

Fabian Beckmann*

Perceived Job Quality in German Minijobs. A Multidimensional Analysis of Work in Marginal Part-time Employment Relationships**

Abstract

Minijobs, a special form of part-time employment, have developed into an established form of employment on the German labour market since the 1990s. They are heavily criticised for their potential labour market effects, their impact on employees' social security and their bad working conditions. Due to the multiple risks, minijobs are often considered as prime examples of low-quality jobs. However, to date there has been hardly any research dealing with the subjective perception of the work situation of minijobbers, resulting in a minijob debate without minijobbers' views. This article examines the perceived job quality in minijobs. Based on a quantitative survey, different dimensions of work in minijobs are being analysed, concentrating on the relationship between desired and experienced work situations. Moreover, the global job satisfaction of minijobbers and its predictors are investigated. The analysis shows that minijobs are evaluated positively regarding many intrinsic, social and health-related aspects of work and that the overall job evaluation is significantly correlated to the perceived job quality. The study underlines the need for multidimensional and subjective approaches to job quality as well as a nuanced critique of minijobs which has to differentiate between the institutional regulation, the working conditions and employees' subjective perception.

Keywords: minijobs, marginal part-time employment, job quality, work values, job satisfaction (JEL: J28,J42,J81)

Introduction

Current debates on the socio-economic situation in Germany often result in contrary evaluations of the status quo. On the one hand, the German economy prospers, which is accompanied by a positive labour market development in the past ten years (Weber, 2017). Germany, being 'sick man of Europe' at the turn of the millennium, is now considered a benchmark for successful labour market politics (Eichhorst, 2013). On the other hand, there are critical evaluations of the socio-economic turnaround which diagnose increased fragmentations in society (see the

* Dr Fabian Beckmann, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Chair for Sociology, Work and Economy, Germany. E-mail: Fabian.Beckmann@rub.de.

** Date submitted: August 23, 2018

Revised version accepted after double-blind review: February 11, 2019.

contributions in Castel & Dörre, 2009). Such positions consider the positive economic development as a “Pyrrhic victory” (Scherschel & Booth, 2012, p. 39; own translation), claiming that the prizes for the new prosperity are widespread insecurities on the labour market, a stabilisation of social inequality and a trend towards social exclusion of the ‘marginalised’ (see the contributions in Marchert, 2013 and in Bude & Staab, 2016). In this regard, critics point out that the all-time high in employment on the German labour market has not led to a reduction of income polarisation, the share of people at risk of poverty or the amount of low-wage employment, resulting in a society of insecurities and social decline (Nachtwey, 2016).

The core of these pessimistic diagnoses is the massive change of labour markets and employment in the past decades (Heinze, 2011; Castel, 2000). For Germany, it is especially the trend towards more ‘atypical’ forms of employment which has led to a structural change of the labour market since the 1990s (Sperber & Walwei, 2017). Atypical employment is often ascribed to more employment-related risks than the standard employment relationship (SER), e.g. lower levels of social security, lower wages and less participation in further educational training (Seifert, 2017). However, these risks may vary not only across different atypical forms of employment but also across different individual employment histories and employment arrangements in families and households (Böhnke et al., 2015). In addition to the gaining importance of atypical forms of employment, it is the questionable stability of the low-wage sector in Germany which puts the focus on the financial dimension and the social security of employees (Kalina & Weinkopf, 2017). On top of that, many authors observe an increased de-standardisation and lack of continuity in individual employment histories (Dütsch & Struck, 2014). These structural changes of the working life are accompanied by various qualitative transformations such as an intensified utilisation of employees’ subjective features (Böhle, 2017) and an assumed increase of psychosocial stress in work (Keupp & Dill, 2010; for a critical point of view Dornes, 2016).

One form of employment which is often considered a prime example of the new insecurities in working life are the so called ‘minijobs’ in Germany, a special form of part-time employment. Due to their negative impact on employees’ social security and the bad ‘objective’ working conditions, e.g. regarding pay, employment rights and further educational training, minijobs are often criticised as precarious low-quality jobs with multiple risks for employees. However, previous research has mainly concentrated on the institutional regulation of minijobs, their (assumed) labour market effects as well as surveying the structure of employees and their ‘objective’ working conditions. In contrast, there has hardly been any research dealing with the subjective perception of the work situation of minijobbers. Such a minijob debate without minijobbers’ views is problematic in order to have a differentiated discussion and evaluation of this form of employment.

