

Nonstandard Employment and Its Effect on Decent Work Agenda

**Dr. Rosemary A. Danesi, Mr. Akinjobi Wasiu &
Mr. Bright Asonye**

*Department of Employment Relations and Human Resource Management,
University of Lagos, Akoka;
Manaar-Ul-Huda College, Ikorodu;
& Department of Employment Relations and Human Resource Management,
University of Lagos, Akoka.*

Abstract

This paper explores the implications of nonstandard employment on decent work agenda. The objectives of this study include: to examine the extent to which nonstandard employment relates to unfair income; to find out how seriously job security is taken care of in nonstandard employment; to confirm whether or not social security exists in nonstandard employment; and to investigate the relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work. The research designs adopted were descriptive and quantitative. A total of 126 participants from five private senior secondary schools in Ikorodu area of Lagos State were used in the study. The study collected only primary data. The main instrument for collecting the primary data was a questionnaire. The statistical analysis included descriptive and inferential statistics to determine the strength of relationship between variables in order to establish the strength of association between the dependent and independent variables. The findings through the test of hypotheses revealed that: unfair income is synonymous with nonstandard employment; nonstandard employment lacks job security; workers in nonstandard employment do not get social security; and there is a relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work. It was deduced that nonstandard employment has huge negative implications for the achievement of decent work agenda. This study recommends that those should be established legal framework that recognises the existence of nonstandard workers, ensuring they enjoy the same benefits as the permanent employee and also ensuring that the legal framework is followed and implemented.

Keywords: Nonstandard employment, decent work, job security, International Labour Organization

Introduction

Before the advent of the British Colonialists, employment for wages was alien to Nigeria. It was largely an agrarian state. It was basically a subsistence economy,

and people served the village heads, whilst custom had established the practice that people should serve their parents, village heads and the community without remuneration. The people engaged in peasant farming as their occupation renders help on co-operative basis on different days, people work for a particular person, that individual will be responsible for everyone's feeding. This is replicated for other people until everyone is served in return (Wogu, 1969).

According to Fajana (2008), the later introduction of currency into the economy of various communities did not on its own culminate in wage employment because the economy was dominated by peasant farming. Therefore, with mutual co-operation, each family was able to produce more than enough to feed members of their family as well as to barter or sell the excess to earn money (cowry shells, manila etc.) to satisfy other needs. Peasant farming based on a co-operative system facilitated relative freedom that cannot be found in wage employment so that when wage employment was later introduced, it was seen as undignifying. Hence, those who accepted it did so as a temporary measure to satisfy immediate wants at the end of which they returned to their peasant farming (Seibel, 1973).

Fajana (2008) claimed that wage employment gained speed when the Landers' Brother discovered the mouth of the River Niger in 1830 and Quinine was developed and experimented in 1854. These two developments paved way for the movement of Europeans along the River Niger into the interior communities. A major outgrowth which further enhanced exploration was the introduction of steam ship which enabled the Europeans to engage in large scale trading with the people of the interior. Factories were established along the River Niger and Benue in such areas like Onitsha, Aboh and Idah. Native people were employed to help man these factories while others were engaged as porters, security men etc.

After this period, other sources of wage employment were in the mines like the tin ore mine in Jos, the Cameroon plantations and harbours across the country. The introduction of taxes for the adult male of the population forced more people to join wage employment, while the British Colonial Government also introduced incentives such as free medical facilities coupled with living in clean environments; these attracted more people into wage employment (Yesufu, 1982). The tastes of the wage earners also changed with the exposure to life in urban areas and with contacts with the Europeans; the only way to satisfy these new tastes was to pick up a permanent wage employment, which also became a status symbol (Ibid, 1982). Since the silver coins were already in circulation, this enhanced the chances of payments of wages and made wage employment very

attractive; this marked the formal beginning of the importation of the British Voluntarist system of employment/industrial relations practiced in Nigeria (Yesufu, 1982; Ananaba, 1969). The British Voluntarist employment relations practice (ERP) worked effectively with payment of wages for labour; the British ERP worked unhindered and replaced the Nigerian Paternalistic employment relations practice (Onwuka, 1982).

In 1930, the International Labour Organization (ILO) adopted the Forced Labour Convention by which forced labour was declared illegal. By 1933, the Nigerian Government through the Forced Labour Ordinance (No. 22 of 1933) implemented the provision of the Convention. It must be said that forced labour still continued in the rural areas as the Chiefs were by law (Native Law and Customs) allowed to use forced labour; the Colonial Administrative officers could then request the Chiefs to supply them with workers (Yesufu, 1982). All forms of forced labour were abolished in Nigeria through the 1956 Labour Code (Amendment) Ordinance, No. 3 of 1956.

The acceptance of wage employment by the natives coupled with the economic depression of 1930 which created surplus of labour made the Government and other employers to reduce their labour intakes and this led to unemployment (Afigbo, 1972). At this stage, it is convenient to suggest that wage employment has come to stay in Nigeria, it is seriously and rapidly gaining more grounds as a major factor in the labour market, and that the British Voluntarist employment/industrial relations practice has totally replaced the Nigerian Paternalistic employment/industrial relations practice (Iwuji, 1968).

Nigeria is bedevilled by the crises of development and labour market saturation coupled with recession, and employers' intention to keep cost of labour as low as possible has resulted in the proliferation in nonstandard employment relations such as contract work, casual work or part time work even though workers in these categories have prerequisite skills to hold full time jobs with varying implications for decent work agenda.

Nonstandard employment relationship is frequently associated with the following typology: part-time, casual work, contract work, outsourced jobs, fixed-term work, temporary work, on-call work and home workers. All of these forms of employment are related in that they depart from the standard employment relationship (full-time, continuous work with one employer). Each form of nonstandard employment may offer its own challenges but they all share more or

less the same disadvantages: low wages, few benefits, lack of collective representation by unions, little or no job security and definite duration (Okougbo, 2004; Okafor, 2007, 2010; Mokwenye, 2008)

The menace of nonstandard employment is gaining grounds in an unprecedented proportion, intensity and scale. The increase in the spread and gradual acceptance of this labour practice in the Nigerian labour market has become an issue of great concern to stakeholders. Employers of labour are increasingly filling positions in their organizations that are supposed to be permanent with temporary employees. The trend has been largely attributed to the increasing desperation of employers to cut down organizational costs. In some foreign firms in Nigeria, it is possible for one to get as many as over one thousand workers in an industry out of which many of them are on contract appointments. In some indigenous industries in the formal sector, it is possible to get situation whereby virtually all the employees are either casual or contract staff. This category of staff has either professional or administrative skills (Adenugba, 2003). It is also very common in many establishments whether in indigenous, transnational or multi-national firms, either public or private industry, including telecommunications sector, oil and gas sector, power sector, banking sector (both old and new generations banks), education sector, and so on (Okougbo, 2004; Okafor, 2007; Idowu, 2010).

Nonstandard employment is seen as an appropriate strategy for cost reduction. It may on the periphery seem to be justifiable since reduced cost means higher profit which is the ultimate goal of every organization. However, such employment ultimately presents lots of challenges to the employees and organizations alike. In the name of survival, the desperate job seekers in the labour force are willing to take any job no matter how precarious or degrading it is. Nonstandard workers occupy precarious positions in the workplace and society, and are effectively a new set of “underclass” in the modern capitalist economy.

