Decent Work

Decent work (DW) has emerged as a growing paradigm for all, entailing fundamental principles and rights at work which can pervade all human resource management (HRM)practices. While studies on DW are generally examined on macro levels, such as social, economic, legal, and political, the rising emphasis to realize the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) No. 8 of the UN and highlight the importance of quality of employment.

1. Introduction

At the turn of the twenty-first century, dating back to the ILO's history within the United Nations (UN) as of 1919, decent work (DW) has emerged as a growing paradigm for all people, entailing fundamental principles and rights at work which can pervade all human resource management practices. Securing decent work for all alleviates inequalities, increases people's purchasing power, enhances social protection, and gives rise to more inclusive and sustainable economic development. DW, at this point, can be proposed as an 'employee-centred approach' [1] that provides employees with physically and interpersonally safe working conditions, access to health care, adequate compensation, adequate workload and working time [2], opportunities to learn and gain professional positions, satisfaction through career development processes [2][3][4][5], and the facilitation of goal accomplishments (e.g., social support, autonomy, and task significance) [6]. A hundred years ahead in 2019, DW has been declared to be one of the sustainable development goals (SDGs) of the United Nations (U.N.) focusing on the importance of quality of employment, safe and secure working environments, and social protection for all.

Work is considered a central aspect of people's lives, which drives them to make it a fulfilling and productive activity. In today's fierce competition, employees, in particular white-collar workers, are generally pushed to work harder and show high performances in the context of digitalization and Industry 4.0, which can put them under serious pressure, giving rise to negative work-related outcomes and the deterioration of their health and well-being. This draws attention to the fact that employees should be provided with a decent working context and that the importance of quality of employment and social protection should not be overlooked.

As a matter of fact, every job that people hold is surrounded by both job resources and job demands. Job resources refer to those physical, psychological, organizational, and social aspects of the job that can be exemplified as job autonomy, feedback, access to social support, a high-quality supervisor relationship [7], adequate working time and workload distribution, opportunities for personal and professional development as well as the provision of adequate remuneration, health, well-being, and security conditions [2][3][4]. Given the increased competition of modern times, higher levels of job demands accompanied by high work pressure, work overload, and other job stressors, i.e., job insecurity, work can turn into an exhausting experience. In cases in which the job demands exceed the job resources, these exceeding demands can hinder job resources, thus creating detrimental employee outcomes, such as low performance, intention to leave [8][9][10], and also health-impairing effects, e.g., acute fatigue and exhaustion [11]. Given the inevitability of high job demands in the current work environment, the idea of increasing job resources can be further acknowledged as buffering the negative outcomes of job demands. These arguments, in line with the literature [12][13], leads to propose that the DW construct might well fit into the job demand–resources (JD–R) framework, which has been used in scholarly research to explain how working conditions influence employee behaviour, e.g., absenteeism, performance, and client satisfaction [14][15][16]. Central to the JD–R model is that adequate amount of resources can buffer the negative outcomes of job demands [8][9][10][11]. Hence, it is proposed that the availability of DW conditions in the workplace should be interpreted as the 'job resources' an employee utilizes in the workplace. The unavailability of decent working conditions can be associated with adverse job demands, while securing such conditions can help buffer the negative effects of job demands on employee outcomes [12].

Given DW was originally developed to examine its availability at a societal level [17], it has been criticized for its lack of focus on work life experiences at the individual level [18]. Nevertheless, there exists some recent empirical research on DW, which found significant associations with some employee-related outcomes, such as work motivation and psychological capital [2][4][19], well-being [17][20], work engagement [3], and employee trust [19][21]. By relying on the social justice aspect of decent work at a macro (societal) level, herein, it is to contribute to fill in the gap regarding the testability of decent work as a set of practices at the individual level and the applicability of social justice in the context of employees. Therefore, the research is novel as it explores whether the availability of DW plays an important role in two plausible outcomes at the employee level: 'employee performance', as proposed by Ferraro et al. [2][4], and 'intention to leave', as held by Arnoux-Nicolas et al. [22]. According to the JD–R Model, an adequate amount of job resources—DW conditions—can buffer the negative outcomes of job demands, thus leading to higher employee performance and a reduced intention to leave [8][9][10].