To date it is unknown whether the scientific diagnosis of minijobs being bad jobs actually corresponds to the subjective work realities of employees. This especially holds true as occasional findings suggest that the perception of the work situation by minijobbers may differ noticeably from their 'objective' working conditions, e.g. with respect to pay (IAB, 2015). Moreover, previous research has only superficially focussed on the work which is done in minijobs. Hence, little is known about several important dimensions of work such as intrinsic, social or health-related aspects, although their importance for employees' evaluation of jobs has been proven by job quality and job satisfaction research (Bruggemann et al., 1975; Findlay et al., 2013). These research gaps show that there is a need for more detailed approaches to the work done in minijobs which include employees' subjective perceptions and evaluations of their work situation in a scientific analysis. Thus, the main research question of this paper is: How do minijobbers perceive and evaluate the job quality in minijobs and which factors are important predictors for the overall job evaluation?

First, some additional information on the quantitative importance of minijobs, the employee structure and the controversial evaluations of this form of employment is provided. After that, theoretical approaches to job quality are being discussed, especially taking a closer look at the pros and cons of subjective and objective indicators. The empirical analysis is based on quantitative data of 1,004 employees in minijobs and focuses on the relationship between work values and experienced work situations. An investigation into the global job satisfaction and its predictors completes the analysis. Since previous research has not paid any attention to such aspects in minijobs, many parts of the analysis are explorative in character. This article aims to add a multidimensional perspective to the debates on job quality in minijobs, stress the importance of employees' subjective perceptions and thereby contribute to conceptual frames and empirical findings of the research on job quality in flexible forms of employment.

Minijobs – A Special Form of Employment in Germany

Minijobs are a special case in the German and – with the exception of Austria – even the European labour market (Eichhorst et al., 2012). They are a special form of part-time employment defined by an income limit of currently 450 Euros per month or a temporal limit of either 3 calendar months or 70 days of labour per year. For employees, minijobs are not subject to social insurance contribution and do thus not offer any financial compensation, e.g. in case of illness or unemployment. Since 2013, people employed in minijobs need to make pension contributions. However, there is the option not to make these contributions ('opt-out') which is what most minijobbers decide to do (Deutsche Rentenversicherung Knappschaft-Bahn-See/Minijob-Zentrale 2016, p. 7). The consequence of the institutional regulation of minijobs is that such employment is attractive to employees

due to the favourable gross-net-relation of the income, despite offering only a marginal level of social security.

Quantity and Structure of Employees in Minijobs

In spite of lacking social security, minijobs have become a popular form of employment in the German labour market – especially since their legal liberalisation in the course of the ‘Hartz reforms’ in 2003 (Bäcker, 2006; for a detailed discussion of the reforms see Spohr, 2015). Mid 2017, 7.5 million people in Germany worked in a minijob – two thirds exclusively and one third as a side job in addition to ‘regular’ employment (Bundesagentur für Arbeit, 2017). Since 2003, it has especially been the number of minijobs done as side jobs which have quantitatively gained in importance. Thus, the development of minijobs as a growing segment of the German labour market primarily relates to minijobs as side jobs, while the number of exclusive minijobbers has been relatively stable for many years (ibid.).

Various studies show that minijobs are characterised by a high level of employee heterogeneity (IAB, 2015; RWI, 2016). The socio-demographic structure of employees in minijobs not only is diverse but also differs from the one of ‘regular’ employees: there are more women than men working in minijobs (approximately 60 to 40 ratio) and high proportions in very young and old employees. Moreover, minijobbers tend to have lower educational and occupational levels (IAB, 2015). Despite the high level of heterogeneity, there are some socio-structural groups who are over-represented in minijobs, notably pupils, students, retirees, housewives and unemployed people (so called ‘Aufstocker’) (Körner et al., 2013). Although these groups are not covered by official statistics, studies suggest that they account for approximately 35 to 50 % of all minijobbers (ibid. as well as RWI, 2016; IAB, 2015). However, there is no such thing as a ‘prototypical’ minijobber. Previous research rather underlines that minijobs are an attractive form of employment for many different socio-demographic groups. What many employees in minijobs have in common though is that the main and most obvious drawbacks of minijobs such as low income and low level of social security are eased either institutionally (e.g. by social benefits) or by family or household (e.g. income of partner, insurance claims derived from the family). Also, additional income from employment of minijobbers themselves plays a role in weakening the drawbacks.