The decent job advocated by the ILO will simply remain a mirage in relation to nonstandard employment relations in Nigeria. The point here is that when concerted effort is not made by the government to create jobs or provide conducive environment for the people to create their own jobs, nonstandard employment relations will continue to flourish to the delight of the employers driven by profit motives. Promoting decent work has been the main thrust of the agenda of Juan Somavia when he assumed office as the Director-General of the ILO in 1999. This is borne out of the fact that there is decent work deficit across

the globe, both in developed and developing countries. Decent work is captured in four strategic objectives enunciated by the ILO. These are the fundamental principles and rights at work and international labour standards and they include employment and income opportunities; social protection and security; social dialogue and tripartism (Adewumi, 2008). However, to make decent work a reality in a country like Nigeria, there is the need for total review of not only the labour law but also the practice of industrial relations to protect this category of workers from the greedy and lawless indigenous and multinational employers who take delight in violating labour standards for their own selfish advantage. This study is meant to examine nonstandard employment and its implication for decent work agenda.

Statement of the Problem

In simple expressions, decent work implies access to employment in conditions of freedom, the recognition of basic rights at work which guarantee the absence of discrimination or harassment, an income enabling one to satisfy basic economic, social and family needs and responsibilities, adequate level of social protection for the worker and family members, and the exercise of voice and participation at work, directly or indirectly through self-chosen representative organizations (ILO, 2005). Nonstandard employment such as casual work which is supposed to be a form of temporary employment has acquired the status of permanent employment in many organizations in Nigeria without the statutory benefits associated with permanent employment. Casual workers are subject to lower pay, barred from their right to join a union, and denied medical and other benefits. They are also in a less favourable situation than their full-time counterparts in terms of job security. Even fixed-term contracts typically offer a lower level of protection to workers in terms of termination of their employment. Workers employed through temporary work agencies may be working particularly long hours if they are isolated from their families or live in dormitories specially provided by the agencies. Long and erratic working hours thus have implications for the occupational safety and health of workers.

It is on record that Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC) opposed nonstandard employment relations and also against the employer's disregard for the dignity, integrity and rights of workers which are protected by the nation's labour laws, constitution and International Labour Organization's conventions. This stance resulted in the NLC and Nigeria Employers Consultative Association (NECA) reaching an agreement for employers to regularize casual employment in accordance with prevailing procedural and substantive collective agreements in

the industry, which will also be taken into account in protecting the rights of the workers. Casualisation still exists to date in some organizations. Also, workers in on-call employment and casual arrangements typically have limited control over when they work, with implications for work–life balance, but also income security, given that pay is uncertain.

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to examine the implications of nonstandard employment on decent work agenda. This study specifically focuses on the following objectives:

- i. To examine the extent to which nonstandard employment relates to unfair income;
- ii. To find out how well job security connects with nonstandard employment;
- iii. To confirm whether social security exist in nonstandard employment or not; and
- iv. To investigate the relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work.

Research Questions

In an attempt to effectively carry out this study, the following research questions are raised:

- i. To what extent is nonstandard employment related to unfair income?
- ii. How well does job security connect with nonstandard employment?
- iii. What level of social security exists in a nonstandard employment?
- iv. What is the relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work?

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses were developed from the research questions. The following hypotheses were tested:

- i. H₀: There is no significant relationship between nonstandard employment and unfair income.
- ii. H₀: There is no significant relationship between nonstandard employment and job security.
- iii. H₀: Workers in nonstandard employment do not significantly get social security.
- iv. H₀: There is no significant relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work.

Theoretical Context of Nonstandard Employment Relations

It is believed that nonstandard employment relationship is anchored on the neo-liberal theory. Conceptually, neoliberalism refers to the desire to intensify and expand the market, by increasing the number, frequency, repeatability, and formalisation of transactions. Neoliberalism seeks to transfer part of the control of the economy from public to the private sector under the belief that it will produce a more efficient government and improve the economic indicators of the nation. The neo-liberal theory sees the nation primarily as a business firm. In this context a firm is selling itself as an investment location, rather than simply selling export goods. A neo-liberal organisation pursues policies designed to make it reduce cost and maximize benefits in the competitive socio-economic environment. These policies are generally pro-business. The features of neoliberalism at the national include the rule of the market; cutting public expenditure for social services and eliminating the concept of “the public good”.

At the organisational or individual level, neoliberalism is based on the freedom of individual contract. Freedom of contract is the right to choose a person’s contracting parties and to trade or work with them on any terms and conditions the person sees fit. Contracts permit organisation and prospective workers to create their own enforceable legal rules and adapt to their unique situations (Hall, 1988; Roper, Ganesh and Inkson, 2010). Organisations operating in a typical neo-liberal economic environment may prefer nonstandard employment which in effect grants them the flexibility to review the terms of engagement depending on the dynamism of labour market and competitive nature of socio-economic environment. This kind of flexibilisation reduces cost of production, boosts profit but at the same time minimizes or cheapens workers' quality of working lives (Friedman, 1988; Roper et al, 2010). In essence globalisation and the spread of information technology have created new kind of rational organisations that emphasize flexibility in the labour market and in employment relationships (Porter, 1990; Stiglitz, 2002). In most countries these influences have resulted in the prevalence of nonstandard employment relations and by extension rise in precarious work.

Literature Review

Nonstandard Employment: Explained

Defining nonstandard employment with consistent terminology is problematic. There was no universally agreed definition which makes inconsistency a major limitation in any attempts at generalisation, and drawing conclusions from

reviews of the literature. There are numerous forms of nonstandard work, while the topic can also be complicated by dynamics such as the presence of a third-party in temporary agency arrangements. The category is defined largely by what it is not, with the diverse range of work types sharing a common feature of differing from standard work.

The fact that there was not universally agreed definition was evident in the work of Danesi (2011), who called it ‘nonstandard work arrangement’. In her view, “nonstandard work arrangements (NSWAs) are widely used to describe work arrangement which do not fall within the traditional understanding or definition of employment”. They are seen as employments that are not permanent in nature. In other parts of the world, however, this is referred to as temporary, fixed-term, non-permanent, and even casual employment (De Cuyper et al., 2008).

Nonstandard employment is considered having two main characteristics of job patterns: part time and temporary. On the contrary, full-time and permanent jobs are considered as standard jobs. The first dimension is in regards to both employees and self-employed, while the second is usually related only to employees. In some cases, nonstandard employment may also include own account self-employment. However, self-employment is a heterogeneous group that cannot be classified in nonstandard employment as a whole.

A key issue in any discussion of the definition of nonstandard work was highlighted in Ashford et al. (2008) that observed the term “nonstandard work” is the assumption that there is a form of “standard work” from which this new work arrangement deviates. They argue that in any serious discussion of nonstandard work or workers, one must consider the context in which that type of work operates. Their point is that some of the effects of nonstandard arrangement on individuals, and on organization stem from the newness of this type of employment arrangement.

Basically, according to Bernard (2011), nonstandard work is distinguished from the standard employment relationship with regards to any of the traditional model’s cores features;

- i. The notion of ongoing employment is absent, and instead of permanency and continuity, there is often limited duration and fixed termination date.
- ii. Rather than working at the employer’s workplace and on the employer’s premises, under his or her supervision, nonstandard arrangements can occur

at a range of sites, and can be ‘market mediated’ as with temporary agency workers (De Cuyper et al. 2008).

