own commitments and wellbeing. Finally, participants experienced several negative personal life impacts as a result of work conditions in non-standard employment, for example difficulty maintaining relationships because of schedule instability.

These key findings were emphasised by participant metaphors collected during the interviews (Cassell & Bishop, 2019; Moernaut et al., 2020). The metaphors highlighted the unhealthy relationships that participants had with their employers, depicting issues such as neglect and lack of care and connection through houses that were un-cared for. Participants' 'houses' were universally not owned by them, signifying a lack of control over their employment conditions. The negative impacts of work conditions on personal life presented as a more subtle aspect of participants' metaphors, with aspects such as unusual interiors reflecting the unrest caused by participants' non-standard work schedules. The themes of lack of autonomy and control and sub-standard employee-employer relationships were more significant aspects of participants' metaphors, indicating that they were more salient to participants' deeper perceptions and experiences of non-standard employment.

Several major conclusions can be drawn from the findings about young workers' experiences of non-standard employment in New Zealand. First, the study found that young workers experience differential treatment and negative bias towards them, similarly to studies in international research which have highlighted that workers in non-standard employment experience lower status in the workplace (Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; McGann et al., 2016; Williamson et al., 2015). Second, the finding that participants experienced serious forms of mistreatment, such as verbal aggression and abuse, and illegal practices, were relatively novel, though supported by findings from Mooney (2016) of discrimination against young workers in New Zealand's hospitality industry. It is suggested that negative stereotypes about young workers in New Zealand may drive such treatment, and that these practices may remain hidden because of the transitory nature of non-standard work (Mooney, 2016). A third main finding was that participants did not trust their employers, and significantly, perceived that their employers did not trust them – evident through experiences such as surveillance. This provides empirical evidence confirming Fleming's (2017) argument that non-standard employment may create prerogative for surveillance and managerial control, as workers in non-standard

employment are viewed as uncommitted and disloyal. Fourth, the research findings were consistent with other studies that workers in non-standard employment, and young workers specifically, experience a loss of autonomy and control over their working time in non-standard employment (McGann et al., 2016; Moore et al., 2018; Piasna, 2017; Woodman, 2012). It found that young workers in non-standard employment in New Zealand experience negative personal life impacts as a result of their non-standard work schedules, reflecting Woodman's (2013) findings with young workers in Australia.

There are also two important conclusions regarding how young workers in New Zealand view non-standard employment. Firstly, rather than viewing non-standard employment as being part of a 'new adulthood' where employment is planned around a preferred lifestyle, participants appeared to view their employment as a delayed adulthood (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016). This suggests that young New Zealand workers are still attached to the concept of traditional adulthood, involving permanent employment and lifelong careers (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016), and therefore perceive their non-standard employment as not being 'real' or 'adult'. These views may intensify perceptions of being lower status employees for young workers in New Zealand. Secondly, the findings indicate that while young workers may normalise being in non-standard employment, they do not normalise non-standard working times, or having a lack of control over their working time. This is contrary to findings that young workers normalise non-standard working times (Moore et al., 2018), but is similar to some extent to research which suggests that young workers may normalise non-standard employment, but are aware of the negative effects of non-standard working times on their lives (Mrozowicki, 2016). The research therefore highlights that young workers in non-standard employment in New Zealand express disquiet about their working times, lack of control over them, and the effects of these on their personal lives – and do not simply accept them as normal.

7.3 Contribution to Knowledge

This study makes a significant contribution to knowledge about young workers' experiences of non-standard employment in New Zealand. To date, research on young workers in non-standard employment New Zealand has been restricted to student populations (Beban & Trueman, 2018; Richardson et al., 2013). This research provides a

broader overview of young workers' experiences in non-standard employment in New Zealand, including experiences from both students and non-students, and including several industries, occupations, and non-standard employment types. In particular, this thesis has revealed previously unknown issues of the mistreatment of young workers in non-standard employment in New Zealand. Further, this is little evidenced in extant international research, adding to our depth of knowledge about workplace relationships in non-standard employment.

While arguments in the international literature support that workers in non-standard employment experience difficulties in their workplace relationships, there is minimal empirical research around these issues (Fleming, 2017; Lepadatu & Janoski, 2018; McGann et al., 2016; Williamson et al., 2015). In addition to the findings on mistreatment, another key contribution of this research to knowledge about relationships is in the area of trust between workers and employers and managers in non-standard employment. There are few, if any, empirical studies on trust in non-standard employment, in line with the limited research on trust in employment relations research more generally (Brandl, 2020). This thesis identifies and explains the presence of mutual distrust present in young people's workplace relationships in non-standard employment, for example through findings of workplace surveillance.

In terms of knowledge about issues specific to young workers, the research contributes to understanding of how social status may interlink with young workers' views of adulthood and employment. This includes the suggestion that young people may label their employment as not being real or adult as a result of their lower workplace status, and that they may be more aware of their lower status because their non-standard employment represents a delayed adulthood to them (Cuervo & Wyn, 2016; McGann et al., 2016). This thesis also adds to knowledge of the ways in which young workers lose autonomy and control over their time in non-standard employment (Moore et al., 2018; Woodman, 2012, 2013). Finally, it offers a more nuanced view of the normalisation of non-standard employment, arguing that while young workers may normalise being in non-standard employment, they do not normalise their non-standard working times or lack of control over their working times.

The research also makes a novel methodological contribution through its use of metaphors within interpretive descriptive methodology. This study illustrates how

elicited metaphors can be thematically analysed alongside interview data, in order to support interpretive processes during thematic analysis. While elicited metaphors have been used with other interview data and thematically analysed, extant studies have not described the analysis process in detail, generally limiting their explanation to how metaphors were categorised by type (Cassell & Bishop, 2019). Concurrently analysing the metaphors alongside the interview data aided interpretation by facilitating and confirming interpretations of the interview data. This involved a process of coding interview data, then coding metaphor data, and then returning to review the interview data coding, building on coding processes outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006) and Saldaña (2013). The metaphors also provided a clearer indication than the interview data of which themes were more salient to participants' experiences (Cassell & Bishop, 2019; Moernaut et al., 2020). Overall, the research demonstrates that elicited metaphors can be a useful data collection and analysis tool in the interpretive descriptive methodology and provides guidance on how to use them.

7.4 Research Limitations

This thesis carried out exploratory research in a context in which there is scant research generally. Therefore, the research was based upon a deliberately broad research question (Korstjen & Moser, 2017). However, this can also be a limitation, as a narrower research question, focused on a select industry or occupation, or one non-standard employment type, may have offered deeper or more specific insights. This potential limitation was somewhat mitigated by the methods used to ensure rigour in this research. These included 1) ensuring confirmability of the research by detailing the research processes (Cope, 2014) and using data triangulation methods (Gray, 2018); 2) improving the credibility of the findings through member checking (Cope, 2014; Thorne et al., 1997); and 3) the authenticity of the research findings being supported by the researcher being an insider to the research group (Hayfield & Huxley, 2015).

Another potential limitation was the relatively small sample size of 12 participants, although this was consistent with the scope of the research as a master's thesis. Some authors argue in favour of using smaller sample sizes, for example the sample size of 12 matched Guest et al.'s (2006) recommendation for thematic analysis. Hennink et al. (2017) suggest that nine interviews are sufficient for reaching a point where no new

codes are developed, although more interviews are needed to reach deeper understandings or insights. A consideration in this research was that the data collected included participants' past and current experiences, and most of the participants in the sample had several non-standard employment experiences. The interviews therefore produced detailed data.

