

# Defining and Regulating Work Relations for the Future of Work

Nicola Countouris\*

*'La crisi consiste appunto nel fatto che il vecchio muore e il nuovo non può nascere : in questo interregno si verificano i fenomeni morbosi piú svariati'*<sup>1</sup>

A. Gramsci, *Quaderni del Carcere*, (vol. 1, Einaudi, 1975) quad. 3, p. 311

## 1. Introduction. Regulating for the Future of Work and the Legacies of the Past.

Our human condition is such that activity is a fundamental feature of our existence. We are all active in different ways, and for a variety of reasons, but, whether to satisfy 'the vital necessities produced and fed into the life process' (Arendt, 1998, p.7) or to satisfy other, perhaps less material - but no less fundamental - needs of our collective and individual human existence, our lives are invariably shaped by our activities. But while activity may be fundamental to our human condition, it does not necessarily follow that all activities are valued, let alone treated, in the same way by human societies or by the laws set up to regulate them. Work, employment, education, training, affection, care, leisure, exercise, rest, there are 'many different kinds of activity that actually make up a 'thriving' human life' (Nussbaum and Sen, 1993, p.7). But for a variety of reasons, our societies have always drawn normatively laden, if often artificial, distinctions and categorisations between them.

One such distinction, as identified primarily by feminist legal and political scholarship, is between activities amounting to 'production associated with the world of paid work, and the role of men, and social production assumed to be women's role' (Stewart, 2012, p. 11) and typically falling outside the realm of paid work, or even outside the realm of work broadly understood (Antonopoulos, 2009; Benería, 1999; ILO, 2018). Nussbaum noted that 'much of the work women do around the world is unpaid care and domestic labour' typically excluded from the concept of 'work', and sometimes even classified as 'leisure activity' (Nussbaum 2017, vii). 'Nevertheless, society could not survive for more than a few days any disruption of the domestic work that secures everyday life' (Supiot, 2001, 53). According to the UK statistical authorities 'figures for 2014 show that total unpaid work had a value of £1.01tn, equivalent to approximately 56%' of the country's GDP (ONS, 2018), while according to the UN the 'total value of unpaid care and domestic work is estimated to be between 10 and 39 per cent of GDP, and can surpass that of manufacturing, commerce, transportation and other key sectors' (UN, 2017).

---

\* Professor of Labour Law and European Law, Faculty of Laws, University College London. I am grateful to Valerio De Stefano, Keith Ewing, Colin Fenwick, Mark Freedland, Susan Hayter, and Tvisha Shroff for comments, generic and specific, on earlier drafts of the present paper. The usual disclaimer applies.

<sup>1</sup> 'The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born: in this interregnum a great variety of morbid phenomena appear'.

Another fundamental conceptual divide between those human activities generally accepted as falling within the domain of 'paid work', is the distinction between subordinate employment and independent or autonomous self-employment. For a number of legal systems, this distinction, and the emergence of the contract of employment as the central 'institution of the labour market' (Veneziani, 2009, Ch. 4) is inextricably tied to the joint, and in many cases mutually reinforcing, effects of the processes of vertically integrated industrial production (Collins, 1999; Stone, 2004, Ch. 2-4), the establishment and functioning of the welfare state (Deakin, 1998), and to the social and political changes (Garofalo, 1999; Dukes, 2014, Ch.2) that affected much of Western Europe, and the Western world, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Deakin, 2006).

The scope of application of labour law in the 20<sup>th</sup> century has been fundamentally shaped by these two binary divides. With some minor exceptions, labour law has been tasked with regulating the world of 'paid-employment' (to the exclusion of other activities perceived as non-work related) and more precisely, and more narrowly, those work related activities fitting the archetypally subordinate, continuous, and bilateral 'standard employment relationship' performed under a contract of employment (to the exclusion of other work relationships and activities performed under other types of contracts). There are of course clear and cogent, if highly contextual, reasons as to why 20<sup>th</sup> century labour law became, in many ways, the law of the contract of employment, and some of them will be elaborated upon in the following section of this paper. But section 3 will go on to identify a number of key, structural, fallacies in this understanding of labour law, partly in an attempt to explain its ongoing crisis, which is both a crisis of policy goals and a crisis determined by a number of clearly identifiable structural failures affecting the contract of subordinate employment model.

Having identified these fallacies, and their regulatory implications, the paper will query the extent to which it is reasonable to expect the contract of employment to continue to act as the 'cornerstone of labour law' in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Section 4 will explore, sometimes in a critical vein, three key regulatory options that have emerged as possible alternatives to the current crisis of the subordinate contract of employment: i) expanding and strengthening its conceptual boundaries; ii) identifying and regulating an intermediate category of workers, sitting between the classic binary divide of subordinate employment and independent self-employment; iii) Retargeting labour rights beyond the contract of employment, with a particular emphasis on the regulation of personal work relations. Section 5 offers a fresh perspective on the Future Regulation of Work question, by reference to the idea of the 'Universal Work Relation', a new macro-category of 'personal work relations' (Freedland and Kountouris, 2011), embracing a wide range of forms of work and work-related activities, and premised on the idea of the universal application of fundamental labour standards, including of course International Labour Standards, and on a fairer mutualisation of the social risks attending to the performance of work, so as to disperse them away from workers, and share them more equitably between employers, the state, but also consumers, and society at large (Freedland and Kountouris, 2011, p. 443).

Ultimately, this paper argues that while, in some jurisdictions, the legal institution known as the contract of subordinate employment still manages to perform some of the worker protective functions that it was originally designed to pursue, in recent years its efficacy has been severely diminished by a series of policy, economic, and technological changes and by the increasingly systematic and conscious attempts to circumvent its legal construction and definitional structures in

order to facilitate the avoidance of employment protection legislation. Therefore, the paper advocates for a progressive transition to a new and broader central organising concept that could, and arguably should, be used to shape the personal scope of application of labour legislation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, namely the concept of 'Universal Work Relation'. This is a new 'umbrella category' embracing a wider range of employment and work relations, including those traditionally captured and covered by the contract of subordinate employment, but also covering other, perhaps less visibly subordinate, continuous, or formalised, personal work relations that are currently excluded from the scope of labour law.

## **2. The rise of the subordinate contract of employment model**

The process through which the contract of employment became what Otto Kahn Freund famously defined as 'the cornerstone of the edifice of labour law' (Kahn-Freund, 1954, p. 45) is possibly one of the most thoroughly explored academic research questions (Hepple, 1986; Supiot, 1994; Deakin and Wilkinson, 2005; Vettori, 2016; Deakin, 2006). At risk of failing to do justice of such a rich and vast literature on the topic, it is arguably possible to identify three key developments in the rise of the contract of employment as 'the fundamental legal institution of Labour Law' (Wedderburn, 1967, p.1).

Firstly, the rise of the contract of employment is inextricably linked to the emergence of what is often termed as the standard employment relationship. In most legal systems, the contract of employment was developed (by labour law but also through the support of other areas of law, including social security and tax law, cf. Deakin and Wilkinson, 2005) as the legal institution devoted to capturing a particular social phenomenon that policy-makers, at some point in history, saw as worthy of specific, and special, legal recognition and protection, namely 'subordinate employment'. Subordinate employment was dressed in the legal exoskeleton that is the contract of employment in a way that, for a considerable part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, was a clearly mutually reinforcing dynamic. Subordinate employment became *the* social phenomenon captured by the legal institution of the contract of employment, and the legal institution of the contract of employment further reinforced the role of subordinate employment as the main social phenomenon and as the very paradigm for labour law regulation. The central paradigm of work captured by this mutually reinforcing dynamic was that of remunerated work provided under the control - preferably the direct control - of the enterprise, integrated within it, and provided on a continuous basis, which - once embedded in a web of statutory and collectively agreed rules - shifted the risk of losses from the worker himself and onto the capitalist enterprise. Crucially, dismissal, redundancy, and social security laws were also tasked with apportioning some of those risks to the state and society at large.

Secondly, in most legal systems, 'subordinate employment' was perfectly understood as being but one of the forms of work, albeit for a relatively long period of time an increasingly prevalent and socially relevant one. Traditionally it was juxtaposed to, and contrasted with, autonomous work, that most legal systems also understood as amounting to work but consciously expunged from the bulk of the protective coverage of employment legislation. That work was understood as being broader than subordinate employment, is evident from a number of sources (Lyon-Caen, 1990, p. 1-2). Take Article 35 of the Italian Constitution of 1948 expressly providing that '*La Repubblica tutela il lavoro in tutte le sue forme e applicazioni*', but with the Italian civil code and labour law statutes essentially protecting subordinate employment alone (Garofalo, 2008). It is not just self-employed workers that

suffered the exclusionary effects of the binary divide, but also workers in training arrangements (Owens and Stewart, 2016), workers offering their services through intermediaries (Vosko, 2001) or employed through informal, temporary, and casual arrangements (Leighton, 1986; Hepple and Napier, 1978; Sylos-Labini, 1964; Kahn-Freund, 1967). No less importantly, as noted by Fudge and Owens, this ‘model of employment ... was premised upon a gendered division of labour in which men had the primary responsibility for paid employment and women were primarily concerned with unpaid care work’. As noted by Deakin, there is now a general acceptance of the fact that ‘the contract of employment is an ‘artificial’ model imposed on a more complex ‘reality’ of labour relations’ (Deakin, 2006, p. 104).