- iii. Typically, workers in nonstandard temporary arrangements have fewer, or even none, of the employment-specific statutory protections and benefits available under standard work.

In countries around the world, there are different forms of nonstandard employment. Spoonley (2004) outlined the New Zealand situation and noted that of all nonstandard work forms, casual/temporary had become the most dominant and the fastest growing. However, a number of classification systems have been used regarding the forms of nonstandard employment. Connolly and Gallagher (2004) for example, proposed four broad groupings of nonstandard work;

- i. Workers directly hired (by an organisation) on a seasonal contract;
- ii. Direct-hire or in-house, where the organization hires temporary workers directly; rather than using an agency, and their hours of work can vary;
- iii. Temporary staff agencies, where work is of fixed duration;
- iv. Workers engaged as independent contractors. It is also often defined as self-employed, where their work is provided on a fixed term or project basis.

Decent work and its Objectives

The concept was first introduced in 1999 by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Director-General, Juan Somavia in the Report of the Director-General: Decent Work. In the Report, the Director-General identified the need for reform of the traditional activities of the ILO as a result of a variety of influences in the 1980s and 1990s, including global economic integration, changing social attitudes towards conditions of work, and a post-Cold War weakening of ILO constituents’ common purpose. In an effort to devise an agenda for the future, the 1999 Report declared that the mission of the ILO was henceforth to be the promotion of, “...opportunities for women and men to obtain decent and productive work, in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity”. This mission thus became popularly known as Decent Work Agenda.

Decent work is captured in four strategic objectives enunciated by the ILO. These are the fundamental principles and rights at work and international labour standards and they include; employment and income opportunities; social protection and social security; social dialogue and tripartism (Adewumi, 2008). However, Barrientos (2007) have identified the employment challenges that are associated with these objectives.

Employment and income opportunities: This objective states that economy should generate opportunities for investment, entrepreneurship, skills development, job creation and sustainable livelihoods. Barrientos (2007) stated that employment challenges arise from the diversity of employment generated by global production system. And for a job to be decent, it should be permanent, regular and secure in order to guarantee continuous income for worker.

Social protection: This objective attempt to promote recognition and respect for the rights of workers. All workers in particular disadvantage, need representation, participation, and laws that work for their interests. In Barrientos' view, the rights challenge relates to the difficulty of organisation or representation amongst such workers. Without collective power to negotiate with employers, workers are not in a position to access or secure other rights.

Social security: This centres on extending social protection. This objective seeks to promote both inclusion and productivity by ensuring that women and men enjoy working conditions that are safe, allow adequate free time and rest, take into account family and social values, provide for adequate compensation in case of lost or reduced income and permit access to adequate healthcare. According to Barrientos, the implication of social protection relates to the lack of access many flexible and informal workers have to a contract of employment and legal employment benefits. They are often denied access to other forms of protection and social assistance by the state.

Social dialogue: This objective maintains that involvement of strong and independent workers' and employers' organization is central to increasing productivity, avoiding disputes at work and building cohesive societies. Barrientos opined that the social dialogue challenge arises from the lack of effective voice or independent representation of such workers in a process of dialogue with employers, government and other stakeholders.

Implications of Nonstandard Employment on Decent Work Agenda

In reference to the work of Okafor (2012), there may be employment that is flexible, insecure and informal within the same firm. The Nigerian economy as presently structured is incapable of generating jobs for millions of able-bodied men and women willing to work. The main implication of this is that people desperately searching for means of survival even if it means picking up any kind of job offered to them. Against this background, most employers, both local and foreign, usually capitalize on this desperate situation of the people to exploit,

oppress and dehumanize this category of people who are in nonstandard employment (Mokwenye, 2008; Abideen & Osuji, 2011). When concerted effort is not made by the government to create jobs or provide conducive environment for the people to create their own jobs, nonstandard employment relations will continue to flourish to the delight of the employers driven by profit motives. With this, decent job as advocated by the ILO will simply remain a mirage in relation to nonstandard employment relations in Nigeria.

Also, nonstandard workers do not enjoy any form of social protection either from their employers or the state. A typical example is not been included in pension scheme by their employers neither do they enjoy any form of unemployment benefit from the state. This leaves many workers in this category very vulnerable to economic shocks both in their places of work and in the large society. The implication here is that this category of employees in relations to social security are despised by their employers and rejected by the state.

In Nigeria, workers in nonstandard employment are denied several rights. The Nigeria labour law does not empower this category of workers to join a trade union. When workers are not allowed to join trade unions in their places of work, so many of their rights could be denied. In such situation, the employers dictate terms and conditions of work with little or resistance from the workers. This affects their ability to negotiate or bargain collectively with their employers especially as it relates to pay, hours of work, health and safety measures and such related issues.

In addition, these categories of workers lack a very strong voice both within and outside the place of work due to their inability to unionize. Hence, their chances of engaging in social dialogue of whatever type with their employees and other stakeholders are very limited (Odu, 2011). When the employers exploit and oppress their workers because the workers do not have real choice or alternate, the dedication, commitment and behavior of such workers to their work, the organization and the state will be questionable. This has a very serious implication for productivity in both the workplace and in the larger society.

Decent work may be ideal but not a reality for most workers in nonstandard employment relations. Nigeria labour market is highly saturated, indigenous and foreign employers capitalize on this, therefore decent work will be difficult to achieve. In some developed countries, nonstandard work is driven by choice not by compulsion to survive but in Nigeria's situation, it is driven by compulsion to

survive and not by choice. Only practice of good industrial relations can protect this category of workers from the present situation.

Empirical Framework

Serrano (2014) believes there is a positive connection between employment opportunities and decent work deficit, as this, according to employers, provides an avenue for nonstandard work employees to be substantially engaged in job employment. And that it serves a way to prepare them by undergoing training and secured job tenure for a standard work and better opportunities in the future. The motive behind Serrano's (2014) opinion is that those still employed in nonstandard work arrangements, that is job considered precarious jobs, should at least be glad at the time, since there are limited job opportunities available for them to be engaged in.

According to Bamidele (2011), Nigerian workers are faced with precarious employment due to the high level of unemployment and the level of poverty in the country. Therefore, over time they resort to creating survival strategies in order to get themselves engaged in any kind of job available for them, regardless of how precarious the jobs are. Hence, employers mistreat workers in Nigerian organisations in terms of salaries, wages and salaries arrears system, promotion, motivation, training, sense of belonging, job commitment, and dehumanization of work and the workers.

Wandera (2011) examined the effects of short term employment contract on an organisation. In order to fully cover the research, the study further examines the impact of employing employees on short-term basis, how short-term employment affects employees and organisational performance, and how organisations are surviving the challenges they are faced with in short-term employment. The study showed that short-term engagement has effect on the productivity of staff in organisations since it requires a lot time and effort to train new employees as their turnover was high. The research also identified that short-term employments increase temporary employees' feelings of divided commitment. Wandera (2011) discovered that more and more temporary employees are engaged because it helps the organisation cut down on their expenses due to the tough economic situation and to ensure the organisation can compete with other organisations. As a result of temporary employment, employees may leave at any time, their motivations will be very low, and it will have negative effect on the productivity (Wandera, 2011).