7.5 Recommendations for Future Research

In this section, recommendations are made for future research, based on this study's findings. First and foremost, large scale national research in New Zealand is warranted to investigate how widespread the experiences found in this research are – particularly experiences of mistreatment. While term-time employment is an important part of the non-standard work experience for young workers in New Zealand (Beban & Trueman, 2018; Richardson et al., 2013), more expansive research, which further develops the findings of this thesis, is needed to extend understanding of youth non-standard employment experiences in New Zealand. Ideally research would be longitudinal, to examine the long-term implications of young workers' experiences. An example of longitudinal research that could provide a model for large-scale longitudinal research in New Zealand is the Life Patterns program in Australia. The program follows two generations of young Australians who exited secondary school in 1991 and 2006 (Melbourne Graduate School of Education, 2018).

Future research is also needed to further explore youth-specific issues, such as discrimination against young workers in New Zealand, and cultural or contextual influences on young New Zealand workers' views about non-standard employment. For example, research could examine factors that foster mistreatment and negative perceptions of young workers in non-standard employment in New Zealand. This study has focused on uncovering young workers' non-standard employment experiences in New Zealand and has not focused on why these experiences occur. Based on challenges identified in the context chapter and findings of this study, further research could examine the roles of discourse or power relations in fostering these experiences and perspectives.

While this research involved a group of young workers with a wide range of experiences, future research should also examine and compare the experiences of sub-groups of

young workers in non-standard employment in New Zealand. Research on sub-groups and comparative research could look at certain types of non-standard employment; specific industries; or intersections of gender, ethnicity and age in non-standard employment.

Finally, future research should also address the experiences of key stakeholder groups, which could include employers, managers, HR practitioners, union representatives, and government officials. In order to improve policy and practice, more needs to be known about the decisions and challenges that these stakeholders face in managing youth non-standard employment, as well as any successful strategies they employ.

7.6 Suggestions for Improving Practice and Policy

This section makes suggestions for how policy and practice could be improved, based on the research findings. First, in line with the findings, it is recommended that employers, managers, and human resource management professionals work toward improving workplace management practices and relationship development with young workers in non-standard employment. The first key issue for practice is ensuring positive relationships with young workers in non-standard employment; including developing trust, preventing mistreatment, and improving status perceptions. Organisations employing young workers in non-standard employment should implement policies that aim to ensure they receive treatment equal to older aged and workers in standard employment. Policies could cover practices such as payment for taking on permanent and/or temporary supervisory tasks, opportunities for development and advancement, and face-to-face time with managers.

The second area of focus should be ensuring that young workers in non-standard employment have improved autonomy over their personal and work time, considering the findings of this thesis and previous research which show that they have a lack of control over their working time (Moore et al., 2018; Woodman, 2012, 2013). As noted in the literature review chapter, research has found that when workers have greater bargaining power, for example due to having higher qualifications, there is a decrease in non-standard working time arrangements (Venn et al., 2016). Young workers are likely to have less bargaining power, have less work experience and generally lower wages – therefore it is important for managers and employers to redress this power imbalance

by offering more control over working times. This could be achieved through staffing practices that prevent short-staffing, planning rosters further in advance, and paying living wages to young workers.

The findings also suggest a role for educators in promoting young people's knowledge of non-standard employment. The findings noted that young workers, when faced with illegal situations in non-standard employment, lacked prior knowledge of their employment rights. Young people who know their rights will be better prepared to protect themselves and others, and as the findings showed, young workers who know their rights are willing to enact them. As noted in the context chapter of this study, in 2019, 176 out of 590 schools offered one or more of the employment-related NCEA standards available under the work and study skills domain (Psychometrics, Reporting and Statistics, 2019). It is recommended that some of these NCEA standards be made compulsory in the secondary school curriculum, to ensure that more young workers have access to employment relations knowledge prior to entering the workforce. Key standards that should be made compulsory are those covering basic employment rights, ways of dealing with employment relationship problems, and employment agreements and collective agreement negotiation.

Finally, the research may also be of interest to government agencies as the Government implements New Zealand's newly developed youth employment strategy, entitled 'Our Youth Employment Action Plan' (New Zealand Government, 2019). As noted earlier in the New Zealand Context Chapter (Chapter Four) the Plan does not address non-standard employment or quality of employment. However, its aims may align to some extent with reducing youth non-standard employment. Planned actions under these aims, such as increased support for training through work-integrated learning and apprenticeships (New Zealand Government, 2019), signal a shift away from demands for work-ready labour, and could reduce the need for young workers to enter non-standard employment in order to fill gaps in their resumes. The Youth Employment Action Plan could therefore be extended to commit to reducing youth non-standard employment, ensuring that young employees have employment opportunities which are of good quality.

7.7 Closing Comments

In view of the knowledge gap in New Zealand literature on young workers' experiences in non-standard employment, this research sought to answer the question: 'what are young New Zealand workers' experiences of non-standard employment?'. The study found that young workers in non-standard employment in New Zealand had poor relationships with their managers and employers, with participants experiencing mistreatment, a lack of trust, and perceptions of being lower status. The study also found that they experienced a lack of autonomy and control over their entry into non-standard employment, and their working time flexibility. Thirdly, the study highlighted the negative impacts of non-standard work conditions in several areas of participants' personal lives.

The findings contribute to several aspects of the international literature, including extending knowledge about three key areas of workers' experiences of relationships at work in non-standard employment: trust, treatment, and social status. The study adds to literature on autonomy and control over working time, and significantly, argues that young workers do not normalise non-standard working times or their lack of control over their working times. The findings, encompassing the experiences of a variety of participants, make an important contribution to knowledge of what young employees experience in non-standard employment in New Zealand. This contribution includes highlighting previously concealed issues in youth non-standard employment in New Zealand, including mistreatment of young workers in non-standard employment. This research provides a basis for improving policy and practice in New Zealand, and it is suggested that in addition to development of management practices, employment rights education is essential to improving the experiences of young workers in non-standard employment. Additionally, it is recommended that longitudinal and national research, as well as research focusing on specific groups of young workers, is needed to expand on the findings of this research.

This thesis offers new insights into the perspectives and experiences of young workers in non-standard employment in New Zealand. It reveals the mistreatment, distrust, and lack of control, among other issues, that young potentially vulnerable New Zealand workers encounter in non-standard employment. In exploring their experiences, the research not only offers representation for these previously unseen workers in academic

research, but also provides understandings which can be used to drive improvements in non-standard employment practices. Furthermore, by acknowledging and understanding the early work experiences of young New Zealanders, we are better placed to prepare for the workforce of the future.

References

Adams-Hutcheson, G., & Longhurst, R. (2017). “At least in person there would have been a cup of tea”: Interviewing via Skype. *Area*, *49*(2), 148–155. https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12306

Alali, H., Braeckman, L., van Hecke, T., de Clercq, B., Janssens, H., & Wahab, M. A. (2017). Relationship between non-standard work arrangements and work-related accident absence in Belgium. *Journal of Occupational Health*, *59*(2), 177–186. https://doi.org/10.1539/joh.16-0119-OA

Anderson, G. (2007). Employment rights in an era of individualised employment. *Victoria University of Wellington Law Review*, *38*(3), 417–434.