Thirdly, while the contract of employment was, essentially, a European legal institution, it quickly spread beyond European confines, seemingly becoming a global legal institution. As evidenced by the work of Hay and Craven (Hay and Craven, 2004), the phenomenon of exporting rules regulating work from Europe to other parts of the world in many ways predates the development of the contract of employment. In the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries in particular, ‘the idea took root that ... emancipation by way of contract was universal in scope, and would one day extend to all nations still in their infancy’ (Supiot, 2000, p. 326). This factor largely contributed to the spread of contract models for the regulation of work, such as the contract of service, and eventually facilitated the spread of the contract of employment model beyond Western Europe (Kollonnay Lehocky, 2006, p. 223). So, for instance, in ‘South Africa, as in most other Southern Africa countries, the employment relationship ... sources in the common law distinction between contracts of employment (service) and contracts for services (independent contractor) [were] inherited from South Africa’s Roman-Dutch law (common law) orientation’ (Benjamin, 2011, p. 102), although the ‘unification of the contract of employment [...] clearly took much longer [with] the South African policy of racial segregation during most of the twentieth century’ being ‘certainly the most obvious reason’ (le Roux, 2010, p. 148). Scholars have noted that ‘the path taken in the evolution of labour law in India in the post-1945 period basically followed the pattern established earlier in the restrictive policies of the colonial government’ (Mitchell, Mahy, and Gahan, 2014, p. 420), and unsurprisingly the notion of ‘employment’ underpinning the ‘workmen’ definition of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, has been understood by the Indian Supreme Court as involving ‘three ingredients: (1) employer (2) employee and (3) the contract of employment’ (*Chintaman Rao & Another vs The State Of Madhya Pradesh* 1958 AIR 388). Even in Latin America, and in spite of a much different and earlier trajectory in the decolonisation process, ‘*el punto de partida de la regulación laboral [...], fueron las normas civiles sobre el arrendamiento de servicios [...] recogidas en códigos civiles, en su mayoría inspirados en el muy liberal Código de Napoleón*’ (Bronstein, 1998), eventually facilitating the spread and emergence of the contract of employment.

This is not to suggest that, across different regions or countries of the world, the concept of the contract of employment has been shaped as a single monolith by its ‘legal origins’ (Deakin, Lele, Siems, 2007; Countouris, 2011) alone. Nor is it to say that, once enshrined as the central legal institutions in labour law statutes across most of the world, it succeeded in attracting comparably large swathes of workers under the protective umbrella of employment protection legislation. On the contrary, careful comparative analysis reminds us, for instance, that many of the important political processes that shaped the 20<sup>th</sup> century, such as the disparate timing and legacy of colonial rule (Hay and Crave, 2004) and de-colonisation, the Cold-war with its crude partitioning of the world between ‘market’ and ‘planned’ economies (Kovács, Lyutov, and Mitrus, 2015; Cooney, Biddulph and

Zhu, 2013, ch.2 and 3), and regional factors such as institutionalised racial segregation and apartheid rule (le Roux, 2010), all meant that the 'contract of employment' unitary model ended up covering or excluding substantially different groups of workers (Sankaran notes that 'The formal sector employs a little over 10 per cent of workers in India, Sankaran, p. 30). But, having noted these important, even fundamental, quantitative and qualitative caveats, it is still arguable that, through the twentieth century, the subordinate 'contract of employment' did emerge as a formidable, and in many ways global, labour market institution. What Villasimil Prieto wrote to describe the evolutionary trajectory of the employment relationship in Latin American countries, holds true in a number of other global latitudes: from a legal evolutionary perspective '*la historia de la relación de trabajo fue, en rigor, la de la subordinación*' (Villasimil Prieto, 2016, p. 227; Villasimil Prieto, 2015).

The emergence of this relatively unitary, binary, and ubiquitous - if ultimately artificial - subordinate contract of employment model was simultaneously entrenched but also nurtured by the rapid institutionalisation of the labour market in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Taken on its own, the contract of employment might not have been the success story it became, as its contractual structures, while offering a veneer of formal equality between very unequal parties, ultimately operate as a vehicle for the legitimate exercise of the managerial prerogative on a subordinate individual. But, as put by Fudge, 'contractualization, which facilitated labour's commodification, was followed by trade union and state regulation' and 'the standard employment relationship was both embedded in, and the outcome of, an institutional ensemble that was fashioned out of the post-war capital-labour compromise in industrialized democracies'(Fudge, 2017, p. 376). As elegantly put by Supiot, the idea of approaching 'the employment relationship as the insertion of a status in a contract, has permitted the expansion of labour's empire in the abstract, favouring the unification of the salaried worker status, and the progressive disappearance of distinctions premised on the actual object of the performance of work' (Supiot, 2002, p. 33-34, my translation). So, what Freedland defined as 'the false unity' of the contract of employment and the 'false duality' between employment contract and 'other work contracts' (Freedland, 2003, p. 17-18) while no doubt being 'good legislative policy' for much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, may well have been ultimately 'imposed or maintained by legislation' (Freedland, 2003, p. 22; for a modern and original articulation of good policy goals attached to the notion of subordinate or dependent work see Davidov, 2016, Ch. 3). And when the policy goals pursued by legislation changed, the whole edifice began to crumble.

### **3. The crisis of the subordinate contract of employment model between policy pressures and institutional rigidities.**

In 1998, writing about one of the arguably most institutionalised and regulated labour law systems in the Western world, the French system, Antoine Lyon-Caen wrote:

*"Quoiqu'on dise, il n'y a jamais eu de modèle juridique unique. Mais la diversité ne recevait pas d'encouragements public et elle rencontrait des bornes, notamment dans celles que les juges puisaient dans des règles générales. La nouveauté provient ainsi de la promotion de la diversité."* (Lyon-Caen, 1988, p. 541)

In a similar vein, Adams and Deakin have identified the proliferation of non-standard and precarious forms of work as being 'due in part to institutional rigidities, associated with the [standard

employment relationship]’ and to ‘conscious policy choices that have privileged casualization, wage suppression, and the fiscalization of employment over the promotion of stable work and a living wage’ (Adams and Deakin, 2014, p. 780).

In terms of shifting policy priorities, it is fairly accepted that, starting from the 1970s and, more markedly, the 1980s, policy makers at a domestic and international level started prioritising new policy goals such as growth, job creation, competitiveness, flexibility, that were seemingly predicated on fundamental changes in the industrial and economic structures of capitalist societies. This is a familiar part of the parabola of the subordinate contract of employment and of the standard employment relationship (for some of the earlier works see Pedrazzoli, 1989; Rogers and Rogers, 1989). In the first instance it was the parable of the ‘vertical disintegration’ of the firm (Collins, 1990), of ‘Toyotism’ (Womack, Jones, and Roos, 1990), of the core and peripheral workforces (Pollert, 1988), of the need for ‘flexible’ and ‘atypical’ forms of work such as part-time, temporary, and agency work (ILO, 2016 a, Ch. 1-2) spreading across labour markets in the West, (Blanpain and Yamakawa, 2000; Veneziani and Hepple, 2001, esp. ch. 1-4) and since the 1990s, in the East (Frankowki and Stephan, 1995, esp. Part IV) and – to some extent and with some important qualifications (Cooney, Lindsey, Mitchell, and Ying, 2002; Berg, 2011) - in East Asia (Lee, 2002), and the South of the World (Novick, Lengyel, and Sarabia, 2009; Ponchmann, 2009; Vega Ruíz, 2005; Teklè, 2010; Roychowdhury, 2018). In more recent decades it also became the parable of globalisation (Blanpain, 2008), of ‘flexicurity’ (Cazes and Nesporova, 2007; Sciarra, 2007), the ‘insider-outsider’ (OECD, 1994) (false) dichotomy (clearly deconstructed by De Stefano, 2014), of fiscalisation (Adams and Deakin, 2014), of ‘austerity’ (Hastings and Heyes, 2016; Countouris and Freedland, 2013) and the ‘global economic crisis’, (Kuttner, 2013) all demanding further deregulatory sacrifices on their respective altars. Moving on to the contemporary debates on the ‘gig-economy’, ‘platform-work’, and ‘crowdwork’ (De Stefano, 2016; Prassl, 2018; Hatzopoulos, 2018) each adding their own verse to the litany of deregulatory policy demands (Harris and Krueger, 2015; Taylor, 2017) and new pressures piling up on the foundations of labour law, including on a contract of employment increasingly incapable to accommodate within its structures the growing number of non-standard forms of work mushrooming in the labour market. Stone and Arthurs warn us that ‘it is unlikely that these trends can be reversed any time soon or that we can reinstate the standard employment contract and the worker-friendly regulatory regimes that were built upon it’ (Stone and Arthurs, 2013, p. 5).

While there is little doubt that conscious policy choices have greatly contributed to the fragmentation of the employment relationship, especially in the ‘Global North’, it should not be assumed that this process has developed synchronically across the globe, or in the absence of countervailing movements. For many Latin American countries, for instance, the turn of the century has coincided with a period of policy trends specifically aiming at the reduction of informality in labour market arrangements (ILO, 2015 a; Gomez Ramírez, 2016), including through highly successful labour and social security law measures that have strengthened the regulation of the employment relationship (Costanzi, Barbosa, and da Silva Bichara, 2013; Berg, 2011). The work by Cooney, Lindsey, Mitchell, and Ying, warns us that in some East Asian labour law systems the impact of regulation and deregulation has also been uneven (Cooney, Lindsey, Mitchell, and Ying, 2002). In fact in some jurisdictions reforms have been recently undertaken with the explicit objective of further institutionalising and formalising employment relations. China is a particularly pertinent example of a system implementing reforms seeking to underpin the standard employment

relationship on a more robust regulatory framework, for instance through measures such as the 2007 Labour Contract Law. While studies continue to test the actual quantitative impact on this reform on informal and casual employment - with some authors seeing the impact as positive (Cheng, Smyth, and Guo, 2013; Freeman and Li, 2013); others as modest (Chen and Xu, 2017), or even negative (Liang, Appleton, and Song, 2016) - it is clear that the overall aim of these reforms has been 'to encourage the use of permanent labour contracts and improve the quality of non-standard jobs' (ILO, 2016 a, p.67), and 'stabilizing work relations through the mandating of formal labour contracts' (Cooney, Biddulph, and Zhu, 2013, p.90). However, even in China, as noted by Cooney, the narrow definition of the concept of 'labour contract' has resulted in the exclusion from labour law protections of substantial numbers of working people, including some that genuinely involved in other types of 'employment contracts' or relationships (Cooney, 2017).