Winkler, Mason, Laska, Christoph, and Neumark-Sztainer (2018) examined the relationships between nonstandard work schedules, employees' health behaviour and wellbeing. The study investigated the possibilities for a series of less healthy behavioural and wellbeing outcomes among nonstandard workers in relations to workers whose employment are standard.

Work, being a major social factor can cause an employee's health and welfare to be affected. Nonstandard workers are at a higher risk of a number of unfavourable behaviour, wellbeing and the likelihood to be obese compared to workers in standard employment. Hence, there are little or no difference in terms of risks existing between various nonstandard work schedules (Winkler, Mason, Laska, Christoph, & Neumark-Sztainer, 2018).

Ntisa, Dhurup & Joubert (2016) studied the influence of contract of employment status and its influence on the job satisfaction of academics, which was carried out within the South African University of Technology. The study adopted a quantitative research method, and a cross-sectional survey design was used in this study. According Ntisa, Dhurup and Joubert (2016), the permanent contract of employment has a positive significant influence on the job satisfaction of academics, and in contrast, both the fixed-term and temporary contract of employment have negative significant influence on the job satisfaction of academics.

Research Methodology

This involves research methods and logical steps - what to do and how to solve the problem and achieve proposed objectives. Which research methods will be used? These include the population of the study, the sampling procedure and data collection, the sampling technique, the sample size, research instrument (questionnaire) and method of data analysis.

Study Population

The population of the study is relatively moderate. It consists of only employees of some private secondary schools in Ikorodu area of Lagos. However, because of the limitation of time, only five (5) private secondary schools consisting of one hundred and eighty-four (184) employees are used.

Sampling Frame

Table 1: The sampling frame shows the number of samples and their destinations in the chosen private secondary schools in Ikorodu:

S/N	Designation	Male	Female	Total
1	Principal	3	2	5
2	Vice Principal	7	3	10
3	DOS	3	2	5
4	HOD	9	6	15
5	Admin. Officer	3	3	6
6	Class teacher	13	11	24
7	Subject teacher	41	34	75
8	Bursar	3	2	5
9	Caterer	2	8	10
10	Cleaner	6	14	20
11	Driver	7	0	7
12	Others	1	1	2
	Total	98	86	184

Source: Survey, 2019

Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

A stratified random sampling technique was used. Then, random sampling was applied to administer the questionnaires to the respondents of the chosen schools. The reason for this is because it affords every member of the sample an equal opportunity of being selected and also to reduce bias to the barest minimum. The sample for the study was determined using the Taro Yamane’s (1967) formula for calculating sampling size. The result of the sample size calculation is limited to 184 respondents. The formula is stated thus:

$$\frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where; n= the sample size,
 N= the population size,
 1= constant, and
 e= the margin of error (i.e. 0.05)

Therefore, n =

$$\frac{184}{1 + 184 (0.05)^2}$$

$$\frac{184}{1 + 184 (0.0025)}$$

$$\frac{184}{1 + 184 (0.0025)}$$

$$\frac{184}{1.46}$$

n= 126.027

n= 126 (Sample Size)

Reliability of the Research Instruments

Scale: All Variables

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	15	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	15	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.945	20

The result from the pilot test above shows that the test which has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.945, meets the minimum criterion, thus the questions are acceptable and very reliable for the research.

3.5 Instrument for Data Collection

Hence, for data collection purpose in the study, a questionnaire was employed. However, the questionnaire comprises of two sections. The questionnaire is divided into two sections. The first section provides the socio-demographical information of the respondents under study.

In addition, the second section contains items that are structured to elicit responses from the respondents regarding the research questions proposed to

guide the study. These items are scored using a five-point Likert scale of strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, undecided = 3, disagreed = 2 and strongly disagreed = 1.

Data Analysis and Presentation

The study collected data from 126 respondents, and two hundred and sixty-four (264) were satisfactorily completed and returned. The data was coded and cleaned through extensive checks and consistency.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 2: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	65	55.6
Female	52	44.4
Total	117	100.0
Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	36	30.8
Married	80	68.3
Divorced	-	-
Widowed	1	0.9
Total	117	100.0
Age group	Frequency	Percent
< 25 years	15	12.8
25- 39 years	78	66.7
40- 49 years	17	14.5
50-59 years	6	5.1
60 years or above	1	0.9
Total	117	100.0
Designation	Frequency	Percent
Class teacher	14	12
Subject teacher	69	59
Bursar	-	-
Admin. Officer	6	5.1
D.O.S	3	2.5
Cleaner	-	-
Driver	-	-
Caterer	-	-
H.O.D	12	10.3
Principal	2	1.7
Vice principal	10	8.5
Others	1	0.9
Total	117	100.0

Qualification	Frequency	Percent
FSCL	-	-
SSCE	3	2.5
NABTEB	1	0.9
NCE	10	8.5
OND	3	2.5
HND	25	21.4
BSc/BEEd	60	51.3
Master's degree	13	11.1
PhD	-	-
Others	2	1.7
Total	117	100.0
Monthly salary range	Frequency	Percent
#10,000-#20,000	13	11.1
#21,000-#30,000	28	23.9
#31,000-#40,000	32	27.4
#41,000-#50,000	15	12.8
#51,000-#60,000	4	3.4
#61,000-#70,000	4	3.4
#71,000-#80,000	-	-
#81,000-#90,000	2	1.7
#91,000 and above	19	16.2
Total	117	100.0
Years of experience	Frequency	Percentage
< 1 year	15	12.8
1 - 5 years	68	58.1
6 - 15 years	30	25.6
16 - 20 years	4	3.4
21 years and above	-	-
Total	117	100

Source: Survey, 2018

Table 1 shows the gender of the respondents in which 55.6% were male while 44.4% were female. This shows that majority of the respondents are male but it will not have any effect on the outcome of the result since the data collected is not gender sensitive. Regarding the respondents' marital status, 30.8% of respondents were single, 68.3% of the respondents were married while 0.9% of them were widowed without any divorced respondents. The data on the respondents' age group shows that 12.8% were under 25 years, 66.7% of respondents were between 25-39 years, 14.5% of respondents were between 40-49 years, 5.1% of respondents were between 50-59 years while 0.9% of respondents in the group of 60 years or above. The highest proportions of the respondents were within the age bracket of 25-39 years. In terms of the designation of the respondents, 12% of

them were class teachers, 59% of them were representing subject teachers, 5.1% of them occupies administrative officer's position, 2.5% of them were D.O.S, 10.3% of respondents represented those occupying H.O.D's positions, 1.7% of respondents were principals, 8.5% of the respondent were vice principals while 0.9% of them were representing others. The data on highest qualification shows that there were no holders of either FSLC or PhD, 2.5% of the respondents each hold SSCE and OND, 0.9% of the respondents were NABTEB holders, 8.5% of the respondents were NCE holders, HND holders occupied 21.4 % of the respondents, B.Sc. holders took 51.3% of the respondents, 11.1% of the respondents were master's degree holders while 1.7% of the respondents were others. This implies that virtually all the respondents are academically grounded and therefore, their contributions to the research will be more relevant and useful.