The relationship of DW practices with performance and intention to leave may not be a direct one, as there may be other contextual factors that can alter the strength, level, and presence of these relationships. Increased competition and new technologies have changed work demands, i.e., the need to manage higher complexity, generate new knowledge, increase skill variety, and intensify work effort [23]. As a consequence, individuals have started to take on more and different roles, each bearing new responsibilities and expectations [24]. However, people have limited personal resources (e.g., time and energy), which makes it difficult for them to participate and meet the expectations of all their roles. The result is an increase in work–family conflict (WFC) and family–work conflict (FWC), the impact of which is to investigate in terms of the DW employee-level outcomes. While WFC addresses inter-role conflicts, whereby demands from the work domain can interfere with the family role requirements [25], FWC arises when family responsibilities affect one's job demands [26]. It is also crucial to understand and address white-collar workers' perceptions about DW, which has so far generally been studied among blue-collar workers [27].

2. Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) Model

The JD–R model proposes that all working environments and job characteristics can be classified into two different categories, namely job demands and job resources. Job demands involve those factors, such as work overload, role ambiguity [28], role conflict, and role stress [7], that put physical, social, psychological, and/or organizational pressure and strain on individuals which compels them to exert physical, psychological, and/or cognitive effort [29]. Job demands are divided into the dimensions of challenge and hindrance. Challenge demands can be exemplified as work load, time pressure, and cognitive processing requirements, which require a lot of effort but pave the way for goal achievement. In contrast, hindrance demands are obstructive and include job insecurity, organizational constraints, role ambiguity, interpersonal conflict, administrative hassles, rather inadequate resources [30], work overload, and excessive working hours [31], thereby preventing good employee morale, well-being, and job performance. Job resources refer to those factors that help reduce job demands, particularly alleviating the negative effects of hindrance demands and the associated physical, psychological, and cognitive costs in order to facilitate goal accomplishment (e.g., autonomy and task significance) [12] and also to allow for more personal learning and development [12][32]. The JD–R model proposes that the interaction between job demands and job resources displays itself in a way that job resources may buffer the negative outcomes of job demands, such as strain, burnout, and poor performance [12][31].

Previous studies have considered the JD–R model highly important in an organizational context as it enables professionals and organizations to recognize the factors related to motivation, performance, and employee well-being. One such study has found the role of job resources in the prevention of exhaustion [33]. Xanthopoulou et al. [34] have also found that employees provided with sufficient resources in their work environment are able to perform their tasks successfully, facilitating their work engagement. Bakker and Demerouti [14] also argue that job resources (i.e., autonomy, social support, fulfilling work, and performance) become particularly important and useful when the job demands are highly challenging.

3. Decent Work Construct

Dating back to the ILO's history within the United Nations (UN) since 1919 [35], the "decent work" (DW) concept has thus been evolving for more than a century, arriving at its current framework and definition as a consequence of a series of conferences, declarations, treaties and so on [36]. The concept formed the basis for raising awareness of working conditions, social justice, and human rights [37]. The official introduction of the DW construct was proposed by the International Labor Organization (ILO) in the 87th session of the International Labor Conference in 1999 as "productive work in which rights are protected, which generates an adequate income, with adequate social protection" [38] (p. 13).

Ever since recent decades, the DW concept has further increased in importance given today's globalized dynamic workplace contexts [2][4], increased employee responsibilities, [21] and accelerated competition in the workplace. While this changing trend has enabled employees to exercise more autonomy, equipped them for higher productivity, and engendered greater commitment, it has, however, at the same time, put them under further pressure in terms of employer demands, such as setting unrealistic and unachievable goals, excessive responsibilities in job descriptions, and excessive working hours [21]. This can lead to multiple negative outcomes, such as job dissatisfaction and poor work performance, as well as reduced care for the health and well-being of employees [39][40]. These changes have further drawn attention to the DW concept, which in particular has recently been put forward as one of the sustainable development goals (SDGs) of the United Nations (U.N.) in 2019, encompassing the importance of quality of employment and social protection. SDG No. 8 aims to "promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all", in which workers have access to "safe and secure working environments" [41].