Anderson, G., Gahan, P., Mitchell, R., & Stewart, A. (2011). The evolution of labor law in New Zealand: A comparative study of New Zealand, Australia, and five other countries. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, *33*(1), 137–170.

Aotearoa Legal Workers’ Union. (n.d.). Who we are. Retrieved July 1, 2019, from https://alwu.org.nz/who-we-are/

Auckland Co-design Lab. (2016). *The attitude gap challenge: A South Auckland employment and skills challenge*. Retrieved from https://static1.squarespace.com/static/55ac5ee5e4b08d4c25220f4b/t/5ab37c25758d46f90e271b4d/1521712213914/Attitude+Gap+Challenge+Final+report.pdf

Auckland Tourism, Events, and Economic Development. (n.d.). Economy and sectors. Retrieved March 26, 2019, from https://www.aucklandnz.com/business-and-investment/economy-and-sectors

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2013). Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC), 2006 (revision 2.0). Retrieved July 7, 2020, from https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/1292.0Contents12006%20(Revision%202.0)?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=1292.0&issue=2006%20(Revision%202.0)&num=&view=

Bąk-Grabowska, D., & Jagoda, A. (2015). Flexibility of workplace vs. Non – standard employment forms – co-occurrence analysis. *Journal of International Studies*, *8*(2), 130–138. https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-8330.2015/8-2/11

Baranowska, A., & Gebel, M. (2010). The determinants of youth temporary employment in the enlarged Europe. *European Societies*, *12*(3), 367–390. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616690903165434

Barbieri, P., Cutuli, G., Luijkx, R., Mari, G., & Scherer, S. (2019). Substitution, entrapment, and inefficiency? Cohort inequalities in a two-tier labour market. *Socio-Economic Review*, *17*(2), 409–431. https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mww035

Beaumont, C. (2013). *Minimum Wage (Starting-out Wage) Amendment Bill—In Committee—New Zealand Parliament*. Retrieved from https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansard-debates/rhr/document/50HansD_20130319_00000020/minimum-wage-starting-out-wage-amendment-bill-in-committee

Beban, A., & Trueman, N. (2018). Student workers: The unequal load of paid and unpaid work in the neoliberal university. *New Zealand Sociology*, *33*(2), 99–131.

Bernhard-Oette, C., De Cuyper, N., Murphy, M., & Connelly, C. E. (2017). How do we feel and behave when we're not permanent full-time employees? The case of the diverse forms of non-standard work. In N. Chmiel, F. Fraccaroli, & M. Sverke (Eds.), *An introduction to work and organizational psychology: An international perspective* (3rd ed., pp. 258–275). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Blackham, A. (2018). Recent developments in Australian and New Zealand age discrimination law: A comparative perspective. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, *43*(2), 66–82.

Blackham, A. (2019). Young workers and age discrimination: Tensions and conflicts. *Industrial Law Journal*, *48*(1), 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1093/indlaw/dwy004

Bosch, G. (2004). Towards a new standard employment relationship in Western Europe. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, *42*(4), 617–636. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.2004.00333.x

Bosmans, K., Hardonk, S., De Cuyper, N., & Vanroelen, C. (2016). Explaining the relation between precarious employment and mental well-being. A qualitative study among temporary agency workers. *Work*, *53*(2), 249–264. https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-152136

Brandl, B. (2020). Variations and (a)symmetries in trust between employees and employers in Europe: Some (not so) well-known stylized facts. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, *26*(3), 313–329. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959680119850721

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *11*(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Breitkreuz, R., & Colen, K. (2018). Who cares? Motivations for unregulated child care use. *Journal of Family Issues*, *39*(17), 4066–4088. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X18806025

Bridges, S. (2013). *Minimum Wage (Starting-out Wage) Amendment Bill—Third Reading—New Zealand Parliament*. Retrieved from https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansard-debates/rhr/document/50HansD_20130321_00000028/minimum-wage-starting-out-wage-amendment-bill-third

Bujold, C., & Fournier, G. (2008). Occupational representations of workers in nonstandard and precarious work situations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *16*(3), 339–359. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072708317380

Careers New Zealand. (n.d.a). How can you get experience without a job? Retrieved May 30, 2019, from https://www.careers.govt.nz/articles/how-can-i-get-experience-without-a-job/

Careers New Zealand. (n.d.b). How to become a work-ready graduate. Retrieved May 30, 2019, from https://www.careers.govt.nz/job-hunting/finding-work/how-to-become-a-work-ready-graduate/

Careers New Zealand. (n.d.c). How to search for jobs. Retrieved May 30, 2019, from https://www.careers.govt.nz/job-hunting/finding-work/how-to-search-for-jobs/

Careers New Zealand. (2020). Job growth and the labour market. Retrieved May 1, 2020, from https://www.careers.govt.nz/job-hunting/whats-happening-in-the-job-market/job-growth-and-the-labour-market/#cID_5017

Carr, C. (2015). Empowering young workers. *PPTA News*, *36*(7), 9.

Casey, C., & Williamson, K. (2007). Young, working, studying: Labour market patterns and education sector expansion. *New Zealand Sociology*, *22*(1), 145–168.

Cassell, C., & Bishop, V. (2019). Qualitative data analysis: Exploring themes, metaphors and stories. *European Management Review*, *16*, 195–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12176

Cassell, C., & Lee, B. (2012). Driving, steering, leading, and defending: Journey and warfare metaphors of change agency in trade union learning initiatives. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, *48*(2), 248–271. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886312438861

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2018). Using thematic analysis in counselling and psychotherapy research: A critical reflection. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, *18*(2), 107–110. https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12165

Companies Office. (2019). Annual return membership reports. Retrieved August 23, 2020, from https://www.companiesoffice.govt.nz/all-registers/registered-unions/annual-return-membership-reports/

Cope, D. G. (2014). Methods and meanings: Credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, *41*(1), 89–91. https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.89-91

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cuervo, H., & Wyn, J. (2016). An unspoken crisis: The ‘scarring effects’ of the complex nexus between education and work on two generations of young Australians. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *35*(2), 122–135. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2016.1164467

Davies, C., & Fisher, M. (2018). Understanding research paradigms. *Journal of the Australasian Rehabilitation Nurses’ Association (JARNA)*, *21*(3), 21–25.

de Lange, M., Gesthuizen, M., & Wolbers, M. H. (2014a). Consequences of flexible employment at labour market entry for early career development in the Netherlands. *Economic & Industrial Democracy*, *35*(3), 413.

de Lange, M., Gesthuizen, M., & Wolbers, M. H. J. (2014b). Youth labour market integration across Europe. *European Societies*, *16*(2), 194–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2013.821621

De Stefano, V. (2017). Non-standard work and limits on freedom of association: A human rights-based approach. *Industrial Law Journal*, *46*(2), 185–207. https://doi.org/10.1093/indlaw/dww034

Dhakal, S. P., Connell, J., & Burgess, J. (2018). Inclusion and work: Addressing the global challenges for youth employment. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *37*(2), 110–120. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-12-2017-0290

Diamond, J. (2018). Employment status persistence in the Japanese labour market. *Japanese Economic Review*, *69*(1), 69–100. https://doi.org/10.1111/jere.12148

Dixon, S. (2011). Temporary employment and the quality of temporary jobs. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, *36*(1), 1–20.