Furthermore, the monthly salary range data shows that 11.1% of the respondents were earning between #10,000 to #20,000, 23.9% of the respondents were earning between #21,000 to #30,000, 27.4% of the respondents were earning between #31,000 to #40,000, 12.8% of the respondents were earning between #41,000 to #50,000, 3.4% of the respondents each were earning between #51,000 to #60,000 and #61,000 to #70,000 respectively, 1.7% of the respondents were earning between ₦81,000 to ₦90,000, 16.2% of the respondents were earning ₦90,000 and above while no respondents were earning between ₦71,000 to ₦80,000. Regarding the years of experience, the data shows that there were 12.8% of respondents who had under a year of experience, 58.1% of respondents had between 1 to 5 years working experience, 25.6% of the respondents had between 6 to 15 years of experience, 3.4% of the respondents had between 16 to 20 years of experience while no respondents had above 21 years of experience. It is evident that the numbers of years majority of the respondents have put in their organizations are reasonable enough to make them earn a reasonable and fair income due to their commitment.

4.1 Analyses of Research Questionnaires

Table 3: Respondents’ views on to what extent is nonstandard employment related to unfair income?

To what extent is nonstandard employment related to unfair income?	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
What I am earning is reasonable.	2 1.7%	34 29%	1 0.9%	48 41%	32 27.4%
My salary is commensurate with the service I am rendering.	1 0.9%	23 19.7%	1 0.9%	47 40.1%	45 38.4%
What I am earning makes me have low standard of living.	30 25.6%	45 38.4%	3 2.6%	32 27.4%	7 6%
What I am paid covers my necessity of life.	6 5.1%	17 14.5%	3 2.6%	46 39.3%	45 38.4%
My contribution to the organization is well rewarded.	3 2.6%	32 27.4%	13 11.1%	49 41.9%	20 17%

Source: Survey, 2018

Respondents’ views on to what extent is Nonstandard Employment related to Unfair Income?

Table 2 shows that 1.7% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 41% respondents disagreed, 29% of respondents agreed with the statement while 0.9% of respondents were undecided about the statement, 27.4% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement that what they are earning is reasonable. The table also shows that 19.7% of respondents agreed about the statement, 0.9% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 0.9% of the respondents were undecided, 40.1% respondents disagreed while 38.4% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement that my salary is commensurate with the service I am rendering. Respondents’ views on the statement that what I am earning makes me have low standard of living shows that 38.4% of respondents agreed with the statement while 25.6% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement. There were 2.6% of respondents, who were undecided about the statement and 27.4% of the respondents who disagreed while 6% of the respondents strongly disagree with the statement. Furthermore, respondents’ views to the question that what I am paid covers my necessity of life shows that 5.1% strongly agree to this statement, 14.5% agree, 2.6% were undecided while 39.3% and 38.4% disagree and strongly disagree respectively. Finally, the question on my contribution to the organization is well rewarded shows that 2.6% strongly agree, 41.9% disagree, 27.4% agree, 11.1% undecided and 17% strongly disagree.

Table 4: Respondents’ views on how well is job security taken care of in a nonstandard employment?

Items	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
My job is secured.	8 6.8%	32 27.4%	6 5.1%	58 49.6%	13 11.1%
I cannot be released off my job unexpectedly.	9 7.7%	46 39.3%	5 4.3%	35 29.9%	22 18.8%
There is provision of severance pay at the end of my employment.	8 6.8%	17 14.5%	12 10.3%	40 34.2%	40 34.2%
I don’t experience harassment in the course of my job.	10 8.5%	45 38.4%	1 0.9%	45 38.4%	16 13.7%
I am treated equally as others.	11 9.4%	58 49.6%	2 1.7%	30 25.6%	16 13.7%

Source: Survey, 2018

Table 3 shows that 6.8% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 49.6% respondents disagreed, 27.4% of respondents agreed with the statement while 5.1% of respondents were undecided about the statement, 11.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement ‘that my job is secured’. The table also shows that 39.3% of respondents agreed about the statement, 7.7% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 29.9% respondents disagreed, 4.3% were undecided while 18.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement that I cannot be released off my job unexpectedly. Respondents’ views on the statement that there is provision of severance pay at the end of my employment shows that 14.5% of respondents agreed with the statement while 6.8% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement. There were 10.3% of respondents, who were undecided about the statement and 34.2% of the respondents who disagreed and strongly disagree with the statement that there is provision of severance pay at the end of my employment. Furthermore, respondents’ views to the question that I don’t experience harassment in the course of my job shows that 8.5% strongly agree to this statement, 38.4% agree, 0.9% were undecided while 38.4% and 13.7% disagree and strongly disagree respectively. Finally, the question on I am treated equally as others shows that 9.4% strongly agree, 25.6% disagree, 49.6% agree, 1.7% undecided and 13.7% strongly disagree.

Table 5: Respondents' views on is social security in existence in a nonstandard employment?

Items	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
When I am sick, there is sickness pay for me.	4 3.4%	22 18.8%	4 3.4%	29 24.8%	58 49.6%
I do enjoy annual vacation from my place of work.	17 14.5%	33 28.2%	5 4.3%	28 23.9%	34 29.1%
A pension scheme is provided for at my place of work.	24 20.5%	30 25.6%	5 4.3%	18 15.4%	40 34.2%
There is partial childcare leave for me at my work place.	14 12%	42 35.9%	7 6%	33 28.2%	21 17.9%
There is provision of employment insurance.	8 6.8%	13 11.1%	9 7.7%	42 35.9%	45 38.4%

Source: Survey, 2018

Data on table 4 shows distribution of responses on is social security in existence in a nonstandard employment? Respondents' view to the statement about when I am sick, there is sickness pay for me shows that 24.8% of respondents disagreed, 49.6% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement that when I am sick, there is sickness pay for me, 18.8% of respondents agreed with the statement, 3.4% of respondents were undecided about the statement, while 3.4% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement.

Additionally, respondents' view to the statement I do enjoy annual vacation from my place of work shows that 28.2% of respondents agreed with the statement while 14.5% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement. There were 4.3% of respondents were undecided about the statement, 29.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement that I do enjoy annual vacation from my place of work while 23.9% respondents disagreed. The next component of question about a pension scheme is provided for at my place of work show up a surprise response as majority of the respondents about 34.2% strongly disagree to this statement. There are a total of 25.6% that agrees to the statement, 15.4% disagree, 20.5% strongly agree and 4.3% were undecided. Furthermore, the respondents' views to the question that there is partial childcare leave for me at my work place shows that 35.9% agree with this statement, 17.9% strongly disagree, 6% were undecided, while 28.2% and 12% disagree and strongly agree to the statement. This is another showing of a clear intent by the respondents about the negative effect of nonstandard work arrangement in the organisation. Lastly, respondents' responses to the statement that there is provision of employment insurance shows that 38.4% of the respondents strongly disagree,

6.8% of respondents strongly agree with the statement, 11.1% of the respondents agree with the statement that there is provision of employment insurance. 35.9% of respondents disagree about the statement, while 7.7% of respondents were undecided with the statement.

Table 6: Respondents' views on what is the relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work?