Taking the ILO documents [42][43][44][45] and the substantive elements explained in the Decent Work Agenda as the foundation, Ferraro, Pais, dos Santos, and Moreira [4] developed a Decent Work Questionnaire (DWQ) as a measurement instrument at the individual worker level and identified a number of factors or dimensions from workers' subjective perceptions of the presence of DW conditions in their current job. They came up with seven dimensions of DW, as presented in the table below (**Table 1**).

Table 1. Decent work dimensions and descriptions.

DW Dimensions	Descriptions
Fundamental Principles and Values at Work	**Justice, dignity, freedom, fair treatment at work, acceptance (without discrimination), clarity of norms, trust, solidarity, participation, and mental health comprise the core of the concept of DW and its foundations.**
Adequate Working Time and Workload	**A decent balance between personal and work life is essential. The efforts made for work, deadlines, shifts, and schedules should be adequate.**
Fulfilling and Productive Work	**Perception that work has some meaning, contributes to personal and professional development, and creates value for the individual and multiple stakeholders at large.**
Meaningful remuneration for the exercise of citizenship	**Perception that the remuneration received for work is fair and allows individuals and their families a life with dignity and autonomy, enhancing their well-being.**
Social Protection	**Perceptions or expectations of workers as to whether they and their family can be socially protected by public or private insurance in case of illness, unemployment, or retirement through a system of social security or that they can be repaid for committed efforts at work in the long run.**
Opportunities	**Workers' perceptions of the existence of opportunities for their employability and entrepreneurial activities and their perceptions of their degree of optimism for better futures and careers with regard to professional positions, assignments, challenges, learning, income, and benefits.**
Health and Safety	**Perception of being protected from risks to physical and psychological health at work and of having safe environmental conditions at the workplace.**

Note: Based on Ferraro, Pais, dos Santos and Moreira, [4] and ILO [42].

4. Work–Family Conflict (WFC) and Family–Work Conflict (FWC)

Work and family are two of the important domains of employees in organizational settings and they might not always be compatible with one another, creating conflicts that give rise to negative outcomes, such as organizational dissatisfaction, psychological distress, lower job performance and oso on [25][46]. WFC takes place when matters at work (severe competition, long and/or inflexible working hours, demanding managers and so on) affects one's ability to meet the demands associated with the family context (care of elderly parents, kids, household duties, domestic spouse and so on). On the other hand, FWC occurs when issues at work clash with family responsibility [24][25]. Previous studies have examined and discussed WFC and FWC (i.e., [47][48]). For instance, FWC was found to drive employees' intention to leave their jobs [49], whereas WFC was negatively related with job performance [48][50].

5. Decent Work and Employee Performance

Several scholarly studies have examined the relationship between DW and employee outcomes, such as employee motivation [51][52], well-being, and work engagement [13][53], which bear implications for achieving superior performance-related results and coping with challenges in the workplace [13]. At the micro level, a DW environment can be created by organisational efforts to implement employee well-being-oriented HRM practices (e.g., jobs with appropriate workload, role clarity, and employee control, as well as information sharing, employment security, and supportive management), which enable employees to work under good employment conditions and benefit from human capital development opportunities [54]. As many of these practices are in line with the DW principles, employees' perception of DW can be enhanced by organisational efforts to improve their HRM practices [55]. An HRM approach that focuses on well-being-oriented practices can help enhance employee performance [54]. In this respect, other scholarly research has provided evidence that employee-centred practices with adequate compensation, appropriate working conditions, workplace safety and security, and access to the healthcare, as well as a balance between work and private time enable individuals to direct their attention more to their role performance [20]. Hence, it is considered that DW plays an important role in enhancing employees' job performance.

6. Decent Work and Intention to Leave

Intention to leave or turnover intention refers to an individual's perceived inclination of staying with or leaving the organisation [56]. The literature portrays that the more inferior the working conditions and the more unsatisfactory the remuneration [57], the more likely that the employees will consider leaving their organisation [5][22]. Furthermore, as it may reduce employees' job satisfaction, the lack of congruence in goals and values of the organisation can be an antecedent to employees' turnover intentions [5]. In a similar vein, a negative relationship was found between decent work and intention to leave [58]. Employees' positive perceptions of access to decent working conditions have impacted their turnover intentions [59]. The dimensions of DW mentioned in the table above are used to state the forthcoming hypotheses of the study.