So while Stone and Arthurs' negative outlook on the prospects of redeveloping new, worker-friendly, regulatory regimes may well be justified on the basis of long term trends in North America and Western Europe, other parts of the globe have had more or less significant, if at times reversible (Ministero Publico do Trabalho, 2017), experimentations with alternative and more worker protective policy frameworks.

But, admittedly, the crisis of the subordinate contract of employment model is not merely a crisis of policy. It is also a crisis of its internal contractual structures, that in more than one way have struggled to adapt to the emergence of both old and new forms of non-standard work. The word 'rigidity' is often invoked in connection with various claims of inadequacy addressed to the contract of employment, the standard employment relationship, and even to labour law at large, and therefore requires some clarification. In some quarters, the expression is used to suggest, in essence, that 'rigidities' in labour laws governing, in particular, the formation and termination of standard contracts of employment, act as a disincentive to either engage workers on permanent contracts, or to engage workers at all (OECD, 1994). As such, these rigidities are seen as contributing to a growth of non-standard forms of employment (Ahsan and Pagés, 2007), or to a growth of unemployment levels (Franks, 1994), and are typically relied upon to justify calls for the deregulation and flexibilisation of labour law systems (World Bank, 2007). In reality, within this – highly contested (Deakin, Malmberg, and Sarkar, 2014; Landau, Mahy, and Mitchell, 2015) - discourse, the word rigidity is a misnomer. What its proponents really contest is the level of protection offered to workers and the fact that these protections are typically not derogable by the parties, and by the employer in particular.

In the present paper, the term 'rigidity' is deployed in a diametrically different way. What is suggested in this paper is that, by and large, the defining structural elements of the contract of employment have been shaped by doctrinal work, by statutes, and by jurisprudential analysis in ways that have had a set of exclusionary consequences on a growing number of workers whose working patterns and arrangements do not fall within the strict confines of the standard employment relationship that, ostensibly, the contract of employment was designed to capture and institutionalise. These 'rigidities' have emerged at various levels but the most glaring ones are arguably attributable to the central function that the concepts of *subordination*, *continuity*, and *bilaterality*, play in the legal construction of the contract of employment.

### 3.1. Subordination

Subordination, broadly understood as a manifestation of the power of control and direction over a worker, is at the same time an essential characteristic and an indicator or test for the existence of a contract of employment (Waas and Heerma van Voss, 2017; Countouris, 2007). 'In the last few decades, however, significant organizational changes have occurred and business practices arisen [...] reducing the grip of legal tests based on strict hierarchical control' (ILO, 2016a, p.11). While, in some systems, jurisprudential and doctrinal developments have made allowances for slightly broader understandings of the concept (Supiot, 2000; Ghera, 2006; Countouris, 2007, p. 38-40; Fudge, Tucker, and Vosko, 2002), and while in some jurisdictions intermediate 'quasi-subordinate' categories of workers have accrued some – though not all - labour rights (Davidov, Freedland, and Kountouris, 2015), it is clear that subordination retains a central normative role in the qualification of a work relationship, a role that defies both the emergence of new forms of, often technological, control and discipline over a seemingly independent workforce (De Stefano, 2017) and the fact that it has traditionally excluded large groups of workers in both the formal and informal economy (Sankaran, 2007), that predominantly or exclusively earn their living through the provision of personal work or labour (Freedland and Kountouris, 2011), whether under the strict control of an employer or otherwise.

Far from being a helpful device for the allocation of labour rights, subordination has become, in many ways, a double jeopardy for workers. Strip the contract of employment of its external worker protective layers provided by statute, collective bargaining, worker protective jurisprudence, and all is left is a vehicle for the subjugation, rather than the emancipation, of workers and society. The paradox is that if workers try to escape this growing subjugation that comes with subordination, and unilaterally try to improve their terms and conditions of employment through genuine individual bargaining, then the contract of employment internal structures collapse. The reason is intrinsically linked to the subordination dimension of the contract of employment: if pay, hours, shifts, or performance, are not exclusively set (often unilaterally) by the employer, but rather they are set by the worker, and are thus for the employer to agree, then an inference - and a very strong one at times - will be made that the employee is actually an autonomous worker, an independent contractor, providing services to a client or customer, setting her own professional fee and organising her own work around her needs and preferences.

### 3.2. Continuity

Similarly, those aspects of the contract of employment that sought to capture the 'continuous performance' dimension of the standard employment relationship have also emerged as a formidable internal rigidity, with considerable exclusionary effects. These effects manifest themselves in various manners in different legal systems (ILO, 2016a, p. 256), usually as requirements for regular or durable employment on which specific 'qualifying periods' for accessing particular labour rights hinge, which typically result in excluding short and 'casual' fixed-term contracts from important protections (ILO, 2016a, p. 256). But, perhaps more worryingly, continuity can also operate as one of the criteria for distinguishing employment from self-employment, in a way that can wholly disenfranchise workers, and female workers in particular (Fredman and Fudge, 2016, p. 231), on short or intermittent contracts (Davies, 2007), from the entire panoply of employment protection legislation, on the ground that their work arrangements do not suggest the presence of any future obligation between the parties. This issue has emerged most vividly in the context of so called 'zero hour' and other 'on-call' contracts' (ILO, 2016a, pp. 22-30, 83-86) and



raises very complex regulatory challenges for labour law systems essentially premised on the binary divide. If the lack of 'continuity' does not fatally affect the classification of a work relationship as essentially amounting to self-employment, then various remedial measures – from 'day one' rights to 'minimum guaranteed hours', to the payment of minimum 'indemnities' (ILO 2016a, pp. 258-261) - can and have been adopted to render less precarious the working lives of these casual workers. But when, in a given legal system, the absence of continuity results in a work relation being classified (or misclassified, for that matter) as one of autonomous or semi-autonomous employment, then the consequences for the worker are far more radical and legal systems premised on the idea of labour rights mainly or exclusively applying to employees working under a contract of subordinate employment, inevitably fall short of the challenge.

### 3.3. Bilaterality

A third structural rigidity of the contract of employment is deeply associated with the understanding of the standard employment relationship as essentially bilateral, and more precisely as arising 'between *one* worker and *one* employer' (ILO, 2016a, p. 11, emphasis added). Clearly, in a number of jurisdictions, this bilateral understanding has generated important challenges for the regulation of temporary agency work relations (ILO, 2016a, p. 274) though it is fair to say that some systems have been more successful than others in addressing some of them (ILO, 2016a, p.87-98). But, strictly understood and applied, bilaterality has also exacerbated other prescriptive and exclusionary facets of the contract of employment 'exoskeleton'. For instance it has exacerbated the already strict and often formalistic requirements of personality in the provision of work, that can be easily defeated by even the loosest of substitution clauses (*IWGB v Deliveroo*, 2016). Even the most sophisticated judicial interpreter can struggle to distinguish a genuine substitution clause from a right to swap shifts, or even a requirement, explicit or implied, to actually find a substitute to mitigate the effects of an unforeseen impediment and absence from the workplace (*Pimlico Plumbers v Smith* [2018]). Bilaterality can also degrade into an 'exclusivity' requirement, perhaps suggesting that a worker offering her labour to multiple parties, under an complex or unclear set of contractual arrangements, ought to be presumptively classified as a self-employed person offering services to multiple 'clients and customers' (*Stringfellow v Quashie* [2012]), given her ability to spread more broadly the risk of loss inherent in her 'business'. A paradoxical situation, considering that many employees working under standard contracts of employment can often work for more than one employer, and may well have to do so to make ends meet if they are hired through low paid or part-time contracts. Narrow views of bilaterality are also associate with what Prassl defines as 'the unitary concept of the employer' (Prassl, 2015, p.16), a notion that permeates most labour law systems (Corazza and Razzolini, 2015), and that can often result in placing in a legal limbo swathes of workers employed through sub-contracting chains, outsourced service companies, franchising arrangements (Koukiadaki and Katsaroumpas, 2017, p.81-97), and other complex private equity businesses arrangements (Prassl, 2015, p. 54). In most of these cases, workers will struggle to identify 'the party responsible for their rights' (ILO, 2016a, p. 275), that is if their resulting employment status grants them any rights in the first place.

It is probably all too easy, through a careful use of sources and intricate legal arguments, to reach the ungracious view that the contract of employment has lost all relevance and is now a relic of the past. It would not be just ungracious, it would also be inaccurate. The contract of employment model has displayed considerable resilience in the face of adverse policy environments, structural

technological changes, and constantly emerging human resource management practices (Countouris, 2007, pp. 58-71; Davidov, 2016, Ch. 6, 8). But, it is also clear that its practical relevance as the principal vehicle for the allocation of labour rights is relatively limited for substantial groups of workers in both economically advanced and developing countries (though clearly more so in the latter) and has a disparate exclusionary impact on women, the young, and migrant workers in particular (ILO, 2016a, Ch.3). Its internal structural rigidities, as discussed above, have provided the perfect blueprint for ‘armies of lawyers’ (*Autoclenz v Belcher & Ors* [2011] UKSC 41, para 25) (and increasingly armies of software and algorithm developers) to shape some forms of work in ways that they would not fit its particular contractual exoskeleton, and would thus fall outside the scope of labour law.