Dolowitz, D. P., Buckler, S., & Sweeney, F. (2008). *Researching online*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Eisley, Z. (2017). The job market is cruel to graduates. *Stuff*. Retrieved from http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff-nation/assignments/share-your-news-and-views/18290925/The-job-market-is-cruel-to-graduates

Employment Contracts Act 1991.

Employment New Zealand. (n.d.). Types of employee. Retrieved March 26, 2019, from https://www.employment.govt.nz/starting-employment/who-is-an-employee/types-of-employee/

Employment New Zealand. (2019). Employment Relations Amendment Act 2018. Retrieved August 23, 2020, from https://www.employment.govt.nz/about/employment-law/employment-relations-amendment-act-2018/

Employment New Zealand. (2020). Young employees. Retrieved July 7, 2020, from https://www.employment.govt.nz/starting-employment/rights-and-responsibilities/young-employees/

Employment Relations Act 2000.

Evans, D., Gruba, P., & Zobel, J. (2014). *How to write a better thesis*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Fair Pay Agreements Working Group. (2018). *Fair pay agreements. Supporting workers and firms to drive productivity growth and share the benefits*. Retrieved from https://www.mbie.govt.nz/assets/695e21c9c3/working-group-report.pdf

Fenton, D. (2013). *Minimum Wage (Starting-out Wage) Amendment Bill—Third Reading—New Zealand Parliament*. Retrieved from https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansard-debates/rhr/document/50HansD_20130321_00000028/minimum-wage-starting-out-wage-amendment-bill-third

Fleming, P. (2017). The human capital hoax: Work, debt and insecurity in the era of uberization. *Organization Studies*, *38*(5), 691–709. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840616686129

Fudge, J. (2017). The future of the standard employment relationship: Labour law, new institutional economics and old power resource theory. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, *59*(3), 374–392. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022185617693877

Goosey, S. (2019). Is age discrimination a less serious form of discrimination? *Legal Studies*, *39*(3), 533–549. https://doi.org/10.1017/lst.2019.7

Grant, B., & Giddings, L. (2002). Making sense of methodologies: A paradigm framework for the novice researcher. *Contemporary Nurse: A Journal for the Australian Nursing Profession*, *13*(1), 10–28. https://doi.org/10.5172/conu.13.1.10

Gray, D. E. (2018). *Doing research in the real world*. London, United Kingdom: SAGE Publications.

Green, A., & Livanos, I. (2017). Involuntary non-standard employment in Europe. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, *24*(2), 175–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776415622257

Grünberg, L., & Matei, Ștefania. (2020). Why the paradigm of work-family conflict is no longer sustainable: Towards more empowering social imaginaries to understand women's identities. *Gender, Work & Organization*, (27), 289–309. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12343

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough?: An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, *18*(1), 59–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903

Hannif, Z., & Lamm, F. (2005). When non-standard work becomes precarious: Insights from the New Zealand call centre industry. *Management Revue*, (3), 324–350.

Hayfield, N., & Huxley, C. (2015). Insider and outsider perspectives: Reflections on researcher identities in research with lesbian and bisexual women. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *12*(2), 91–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2014.918224

Haynes, P., Vowles, J., & Boxall, P. (2005). Explaining the younger– older worker union density gap: Evidence from New Zealand. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, *43*(1), 93–116. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.2005.00346.x

Hennink, M. M., Marconi, V. C., & Kaiser, B. N. (2017). Code saturation versus meaning saturation: How many interviews are enough? *Qualitative Health Research*, *27*(4), 591–608. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316665344

Higgins, J., & Nairn, K. (2006). 'In transition': Choice and the children of New Zealand's economic reforms. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *27*(2), 207–220. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690600556321

Hipp, L., Bernhardt, J., & Allmendinger, J. (2015). Institutions and the prevalence of nonstandard employment. *Socio-Economic Review*, *13*(2), 351–377. https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwv002

Holland, P. J., Cooper, B., & Hecker, R. (2015). Electronic monitoring and surveillance in the workplace: The effects on trust in management, and the moderating role of occupational type. *Personnel Review*, *44*(1), 161–175. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2013-0211

Holt, N. L., Kingsley, B. C., Tink, L. N., & Scherer, J. (2011). Benefits and challenges associated with sport participation by children and parents from low-income families. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *12*(5), 490–499. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.05.007

Huang, W., & Feng, D. W. (2019). Exploring the dynamics of motivation for learning Japanese among Chinese learners: An elicited metaphor analysis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *40*(7), 605–617. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1571071

Human Rights Act 1993.

Human Rights Commission. (2011). *Breaking through—Young people at work*. Retrieved from https://www.hrc.co.nz/files/2814/4910/7293/Final_report-28Jan11.pdf

Hunt, M. R. (2009). Strengths and challenges in the use of interpretive description: Reflections arising from a study of the moral experience of health professionals in humanitarian work. *Qualitative Health Research*, *19*(9), 1284–1292. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732309344612

Imdorf, C., Helbling, L. A., & Inui, A. (2017). Transition systems and non-standard employment in early career: Comparing Japan and Switzerland. *Journal of Education and Work*, *30*(5), 486–500. https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2016.1243234

Inkson, K. (2004). Images of career: Nine key metaphors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *65*, 96–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00053-8

International Labour Office. (2016). *Non-standard employment around the world: Understanding challenges, shaping prospects*. International Labour Organization. Retrieved from International Labour Organization website: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_534326.pdf

Jackson, E. (2013). Choosing a methodology: Philosophical underpinning. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education Journal*, *7*(1), 49–62.

Kallio, H., Pietilä, A.-M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *72*(12), 2954–2965. ccm. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031

Kelloway, E., Gallagher, D., & Barling, J. (2004). Work, employment and the individual. In B. Kaufman (Ed.), *Theoretical perspectives on work and the employment relationship* (pp. 105–132). Champaign, IL: Industrial Relations Research Association.

Kelloway, E. K., & Harvey, S. (1999). Learning to work: The development of work beliefs. In J. Barling & E. K. Kelloway (Eds.), *Young workers: Varieties of experience*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kiersztyn, A. (2016). Fixed-term employment and occupational position in Poland: The heterogeneity of temporary jobs. *European Sociological Review*, *32*(6), 881–894. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcw044

Kim, W., Lee, T.-H., Ju, Y. J., Chun, S. Y., Kim, T.-H., & Park, E.-C. (2017). Temporary work and depressive symptoms in South Korean workers. *Occupational Medicine*, *67*(6), 421–424. https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqx050

Korstjen, I., & Moser, A. (2017). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 2: Context, research questions and designs. *European Journal of General Practice*, *23*(1), 274–279. https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375090

Landers, R. N., & Behrend, T. S. (2015). An inconvenient truth: Arbitrary distinctions between organizational, mechanical turk, and other convenience samples. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(2), 142–164. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.13

Laß, I., & Wooden, M. (2019). The structure of the wage gap for temporary workers: Evidence from Australian panel data. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, *57*(3), 453–478. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjir.12458

Lepadatu, D., & Janoski, T. (2018). Just-in-time workforce? Temporary workers as a structural aspect of lean production in the US auto industry. *International Journal of Automotive Technology & Management*, *18*(2), 160–177. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJATM.2018.092189

Leschke, J., & Vandaele, K. (2018). Explaining leaving union membership by the degree of labour market attachment: Exploring the case of Germany. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, *30*(1), 64–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X15603456

Litonjua, M. D. (2008). The socio-political construction of globalization. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, *34*(2), 253–278.