Items	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
My job has a welfare package like any other decent job.	14 12%	36 30.7%	2 1.7%	32 27.4%	33 28.2%
The fair pay in a decent job is related to what I am earning.	7 6%	34 29.1%	2 1.7%	39 33.3%	35 29.9%
My rights are recognized and protected in my workplace.	11 9.4%	55 47%	2 1.7%	30 25.6%	19 16.2%
My job is secured at all time.	4 3.4%	26 22.2%	9 7.7%	43 36.8%	35 29.9%
I enjoy same status as those in permanent employment.	7 6%	19 16.1%	5 4.3%	43 36.8%	43 36.8%

Source: Survey, 2018

Table 5 shows distribution of the components on what is the relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work? It can be observed that respondents were of the opinion that nonstandard employment and decent work are inversely correlated. For instance, respondents' views on the question that my job has a welfare package like any other decent job shows that 30.7% of respondents agreed with the statement, 1.7% respondents were undecided, 28.2% of the respondents strongly disagreed, 27.4% of respondents disagreed, while 12% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement. The data on the respondents' views on the question that the fair pay in a decent job is related to what I am earning shows that 6% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 29.1% of respondents agreed with the statement, 1.7% of respondents were undecided about the statement, 33.3% of respondents disagreed while 29.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement.

Also, respondents' view on my rights are recognized and protected in my workplace shows that 25.6% of respondents disagreed with the statement while 9.4% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 1.7% of respondents were undecided about the statement, 16.2% of the respondents strongly disagreed while 47% agreed with the statement that my rights are recognized and protected in my workplace. In addition, respondents' views on my job is secured at all time

shows that 3.4% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 22.2% of respondents agreed with the statement, 36.8% respondents disagreed, 7.7% of respondents were undecided while 29.9% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. Lastly, respondents' views I enjoy same status as those in permanent employment shows that 16.1% agree, 6% strongly agree, 4.3 % were undecided, 36.8% disagree and 36.8% strongly disagree.

Testing of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

H₀: There is no significant relationship between nonstandard employment and unfair income.

The Table below gives a correlation value of 0.599 which shows the relationship between nonstandard employment and unfair income. It reflects that there is a significant relationship between nonstandard employment and unfair income ($r=.599$, $N=117$, $P<.01$) which shows the moderate correlations between the said variables. The calculated r value is significant at 0.01 level of significant on the two-tailed test table. The r value is the result of the calculated correlation while the P value is less than 0.01 ($P<.01$). The data on Table 2 about the components of the relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work was used to test the hypothesis. The independent variable is nonstandard employment and the dependent variable is unfair income. In the case of this correlation, the null hypothesis would be rejected and the alternative hypothesis would be accepted as the P -value is less than 0.05. This concludes that there is a relationship between nonstandard employment and unfair income.

Correlation between Nonstandard Employment and Unfair Income

	NE	UI
Pearson Correlation	1	.599**
NE Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
N	117	117
Pearson Correlation	.599**	1
UI. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
N	117	117

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Where **NE:** Nonstandard Employment

UI: Unfair Income

Hypothesis 2

H₀: There is no significant relationship between nonstandard employment and job security.

The Table below gives a Correlation value of 0.802. The table summarizes the results of the correlation. This table reflects that there is a correlation between nonstandard payment and job security($r=.802$, $N=117$, $P<.01$) which shows the strong correlations between the said variables. The calculated r value is significant at 0.01 level of significant on the two-tailed test table. The r value is the result of the calculated analysis while the P value is less than 0.01 ($P<.01$).The data on table 3 about the components of the relationship between nonstandard employment and job security was used to test this hypothesis. The variables were nonstandard employment and job security. In the case of this correlation, the null hypothesis would be accepted and the alternative hypothesis would be rejected as the P -value is less than 0.05. This concludes that there is a significant relationship between nonstandard employment and job security.

Correlation between Nonstandard Employment and Job Security

	NP	JS
Pearson Correlation	1	.802**
NP. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
N	117	117
Pearson Correlation	.802**	1
JS Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
N	117	117

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Where **NP:** Nonstandard employment
JS: Job Security

Hypothesis 3

H₀: Workers in nonstandard employment do not significantly get social security. Hypothesis 3 was supported for the most part. There is a significance relationship between workers in nonstandard employment and social security. The calculated r value is significant at 0.01 level of significance on the two-tailed test table. The r value is the result of the calculated correlation while the P value is less than 0.01 ($P<.01$). The table below summarizes the results of the correlation. This table reflects workers in nonstandard employment lack social security ($r=.912$, $N=184$, $P<.01$) which shows the strong correlations between the said variables. The data on Table 4 was used to test the hypothesis. The variables were nonstandard employment and social security. In the case of this correlation, the null hypothesis

would be accepted and the alternative hypothesis would be rejected as the P-value is less than 0.05. This concludes that nonstandard workers do not get social security.

Correlation between workers in Nonstandard Employment and Social Security

	NE	SS
Pearson Correlation	1	.912**
NE. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
N	117	117
Pearson Correlation	.912**	1
SS. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
N	117	117

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Where **NE:** Nonstandard Employment
SS: Social Security

Hypothesis 4

Ho: There is no significant relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work.

The Table below gives a correlation value of 0.599 which shows the relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work. It reflects that there is a significant relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work ($r=.599$, $N=117$, $P<.01$) which shows the moderate correlations between the said variables. The calculated r value is significant at 0.01 level of significant on the two-tailed test table. The r value is the result of the calculated correlation while the P value is less than 0.01 ($P<.01$). The data on Table 5 about the components of the relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work was used to test the hypothesis. The independent variable is nonstandard employment and the dependent variable is decent work. In the case of this correlation, the null hypothesis would be rejected and the alternative hypothesis would be accepted as the P-value is less than 0.05. This concludes that there is a significant relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work.

Correlation between Nonstandard Employment and Decent Work

	NE	DW
Pearson Correlation	1	.599**
NE. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
N	117	117
. Pearson Correlation	.599**	1
DW. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
N	117	117

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Where **NE:** Nonstandard Employment
DW: Decent Work

Discussions of Findings

The results of the study offers strong empirical support for the existence of a positive and statistically significant correlation between nonstandard employment and decent work. Results in the data analysis show that if there is adequate remuneration, recognition, support of employees, and welfare package like any other job, nonstandard workers will have decent jobs. To a very large extent, the findings of this present study concur with earlier empirical studies on the impact of nonstandard employment on job satisfaction (Wooden & Warren, 2004; Buddelmeyer, McVicar & Wooden, 2013)

Review of literature shows that high level of unemployment and abundance or excess supply of human resources both skilled and unskilled also plays a major role in fuelling nonstandard work. Fapohunda (2010) reports that, on a national basis, nonstandard workers give only 10% of their commitment to the organisation. A lot of casual workers are only committed to the organisation because there are no visible alternative and will jump at every slight opportunity that will come their way as long as it will take away the unwanted title of casual staff. This confirms the observation of Nwachukwu (2000) that the challenge for human resource managers is how to motivate nonstandard workers to give 100% commitment to the organisation. The results of this present study are consistent and in harmony with those in literature and further replicate previous empirical studies of Uchedu, Anijaobi and Odigwe (2013); Tseveendorj (2008) and Ikeda, Veludo and Campomar (2005) on the causes of nonstandard work arrangement. As such, empirical evidence from the study did confirm that the job of nonstandard workers is not decent and they could be laid off any time. Furthermore, nonstandard workers do not enjoy same status as those in permanent employment. Anugwom (2007) suggests that decent work is supposed to improve employee’s performance in organizations in their pursuit of organisational values

of high productivity, efficiency and effectiveness. A resultant effect of nonstandard work is sub-optimal productivity. Hall (2000) opines that though nonstandard work may suit short term interest of cost saving, it may depress innovation and dynamic productivity and therefore, not be in the medium or long-term interest of individual employers.