The artificiality of the entire exercise is best grasped by the fact that different types of contractual exoskeletons can often host factually identical work relationships. For instance it is increasingly accepted that, sometimes in the same workplace, you can have an employee-cleaner, or a self-employed cleaner, or just a cleaner working for cash through a variety of informal arrangements that are not contractually relevant. In the same British school, one can find employee teachers and self-employed teachers working side by side year after year. We have employee orchestra players and self-employed orchestra players. Very soon we could have self-employed waiters working alongside employee waiters, their customers and clients being the various diners placing orders, paying, and rating them via apps, while expecting the same service they have been traditionally accustomed to. As put by Supiot nearly two decades ago, the earlier distinction between salaried and independent employment, ‘*a laissez la place, au sein de chaque profession, à la coexistence du salariat et de l’indépendance*’ (Supiot, 2000, p.132). There is now a growing awareness that ‘work understood to be indefinite employment in a subordinate employment relationship, while still the most common form of salaried employment in developed countries, has nonetheless lost ground over the past few decades, in both developed and developing countries’ (ILO, 2017, p. 32). An emerging consensus that reform, whether incremental or more radical in character, is necessary is progressively shaping up.

#### **4. Reforms: Reaffirming the contract of employment model, identifying new intermediate categories, and retargeting labour law.**

Before exploring and evaluating some of the main reform options that, in different ways, seek to address at least some of the regulatory challenges described in the previous sections of this paper, it is important to acknowledge that inaction, or even more action aimed at further deinstitutionalising the exchanges between capital and labour in market economies, remains one of the options on the table. Capitalism may well have reached a dystopian stage in its centuries-old evolutionary trajectory, where public intervention in the regulation of markets in general, and of labour markets in particular, is no longer a priority in terms of its sustainability and functioning, and where private regulation, or the simple power of ‘dominium’, may well be destined to play an even greater role in shaping our working lives, and our lives more generally (Supiot, 2012).

So, in a sense, it is possible to argue that if reform is to be pursued, it ought to take as its starting point the view that public intervention in the regulation of market economies is both necessary in terms of their functioning and desirable in terms of the more equitable distributive and societal

outcomes it can generate (Deakin, 2011; Deakin, 2016). This approach arguably sits at the core of the ILO's Future of Work agenda (ILO, 2015 b), and remains the main driver behind its debates on the future of the employment relationship (ILO, 2016 b): reforms must tackle the 'regulatory challenges in providing adequate protection to workers in evolving employment relationships' (ILO, 2016).

With this important caveat in mind, this section of the paper introduces three main reform approaches that, in recent years, have emerged as the most conceptually coherent sets of ideas aimed at providing increased protection for the growing numbers of workers currently falling outside labour law's safety nets.

#### 4.1. Reaffirming the contract of employment model

The first approach essentially consists of reforms and proposals aimed at strengthening the centrality of the subordinate or dependent contract of employment model. This approach is variably referred to by academic authors as 'stretching the notion of employee' (Countouris, 2007, p. 58), or expanding the notion of subordination, sometimes by reference to a broad notion of dependency (Davidov, 2016, pp. 122-135). It can often entail recommendations aimed at strengthening the conceptual frontiers between standard employment and self-employment by reference to long lists of indicators (Davidov, 2016, pp. 128-133), or seeking to police that frontier more effectively by means of clearer 'sham contract' tests and rebuttable presumptions of status, general or specific (ILO and ELLN, 2003). Much about this approach is commendable, not least the fact that it includes a range of practical measures that have been or are being already implemented in a number of legal systems, precisely with the view of retaining the relevance of the contract of employment against a background of relentless political, social, economic, and technological changes. By reinforcing the norm it can also assist with those policies seeking to approximate, on an equal treatment basis, the rights of some non-standard workers to those enjoyed by typical employees, as it has done in the past for, for instance, for part-time, fixed-term, and temporary agency workers (Kountouris, 2016).

There are however three underlying weaknesses with this first approach. Firstly it rests on the assumption that the standard employment relationship will at least retain a factual dominant relevance in the years to come, and therefore that it is both practicable and desirable to invest resources to ensure that the law of the contract of employment continues to provide a good legal fit for this broadly stable phenomenon, and perhaps contribute to stabilising it. As noted in the previous sections of this paper this is a big assumption. The second weakness applies to particular versions of this approach that, for the sake of strengthening the unitary model of a new 'single contract of employment' (for a review of the debate, cf. Casale and Perulli, 2014), may be willing to make important concessions in terms of the level of protection workers would be entitled to, especially in terms of job security. While it is unclear whether this genre of proposals would attain any of the unification objectives it purports to achieve, it is all too obvious that if it did so, it would 'significantly lower the protection of standard workers as they will not be protected against unfair dismissal before the expiry of a probation/qualifying period much longer than in the past' (De Stefano, 2014, p. 279). Many would argue that it is important that reforms aimed at rescuing the standard employment relationship from its current process of decay do not end up throwing the 'labour law baby' along with the dirty bathwater elements arising from a narrow understanding of the subordinate contract of employment model. Secondly, the idea of reinforcing and underpinning

the 'norm', arguably ignores the all too obvious fact that, at the best of times, the contract of employment and the standard employment relationship 'norm' have had some serious exclusionary effects on large groups of working people, and 'fails to acknowledge that many of these other people are women, migrants, and those living in Southern countries where self-employment and reproductive work are central' (Albin, 2017, p. 17). So, even in its best case scenario, it still ends up delivering sub-optimal results.

#### 4. 2. Identifying new intermediate categories

The second approach is possibly less incremental and more radical in character, and effectively suggest the identification of a new third form of employment relationship sitting between employment and self-employment and thus broadly located within the conceptual space currently occupied by 'quasi-subordination' or 'quasi-dependence', tasked with absorbing vast numbers of non-standard forms of work, both old and new. There is nothing particularly new with this idea. Dependent contractors, para-subordinate contract workers, *collaborazioni coordinate e continuative*, 'limb-b workers', *arbeitnehmerähnliche Personen*, *trabajadores autónomos económicamente dependientes* (Perulli, 2003; Eurofound, 2017; Davidov, 2014; Fudge, 2010), have been recognised, with varying degree of protections (Fudge, 2010), by a number of jurisdictions around the world, in some case already since the 1960s and 1970s. They have also failed to address the underlying problems arising from the changing nature of the employment relationship. In fact they may have exacerbated them, and this, I believe, for three main reasons.

Firstly, in some systems, they have facilitated the ability of employers to structure their work needs and arrangements through contractual forms that departed from the employee/contract of employment classification. It is easier to persuade a court that a worker is not an employee with a contract of employment, but rather (and legitimately) a quasi-subordinate worker, than to argue that she or he was a self-employed. Quasi-subordinate/dependent worker contracts retain, in all systems, an important set of contractual characteristics borrowed from the contract of employment model. So disguising employment relations as 'quasi-subordinate' ones is typically easier than trying to fit them in a 'bogus self-employment contract'. In most systems para-subordination simply offers a new, easier opportunity for misclassifying employees, without paying any significant worker protective dividends.

Secondly, in most systems they have led to a further fragmentation of the labour law, social security, and fiscal regulatory bases, exacerbating the problem of 'fiscalisation' (Adams and Deakin, 2014). This is doubly challenging because we now have labour systems where workers need to classify themselves as 'quasi-subordinates' in order to benefit from the tax advantages that are typically offered to the self-employed and make ends meet. It has also engrained a dependence of these workers not just on their employer/client, but on a particular tax (and welfare) dimension that only adds to the challenges faced by the standard employment relationship. We now have important groups of quasi-subordinate workers that, while aspiring to more robust labour law protections, would naturally resist being reclassified as employees if that meant losing the tax benefits that are essential to their, usually modest, livelihoods (IWGB, 2017, paras. 9, 74).

Thirdly, there is now a serious risk that labour law (or important areas of labour law) could be asked to refocus itself around these intermediate contractual forms. Harris and Krueger's work in 2015 arguably anticipated this prospect, especially when advocating their 'independent worker' category

as ideally suited to structure the work relations of 'temporary staffing agency employees, ... members who secure jobs through union hiring halls, outside sales employees, and (perhaps) direct sales employees occupy the points of triangles with other economic actors' (Harris and Krueger, 2015; Taylor, 2017), all workers that, in most systems are or ought to be classified as standard employees enjoying the full spectrum of individual and collective labour rights (Cherry and Aloisi, 2018).

#### 4. 3. Retargeting labour rights beyond the contract of employment. Regulating personal work.

The third approach includes a range of different reform suggestions that can be varyingly described as advocating an extension of labour rights beyond the subordinate contract of employment and, to the extent that the latter operates as the exoskeleton of the standard employment relationship, beyond the standard employment relationship itself. Of all three approaches this is admittedly the one where less actual experimentation has taken place, with academic authors, but also increasingly some trade unions, taking the lead in developing reform ideas, and sometimes even reform proposals, to expand the coverage of labour rights '*au-delà de l'emploi*' (Supiot et al, 1999). Within this broad reform approach, two main strands can be identified. One strand advocates the extension of all or most labour rights beyond the contract of employment and to other 'work' or 'personal work' relations (Freedman and Kountouris, 2011; CGIL, 2016; Ewing, Hendy, and Jones, 2016; Dockès, 2017). The other believes that only some labour rights, such as anti-discrimination or health and safety rights, can or should be applied beyond the confines of the employee concept, and crucially that core labour protection such as the protection against unjustified dismissal ought to remain limited to subordinate employees (Davidov, 2016, pp.101-103, 121).

Typically, this approach attracts three sets of critiques. Firstly, there are concerns that expanding the scope of labour rights beyond the contract of employment may actually contribute to further destabilising the standard employment relationship, whose lack of viability is all but proven. Secondly, especially those proposals advocating a broad extension of most labour rights, are met with the concern that an overly broad extension of their scope of application could result in a rapid deterioration of the actual standards. Can we really ask a customer or client of a plumber, window washer, or greengrocer to guarantee these 'professionals' holiday pay, or unfair dismissal rights, the argument goes? Thirdly, there are concerns that guaranteeing some labour rights to independent contractors, including fundamental rights such as the right to bargain collectively, may unduly interfere with some fundamental laws of the market, including laws that seek to promote free competition and prevent the formation of cartels or abusive dominant positions (Case C-413/13, *FNV Kunsten Informatie en Media*).