Loughlin, C., & Barling, J. (2001). Young workers' work values, attitudes, and behaviours. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, *74*(4), 543–558.

Low, G. (2015). A practical validation model for researching elicited metaphor. In W. Wan & G. Low (Eds.), *Elicited metaphor analysis in educational discourse* (pp. 15–38). John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1075/milcc.3

Lub, X. D., Bal, P. M., Blomme, R. J., & Schalk, R. (2016). One job, one deal…or not: Do generations respond differently to psychological contract fulfillment? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *27*(6), 653–680. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1035304

Martínez-de-la-Hidalga, Z., & Villardón-Gallego, L. (2017). Using metaphors to know the conceptions about the teaching profession in initial teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, *6*(2), 183–208. https://doi.org/10.17583/ijep.2017.2602

McCarroll, P. (2017). The house that facilities management built: A story of identity and metaphor in a secondary service. *Culture and Organization*, *23*(4), 291–305. https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2017.1346653

McDonald, P., Price, R., & Bailey, J. (2013). Knowledge is not power, but it's a start: What young people know about their rights and obligations in employment. *Youth Studies Australia*, *32*(2), 49–58.

McGann, M., White, K., & Moss, J. (2016). Labour casualization and the psychosocial health of workers in Australia. *Work, Employment and Society*, *30*(5), 766–782. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017016633022

Melbourne Graduate School of Education. (2018). Life patterns. Retrieved from https://education.unimelb.edu.au/yrc/research/life-patterns

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Minimum Wage Act 1983.

Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment. (2020). Fair pay agreements. Retrieved August 23, 2020, from https://www.mbie.govt.nz/business-and-employment/employment-and-skills/employment-legislation-reviews/fair-pay-agreements/

Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. (2019). *Appendix to national survey of employers 2017/18: Summary of findings*. Retrieved from https://www.mbie.govt.nz/business-and-employment/employment-and-skills/labour-market-reports-data-and-analysis/national-survey-of-employers/

Ministry of Education. (2020). Leaving school before the age of 16. Retrieved July 7, 2020, from https://parents.education.govt.nz/secondary-school/your-child-at-school/leaving-school-before-the-age-of-16/#:~:text=By%20law%20children%20in%20New,local%20Ministry%20of%20Education%20office.

Ministry of Social Development. (2016). *The Social Report 2016 – Te pūrongo oranga tangata*. Retrieved from http://socialreport.msd.govt.nz/

Moernaut, R., Mast, J., & Pauwels, L. (2020). Visual and multimodal framing analysis. In L. Pauwels & D. Mannay (Eds.), *The sage handbook of visual research methods* (pp. 484–499). London, United Kingdom: SAGE Publications. Retrieved from 10.4135/9781526417015

Mooi-Reci, I., & Wooden, M. (2017). Casual employment and long-term wage outcomes. *Human Relations*, *70*(9), 1064–1090. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726716686666

Mooney, S. (2016). Wasted youth in the hospitality industry: Older workers' perceptions and misperceptions about younger workers. *Hospitality & Society*, *6*(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1386/hosp.6.1.9_1

Moore, S., Tailby, S., Antunes, B., & Newsome, K. (2018). 'Fits and fancies': The Taylor Review, the construction of preference and labour market segmentation. *Industrial Relations Journal*, *49*(5–6), 403–419. https://doi.org/10.1111/irj.12229

Mrozowicki, A. (2016). Normalisation of precariousness? Biographical experiences of young workers in the flexible forms of employment in Poland. *Przeglad Socjologii Jakosciowej*, *12*(2), 94–112.

Muller-Jentsch, W. (2004). Theoretical approaches to industrial relations. In B. E. Kaufman (Ed.), *Theoretical perspectives on work and the employment relationship* (pp. 1–40). Champaign, IL: Industrial Relations Research Association.

Murphy, C., & Turner, T. (2016). Organising precarious workers: Can a public campaign overcome weak grassroots mobilisation at workplace level? *Journal of Industrial Relations*, *58*(5), 589–607. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022185615623082

Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). Essex, England: Pearson.

New Zealand Government. (2019). *Our youth employment action plan. Setting our young people on a strong pathway to fulfilling working lives*. Retrieved from https://www.mbie.govt.nz/dmsdocument/6613-our-youth-employment-action-plan

New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). (n.d.). Domain—Work and study skills. Retrieved June 3, 2019, from https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/framework/explore/domain.do?frameworkId=76443

Nunez, I., & Livanos, I. (2015). Temps "by choice"? An investigation of the reasons behind temporary employment among young workers in Europe. *Journal of Labor Research*, *36*(1), 44–66. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12122-014-9195-3

OECD. (2013). *OECD employment outlook 2013*. OECD Publishing. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1787/19991266

Ongley, P. (2013). Work and inequality in neoliberal New Zealand. *New Zealand Sociology*, *28*(3), 136–163.

Ongley, P. (2014). Work and inequality in neoliberal New Zealand: Updated results. *New Zealand Sociology*, *29*(3), 24–29.

Peiró, J. M., Sora, B., & Caballer, A. (2012). Job insecurity in the younger Spanish workforce: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *80*, 444–453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.09.007

Piasna, A. (2017). Scheduled to work hard: The relationship between non-standard working hours and work intensity among European workers (2005–2015). *Human Resource Management Journal*, *28*, 167–181. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12171

Prikshat, V., Montague, A., Connell, J., & Burgess, J. (2019). Australian graduates' work readiness – Deficiencies, causes and potential solutions. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, *10*(2), 369–386. https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-02-2019-0025

Psychometrics, Reporting and Statistics. (2019). *PRS-3141 Work and study skills domain use in schools* [Data file]. New Zealand Qualifications Authority.

Public Service Association, & E tū. (n.d.). Guaranteed hours. Frequently asked questions. Retrieved July 12, 2020, from https://www.psa.org.nz/assets/Uploads/FAQ-E-tu-and-PSA-final.pdf

Quesnel-Vallée, A., DeHaney, S., & Ciampi, A. (2010). Temporary work and depressive symptoms: A propensity score analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*, *70*(12), 1982–1987. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.02.008

Rainsford, E., Maloney, W. A., & Popa, S. A. (2019). The effect of unemployment and low-quality work conditions on work values: Exploring the experiences of young

Europeans. *Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science*, *682*(1), 172–185. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716219830378

Ranchhod, S. (2019). *Westpac Mcdermott Miller consumer confidence index. Consumer confidence down 5.3 points to 103.8 in March*. Retrieved from https://www.westpac.co.nz/assets/Business/Economic-Updates/2019/Bulletins-2019/Q1-Consumer-Confidence-19-March-2019.pdf

Rasmussen, E., Bray, M., & Stewart, A. (2019). What is distinctive about New Zealand's Employment Relations Act 2000? *Labour & Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work*, *29*(1), 52–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/10301763.2018.1556233

Rasmussen, E., & Fletcher, M. (2018). Employment relations reforms and New Zealand's "productivity paradox." *Australian Journal of Labour Economics*, *21*(1), 75–92.

Rasmussen, E., Foster, B., & Farr, D. (2016). The battle over employers' demand for "more flexibility": Attitudes of New Zealand employers. *Employee Relations*, *38*(6), 886–906. https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-12-2015-0226

Richardson, J. J., Kemp, S., Malinen, S., & Haultain, S. A. (2013). The academic achievement of students in a New Zealand university: Does it pay to work? *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *37*(6), 864–882. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2012.699517

Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *11*(1), 25–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2013.801543

Roper, B. (2018). Neoliberalism's war on New Zealand's universities. *New Zealand Sociology*, *33*(2), 9–39.