Chances, Risks and Controversial Evaluations

In public, political and scientific debates, minijobs are evaluated controversially – be it with respect to their labour market effects, their impact on employees’ social security gaps or their working conditions. Proponents argue that minijobs play an essential role in making the German labour market more flexible, in offering job opportunities for low skilled employees and in building a bridge back into work for unemployed people (BDA, 2017, p. 22f.). Moreover, they can be a fitting form of

employment for people not wanting or being able to work many hours and thus offer job opportunities for people not interested in full-time employment. Also, minijobbers' low earnings are often financially compensated by additional income in the family or household context so that income poverty amongst minijobbers on a household level is quite rare (Eichhorst et al., 2012).

On the other hand, it is criticised that their special legal role not only leads to a spread of low-income employment but also to a growing amount of employees without any legal claims to social insurance (Weinkopf, 2011). With more women than men working in minijobs, they are also criticised for fostering a gender-specific segmentation of the labour market (Zimmer, 2010). In addition to that, more than three out of four minijobbers earn less than 60 % of the median hourly wage (Kalina & Weinkopf, 2017), and there is widespread violation of employment rights, e.g. regarding the minimum wage or payments in case of illness (Stegmaier et al., 2015; Pusch & Seifert, 2017). Moreover, minijobbers rarely participate in further educational training and therefore tend to have only little chance for promotion (Bellmann et al., 2013). Since minijobs are a phenomenon of the service sector – approximately 86 % of all minijobbers are employed in this sector – and can primarily be found in small and medium enterprises (SME), many of these employment relationships are not subject to industrial relations institutions (Beckmann, 2019). In combination with the majority of minijobbers working in low-skilled sectors and unskilled routine jobs, minijobs can be described as an example of work in an unstructured segment of the labour market (Sengenberger, 1987). Due to the multiple risks of this form of employment, critics judge minijobs prime examples of low-quality jobs which are a 'trap' and a 'dead end' for employees (BMFSFJ, 2012; Bosch & Weinkopf, 2017).

What Makes a Job 'Good' or 'Bad'? The Challenge of Job Quality

Discourses on job quality have risen in importance in the past decade – be it with respect to political strategies promoting 'more and better jobs' (European Commission, 2008) or scientific works dealing with conceptual approaches (Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011a) and empirical studies on job quality (Holman, 2013; Olsen et al., 2010). Nonetheless, job quality is vague "because it is one of those concepts used in the social sciences [...] which everyone understands yet is very difficult to define precisely" (Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011a, p. 450). There is broad agreement, however, that job quality is an *employee-centred* concept since it focuses on working conditions and their impact on the well-being of employees (ibid.). Second, it is a *multidimensional* concept because approaches to job quality need to include many different dimensions of work (Hauff & Kirchner, 2013). Hence, it is misleading to evaluate 'good' or 'bad' jobs simply against the 'objective' employment conditions such as working hours or pay. Rather, there is strong evidence from labour psychology research that intrinsic and social factors in work signifi-

cantly influence employees' evaluations of and satisfaction with their jobs (Herzberg, 1966; Bruggemann et al., 1975). Thus, "measuring more than money" (Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011b) seems a reasonable strategy in dealing with job quality.

At the same time, there is also some dissent regarding different approaches, conceptualisations, operationalisations as well as measurements of job quality. These differences range from the data used (individual vs. aggregate; primary vs. secondary) and the empirical method (qualitative vs. quantitative; system of indicators vs. index) to the scope of analysis (limitation to job characteristics vs. inclusion of institutional context) and the relevant dimensions of job quality (for detailed discussions see Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011a; Schäfer et al., 2013; Gundert, 2013; Cooke et al., 2013; Gallie, 2007). Consequently, as yet there is no scientific consensus of what makes a job 'good' or 'bad'. This is also due to the fact that there is a long tradition in job quality research involving economic, psychological, sociological and legal perspectives (Gundert, 2013).