With these criticisms in mind, the following section of this paper goes on to develop a set of proposals, broadly located in this third genre of reform approaches, that might contribute to an extension of employment protections beyond the contract of employment, and address some of the regulatory failures identified in the previous sections of this paper, without incurring in any of the pitfalls described in the previous paragraph.

## 5. Regulating for universal work relations

The set of proposals briefly illustrated in this section is currently being developed by the present author and a number of other academic authors (Ewing, Hendy, and Jones, 2019; Countouris and De Stefano, 2019) on the basis of two key prior publications. The first one is the 2011 monograph *The Legal Construction of Personal Work Relations*, co-authored with Professor Mark Freedland (Freedland and Kountouris, 2011; Freedland 2007). The second one is the 2016 publication *A Manifesto for Labour Law: Towards a Comprehensive revision of Workers' Rights* produced by a number of UK-based academics for the London based think-tank Institute of Employment Rights and edited by Keith Ewing, John Hendy, and Carolyn Jones (Ewing, Hendy, and Jones, 2016).

This set of proposals takes as its starting point the analysis developed in sections 2 and 3 of the present paper, and in particular the view that much of what is wrong with the, in many ways, unsatisfactory and inadequate coverage of labour law can be attributed to a series of complex processes leading to the de-institutionalisation and weakening of the standard employment relationship, but also to the internal failures in the structure of the contract of employment model. As discussed in section 3, this model is too narrowly focused on subordinate employment, too tied to the idea of continuous performance, and fatally affected by a narrow understanding of bilaterality. An alternative approach is necessary, and one that is premised on the idea of universality, both in the sense of the personal scope of application of labour law, and in the sense of the substance of the rights and protections it ought to guarantee.

### 5.1. Workers, employing entities, and presumptions of work

As such, a first step in these proposals is to suggest a new framing concept for the application of labour rights that would cover a broader range of personal work relations, including of course those currently covered by a contract of employment, while only excluding genuine own account businesses. Such framing concept could be formulated along the idea that labour rights ought to apply to every 'worker' understood as an 'individual who (a) seeks to be engaged by another to provide labour, (b) is engaged by another to provide labour; or (c) where the employment has ceased is engaged by another to provide labour, and is not genuinely operating a business on her or his own account' (cf. Workers (Definition and Rights) Bill 2017-19).

This concept of worker would entail that all those providing their labour to another party would be put in a position to enjoy the rights and protections contained in employment statutes (and for that matter most rights contained in the International Labour Code) regardless of the way their contracts or work relations define them. So, it goes without saying, this concept would naturally cover those workers offering their labour through a standard contract of subordinate employment. But crucially, the absence of a 'control' or 'subordination' requirement means that the new status would also include those that are currently classified as self-employed people who provide their services as part of a profession or business undertaking carried on by someone else, that shall thus benefit from employment protection laws. It would also cover other workers currently classified or misclassified as self-employed, on the basis of a variety of contracts for services or personal self-employed relations, as long as they are not genuinely operating a business undertaking on their own account. By excluding from the scope of labour law these genuine business and commercial activities, this definition of worker ensures that employment protection legislation does not interfere with civil and

commercial relationships, and could be rendered compatible with the functioning of competition and anti-trust law (Schiek and Gideon, 2018).

The new definition would also be broader than the current notion of contract of employment in that it would not require the existence of mutual obligations of a contractual character, and would thus cover various informal work relations that do not meet strict contractual requirements, as long as a legal obligation or duty to provide personal work, including one that is unpaid or voluntarily undertaken (Supiot, 2001, p. 54), can be ascertained from the reality of the situation. The definition would exclude those operating a genuine business and providing services to a plurality of clients or customers by means of substantial tangible or intangible assets (though it would of course apply to the staff that they may employ). If the assets are not substantial but marginal, or if they are ancillary to what is essentially a provision of personal work or services for an employer, then the person would be deemed to be a worker. A fortiori, the new definition would exclude those in business on their own account who employ other workers for the purpose of their business undertaking, though of course the staff they employ would be covered. In that sense the definition acknowledges that, in 21<sup>st</sup> century capitalist societies, the way in which factors of production interact and combine to generate value (Ekbia and Nardi, 2017) is sometimes less clear-cut than in the past (Freedland and Kountouris, 2017, pp. 67-70). But such a broader definition would also make sure that adequate labour protections are offered to 'those who 'labour to live' [because] it remains the case that 'capital hires labour' (Putterman, 1984) rather than the reverse' (Deakin, 2016, p. 10).

For this definition to accomplish its protective goals, at least two further elements would need to be present. Firstly, it would require the adoption of an equally broad concept of employing entity. A broad formulation of the 'employer' concept can be found in s.43K(1)(a) of the UK Employment Rights Act of 1996, essentially positing that where a worker's terms of employment are 'in practice substantially determined ... by the person for whom he works or worked, by the third person or by both of them' then the worker may be considered as employed by whichever of the two entities played a greater role in setting those terms, and potentially by *both* of them if both have 'substantially determined' the terms of engagement and employment (Day v Health Education England and Ors [2017] EXCA Civ 329). This definition of employer is thus not an 'exclusive' definition in any sense, and can in effect result in a 'joint employer' status arising in respect of multiple employing entities. A similar understanding of the employing entity would arguably assist with a range of personal work situations where various limbs of the employer prerogative are dispersed across a number of nodes and actors, as it often happens in both the new and in the old economy.

Secondly, a rebuttable presumption of worker status should apply so that all those providing their labour to others would be presumed to fall within the scope of labour law, unless the end user or the service provider can demonstrate that they are performing a genuine entrepreneurial activity (i.e. a rebuttable presumption). When it is possible, on a reasonable construction of the relationship, for a tribunal or court to characterize the person as a worker, then it should be understood that the employer will not be able to rebut the presumption. This will require the addition of specific provisions dictating that where in any civil proceedings any question arises as to whether an individual qualifies or qualified at any time for the status of worker, it shall be presumed that the individual qualifies as such unless the other party to the arrangement establishes that the *only* possible construction of the engagement is that the individual was not providing labour as a worker.

## 5.2. The role of international labour standards.

These proposals very much dovetail with the overall regulatory and policy framework promoted by the ILO. One of the ILO's core objectives has always been 'to ensure a just share of the fruits of progress to all' (ILO, 1944), and the broad personal scope of application of international labour standards has played a crucial role in pursuing this wide redistributive goal promoted by the organisation. *'It is untrue that ILO standards are only for those in the formal economy where there is a clear employer-employee relationship.* Most ILO standards refer to "workers" rather than the narrower legal category of "employees" (ILO, 2002, p. 45). So the broad definition of 'worker' advocated in these pages would be of considerable assistance to those policy initiatives that seek to encourage the transition from the informal to the formal economy, as it would, for instance, necessarily include 'employees holding informal jobs in or for formal enterprises' and 'workers in unrecognized or unregulated employment relationships', and a variety of other work relationships covered by ILO Recommendation 204, that may not meet the strict contractual and formal requirements of subordination, continuity, and bilaterality expected for a formal contract of subordinate employment to arise.

It should be noted that some of the most fundamental ILO instruments are already expressly understood as covering workers that, in some national jurisdictions, are classified as self-employed. For instance in construing the scope of application of Conventions 87 and 98, the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association has long established that 'The criterion for determining the persons covered by that right...is not based on the existence of an employment relationship, which is often non-existent, for example, in the case of agricultural workers, self-employed workers in general or those who practice liberal professions, who should nevertheless enjoy the right to organize' (ILO, 2001). More recently the Committee requested the Korean Government to take the necessary measures to 'ensure that 'self-employed' workers, such as heavy goods vehicle drivers, fully enjoy freedom of association rights, in particular the right to join the organizations of their own choosing' (ILO, 2012b) and it is accepted that several other ILO instruments, both 'fundamental' (ILO, 2012a, pp. 19, 26, 85, 148, 153, 189, 234, 307, 310, 324, 391) and not (ILO, 1970), are equally bestowed with very broad personal scopes of application, applying well beyond subordinate contracts of employment.

Perhaps most importantly, the ILO's own Employment Relationship Recommendation, 2006 (No. 198), is premised on the recognition that 'situations exist where contractual arrangements can have the effect of depriving workers of the protection they are due' and that 'protection should be accessible to all' (ILO R-198, Preamble), 'notwithstanding how the relationship is characterized in any contrary arrangement, contractual or otherwise, that may have been agreed between the parties' (ILO R-198, Paragraph 9). Unsurprisingly it offers the conceptual building blocks for moulding labour rights onto a broad notion of work, that includes both traditional, and narrower, forms of employment 'carried out according to the instructions and under the control of another party' but also broader or looser conceptions of work that are 'carried out personally by the worker' (ILO R-198, Paragraph 13). In doing so, the Recommendation relies on a series of indicators that ought to be read and understood on the basis of the protective purposes of the instrument, and should therefore be seen as directory, not mandatory, and inclusive, not exclusive. The only limit imposed by the Recommendation is that 'national policy for protection of workers in an employment relationship should not interfere with true civil and commercial relationships', which certainly suggests that self-employed individuals operating genuine and sufficiently capitalised business



undertaking on their own account, perhaps by employing others, should be left outside the scope of employment protection legislation. The Recommendation also asks national definitions to ensure that standards are 'applicable to all forms of contractual arrangements, including those involving multiple parties' (ILO R-198, Paragraph 4(c)), and encourages the adoption of 'a legal presumption that an employment relationship exists where one or more relevant indicators is present' (ILO R-198, Paragraph 11(b)).