Furthermore, the empirical study has shown that there is significant relationship between nonstandard employment and unfair income. Study findings indicate that nonstandard work not only attacks the wages and job security of the employees, it attacks the employees' health. It brings about repetitive strain; muscular pain and exhaustion due to long hours doing the same job without much rest. This affects workers life expectancy. The results of the present study were aligned with those of Comboh (2014) and Mugal and Khan (2013) on nonstandard employment and unfair income. Empirical evidence from this study has suggested a positive link between nonstandard employment and unfair income. This position was reinforced by the previous findings of Mugal and Khan (2013) as re-affirmed by the study hypotheses.

Specifically, nonstandard workers are excluded from the benefits of social security legislation. Thus, the findings corroborated with the assertions of Mba (2013) that work may be terminated instantly without due processes being adhered to, this to the detriment of social justice. On aspects of exclusions in terms of social insurance, nonstandard workers are first subjected to poor working conditions, low wages, less job security and in certain instances, the long term effect of income insecurity. Nonstandard work is the driving force behind the declining living standards, discrimination, and other aspects. This is particularly prevalent especially amongst populations that live in under-developed and developing countries (Beneria, 2001). It is without doubt that workers in these types of employment arrangements are subjected to exploitation.

Summary of Findings

This section deals with discussions on findings emanating from the study.

- i. The first hypothesis tested shows that unfair income is synonymous with nonstandard employment. This trend will continue to downgrade the standard of living of those workers since there is no recognized platform for them to agitate for a reasonable pay from their employers.
- ii. The second hypothesis revealed that there is a relationship between nonstandard employment and job security. Even though, without job security, commitment from the nonstandard workers will be low as they

know that continuity on their jobs is not guaranteed. They can lose their jobs at any point in time which is against what decent work agenda preaches.

- iii. The third hypothesis made it known that there is significant relationship between workers in nonstandard work arrangement and social security. The absence of social security is a pointer to the fact that extrinsic motivation would be lost since cash reward in form salary and wages alone cannot motivate workers to perform to the best of their abilities.
- iv. The fourth hypothesis indicated that there is a relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work. Nonstandard work arrangement involves parties among which is the worker and the agency where job is created, rights are not guaranteed, no social protection and social dialogue is not in existence.

All the aforementioned elements are what decent work agenda is all about. Even though job is created, other issues to make it a decent job are missing. From the foregoing revelations emanating from this study, it can be deduced that nonstandard employment has huge negative implications for the achievement of decent work agenda. Attempt should therefore be made by the right government agencies to minimize such implications in the interest of the economy as a whole.

Conclusion

Nonstandard employment has been embraced by most employers including some multinationals who are expected to exhibit good industrial relations due to their status in the global economy. They are employment that are not permanent in nature, short term, fixed term and even casual as the case may be (Danesi, 2011; De Cuype et al., 2008). This study revealed that there is a relationship between nonstandard employment and unfair income which corroborates the view of Beneria (2001) that such work arrangement is the cause of declining living standards of the employees in question. It is without doubt that workers in these types of arrangements are subjected to exploitation. It was also revealed from the study that nonstandard employment lacks job security. This finding seems to be in tandem with the submission of Mba (2013) that work may be terminated without due processes being adhere to which is detrimental to social justice.

This study further revealed that workers in nonstandard employment do not get social security. In the view of Barrientos (2007) the nonstandard workers are often denied access to other forms of protection and social assistance. This means there is lack of access to safe working conditions, adequate free time and rest,

family and social value, adequate health care and compensation for loss of income. It also revealed that there is a relationship between nonstandard employment and decent work which is in line with the view of Bernard (2011) that holds that nonstandard work and standard employment are both employment arrangements but are only distinguished based on the traditional features like ongoing employment, employer- employee relationship and statutory protections. In the light of the findings from this study, nonstandard employment is a deviation from the status quo of standard employment due to the emergence of global challenges. The effect may change over time as individuals and organizations adjust their attitudes and practices to it.

Recommendations

Sequel to the findings of the study, the following recommendations are suggested: The study recommends that the educational system should be restructured to embrace a viable vocational training so that a reasonable percentage of graduates would have been equipped with certain skills to embrace self-employment. This will reduce the pressure of employment that is fuelling nonstandard work arrangements.

Government should propose a legislation that will create a legal framework to regulate non-standard employment and thus protect the right of non-standard workers to decent work to ensure that the legal framework is followed and implemented, employers' association should be heavily involved.

Government should help create an enabling environment for businesses to flourish in order to cushion the effect of nonstandard employment on decent work agenda. An environment with necessary infrastructure and business friendly policies aids the expansion of business activities and subsequently bring about the establishment of more companies that would offer standard jobs to the available labour force.

Finally, it is recommended that International Labour Organization (ILO) conventions should be effectively domesticated into the local legislations to enable local organizations as well as multinationals to embrace good industrial relations practice in any country they operate.

References

- Abideen, O. & Osuji, C. (2011). We are slaves in our fatherland – A factory worker. *The Source*, 30(9), 20-21.
- Adenugba, A.A. (2006). Economic globalization and trade unionism in Nigeria: A case study of the Nigerian Labour Congress (NLC). Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the Department of Sociology, University of Ibadan.
- Adewumi, F. (2008). Globalization, labour standards and the challenge of decent work in Nigeria. A paper presented at a lecture organized by the MIPRSA, Socio. Department, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Afigbo, A. E. (1989). *Federal character: Its meaning and history*. Nigeria: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Anababa, W. (1969). *The trade union movement in Nigeria*. Benin City: Ethiope Publishing Company.
- Anugwom, B. (2007). An address he delivered at the seminar/workshop on casualization, organised by OPTS at the Nicon Hilton, Abuja, Nigeria.
- Ashford, S. J., George, E., & Blatt, R. (2007). 2 old assumptions, new work: The opportunities and challenges of research on nonstandard employment. *Academy of management annals*, 1(1), 65-117.
- Bamidele, R. (2011). *Casualization and labour utilization in Nigeria*. Geneva: International Labour Office. Retrieved September 15, 2019 from <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/iira/documents/congresses/regional/lagos2011/1stparallel/session1b/casualization.pdf>
- Barley, R. & Kunda, G. (2006). *Gurus, hired guns and warm bodies: Itinerant experts in a knowledge economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Barrientos, A. (2007). *Modernising social assistance in proceedings world conference on social protection and inclusion: Converging efforts from a global perspective*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation, 7-24.
- Beaulieu, N. D. (2002). *Contingent workforce planning at Motorola, Inc*. Harvard Business School.
- Beneria, L. (2001). *Changing employment patterns and the in formalization of jobs: General trends and gender dimension*. International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Benjamin, P. (2005). A review of labour markets in South Africa: Labour market regulation – International and South African perspectives. *Human Sciences Research Council*, 1-63.