References

1. ILO. Reducing the Decent Work Deficit: A Global Challenge Report of the Director-General. In Proceedings of the International Labour Conference, 89th Session, Geneva, Switzerland, 5–21 June 2001.

2. Ferraro, T.; Moreira, J.M.; dos Santos, N.R.; Pais, L. Decent work, work motivation and psychological capital: An empirical research. Work 2018, 60, 339–354.

3. Graça, M.; Pais, L.; Mónico, L.; dos Santos, N.R.; Ferraro, T.; Berger, R. Decent Work and Work Engagement: A Profile Study with Academic Personnel. Appl. Res. Qual. Life 2019, 16, 917–939.

4. Ferraro, T.; Pais, L.; dos Santos, N.R.; Moreira, J.M. The Decent Work Questionnaire (DWQ): Development and Validation in two Samples of Knowledge Workers. Int. Labour Rev. 2018, 157, 243–265.

5. Wang, Y.; Zhang, H.; Lei, J.; Yu, Y. Burnout in Chinese Social Work: Differential Predictability of the Components of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Int. J. Soc. Welf. 2019, 28, 217–228.

6. Bakker, A.B.; Demerouti, E. The Job Demands-Resources Model: State of the Art. J. Manag. Psychol. 2007, 22, 309–328.

7. Bakker, A.B.; de Vries, J.D. Job Demands–Resources theory and self-regulation: New explanations and remedies for job burnout. Anxiety Stress Coping 2021, 34, 1–21.

8. Schaufeli, W.B.; Taris, T.W. A Critical Review of the Job Demands-Resources Model: Implications for Improving Work and Health. In Bridging Occupational, Organizational and Public Health: A Transdisciplinary Approach; Bauer, G.F., Hämmig, O., Eds.; Springer: Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2014; pp. 43–68.

9. Demerouti, E.; Bakker, A.B. The Job Demands–Resources model: Challenges for future research. SA J. Ind. Psychol. 2011, 37, 974–983.

10. Lewig, K.A.; Xanthopoulou, D.; Bakker, A.B.; Dollard, M.F.; Metzer, J.C. Burnout and connectedness among Australian volunteers: A test of the Job Demands–Resources model. J. Vocat. Behav. 2007, 71, 429–445.

11. Gu, Y.; Wang, R. Job Demands and Work–Family Conflict in Preschool Teachers: The Buffering Effects of Job Resources and Off-Job Recovery Experiences. Curr. Psychol. 2019, 40, 3974–3985.

12. Bakker, A.B.; Demerouti, E.; Taris, T.W.; Schaufeli, W.B.; Schreurs, P.J. A multigroup analysis of the job demands-resources model in four home care organizations. Int. J. Stress Manag. 2003, 10, 16.

13. Kashyap, V.; Nakra, N.; Arora, R. Do "Decent Work" Dimensions Lead to Work Engagement? Empirical Evidence from Higher Education Institutions in India. Eur. J. Train. Dev. 2021, 46, 158–177.

14. Bakker, A.B.; Demerouti, E. Multiple Levels in Job Demands-Resources Theory: Implications for Employee Well-Being and Performance. In Handbook of Wellbeing; Diener, E., Oishi, S., Tay, L., Eds.; DEF Publishers: Salt Lake City, UT, USA, 2018.

15. Bakker, A.B.; Demerouti, E. Job Demands–Resources Theory: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. J. Occup. Psychol. 2017, 22, 273.

16. Bakker, A.B.; Demerouti, E. Job Demands-Resources Theory. In Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide. Work and Wellbeing; Chen, P.Y., Cooper, C.L., Eds.; Wiley Blackwell: Chichester, UK, 2014; pp. 37–64.

17. Blustein, D.L.; Olle, C.; Connors-Kellgren, A.; Diamonti, A.J. Decent Work: A Psychological Perspective. Front. Psychol. 2016, 7, 407.

18. Deranty, J.; MacMillan, C. The ILO's Decent Work Initiative: Suggestions for an Extension of the Notion of "Decent Work". J. Soc. Philos. 2012, 43, 386–405.