The ILO Commission on the Future of Work is contemplating the prospect that 'a comprehensive policy response will be needed to ensure the promotion of decent work and equality treatment for all workers' (ILO, 2017 p. 35). Should the organisation be mandated to develop such a response, it is almost inescapable that such a process should begin internally and incrementally, by surveying and reviewing the personal scope of application of its own standards. A second step could see the production of a general survey on the personal scope of application of ILO conventions and recommendations as applied and implemented by ILO constituents. And this could be followed by the adoption of a horizontal instrument on the scope of application of ILO Conventions and Recommendations, perhaps in the form of a recommendation for the ILO at large to interpret and apply its own instruments broadly, beyond the scope of formal salaried employment, subject only to specific instruments expressly requiring a narrower scope. The recommendation should be inspired by the principles of universalism and coherence, and apply not only to the organisation's supervisory bodies, but also to the constituents of the ILO and to the Office. Its personal scope should be shaped by reference to a broad definition of 'worker' covering all those 'engaged by another to provide labour', regardless of the contractual form or other arrangement under which labour is provided, thus only excluding genuine self-employed persons who genuinely manage a business on their own account, as opposed to those that mainly 'labour to live'.

## **6. Conclusions.**

Writing in 2006 about the state of health of the contract of employment model, Davidov caustically stated 'The Reports of My Death are Greatly Exaggerated' (Davidov, 2006). He was, and in many ways is, right. The contract of employment continues to act as the gateway for the application of a great number of labour rights for a great number of workers. But as recently noted by the ILO, 'work understood to be indefinite employment in a subordinate employment relationship, while still the most common form of salaried employment in developed countries, has nonetheless lost ground over the past few decades, in both developed and developing countries' (ILO, 2017, p. 32). So this paper argues that the state of health of the contract of subordinate employment is hardly something to aspire to, and that this once fundamental legal institutions may well be going through the twilight stage of its existence: still too strong to die, but also too weak to thrive and perform its original purposes and functions. We are witnessing an *interregnum* fraught with difficulties. It is hardly the pedestal on which the Future of Work or the future of labour law should be built. The paper proposes and elaborates on a broader concept of personal work relation, and suggests that it could be used to replace the functions once performed, in a fairly adequate if always incomplete way, by the contract of employment. Guaranteeing universal labour rights to an increasingly complex universe of personal work relations. In doing so, this new, broad, and relational concept could go as far as rescuing the standard employment relationship from its current process of decay and would

do so without compromising the integrity and level of protection offered by employment protection legislation. It would get rid of the dirty bathwater elements arising from a narrow understanding of the subordinate contract of employment model, but without throwing the 'labour law baby' in the process.

It should also be acknowledged, by way of conclusion, that the proposals elaborated in this paper would not be able to achieve their full desired effects if they were exclusively tied to labour law reform. Further regulatory interventions may well be necessary to pursue a fairer mutualisation of the social risks attending to the performance of work, so as to disperse them away from workers, and share them more equitably between employers, the state, but also consumers, and society at large (Freedland and Kountouris, 2011, p. 443-446). In particular, the pursuit of the policy goals underpinning the regulation and protection of 'universal work relation' would require, or at least greatly benefit, from three broader sets of interventions. Firstly, they would be greatly assisted by targeted interventions in the area of social security law, aimed at bestowing non-contributory and redistributive entitlements to larger groups of active persons, including in the form of a guaranteed basic income (Atkinson, 2015; Standing, 2017; Behrendt and Anh Nguyen, 2017; De Stefano, 2018) especially where – in spite of the reliance on a broader definition of 'employing entity' – the law fails to identify a party responsible for the payment of wages (so long as other personal nexuses point to the performance of work) (Fredman and Fudge, 2013) and increasingly for those who produce value through activities that are not (yet) recognised as work in the automated digital economy (Ekbj and Nardi, 2017). Secondly, they would necessitate a more far-reaching role for sectoral collective bargaining in shaping specific protections underpinned by fundamental statutory rights, including in terms of enhanced job-security. Finally they would entail, but could also lead to, significant transformations in the way capital and labour interact with each other, with workers also organising for the purposes of sharing costs and, ultimately, capital through a range of arrangements, including cooperative and corporate ones, so as to be able to offer their services to a variety of clients and customers while enjoying the rights and benefits that typically accrue to employees in a traditional business structures.

It may be questioned whether it is both realistic and desirable to associate the future of labour law with reforms that span well beyond the traditional remit of the discipline. In reality however, labour law has always interfaced with, and occasionally relied upon, other areas of regulation in market economies, and in this sense the proposals and ideas developed in this paper simply suggest a new, if slightly broader and deeper, institutionalisation trajectory for personal work relations in 21<sup>st</sup> century capitalist societies.

# References

- Adams Z.; Deakin, S. 2014. "Institutional Solutions to Precariousness and Inequality in Labour Markets", in *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, p. 780.
- Ahsan, A; Pagés, C. 2007. "Are All Labor Regulations Equal? Assessing the Effects of Job Security, Labor Dispute, and Contract Labor Laws in India", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper; No. 4259.
- Albin, E. 2017. "The Missing Context: Comments on A Purposive Approach to Labour Law", in *Jerusalem Review of Legal Studies*, p. 17.
- Antonopoulos, R. 2009. 'The unpaid care work - paid work connection' Working paper no. 86 (International Labour Office, Policy Integration and Statistics Department, Geneva, ILO).
- Arendt, H. 1998. *The Human Condition* (University of Chicago Press).
- Atkinson, A. B. 2015. *Inequality: What can be done?* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press).
- Autoclenz v Belcher & Ors* [2011] UKSC 41, para 25.
- Behrendt, C.; Anh Nguyen, Q. 2018. *Innovative approaches for ensuring universal social protection for the future of work* (ILO).
- Benería, L. 1999. "The Enduring Debate over Unpaid Labour" in *International Labour Review*, p. 287.
- Benjamin, P. (assisted by Bhoola, U.) 2011. "Subordination, Parasubordination and Self-Employment: A Comparative Study in Selected African Countries", in G. Casale (ed.): *The Employment Relationship – A Comparative Overview* (Geneva, ILO), p. 102.
- Berg, J. 2001. "Laws or luck? Understanding rising labour formality in Brazil in the 2000s", in S. Lee; D. McCann (eds.): *Regulating for Decent Work: New Directions in Labour Market Regulation* (Basingstoke, Palgrave).
- Blainpain, R. (ed.): 2008. "The Global Labour Market: From Globalization to Flexicurity", in *Bulletin of Comparative Labour Relations*.
- Blanpain, R.; Yamakawa, R. (eds.). 2000: "Deregulation and Labour Law: In Search of a Labour Concept for the 21st Century (2000), in *Bulletin of Comparative Labour Relations*.
- Bronstein, A. 1998. *Pasado y Presente de la Legislacion Laboral en America Latina* (Geneva, ILO).
- Casale, G.; Perulli, A. 2014. *Towards the Single Employment Contract: Comparative Reflections* (Oxford, Hart).
- Case C-413/13, *FNV Kunsten Informatie en Media v Staat der Nederlanden* judgment of 4 December 2014.
- Cazes, S.; Nesporova, A. (eds.): 2010. *Flexicurity: A Relevant Approach in Central and Eastern Europe* (Geneva, ILO)
- CGIL. 2016. "Carta dei diritti universali del lavoro - Nuovo statuto di tutte le lavoratrici e di tutti i lavoratori".
- Chen, Y.; Xu, Z. 2017. "Informal Employment and China's Economic Development", in *The Chinese Economy*, p. 425.

Cheng, Z.; Smyth, R.; Guo, F. 2013. "The impact of China's new labour contract law on socioeconomic outcomes for migrant and urban workers", Monash University, Department of Economics Discussion Papers, 51/13.

Cherry, A. M.; Aloisi, A. 2018. 'A Critical Examination of a Third Employment Category for On-Demand Work (In Comparative Perspective)', in N. M. Davidson; M. Finck; J. J. Infranca (eds.): *Cambridge Handbook on the Law of the Sharing Economy* (Cambridge, CUP). Forthcoming.

*Chintaman Rao & Another vs The State Of Madhya Pradesh* 1958 AIR 388.

Collins, H. 1990. "Independent Contractors and the Challenge of Vertical Disintegration to Employment Protection Laws" in *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, p. 353.

Cooney, S. 2017. "The Employment Relationship: China", paper presented at the ILO hosted conference 'Defining and Regulating the Employment Relationship: A comparative legal perspective' (Geneva).

Cooney, S.; Biddulph, S.; Zhu, Y. 2013. *Law and Fair Work in China* (London, Routledge).

Cooney, S.; Lindsey, T.; Mitchell, R.; Ying, Z. (eds.), 2002. *Law and Labour Market Regulation in East Asia* (London, Routledge).

Corazza, L.; Razzolini, O. 2015. "Who is an Employer?", in M. Finkin; G. Mundalak (eds.): *Research Handbook in Comparative Labor Law* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar), 132.

Costanzi, R. G; Barbosa, E.D.; da Silva Bichara, J. 2013. "Extending social security coverage to self-employed workers in Brazil", in *International Labour Review*, p. 549.

Countouris, N. 2007. *The Changing Law of the Employment Relationship – Comparative Analysis in the European Context* (Aldershot, Ashgate).

Countouris, N. 2011. "The Employment Relationship: A Comparative Analysis of National Judicial Approaches", in G. Casale (ed.): *The Employment Relationship – A Comparative Overview* (Geneva, ILO), p. 35.

Countouris, N.; De Stefano, V. 2019. "New trade union strategies for new forms of employment" (Brussels, ETUC), forthcoming.

Countouris, N.; Freedland, M. 2013. "Labour Regulation and the Economic Crisis in Europe: Challenges, Responses and Prospects", in J. Heyes; L. Rychly (eds): *Labour Administration in Uncertain Times* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar), p. 66.

Davidov, G. 2006. "The Reports of My Death are Greatly Exaggerated: Employee as a Viable (Though Overly-Used) Legal Concept", in G. Davidov; B. Langille (eds.): *Boundaries and Frontiers of Labour law: Goals and Means in the Regulation of Work* (Oxford, Hart).