Above the differences mentioned, the major distinction is between objective and subjective approaches to job quality, which also influences the operationalisation and measurement of job quality. Objective approaches concentrate on data on the 'objective' employment conditions such as working hours, pay or accident rates. 'Objective' in this case means that such approaches focus on information on the employment relationship instead on the subjective perceptions of employees. Proponents argue that such approaches are not biased by 'wrong' subjective evaluations of employees (Holman, 2013). From labour psychology research it is known that employees may euphemise even bad working conditions for reasons of cognitive dissonance reduction (Bruggemann et al., 1975; Brenke, 2015). Also, work values may change and adapt to bad workplace situations (Knox et al., 2014). Previous literature indicates that the relationship between work values and workplace situation is complex and involves many possible scenarios (for a detailed discussion see Hauff & Kirchner 2014, p. 29ff.; Bruggemann et al., 1975). Thus, a drawback of subjective approaches to job quality is that 'good' jobs might simply be the result of employees' adaption, euphemism or resignation. Moreover, objective approaches may be helpful since employees tend to have short-term interests and thus may ignore negative long-term consequences of problematic work situations, e.g. regarding stress in work (Gallie 2007, p.8). Last but not least, an obvious advantage of such approaches is that they offer a high level of (international) comparability since much of the data used is relatively easy to collect and accessible across different countries, sectors and occupations.

However, objective approaches also provoke serious criticism (Cooke et al., 2013; Schäfer et al., 2013). First, not all relevant aspects and dimensions of job quality can be drawn from 'objective' information. Many social or intrinsic aspects like the relationship to colleagues or autonomy at work are subjective in nature (Hauff &

Kirchner 2013, p. 339). Consequently, objective approaches tend to cover only a small range of relevant aspects of job quality, while leaving out other important aspects which have proven to be significant predictors for employees' evaluations of jobs. This is problematic since one major conceptual feature of job quality is its multidimensionality (Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011a). Second, objective approaches may also be biased because even a concentration on 'objective' variables requires some guidelines which make it possible to distinguish 'good' from 'bad' jobs (Schäfer et al., 2013, p. 28f.). Here, the consequence may be that it is the researchers who decide in place of employees what is favourable for the latter. Third, objective approaches tend to imply that similar working conditions are also perceived similarly by individuals. However, there is evidence from research that often this is not the case, e.g. regarding job security (Erlinghagen, 2010; Olsen et al., 2010). Fourth, objective approaches largely ignore different work values of employees, simply supposing that there is a homogeneity regarding the question of what individuals expect from work and what ideas of 'good work' they have (Hauff & Kirchner, 2013, p. 340).

In summary, there are positive arguments for choosing a rather subjective approach to job quality. This especially holds true since many studies show "that the search for the 'good job' is unlikely to find an optimal mix of job components: no one shoe can fit all" (Findlay et al., 2013, p. 445). Still, objective and subjective approaches are complimentary (Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011a, 2011b; Green & Mostafa, 2012). While subjective indicators need 'objective' framing and additional information on objective working and employment conditions, objective indicators alone are limited as they do not necessarily represent employees' perception of jobs and do not cover all relevant dimensions of job quality. In this study, a subjective approach to job quality is chosen because the objective working conditions and precarious features of minijobs regarding pay, employment rights, further educational training and industrial relations are well documented in previous research.

Data, Conceptualisation, Method

This article investigates job quality in German minijobs as it is perceived by the employees. The analysis is based on a quantitative online survey of 1,004 minijobbers conducted during a PhD-project in April 2016 across all of Germany (for detailed information on the research design and empirical findings see Beckmann, 2019). For the study, employees in all kinds of minijobs were surveyed. This is important to note as many previous empirical studies concentrated on specific sub-groups of minijobbers such as women (BMFSFJ, 2012), exclusive minijobbers (Körner et al., 2013), unemployed people (Dingeldey et al., 2012) or were restricted to specific regions (RWI, 2016) or industries (Voss-Dahm, 2004; Benkhoff & Hermet, 2008). For the online survey the panel provider respondi AG was used. Their panel is primarily used for market, opinion and social research, involves approximately

100,000 people in Germany and is representative of the German resident population with respect to socio-demographic characteristics. Still, the study is not based on random sampling as the respondents are part of respondi's online panel and were invited to the survey. Since respondi's information on the employment status of their participants only allows distinguishing full-time from part-time work, a screening filter at the beginning of the questionnaire was used. Regarding the sample of minijobbers in this study, a comparison of descriptive statistics between population and sample (see appendix) shows a high congruence with respect to sex, age and occupational level¹. The panel provider respondi AG is an ISO-certified panel provider and cooperates with the Leibniz Institute for Social Sciences (gesis) for reasons of quality management (respondi AG online a, b).