19. Ferraro, T.; dos Santos, N.R.; Moreira, J.M.; Pais, L. Decent Work, Work Motivation, Work Engagement and Burnout in Physicians. Int. J. Appl. Posit. Psychol. 2020, 5, 13–35.

20. Kozan, S.; Işık, E.; Blustein, D.L. Decent Work and Well-Being among Low-Income Turkish Employees: Testing the Psychology of Working Theory. J. Consuel. Psychol. 2019, 66, 317–327.

21. Braganza, A.; Chen, W.; Canhoto, A.; Sap, S. Productive Employment and Decent Work: The Impact of AI Adoption on Psychological Contracts, Job Engagement and Employee Trust. J. Bus. Res. 2020, 131, 485–494.

22. Arnoux-Nicolas, C.; Sovet, L.; Lhotellier, L.; Di Fabio, A.; Bernaud, J. Perceived Work Conditions and Turnover Intentions: The Mediating Role of Meaning of Work. Front. Psychol. 2016, 7, 704.

23. Meyer, S.; Hünefeld, L. Challenging Cognitive Demands at Work, Related Working Conditions, and Employee Well-Being. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2018, 15, 2911.

24. Soomro, A.A.; Breitenecker, R.J.; Shah, S.A.M. Relation of Work-Life Balance, Work-Family Conflict, and Family-Work Conflict with the Employee Performance-Moderating Role of Job Satisfaction. South Asian J. Bus. Stud. 2017, 7, 129–146.

25. Greenhaus, J.H.; Beutell, N.J. Sources of Conflict Between Work and Family Roles. Acad. Manag. Rev. 1985, 10, 76–88.

26. Kossek, E.; Lee, K. Work-Family Conflict and Work-Life Conflict. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management. 2017. Available online: http://business.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.001.0001/acrefore-9780190224851-e-52 (accessed on 7 August 2022).

27. Ferraro, T.; Pais, L.; Moreira, J.M.; dos Santos, N.R. Decent Work and Work Motivation in Knowledge Workers: The Mediating Role of Psychological Capital. Appl. Res. Qual. Life 2017, 13, 501–523.

28. Bakker, A.B. A job demands-resources approach to public service motivation. Public Admin. Rev. 2015, 75, 723–732.

29. Demerouti, E.; Bouwman, K.; Sanz-Vergel, A.I. Job resources buffer the impact of work-family conflict on absenteeism in female employees. J. Pers. Psychol. 2011, 10, 166–176.

30. Crawford, E.R.; LePine, J.A.; Rich, B.L. Linking Job Demands and Resources to Employee Engagement and Burnout: A Theoretical Extension and Meta-Analytic Test. J. Appl. Psychol. 2010, 95, 834–848.

31. Bakker, A.B.; Demerouti, E.; Sanz-Vergel, A.I. Burnout and Work Engagement: The JD-R Approach. Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav. 2014, 1, 389–411.

32. Bakker, A.B. An Evidence-Based Model of Work Engagement. Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci. 2011, 20, 265–269.

33. Bakker, A.B.; Demerouti, E.; Euwema, M.C. Job resources buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. J. Occup. Health Psychol. 2005, 10, 170.

34. Xanthopoulou, D.; Baker, A.B.; Heuven, E.; Demerouti, E.; Schaufeli, W.B. Working in the sky: A diary study on work engagement among flight attendants. J. Occup. Health Psychol. 2008, 13, 345.

35. Treaty of Versailles. In Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany; Hall of Mirrors in the Palace of Versailles: Paris, France, 1919.

36. Ferraro, T.; dos Santos, N.R.; Pais, L.; Mónico, L. Historical Landmarks of Decent Work. Eur. J. Appl. Bus Manag. 2016, 2, 77–96.

37. Pouyuad, J. For a Psychosocial Approach to Decent Work. Front. Psychol. 2016, 7, 422.

38. ILO. Decent Work. Report of the Director-General. In Proceedings of the International Labour Conference, 87th Session, Geneva, Switzerland, 1–17 June 1999.

39. Tentama, F.; Rahmawati, P.; Muhopilah, P. The Effect and Implications of Work Stress and Workload on Job Satisfaction. Int. J. Sci. Technol. Res. 2019, 8, 2498–2502.