Rosenthal, L., Carroll-Scott, A., Earnshaw, V. A., Santilli, A., & Ickovics, J. R. (2012). The importance of full-time work for urban adults' mental and physical health. *Social Science & Medicine*, *75*(9), 1692–1696. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.07.003

Rowe-Williams, J. (2018). The financialisation of tertiary education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *New Zealand Sociology*, *33*(2), 41–68.

Ryall, S., & Blumenfeld, S. (2019). *Unions and union membership in New Zealand – Report on 2017 survey*. Centre for Labour, Employment and Work. Retrieved from Centre for Labour, Employment and Work website: https://www.victoria.ac.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0016/1731211/New-Zealand-Union-Membership-Survey-report-2017v3-140219.pdf

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Sandelowski, M., & Barroso, J. (2003). Classifying the findings in qualitative studies. *Qualitative Health Research*, *13*(7), 905–923. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732303253488

Schalk, R., de Jong, J., Rigotti, T., Mohr, G., Peiro, J. M., & Caballer, A. (2010). The psychological contracts of temporary and permanent workers. In D. E. Guest, K. Isaksson, & H. D. Witte (Eds.), *Employment contracts, psychological contracts,*

and employee well-being: An international study (pp. 89–120). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Schweder, P., Quinlan, M., Bohle, P., Lamm, F., & Bin Ang, A. H. (2015). Injury rates and psychological wellbeing in temporary work: A study of seasonal workers in the New Zealand food processing industry. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, *40*(3), 23–46.

Scott, M. (2019). How can I keep millennials interested in working for me? *Stuff*. Retrieved from https://www.stuff.co.nz/life-style/well-good/teach-me/112551574/how-can-i-keep-millennials-interested-in-working-for-me

Seung, E., Park, S., & Jung, J. (2015). Methodological approaches and strategies for elicited metaphor-based research: A critical review. In W. Wan & G. Low (Eds.), *Elicited metaphor analysis in educational discourse* (pp. 39–64). John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/AUT/detail.action?docID=2083573

Skilling, P. (2016). Neoliberalism, public policy and public opinion. *New Zealand Sociology*, *31*(7), 159–182.

Smith, C. S. (2018). The precarious and the transitional: Labor casualization and youth in post-bubble Japan. *Children's Geographies*, *16*(1), 80–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2017.1395392

Spoonley, P. (2004). Is non-standard work becoming standard?: Trends and issues. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, *29*(3), 3–24.

Statistics New Zealand. (n.d.a). 2013 census quickstats about a place: Auckland region. Retrieved March 26, 2019, from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/quickstats-about-a-place.aspx

Statistics New Zealand. (n.d.b). *Earnings for people in paid employment by region, sex, age groups and ethnic groups*. Retrieved from https://www.employment.govt.nz/starting-employment/hiring/hiring-young-people/barriers-to-youth-employment/

Statistics New Zealand. (n.d.c). New Zealand standard industry output categories classification tables. Retrieved July 1, 2019, from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/industry_sectors/anzsic06-industry-classification/tables.aspx

Statistics New Zealand. (2008). *Survey of working life: March 2008 quarter*. Retrieved from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/income-and-work/employment_and_unemployment/SurveyOfWorkingLife_HOTPMar08qtr.aspx

Statistics New Zealand. (2012). *Survey of working life: December 2012 quarter*. Retrieved from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/income-and-work/employment_and_unemployment/survey-of-working-life-info-releases.aspx

Statistics New Zealand. (2014). *Flexibility and security in employment: Findings from the 2012 survey of working life*. Retrieved from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/income-and-work/employment_and_unemployment/flexibility-security-employment.aspx

Statistics New Zealand. (2016). *Union membership and employment agreements – June 2016 quarter*. Retrieved from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/income-and-work/employment_and_unemployment/improving-labour-market-statistics/union-memship-emplymt-agmt.aspx

Statistics New Zealand. (2017). *Employment relationships – Permanent and temporary workers: December 2016 quarter*. Retrieved from https://www.stats.govt.nz/reports/employment-relationships-permanent-and-temporary-workers-december-2016-quarter

Statistics New Zealand. (2018). *Characteristics of the underemployed in New Zealand*. Retrieved from https://www.stats.govt.nz/reports/characteristics-of-the-underemployed-in-new-zealand

Statistics New Zealand. (2019a). *Age by LEED ANZSIC06 level 1 (2-way) (qrtly-mar/jun/sep/dec)*. Retrieved from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/snapshots-of-nz/nz-social-indicators/Home/Standard of living/pop-low-incomes.aspx

Statistics New Zealand. (2019b). Gross domestic product visualisation. Retrieved June 21, 2019, from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/datavisualisation/gdp.html

Statistics New Zealand. (2019c). *Labour market statistics: March 2019 quarter*. Retrieved from https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/labour-market-statistics-march-2019-quarter

Statistics New Zealand. (2019d). *Labour market statistics (working life): December 2018 quarter*. Retrieved from https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/labour-market-statistics-working-life-december-2018-quarter

Statistics New Zealand. (2019e). *Youth labour force and education status: Seas adj & trend series (qrtly-mar/jun/sep/dec)*. Retrieved from http://archive.stats.govt.nz/infoshare/ViewTable.aspx?pxID=63f97327-37a0-4de9-9a35-71f16b2eabc9

Statistics New Zealand. (2020). Labour market statistics: March 2020 quarter. Retrieved August 23, 2020, from https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/labour-market-statistics-march-2020-quarter

Statistics New Zealand. (n.d.-d). Employment and unemployment. Retrieved August 23, 2020, from https://www.stats.govt.nz/topics/employment-and-unemployment

Stecy-Hildebrandt, N., Fuller, S., & Burns, A. (2019). ‘Bad’ jobs in a ‘good’ sector: Examining the employment outcomes of temporary work in the Canadian public sector. *Work, Employment and Society*, *33*(4), 560–579. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018758217

Stephenson, S. (2019). Why middle-class millennials aren’t leaving home. Retrieved May 1, 2020, from Noted website: https://www.noted.co.nz/currently/currently-currently/why-middle-class-millennials-arent-leaving-home

Svensson, S. (2011). Flexible working conditions and decreasing levels of trust. *Employee Relations*, *34*(2), 126–137. https://doi.org/10.1108/01425451211191850

Thananowan, N., Kaesornsamut, P., O'Rourke, T., & Hegadoren, K. (2018). How Thai women manage living in the context of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *0*(0), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518799457

Thorne, S. E. (2008). *Interpretive description*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Thorne, S. E. (2016). *Interpretive description: Qualitative research for applied practice*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Thorne, S. E., Kirkham, S. R., & MacDonald-Emes, J. (1997). Interpretive description: A non-categorical qualitative alternative for developing nursing knowledge. *Research in Nursing & Health*, *20*(2), 169–177. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-240X(199704)20:2<169::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-I

Thorne, S. E., Kirkham, S. R., & O'Flynn-Magee, K. (2004). The analytic challenge in interpretive description. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *3*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690400300101

Toulson, P., & Foster, B. (2013). How did we get here? The relevance of the historical context to HRM and ER. In J. Parker (Ed.), *The big issues in employment: HR management and employment relations in New Zealand* (pp. 15–36). Auckland, New Zealand: CCH New Zealand Ltd.