Regarding the conceptualisation of perceived job quality in minijobs the aspects discussed above are considered. In studies taking a rather subjective approach to job quality, two main ways of operationalising job quality can be differentiated. One approach is using the global job satisfaction as the only indicator of the perceived job quality (for such approaches see Hammermann & Stettes, 2013; Clark, 2005). The basic idea here is to concentrate on the output rather than the input of job quality, i.e. focussing on the consequences of job quality rather than the evaluation of specific job characteristics (Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011a, p. 450f.). The most obvious advantages of this approach are that the global job satisfaction can be easily measured, that it is highly comparable since it is a single indicator for job quality and that there is no need for further conceptual discussions. Moreover, it gives employees the opportunity to include all possible aspects of work which they subjectively consider to be important (Hammermann & Stettes, 2013; Schäfer et al., 2013). The major disadvantage though is that concentrating on job satisfaction alone does not give much information as to different dimensions and aspects of work. Thus, global job satisfaction is a black box, its interpretation is difficult and it is hard to actually explain variance in job satisfaction (Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011a, p.452). This is especially true since many studies show that there tends to be little variance in job satisfaction across different gender, age groups, or educational levels as well as occupations and national economies (ibid.; Brenke, 2015). In contrast, many task- and health-related as well as social aspects in work proved to be substantial influence factors (Olsen et al., 2010; Florack, 2010). Nonetheless, the global job satisfaction can be useful as an indicator of the overall job evaluation when it is combined with a multidimensional conceptual framework integrating job characteristics (Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011a).

The second approach emphasises the multidimensional character of job quality as well as the importance of employees' work values. Here, job quality is opera-

1 The fact that the qualification level of the respondents is higher than it is in the population mainly results from the high share of missing information in the official data. This is also the case in other surveys of minijobbers (IAB 2015; RWI 2016).

tionised as the relationship between the desired work situation (i.e. work values) and the experienced work situation (i.e., the fulfilment of the work values in the current job) in different dimensions of work. Such approaches show parallels to many job satisfaction studies from labour psychology research, in which the importance of the comparison between desired and experienced work situations for the well-being of employees is highlighted (Bruggemann et al., 1975; Wiendick, 1994; Felfe & Six, 2006).

For the analysis of perceived job quality in minijobs, these considerations are taken into account. Thus, job quality is operationalised – according to Hauff & Kirchner (2013) – as a subjective, multidimensional and evaluative-relational construct: *subjective* because it focusses on the perceptions of employees; *multidimensional* because it considers several dimensions and single aspects of work; *evaluative* since it measures the evaluation of the current job in comparison to the work values of employees and *relational* since different aspects of work may have a different impact on the overall subjective job evaluation (ibid., p.340f.). Congruent to numerous studies on job quality, the overall job evaluation is operationalised with the global job satisfaction (ibid.; Olsen et al., 2010).

Previous research regarding relevant dimensions of job quality has produced a wide variety (for some examples, Fuchs, 2006; Leschke & Watt, 2009; Seifert & Tangian, 2009; Holman, 2013). Thus, there is no consensus regarding the particular dimensions which constitute job quality. However, since there is a long tradition in several scientific disciplines dealing with the quality of jobs, there is a pool of dimensions which have proven to be relevant both with respect to what individuals desire in work and their impact on the subjective well-being of employees (for a detailed overview and discussion of various job quality research traditions amongst different disciplines see Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011b, p. 29ff.). Reviewing the existing literature on relevant dimensions of job quality, there are certain ‘core dimensions’ of job quality which are the fundament of the analysis of perceived job quality in minijobs:

- (1) The security and development dimension;
- (2) The intrinsic dimension;
- (3) The social dimension and
- (4) The salutogenic dimension.

In the *security and development dimension* four single aspects of work are considered: good income; fair wages; job security; good career prospects. The *intrinsic dimension* focusses on task-related aspects in work and contains six variables: a job useful to society; an interesting job; autonomy at work; the variety of tasks; the fit of requirements and skills; the chances for learning. The *social dimension* concentrates on the social and interpersonal relationships at the workplace and contains five variables: the relationship to colleagues; the relationship to supervisors; an equal treat-

ment of employees; the valuation of one's work; the chances for participation. Finally, the *salutogenic dimension* highlights four health-related aspects of work: absence of physical strains; absence of psychological stress; lack of dangers and risks in work; chances for work-life balance. All in all, 19 variables in four core dimensions of job quality are part of the analysis. As discussed above, for each aspect the respondents were asked to evaluate the *importance of the respective aspect* (work values) as well as the *extent to which the respective aspect is realised* in the minijob (fulfilment).