Davidov, G. 2014. "Setting Labour Law's Coverage: Between Universalism and Selectivity", in *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, p. 543.

Davidov, G. 2016. *A Purposive Approach to Labour Law* (Oxford, OUP).

Davidov, G.; Freedland, M.; Kountouris, M. 2015. "The Subjects of Labor Law: "Employees" and Other Workers", in M. Finkin; G. Mundalak (eds.): *Research Handbook in Comparative Labor Law* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar), p. 115.

Davies, A.C. L. 2007. "The Contract for Intermittent Employment", in *Industrial Law Journal*, p. 102.

*Day v Health Education England & Ors* [2017] EWCA Civ 329.

De Stefano, V. 2014. "A Tale of Oversimplification and Deregulation: The Mainstream Approach to Labour Market Segmentation and Recent Responses to the Crisis in European Countries", in *Industrial Law Journal*, 253.

De Stefano, V. 2016. "The rise of the «just-in-time workforce»: On-demand work, crowdwork and labour protection in the «gig-economy»"(Geneva, ILO).

De Stefano, V. 2017. "Labour is not a technology – Reasserting the Declaration of Philadelphia in Times of Platform-Work and Gig-Economy", in *IUSLabor*, 2, pp. 6-8.

De Stefano, V. 2018. "Negotiating the Algorithm': Automation, Artificial Intelligence and Labour Protection", in *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, forthcoming. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3178233> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3178233> .

Deakin, S. 1998. "The Evolution of the Contract of Employment, 1900-1950. The influence of the welfare state", in N. Whiteside and R. Salais (eds.): *Governance, Industry and Labour Markets in Britain and France—The Modernising State in the Twentieth Century* (London, Routledge), Ch. 11.

Deakin, S. 2006. "The Comparative Evolution of the Employment relationship", in Davidov, G.; Langille, B. (eds.): *Boundaries and Frontiers of Labour Law* (Oxford, Hart), 89.

Deakin, S. 2006. "The Comparative Evolution of the Employment relationship", in G. Davidov and B. Langille (eds): *Boundaries and Frontiers of Labour Law* (Oxford, Hart), p. 104.

Deakin, S. 2011. "The Contribution of Labour Law to Economic and Human Development", in G. Davidov; B. Langille (eds.): *The Idea of Labour Law* (Oxford, OUP), 156.

Deakin, S. 2016. "The Contribution Of Labour Law To Economic Development And Growth", Centre for Business Research, University of Cambridge Working Paper No. 478.

Deakin, S.; Lele, P.; Siems, M. 2007. "The evolution of labour law: Calibrating and comparing regulatory regimes", in *International Labour Review*, p. 133.

Deakin, S.; Malmberg, J. ; Sarkar, P. 2014. "How do labour laws affect unemployment and the labour share of national income? The experience of six OECD countries, 1970–2010", in *International Labour Review*, p. 1.

Deakin, S.; Wilkinson, F. 2005. *The Law of the Labour Market – Industrialisation, Employment and Legal Evolution* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Dockès, E. et al. 2017. *Proposition de code du travail* (Paris, Dalloz).

Dukes, R. 2014. *The Labour Constitution: The Enduring Idea of Labour Law* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Ekbja, H. R.; Nardi, B. A. 2017. *Heteromation, and Other Stories of Computing and Capitalism* (Cambridge, MIT Press).

Eurofound. 2017. "Exploring self-employment in the European Union" (Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union).

Ewing, K. D.; Hendy, J.; Jones, C. (eds.): 2016. *A Manifesto for Labour Law: Towards a Comprehensive revision of Workers' Rights* (London, IER).

- Ewing, K.; Hendy, J.; Jones, C. (eds): 2019. *The future of labour law: progressive rights under a progressive government* (London, IER). Forthcoming.
- Frankowski, S.; Stephan, P. B. (eds.). 1995: *Legal Reform in Post-Communist Europe: The View from Within* (Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff).
- Franks, J. R. 1994. 'Explaining Unemployment in Spain: Structural Change, Cyclical Fluctuations, and Labor Market Rigidities', (IMF).
- Fredman, S.; Fudge, J. 2013. "The Legal Construction of Personal Work Relations and Gender", in *Jerusalem Review of Legal Studies*, 122.
- Fredman, S.; Fudge, J. 2016. "The Contract of Employment and Gendered Work", in M. Freedland, et al. (eds.): *The Contract of Employment* (Oxford, OUP), p. 231.
- Freedland, M. 2006. "From the Contract of Employment to the Personal Work Nexus", in *Industrial Law Journal*, p. 1.
- Freedland, M. 2007. "Application of labour and employment law beyond the contract of employment", in *International Labour Review*, p. 3.
- Freedland, M. R. 2003. *The Personal Employment Contract* (Oxford, OUP).
- Freedland, M.; Kountouris, N. 2011. *The Legal Construction of Personal Work Relations* (Oxford, OUP).
- Freedland, M.; Kountouris, N. 2017. "Some Reflections on the 'Personal Scope' of Collective Labour Law", in *Industrial Law Journal*, pp. 67-70.
- Freeman R.B.; Li, X. 2013. "How Does China's New Labor Contract Law Affect Floating Workers?", NBER Working Paper No. 19254.
- Fudge, J. 2010. "A Canadian Perspective on the Scope of Employment Standards, Labor Rights, and Social Protection: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly", in *Comparative Labour Law and Policy Journal*, 253.
- Fudge, J. 2017. "The future of the standard employment relationship: Labour law, new institutional economics and old power resource theory", in *Journal of Industrial Relations*, p. 376.
- Fudge, J.; Owens, R. (2006). "Precarious Work, Women, and the New Economy: The Challenge to Legal Norms", in J. Fudge; R. Owens (eds.): *Precarious Work, Women, and the New Economy: The Challenge to Legal Norms* (Oxford, Hart), pp. 3-4.
- Fudge, J.; Tucker, E.; Vosko, L. 2002. *The Legal Concept of Employment: Marginalizing Workers - Report for the Law Commission of Canada* (Ottawa, Law Commission of Canada).
- Garofalo, M. G. 1999. "Un Profilo Ideologico del Diritto del Lavoro", in *Giornale di Diritto del Lavoro e di Relazioni Industriali*, 81.
- Garofalo, M. G. 2008. "Unità e pluralità del lavoro nel sistema costituzionale" (2008) in *Giornale di Diritto del Lavoro e di Relazioni Industriali*, 22.
- Ghera, E. 2006. "Subordinazione, Statuto Protettivo, e Qualificazione del Rapporto di Lavoro", in *Giornale di Diritto del Lavoro e di Relazioni Industriali*, p. 1.
- Gomez Ramírez, E. 2016. "Latin America's informal economy - Some formalisation strategies" (European Parliament).

- Harris, S.D.; Krueger, A. B. 2015. "A Proposal for Modernizing Labor Laws for Twenty-First-Century Work: The "Independent Worker"" (Brookings).
- Hastings, T.; Heyes, J. 2016. "Farewell to flexicurity? Austerity and labour policies in the European Union", in *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, p. 1.
- Hatzopoulos, V. 2018. *The Collaborative Economy and EU Law* (London, Bloomsbury).
- Hay, D.; Craven, P. (eds.): 2004. *Masters, Servants, and Magistrates in Britain and the Empire, 1562-1955* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press).
- Hepple B. A.; Napier, B. W. 1978. "Temporary Workers and the Law", in *Industrial Law Journal*, 84.
- Hepple, B. (ed.) 1986. *The Making of Labour Law in Europe* (London, Mansell).
- Hepple, B.; Veneziani, B (eds.). 2009: *The Transformation of Labour Law in Europe: A Comparative Study of 15 Countries 1945-2004* (Oxford, Hart).
- ILO. 1944. ILO Declaration of Philadelphia 1944.
- ILO. 1970. Opinion given by the Office concerning the Prevention of Accidents (Seafarers) Convention, 1970 (No. 1970), Poland, OB, Vol. LVII, 1974, Nos. 2-4, p. 209, para. 6.
- ILO. 2001. ILO Committee on Freedom of Association (2001) Report No 326, Case No 2013.
- ILO. 2002. "Report VI – Decent Work in the Informal Economy – Sixth Item on the Agenda", International Labour Conference, 90<sup>th</sup> session.
- ILO. 2006. Employment Relationship Recommendation, 2006 (No. 198).
- ILO. 2012 a. General Survey on the fundamental Conventions concerning rights at work in light of the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008 (2012) International Labour Conference, 101st Session, 2012.
- ILO. 2012 b. *ILO Committee on Freedom of Association (2012) Report No 363, Case 2602*.
- ILO. 2015 a. *Informal Employment Among Youth in Brazil* (Geneva, ILO).
- ILO. 2015 b. *The future of work centenary initiative - Report of the Director-General*, International Labour Conference, 104th Session.
- ILO. 2016 a. *Non-standard Employment Around the World – Understanding Challenges, Shaping Prospects* (Geneva).
- ILO. 2016 b. *A Challenging Future For The Employment Relationship: Time For Affirmation Or Alternatives?* (ILO).
- ILO. 2017. *Inception Report for the Global Commission on the Future of Work* (Geneva, ILO).
- ILO. 2018. *Statistics on work relationships - Report for discussion at the Meeting of Experts on Labour Statistics in Preparation for the 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians* (Geneva, 5–9 February).
- ILO; ELLN. 2003. *Regulating The Employment Relationship In Europe: A guide to Recommendation No. 198* (ILO).

*IWGB v Deliveroo* Case Number: TUR1/985(2016) 14 November 2017.

IWGB. 2017. "Dead on Arrival, The IWGB's reply to the Taylor Review on Modern Employment Practices" (IWGB).