Treen, M. (2014). *A short history of the unite union in New Zealand*. Retrieved from https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/uniteunion/pages/239/attachments/original/1446063084/A_short_history_of_Unite_PDF.pdf?1446063084

Turner, S., & Wan, W. (2018). Applying metaphor analysis to academic literacy research. A critical review over 30 years. *Metaphor and the Social World*, *8*(2), 286–311. https://doi.org/10.1075/msw.17012.wan

Venn, D., Carey, G., Strazdins, L., & Burgess, J. (2016). What explains trends in Australian working-time arrangements in the 2000s? *Labour & Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work*, *26*(2), 138–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/10301763.2016.1175785

Vosko, L. (2008). Temporary work in transnational labor regulation: SER-centrism and the risk of exacerbating gendered precariousness. *Social Indicators Research*, *88*(1), 131–145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9206-3

Walker, B. (2011). How does non-standard employment affect workers? A consideration of the evidence. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, *36*(3), 14–29.

Wegner, E., & Nückles, M. (2015). Training the brain or tending a garden? Students' metaphors of learning predict self-reported learning patterns. *Frontline Learning Research*, *3*(4), 95–109. https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v3i4.212

Williams, E. P., & Walter, J. K. (2015). When does the amount we pay research participants become "undue influence"? *AMA Journal of Ethics*, *17*(12), 1116–1121. https://doi.org/10.1001/journalofethics.2015.17.12.ecas2-1512.

Williamson, S., Cooper, R., & Baird, M. (2015). Job-sharing among teachers: Positive, negative (and unintended) consequences. *Economic and Labour Relations Review*, *26*(3), 448–464. https://doi.org/10.1177/1035304615595740

Wilson, M. (2014). Precarious work—New Zealand experience. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, *39*(2), 22–33.

Winkler, M. R., Mason, S., Laska, M. N., Christoph, M. J., & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2018). Does non-standard work mean non-standard health? Exploring links between non-standard work schedules, health behavior, and well-being. *SSM - Population Health*, *4*, 135–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2017.12.003

Woodman, D. (2012). Life out of synch: How new patterns of further education and the rise of precarious employment are reshaping young people’s relationship. *Sociology*, *46*(6), 1074 –1090. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038511428755

Woodman, D. (2013). Young people’s friendships in the context of non-standard work patterns. *Economic and Labour Relations Review*, *24*(3), 416–432. https://doi.org/10.1177/1035304613494636

Appendixes

Appendix 1: Ethics Approval

Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee (AUTEC)

Auckland University of Technology
D-88, Private Bag 92006, Auckland 1142, NZ
T: +64 9 921 9999 ext. 8316
E: ethics@aut.ac.nz
www.aut.ac.nz/researchethics

29 January 2019

Katherine Ravenswood
Faculty of Business Economics and Law

Dear Katherine

Ethics Application: 19/10 **Young New Zealand workers experiences of non-standard work and employment in New Zealand**

I wish to advise you that a subcommittee of the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee (AUTEC) has **approved** your ethics application.

This approval is for three years, expiring 29 January 2022.

Standard Conditions of Approval

1. A progress report is due annually on the anniversary of the approval date, using form EA2, which is available online through http://www.aut.ac.nz/research/researchethics.
2. A final report is due at the expiration of the approval period, or, upon completion of project, using form EA3, which is available online through http://www.aut.ac.nz/research/researchethics.
3. Any amendments to the project must be approved by AUTEC prior to being implemented. Amendments can be requested using the EA2 form: http://www.aut.ac.nz/research/researchethics.
4. Any serious or unexpected adverse events must be reported to AUTEC Secretariat as a matter of priority.
5. Any unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project should also be reported to the AUTEC Secretariat as a matter of priority.

Please quote the application number and title on all future correspondence related to this project.

AUTEC grants ethical approval only. If you require management approval for access for your research from another institution or organisation then you are responsible for obtaining it. You are reminded that it is your responsibility to ensure that the spelling and grammar of documents being provided to participants or external organisations is of a high standard.

For any enquiries please contact ethics@aut.ac.nz

Yours sincerely,

K O'Connor

Kate O'Connor
Executive Manager
Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee

Cc: wpn2956@autuni.ac.nz; julie.douglas@aut.ac.nz

Appendix 2: Participant Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet

Date Information Sheet Produced:

10 December 2018

Project Title

Young New Zealand workers' experiences of non-standard work and employment in New Zealand.

An Invitation

Hello, my name is Tanya Ewertowska and I am a student in the Master of Business program at the Auckland University of Technology. I am carrying out this research to fulfil the thesis requirement of my qualification. My study aims to find out about young New Zealand workers' experiences of non-standard work and employment in New Zealand.

Your participation in this research is voluntary; for full details on consent, please see the section titled 'How do I agree to participate in this research?' below.

What is the purpose of this research?

I am interested in young workers' experiences of non-standard work and employment because work experiences affect assumptions, values, and behaviours. Examples of non-standard work and employment are casual or fixed term employment, working outside standard business hours, and having variable weekly work schedules.

The interview findings will be discussed in my thesis. They may also be used in journal articles, and other academic presentations and publications.

How was I identified and why am I being invited to participate in this research?

You were identified and invited to participate in this research because you saw an ad and indicated your interest in participating by emailing me. You also meet the criteria to participate in this research.

How do I agree to participate in this research?

If you accept the invitation to participate, we will schedule your interview and I will email you a soft copy of the consent form. I will bring two copies of the consent form to the interview for you to sign; one for you to keep. By signing the consent form you agree to participate in the research.

Your participation in this research is voluntary (it is your choice) and whether or not you choose to participate will neither advantage nor disadvantage you. You are able to withdraw from the study at any time. If you choose to withdraw from the study, then you will be offered the choice between having any data that is identifiable as belonging to you removed or allowing it to continue to be used. However, once the findings have been produced, removal of your data may not be possible.

What will happen in this research?

We will meet for your scheduled interview either at an AUT meeting room (South, City or North campuses), or at an otherwise public location which is more convenient for you.

At the interview, I will introduce myself and the research again, and I will also ask you to introduce yourself. I will have a list of interview questions to ask you, but the interview will be a two-way conversation, so you will be encouraged to ask questions and I might ask you some follow-up questions too. The interview will be audio recorded, and I'll write notes as well. The interviews will then be transcribed to written format and analysed.

What are the discomforts and risks?

There are unlikely to be any discomforts or risks in the interview. However, as the interview questions will ask you to recall past experiences, you might experience slight negative emotions or some emotional discomfort.

How will these discomforts and risks be alleviated?

If there are any questions that you are not comfortable answering, you are welcome to let me know and we will skip the question or can stop the interview.

My research and the interview questions do not ask about unlawful employment practices. However, if you are concerned about your employment, the following free employment advice channels are available:

- Employment hotline for employee enquiries offered by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment: phone 0800 20 90 20
- Auckland Community Law Centre: phone (09) 377 9449

What are the benefits?

By participating in this research, you will be able to share your experiences of work and employment and have them heard; this will shed light on non-standard work and employment in New Zealand. Hopefully other young New Zealand workers will be empowered to voice their experiences, and other researchers encouraged to build on this research. The research could also inform employment policy decision making.

I will benefit from this research by growing my knowledge of the research topic, so that I can contribute to debate in the area. This research will also benefit me by fulfilling part of the requirements for my qualification.