The analysis of job quality in minijobs involves three steps: the first is a descriptive analysis both of the work values and the extent of fulfilment in minijobs. In the second stage the work values and the fulfilment are analysed in connection to each other. This step of analysis contains a comparison of means for each aspect investigated as well as an analysis of individual mismatches. These mismatches are based on mismatch indices which were computed as the difference between work values and experienced work situation, both measured on a five-point scale. Since the analysis concentrates on mismatches due to undersupply of work values, all cases of match and oversupply were coded as zero. Thus, the final mismatch index ranges from 0 (match/oversupply) to 4 (maximal mismatch between desired and experienced work situation), also displaying light ("1"), medium ("2") and strong ("3") mismatches (for this method see Hauff & Kirchner, 2012, 2014). This method allows not only the analysis of the quantity of individual mismatches between desired and experienced work situations, but also their quality. The last step of the analysis is a multiple linear regression, which is computed in order to examine the relationship between the job evaluation and job satisfaction, the latter being the dependent variable of the regression model. The linear regression model contains predictors from the group of the socio-demographic and socio-structural characteristics of the respondents, their objective working conditions and the evaluation of the perceived job quality (based on equally weighted indices for the four dimensions). With respect to socio-demographic and socio-structural characteristics, gender, age, educational and occupational qualification, an official unemployment of the employees and the socio-structural group (here: retirees) were included in the analysis in order to check for the characteristics of job-holders – an aspect increasingly debated in job quality research (Holman, 2013; Kalleberg, 2011). Since previous research has underlined the importance of financial compensation of minijobs in the household context, the effect of the net monthly household income is also investigated. Regarding the objective working conditions, two financial measures (monthly income, hourly wage) are included as predictors for job satisfaction since previous research has shown that the monthly income and the hourly wage of minijobbers may differ noticeably from one another (IAB, 2015; RWI, 2016). Moreover, the regression model controls for minijobs as side jobs and in private households, the duration of the current minijob and the type of employment contract. With respect to working time, the weekly working hours are included into the analysis as well as night and weekend work since atypical working hours are said to

have a negative impact on the well-being of employees (Wöhrmann et al., 2019). Last but not least, the potential effect of the granting of employment rights is examined since the violation of employment rights has been discussed as a main precarious feature of minijobs (Stegmaier et al., 2015)².

Findings

Work Values and Their Fulfilment in Minijobs

Regarding the work values of minijobbers, the findings show that most of the 19 single aspects of work are rated as important by employees³. Nevertheless, there is variance between the evaluation of the importance of these aspects both across and within the four core dimensions of job quality: ‘Good career prospects’, ‘a job useful to society’ and the ‘absence of psychological stress in work’ are evaluated least important, while the ‘valuation of one’s work’, a ‘good work-life balance’ and a ‘good relationship to colleagues’ are evaluated most important of all work values. Regarding the four core dimensions, employees’ average ascribed importance shows no difference between the security and development dimension, the intrinsic dimension and the salutogenic dimension – here, the mean is around 3.9 on a five point scale. In contrast to that, the social dimension of job quality is reported to be most important with a mean of 4.2. This can also be observed with respect to the single aspects: four out of the ‘top five’ work values belong to the social dimension. This finding is important as previous studies on minijobs have largely ignored social aspects of work and thus ignored several aspects which the employees themselves rate as being most important in their job.

With respect to the experienced work situation – i.e. the fulfilment of the work values in minijobs –, the findings show a much higher variance than the work values. On the level of single aspects, ‘good career prospects’, the ‘chances for learning’ and a ‘job useful to society’ are reported to be the least fulfilled in the minijob. In contrast, ‘autonomy at work’, a ‘good relationship to supervisors’ and a ‘good relationship to colleagues’ are evaluated most positively, i.e. as being most fulfilled in the minijob. Regarding the core dimensions of job quality, the average fulfilments show noticeable differences across the four dimensions. The highest average level of fulfilment can be found in the social dimension (mean of 3.9), i.e. in the same dimension which was also ascribed the highest importance. The social dimension is followed by the salutogenic (i.e. health-related) (mean of 3.8) and the intrinsic dimension (3.5), while minijobbers evaluate those aspects from the security and development dimension most negatively, i.e. as being the least fulfilled (3.1). Regarding the experienced work situation of minijobbers, the empirical findings thus show the ne-

2 The model has been checked for multicollinearity. No tolerance value is less than 0.1, the VIF is not higher than 2.5.


3 Tables showing the relative frequencies for the work values as well as the experienced work situation can be found in the appendix.

cessity to differentiate between different dimensions and aspects of work. The findings underline that those aspects which are objectively precarious are also reflected in a negative subjective perception and evaluation by minijobbers. The results suggest that minijobbers have a good sense of their work situation and the possible downsides of minijobs – e.g. regarding pay, career prospects or the chances for learning.