Kahn-Freund, O. 1954. "Legal Framework", in Flanders, A.; Clegg, H. A. (eds.): *The System of Industrial Relations in Great Britain* (Oxford, Blackwell), p.45.

Kahn-Freund, O. 1967. "Status and Contract in Labour Law", in *Modern Law Review*, 642.

Kollonay Lehocky, C. 2006. "The Post-Socialist New Member States", in G. Davidov; B. Langille (eds.): *Boundaries and Frontiers of Labour Law* (Oxford, Hart), 223.

Koukiadaki, A.; Katsaroumpas, I. 2017. *Temporary Contracts, Precarious Employment, Employees' Fundamental Rights and EU Employment law* (European Parliament).

Kountouris, N. 2016. "EU Law and the Regulation of 'Atypical' Work", in A. Bogg; C. Costello; A.C.L. Davies (eds.): *Research Handbook on EU Labour Law* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar), p. 246.

Kovács, E.; Lyutov, N.; Mitrus, N. 2015. "Labour Law in Transition: From a Centrally Planned to Free Market Economy in Central and Eastern Europe", in M. W. Finkin; G. Mundlak (eds.): *Comparative Labour Law* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar), p. 403.

Kuttner, R. 2013. "Labor Market Regulation and the Global Economic Crisis", in K. V. W. Stone; H. Arthurs (eds.): *Rethinking Workplace Regulation: Beyond the Standard Contract of Employment* (Cambridge, CUP), p. 42.

Landau, I.; Mahy, P.; Mitchell, R. 2015. *The regulation of non-standard forms of employment in India, Indonesia and Viet Nam* (ILO).

le Roux, R. 2010. "The Evolution of the Contract of Employment in South Africa", in *Industrial Law Journal*, p. 148.

Lee, C.-S. 2002. "Law and Labour-management Relations in South Korea" in S. Cooney; T. Lindsey; R. Mitchell; Y. Zhu (eds.): *Law and labour Market Regulation in East Asia* (London, Routledge, 2002).

Leighton, P. 1986. "Marginal Workers", in R. Lewis (ed.): *Labour Law in Britain* (Oxford, Blackwell), 503.

Liang, Z.; Appleton, S.; Song, L. 2016. "Informal Employment in China: Trends, Patterns and Determinants of Entry", in IZA DP No. 10139, 23.

Lyon-Caen, A. 1998. "Actualité du Contrat de Travail, Brefs Propos", in *Droit Social*, p. 541.

Lyon-Caen, G. 1990. *Le Droit du Travail Non Salaré* (Paris, Sirey).

Ministero Publico do Trabalho. 2017. *Manual de Apoio – Inconstitucionalidades da Lei nº 13.467/2017* (MPT).

Mitchell, R.; Mahy, P.; Gahan, P. 2014. "The Evolution of Labour Law in India: An Overview and Commentary on Regulatory Objectives and Development", in *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, p. 420.

Novick, M.; Lengyel, M.; Sarabia, M. 2009. "From Social Protection to Vulnerability: Argentina's Neo-Liberal Reforms of the 1990s Latin America's Neo-Liberal Experiment", in *International Labour Review*, 235.

Nussbaum, M. 2017. "Preface" in M. Lansky; J. Ghosh; D. Méda; U. Rani, (eds.): *Women, Gender, and Work – Social Choices and Inequality* (Geneva, ILO), vii.

Nussbaum, M.; Sen, A. 1993. *The Quality of Life* (Oxford, Clarendon).



- OECD. 1994. *The OECD Jobs Study Facts, Analysis, Strategies 1994* (Paris).
- ONS. 2016. 'Women shoulder the responsibility of 'unpaid work' 10 November 2016 available at <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/articles/women-shoulder-the-responsibility-of-unpaid-work/2016-11-10> (last accessed 25 April 2018).
- Owens, R.; Stewart, A. 2016. "Regulating for decent work experience: Meeting the challenge of the rise of the intern", in *International Labour Review*, 679.
- Pedrazzoli, M. (ed.): 1989. *Lavoro Subordinato e Dintorni – Comparazioni e Prospettive* (Bologna, Il Mulino)
- Perulli, A. 2003. "Economically Dependent/Quasi-subordinate (Parasubordinate) Employment: Legal, Social and Economic Aspects"(European Commission).
- Pimlico Plumbers v Smith* [2018] UKSC 29.
- Pollert, A. 1988. "The 'Flexible Firm': Fixation or Fact?", in *Work, Employment and Society*, p. 281.
- Ponchmann, M. 2009. "What Brazil Learned from Labour Flexibilization in the 1990s Latin America's Neo-Liberal Experiment", in *International Labour Review*, 269
- Prassl, J. 2015. *The Concept of the Employer* (Oxford, OUP).
- Prassl, J. 2018. *Humans as Service* (Oxford, OUP).
- Rogers, G.; Rogers, J. 1989. *Precarious Jobs in Labour Market Regulation: The Growth of Atypical Employment in Western Europe* (Geneva, International Institute for Labour Studies).
- Roychowdhury, A. 2018. *Labour Law Reforms in India: All in the Name of Jobs* (London, Routledge).
- Rubiano, C. 2013. "Collective Bargaining and Competition Law: A Comparative Study on the Media, Arts and Entertainment Sectors" (International Federation of Musicians).
- Sankaran, K. 2007. "Labour Laws in South Asia: The need for an Inclusive Approach" (Geneva, International Institute for Labour Studies), p. 3.
- Sankaran, K. 2012. "Flexibility and Informalisation of Employment Relationships", in J. Fudge; S. McCrystal; K. Sankaran (eds.): *Challenging the Legal Boundaries of Work Regulation* (Oxford, Hart), p. 30.
- Sciarra, S. 2007. "EU Commission Green Paper 'Modernising labour law to meet the challenges of the 21st century", in *Industrial Law Journal*, p. 375.
- Schiek, D.; Gideon, A. 2018. "Outsmarting the gig-economy through collective bargaining - EU competition law as a barrier? (2 ed.)", CETLS Working Paper Series.
- Standing, G. 2017, *Basic Income: And How We Can Make It Happen* (London, Pelican).
- Stewart A.; Stanford, J. 2017. "Regulating work in the gig economy: What are the options?", in *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 420.
- Stewart, A. 2012. *Gender, Law and Justice in a Global Market* (Cambridge University Press).
- Stone K. V. W.; Arthurs, H. 2013. "The Transformation of Employment Regimes: A Worldwide Challenge", in K. V. W. Stone; H. Arthurs (eds.): *Rethinking Workplace Regulation: Beyond the Standard Contract of Employment* (Cambridge, CUP), 5.

- Stone, K. V. W. 2004. *From Widgets to Digits - Employment Regulation for the Changing Workplace* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press) Ch. 2-3.
- Stringfellows v Quashie* [2012] EWCA Civ 1735.
- Supiot, A. 1994. *Critique du Droit du Travail* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France), Ch. 1.
- Supiot, A. 1999. *Au-delà de l'emploi : Transformations du travail et devenir du droit du travail en Europe* Paris, Flammarion).
- Supiot, A. 2000. "Les Nouveaux Visages de la Subordination", in *Droit Social*, 139.
- Supiot, A. 2000. "The Dogmatic Foundation of the Market", in *Industrial Law Journal*, p. 326.
- Supiot, A. 2002. *Critique du Droit du Travail* (Paris, Quadrige, PUF), p. 33-34.
- Supiot, A. 2012, *The Spirit of Philadelphia – Social Justice vs the Total Market* (London, Verso).
- Supiot, A; et al. 2001. *Beyond Employment - Changes in Work and the Future of Labour Law in Europe*, (Oxford, Oxford University Press), p. 53.
- Sylos Labini, P. (1964). "Precarious Employment in Sicily", in *International Labour Review*, p. 270.
- Taylor, M. 2017. *Good work: the Taylor review of modern working practices* (London).
- Teklè, T. 2010. *Labour Law and Worker Protection in Developing Countries* (Geneva, ILO).
- UN. 2017. *Women's economic empowerment in the changing world of work - Report of the Secretary-General*, UN Economic and Social Council, Commission on the Status of Women, 'E/CN.6/2017/3, at p. 9.
- Vega Ruíz, M. L. (ed.): 2005. *La Reforma Laboral en América Latina: 15 Años Después - Un Análisis Comparado* (Lima, ILO).
- Veneziani, B. 2009. 'The Employment Relationship', in Hepple, B.; Veneziani, B. (eds), *The Transformation of Labour Law in Europe - A Comparative Study of 15 Countries 1945-2004* (Oxford, Hart), Ch 4.
- Vettori, S. 2016. *The Employment Contract and the Changed World of Work* (Abingdon, Routledge).
- Villasimil Prieto, H. 2015, "Pasado y Presente del Derecho Laboral Latinoamericano y las Vicisitudes de la Relación de Trabajo (Primera Parte) (2015)", in *Revista Latinoamericana de Derecho Social*, 207.
- Villasimil Prieto, H. 2016, "Pasado y Presente del Derecho Laboral Latinoamericano y las Vicisitudes de la Relación de Trabajo (Segunda Parte)", in *Revista Latinoamericana de Derecho Social*, 227.
- Vosko, L. F. 2001. *Temporary Work: The Gendered Rise of a Precarious Employment Relationship* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press).
- Waas, B.; Heerma van Voss, G. (eds.): 2017. *Restatement of Labour Law in Europe: Vol I: The Concept of Employee* (Oxford, Hart)
- Wedderburn, B. W. 1967. *Cases and Materials on Labour Law* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 1.
- Womack, J. P.; Jones, D. T.; Roos, D. 1990. *The Machine That Changed the World* (New York, Rawson Associates).
- Workers (Definition and Rights) Bill 2017-19, sponsored by Chris Stephens MP and available at <https://services.parliament.uk/bills/2017-19/workersdefinitionandrights.html>
- World Bank. 2007. *Doing Business 2008* (World Bank).