How will my privacy be protected?

Your participation and information will be kept confidential. Your information also won't be shared except in connection with the purposes of this research. Your data will only be used for the purposes of the research as identified in this information sheet. Your interview data and consent form will be stored securely at AUT, where you may access it by contacting myself or my supervisors, and it will be destroyed after six years.

The findings won't include any identifiable information about you, but they will be based on information from all the interviews. Should interview quotes be used in research outputs, they will be attached to a pseudonym (fake name). If a professional interview transcriber is employed, they will be required to sign a confidentiality agreement. You will also be given the option to review your interview transcript so that identifying information can be removed.

What are the costs of participating in this research?

The costs of participating in this research include any travel expenses and approximately two hours of your time, including reading the information sheet and consent form, participating in the interview, travel, and providing any feedback on your transcript or the findings.

What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?

You will have two weeks from receiving your invitation email to consider the invitation. If you haven't contacted me after two weeks, I will send one follow-up email. You are welcome to ask for any information that you may need to make an informed decision about your participation.

Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?

You can indicate on your consent form whether you would like to review your transcript, a summary of the draft findings, and the completed findings. I will take all feedback into consideration before finalising the research findings.

You will be able to access my final thesis after it is complete, by searching at https://tuwhera.aut.ac.nz/open-theses.

What do I do if I have concerns about this research?

Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Dr Katherine Ravenswood, *Katherine.ravenswood@aut.ac.nz, 921 9999 ext 5064.*

Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary of AUTEC, Kate O'Connor, *ethics@aut.ac.nz*, 921 9999 ext 6038.

Whom do I contact for further information about this research?

Please keep this Information Sheet and a copy of the Consent Form for your future reference. You are also able to contact the research team as follows:

Researcher Contact Details:

Tanya Ewertowska, *wpn2956@autuni.ac.nz*, 021 0232 0427.

Project Supervisor Contact Details:

Dr Katherine Ravenswood, *Katherine.ravenswood@aut.ac.nz, 921 9999 ext 5064.*

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 29/01/2019, AUTEC Reference number 19/10.

Appendix 3: Participant Consent Form

Consent Form

Project title:	***Young New Zealand workers' experiences of non-standard work and employment in New Zealand.***
Project Supervisor:	***Dr Katherine Ravenswood and Dr Julie Douglas***
Researcher:	***Tanya Ewertowska***

- ○ I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated 10 December 2018.
- ○ I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.
- ○ I understand that notes will be taken during the interviews and that they will also be audio-taped and transcribed.
- ○ I understand that taking part in this study is voluntary (my choice) and that I may withdraw from the study at any time without being disadvantaged in any way.
- ○ I understand that if I withdraw from the study then I will be offered the choice between having any data that is identifiable as belonging to me removed or allowing it to continue to be used. However, once the findings have been produced, removal of my data may not be possible.
- ○ I agree to take part in this research.
- ○ I wish to receive a copy of my interview transcript for the specific purpose of removing identifying information (please tick one): Yes○ No○
- ○ I wish to receive a summary of the draft research findings so that I will have the opportunity to give feedback on them (please tick one): Yes○ No○
- ○ I wish to receive a summary of the completed research findings (please tick one): Yes○ No○

Participant's signature: ....

Participant's name: ....

Participant's contact details:

....

....

....

....

Date:

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 29/01/2019, AUTEC Reference number 19/10.

Note: The Participant should retain a copy of this form.

Appendix 4: Transcriber Confidentiality Agreement

Confidentiality Agreement

Project title:	***Young New Zealand workers' experiences of non-standard work and employment in New Zealand.***
Project Supervisor:	***Dr Katherine Ravenswood and Dr Julie Douglas***
Researcher:	***Tanya Ewertowska***

○ I understand that all the material I will be asked to transcribe is confidential.

○ I understand that the contents of the tapes or recordings can only be discussed with the researchers.

○ I will not keep any copies of the transcripts nor allow third parties access to them.

Transcriber's signature: ....

Transcriber's name: ....

Transcriber's Contact Details (if appropriate):

....

....

....

....

Date:

Project Supervisor's Contact Details (if appropriate):

....

....

....

....

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 29/01/2019. AUTEC Reference number 19/10.

Note: The Transcriber should retain a copy of this form.

Appendix 5: Research Advertisements

MILLENIAL WORKER

Share your experiences in a 60-minute interview.

The purpose of this master's research is to find out what young New Zealanders' experiences of non-standard work are.

I am looking for individuals who are **20-24 years old** and completed **primary and high school in New Zealand**.

Get in contact if you have done any of the following types of work for at least **6 months** continuously, sometime in the last 2 years:

- **Casual hours**
- **Shifts and changing shifts**
- **Weekends or nights**
- **Less than 40 hours a week**
- **Fixed term**
- **Something like the above**

All interviews will be at an AUT campus in a mutually agreed place and time. Participation is confidential.

Contact Tanya at **wpn2956@autuni.ac.nz** for more information, and to register your interest.

This master's research was approved by AUTEC on 29/01/2019, application number 19/10.

Posted 8 March 2019

Have you done non-standard* work?

Research participants wanted for 60-minute interview

*Non-standard includes casual hours, shifts, weekends, nights, part-time, fixed-term and more

Email wpn2956@autuni.ac.nz to register interest

Participants need to:

- be aged 20-24
- have done primary and high school in NZ
- have done any of the above types of work for at least **6 months** continuously, sometime in the last 2 years

This master's research was approved by AUTEC on 29/01/2019, application number 19/10.

Posted 10 July 2020

Appendix 6: Interview Questions

Interview Questions

Interview number: ___

Pseudonym (name to be used in research outputs): _____________

☐ Completed primary and high school in NZ

☐ Have done at least six months continuous non-standard work or employment sometime in the last two years

Age: ___

---

1. To start with, could you tell me briefly about the work experience you have, starting with when you first began working?
2. You're here today because of your experience with non-standard work/employment, could you tell me (more about) what non-standard work and employment you have been in?
   - What type of work or organisation(s) were (are) you in?
   - What was (is) the job(s)?
   - What sort of contract(s) were (are) you on?
   - Could you describe how your schedule worked (works)?
3. How did you get this work?
   - Why did you go into non-standard work/employment?
   - What sort of work/employment were you looking for at the time? Was it for this type of work/ employment? Or another type?
4. Could you perhaps reflect on your day-to-day life (while you were) in non-standard work/employment?
   - Talk me through a typical day/week, including being at work and at home?
     - What did that mean for you?
     - Would you like to tell me?
     - How did you feel?
5. What I'd like to do now is explore what you felt were (feel are) the positive and negative aspects of that work. What were (are) the aspects of your life that were positively impacted? And what aspects of life were (are) negatively impacted? E.g. relationships, income, work-life balance.
   - Are there any ways that you felt (feel) treated differently by your employer(s)? For example, compared to other employees? Or compared to any standard work you have done.
   - What was the worst impact? And which was the best impact?
6. If your experience was a house, what sort of house would it be? How would you describe that house?
7. What are the main differences that stand out to you between your non-standard work that you have done, and standard work/employment?
   - How might your life be different if you were in standard work/employment?
   - Were (are) there any noticeable changes or differences in your life – between the work you did before and/or after doing non-standard work?
8. I've reached the end of my questions now – Is there anything else that you think we've missed, or that you've thought of while we've been talking?