40. McCalister, K.T.; Dolbier, C.L.; Webster, J.A.; Mallon, M.W.; Steinhardt, M.A. Hardiness and Support at Work as Predictors of Work Stress and Job Satisfaction. Am. J. Health Promot. 2006, 3, 183–191.

41. United Nations (UN). Sustainable Development Goals. 2019. Available online: https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/economic-growth/ (accessed on 25 June 2021).

42. ILO. Measurement of Decent Work. In Proceedings of the Discussion paper for the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work, Geneva, Switzerland, 8–10 September 2008.

43. ILO. Decent Work Indicators: Concepts and Definitions. In ILO Manual, 1st ed.; International Labour Office: Geneva, Switzerland, 2012.

44. ILO. Decent Work Indicators: Guidelines for Producers and Users of Statistical and Legal Framework Indicators. In ILO Manual, 2nd ed.; International Labor Office: Geneva, Switzerland, 2013.

45. ILO. Report on Progress and Outcomes on the Monitoring and Measurement of Decent Work. In Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians, Geneva, Switzerland, 2–11 October 2013.

46. Voydanoff, P. Work Demands and Work-to-Family and Family-to-Work Conflict: Direct and Indirect Relationship. J. Fam. Issues 2005, 26, 707–726.

47. Nohe, C.; Michel, A.; Sonntag, K. Family–work conflict and job performance: A diary study of boundary conditions and mechanisms. J. Organ. Behav. 2014, 35, 339–357.

48. Netemeyer, R.G.; Brashear-Alejandro, T.; Boles, J.S. A cross-national model of job-related outcomes of work role and family role variables: A retail sales context. J. Acad. Mark. Sci. 2004, 32, 49–60.

49. Varokka, A.; Febrilia, I. Work-Family Conflict and Job Performance: Lesson from a Southeast Asian Emerging Market. J. Southeast Asian Stud. 2015, 2015, 420802.

50. Karatepe, O.M.; Kilic, H. Relationships of Supervisor Support and Conflicts in The Work-Family Interface with the Selected Job Outcomes of Frontline Employees. Tour. Manag. 2007, 28, 238–252.

51. Li, J. Join the Fight Against Poverty: Utilizing HRD Practices to Support Pathways to Sustainable Employment and Decent Work. Hum. Resour. Dev. Int. 2020, 23, 1–4.

52. Nahrgang, J.D.; Morgeson, F.P.; Hofmann, D.A. Safety at Work: A Meta-analytic Investigation of the Link between Job Demands, Job Resources, Burnout, Engagement, and Safety Outcomes. J. Appl. Psychol. 2011, 96, 71–94.

53. Wollard, K.K.; Shuck, B. Antecedents to Employee Engagement: A Structured Review of the Literature. Adv. Dev. Hum. Resour. 2011, 13, 429–446.

54. Guest, D. Human Resource Management and Employee Well-Being: Towards a New Analytic Framework. Hum. Resour. Manag. J. 2017, 27, 22–38.

55. Tao, Q.; Shuang, L.; Ting, W. The relationship between decent work and engagement: Role of intrinsic motivation and psychological needs. J. Sichuan Univ. (Philos. Soc. Sci. Ed.) 2016, 5, 134–143.

56. Cotton, J.L.; Turtle, J.M. Employee Turnover: A Meta-Analysis and Review with Implications for Research. Acad. Manag. Rev. 1986, 11, 55–70.

57. Singh, P.; Loncar, N. Pay Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intent. Relat. Ind.-Ind. Relat. 2010, 65, 470–490.

58. Urgan, S.; Murat, A.K. İşe Tutulma ve İşten Ayrılma Niyeti Arasında İnsana Yakışır İşin Düzenleyici Rolü: Belediye Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma Moderating Role of Decent Work on the Relationship between Work Engagement and Intention to Leave Work: A Study on Municipal Employees. J. Organ. Behav. Rev. 2022, 4, 266–280.

59. Ribeiro, M.A.; Teixeira, M.A.P.; Ambiel, R.A.M. Decent work in Brazil: Context, conceptualization, and assessment. J. Vocat. Behav. 2019, 112, 229–240.