Relationship Between Desired and Experienced Work Situation

The investigation of work values and their fulfilment alone does not give information detailed enough to analyse their relationship. In order to approach these aspects in connection to each other, a comparison of means for each of the 19 aspects in the four core dimensions of job quality was executed. The results are shown in figure 1.

Figure 1. Desired and experienced work situation in minijobs (comparison of means)



Own calculation and visualisation; scales ranging from “1=very unimportant/not fulfilled at all” to “5=very important/totally fulfilled”

Regarding the *security and development dimension*, the findings show widespread mismatches between desired and experienced work situations on an average level. This is true for all four of the single aspects examined in this dimension. The results underline that minijobbers evaluate a good income, fair wages and a secure job as being important features of a job, but good career prospects less so. However, minijobbers tend to be disappointed with regard to these favoured features in work. This

is also true for good career prospects: although this aspect is rated as below average importance, the level of fulfilment is even lower. As mentioned above, the subjective perceptions and evaluations of minijobbers in the security and development dimension of job quality go hand in hand with bad working conditions regarding these aspects.

With respect to the *intrinsic dimension*, the findings are much more ambivalent. Here, mismatches only occur in relation to some of the examined aspects. 'A job useful to society' is rated as only being of medium importance, but the average level of fulfilment is higher than the average rating of importance. This also holds true for autonomy at work: not only is this aspect rated as being important for minijobbers, but the average level of fulfilment is even higher. In contrast to these findings, also some mismatches in this dimension of job quality can be found. These mismatches are not that widespread with respect to an 'interesting job', the variety of tasks and the fit of requirements and skills, but can especially be observed regarding the chances for learning. These findings are likely to mirror the rare participation of minijobbers in further educational training and the high share in rather low-skilled routine jobs. Nevertheless, the intrinsic dimension of job quality in minijobs shows ambivalent findings. On the one hand, there are some mismatches, which indicate that minijobs cannot offer all the intrinsic features employees desire, while on the other hand, these average mismatches are not as widespread as in the security and development dimension. In spite of widespread low-skill routine jobs, many intrinsic aspects of minijobs are not evaluated as badly as one may expect. This underlines the argument that job quality is a subjective – and thus relative – construct.

As mentioned above, the *social aspects of job quality* are not only rated the most important by minijobbers, but also show a high level of fulfilment. With respect to a good relationship to colleagues and supervisors, the comparison of the desired and the experienced work situation of minijobbers shows almost a match on an average level. Here, the high expectations of employees seem to be fulfilled in their current minijob. Regarding the equal treatment of employees, only a small average mismatch can be observed. The same is true for the 'chances for participation'. This finding is relevant as minijobbers are only marginally protected by industrial relations institutions. However, these regulation gaps do obviously not lead to a perceived weakening of participation chances. Despite the many risks of the absence of collective regulation of labour, the findings show that – at least regarding the subjective perceptions of minijobbers – industrial relations institutions are not a necessary condition for making one's voice heard.

An even higher average level of match between desired and experienced work situations can be observed in the *salutogenic dimension* of job quality. Regarding the absence of physical strains, of psychological stress and of dangers and risks in work, the findings show a surprisingly congruent match of desired and experienced work situations amongst minijobbers – although these three aspects are not rated as the

most important features of the job. A good work-life balance is rated as one of the most important features and at the same time shows a high level of fulfilment in minijobs. Thus, the findings not only underline the importance of minijobs as enablers for a good work-life balance, but also show that for the vast majority of employees the work in minijobs does not exceed physical or mental limits. With respect to the health-related facets, the empirical findings hardly evidence precarious features of minijobs.