- Bernard, W (2011). How does non-standard employment affect workers? A consideration of the evidence. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 36(3), 14-29.
- Buddelmeyer, H., McVicar, D., & Wooden, M. (2013). Non-standard 'contingent' employment and job satisfaction: A panel data analysis.
- Capelli, P. & Keller, J. R. (2013). Classifying work in the new economy. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(3), 575-596.
- Cohen, T. & Moodley, L. (2012). Achieving "decent work" in South Africa? *Potchefstroom Electronic Journal*, 15(2), 320-344.
- Combh, M. (2014). The effect of nonstandard employment on employee's performance. *Academy of Contemporary Research Journal*, 3(1), 14-25.
- Connelly, C. E. & Gallagher, D. G. (2004). Emerging trends in contingent work research. *Journal of Management*, 30(6), 959-983.
- Correll, D. (2012). News and views from ICSW: The agenda social protection floor initiative. *Journal of Social Network*, 53(6), 167-177.
- Danesi, R. A. (2011). *Nonstandard work arrangement and right to freedom of association in Nigeria*. IIRA regional Conference, Lagos.
- De Cuyper, N., de Jong, J., De Witte, H., Isaksson, K., Riggotti, T. & Schalk, R. (2008). Literature review of theory and research on the psychological impact of temporary employment: Towards a conceptual model. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol.10 (1,) 25-51.
- Elizabeth, G. & Prithviraj, C. (2017). *Understanding nonstandard work arrangements: Using research to inform practice*. Society for Human Resource Management and Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Business School University of Auckland.
- Fajana, S. (2008). *Functioning of the Nigeria labour market*. University of Lagos: Labofin and company, Yaba-Lagos.
- Fapohunda, O. J. (2010). *Employment and unemployment in Lagos*. Institute of social studies. Netherlands: Occasional Ltd.
- Fapohunda, T. M (2012). Employment casualization and degradation of work in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(9).
- Friedman, D. (1988). *The misunderstood miracle: Industrial development and political change in Japan*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Hall, R. (2000). Outsourcing, contracting out and labour hire: Implications for human resource development in Australian organization. *Asian Pacific Journal of Human Resource*, 38(2), 23-41.
- Houngbo, G. (2014). Key challenges for labour rights protection on a global scale. Conference on Fostering labour Rights in the Global Economy, Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies.

- International Labour Organisation (2005). *Youth: Pathway to decent work - (defining youth)*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Kalula, E. (2008). The decent work agenda: An African perspective on research needs and priorities. In Rodgers, G. & Kuptscha, C. *Pursuing decent work goals: Priorities for research*, ILO (International Institute for Labour Studies).
- MaríaArranz, J., & García-Serrano, C. (2014). The interplay of the unemployment compensation system, fixed-term contracts and rehiring: the case of Spain. *International Journal of Manpower*, 35(8), 1236-1259.
- Mashele, R. (2014). Atypical or non-standard work: A challenge to workers' protection in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences MC SER Publishing, Rome-Italy*, 5(27).
- Mba, O. (2013). The impact of human capital development on employee's performance. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 2(4), 125-139.
- McKeown, T. & Hanley, G. (2009). Challenges and changes in the contractor workforce. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*. 47(3), 295-317.
- Mokwenye, K. (2008). Workers groan under modern day slavery at Asian firms, *Nigerian Compass*, 39-40.
- Mugal, M., & Khan, M. (2013). Developing human resources. *International Journal of Modern Business*, 1(3), 1-19.
- Naidoo, K. (2010). Understanding precarious work in Africa. Retrieved from <http://www.industriallunion.org/archive/imf/understanding-precarious-work-in-africa>
- Nesheim, T., Olsen, K.M., & Kalleberg, A.L. (2007). Externalizing the core: Firms' use of employment intermediaries in the information and communication technology industries. *Human Resource Management*, 46(2), 247-264.
- Ntisa, A. A., Dhurup, M., & Joubert, P. A. (2016). The contract of employment status and its influence on the job satisfaction of academics within South African Universities of Technology. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, 8(2), 180-195.
- Nwachukwu, C.C. (2000). *Human resource management*. Nigeria: David Stone Publishers Ltd.
- Odu, O. (2011). Slaves in their Fatherland. *The Source*, 30(9), 16-22.
- Okafor, E. (2012). Nonstandard employment relations and implications for decent work deficits in Nigeria. *International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*, 6(3), 26.

- Okougbo, E. (2004). *Strategic issue on the dynamic of industrial relations: theory and practice*. Lagos: Wepoapo Enterprises.
- Oladimeji, J. O. (2013). *Introduction to social scientific research*. Ibadan: Lad-Od Prints & Publishing Company.
- Olusoji J. G et al (2012). Evolution of employment and industrial relations practice: The Nigerian experience. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(12).
- Onwuka, A. (1982). The ECOWAS protocol on free trade movement of person: A threat to Nigerian Security. *African Affairs*, vol.81 (323), 193-206.
- Owujii, E. C. (1968). *International handbook of industrial relations contemporary developments and research*. Aldwych Press.
- Pfeffer, J. & Baron, N. (1988). Taking the workers backout: Recent trends in the structuring of employment. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 10(1), 257– 303.
- Porter, M. (1990). The competitive advantage of nations. Harvard Business Review.
- Rapatsa, M. (2014). Atypical or nonstandard work: A challenge to workers' protection in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences MCSEER Publishing, Rome-Italy*, 5(27).
- Roper, J., Ganesh, S. & Inkson, K. (2010). Neoliberalism and knowledge interests in boundaryless career discourse. *Work, Employment and Society*, 24(4), 661-678.
- Serrano, M. R. (2014) From standard to non-standard employment: The changing patterns of work. In M. R. Serrano, M. L. C. Marasigan & V. E. V. Pupos (2014). *Between flexibility and security: The rise of non-standard employment in selected ASEAN countries*. Indonesia: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) and the ASEAN Services Employees Trade Unions Council (ASETUC). Retrieved October 13, 2016 from <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/singapur/10792.pdf>
- Smeaton, D. (2003). Self-employed workers: calling the shots or hesitant independents? A consideration of the trends. *Work, Employment and Society*, 17(2), 379-391.
- Spoonley, P. (2004). Is nonstandard work becoming standard? Trends and issues. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 29(3), 3-24.
- Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The new dangerous class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Stiglitz, J. (2002). *Globalisation and its discontent*. New York: Norton.
- Tilly, C. (1996). The state of nationalism. *Critical Review*, 10(2), 299-306.

- (2010). *Half a job: Bad and good part-time jobs in a changing labor market*. Philadelphia, PA.: Temple University Press.
- Townsend, A. M. & Bennett, J. T. (2003). Emerging issues and action in workplace privacy. *Journal of Labor Research*, 24(2), 195–205.
- Tucker, P. (2003). The impact of rest breaks upon accident risk, fatigue and performance. *A review of work and stress*, 17(2), 123-137.
- Wandera, H. T. (2011). The effects of short term employment contract on an organization: A case of Kenya Forest Service. *International journal of humanities and social science*, 1(21), 184-204.
- 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.
- Wooden, M. & Warren, D. (2004). Non-standard employment and job satisfaction: evidence from the HILDA Survey. *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46(3), 275-97.
- Yesufu, T. M. (1982). *The dynamics of industrial relations: The Nigerian experience*. Ibadan: University Press Limited.