The empirical findings are supported by a look at the individual mismatch indices⁴. They not only confirm widespread mismatches in the security and development dimension, but also prove that these mismatches are a lot stronger in quality. For example, this is the case regarding the variable 'good income': only 47 % of the respondents show a match or oversupply, i.e. their ideas of a good income are fulfilled in their current minijob. Accordingly, more than half of minijobbers show a mismatch: 24 % report a light, 17 % a medium, 9 % a strong and 3 % even a maximal mismatch with respect to this aspect. The same is true for fair wages, a secure job and good career prospects: when the work values are not fulfilled, the share of 'strong' mismatches is rather high. In contrast to that, the share of minijobbers reporting a match or oversupply in the three other dimensions of job quality is not only a lot higher, but mismatches are – in case they occur – of lighter quality. One example is the social dimension: regarding e.g. a 'good relationship to supervisors', three out of four minijobbers show a match or oversupply. In case of mismatches, the vast majority are light mismatches. Medium, strong and maximal mismatches do not play a significant role and only account for 7 % of all respondents. By comparison this share is almost 30 % with respect to a good income, 25 % regarding fair wages and even 33 % in relation to good career prospects.

The analysis of the individual mismatch indices complements the empirical findings discussed above. The findings show that the evaluation of job quality amongst minijobbers not only differs between different dimensions of work, also resulting in different amounts of matches and mismatches between their desired and experienced work situation, but that it is also the quality of mismatches which varies between different aspects and dimensions of work. The 'problematic' aspects of the security and development dimension are also reflected in widespread mismatches on the individual level. In contrast, mismatches in the other three dimensions – especially the social and the salutogenic dimension – are cases in which individual expectations are only slightly unfulfilled. Consequently, widespread matches between desired and experienced work situations can be found especially in the social and salutogenic and partly the intrinsic dimension. The findings in the security and development dimension also show that minijobbers do not adjust their work values to

4 A table showing the relative frequencies of respondents having a light, medium, strong or maximal mismatch as well as a match can be found in the appendix.

the often precarious status quo (so called *adaption*), but that these aspects remain of high importance for their ideas of a 'good job'.

Global Job Satisfaction and Predictors

Before analysing the predictors of job satisfaction, a look at the descriptive statistics shows a high global job satisfaction amongst minijobbers⁵. Only 1.3 % of the respondents report being very dissatisfied with their job, 6.5 % are rather dissatisfied. 22.6 % of all minijobbers report a medium job satisfaction, while the vast majority are rather (42.0 %) or very satisfied (27.6 %) with their job. The empirical findings not only underline a high job satisfaction amongst minijobbers, but also show almost no difference from employees in other forms of employment. Data from the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) in Germany indicate that there is almost no difference in job satisfaction between minijobbers and employees in other forms of employment – a finding which was also discussed in other studies (Brenke, 2015). The hypothesis claiming a correlation between employment forms and employees' job satisfaction is put into question by these findings. With respect to job satisfaction's predictors, a multiple linear regression was computed (for predictors and method, see above). The findings of the multiple linear regression are shown in table 1.

Regarding the predictors from the group of socio-demographic and socio-structural characteristics of the employees, the regression model does not show a significant correlation for most of the independent variables included. This is true for gender (standardised β of .014), age (.005), the highest graduation (.0) or the occupational qualification (-.007), as well as the net monthly household income (-.029) and official unemployment of minijobbers (-.010). However, there are two exceptions: first, the social class of minijobbers (self-classification) shows a significant correlation (≤ 0.05 level) to the global job satisfaction of minijobbers (standardised β of .085). Second, working in a minijob as a retiree also is a significant (≤ 0.05 level) positive predictor of the global job satisfaction (standardised β of .110). This finding is of relevance as the high number of retirees in minijobs is often criticised as an indicator of increasing poverty in old age. While the findings say nothing about the socio-economic status of retirees in minijobs, they show that retirees in minijobs report a higher job satisfaction than the reference group.

5 The global job satisfaction was measured on an eleven point scale ranging from 0 to 10. Such a method is also used by the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). For the analysis, this scale was condensed to a five point scale with the values 1 (very dissatisfied), 2 (rather dissatisfied), 3 (partly satisfied), 4 (rather satisfied) and 5 (very satisfied).

Table 1. Multiple Linear Regression of Global Job Satisfaction Amongst Minijobbers

Predictors	Standardised β
Gender: female (Reference: male)	.014
Age	.005
Graduation: A-Levels (Reference: no A-Levels)	.000
Occupational qualification: medium/high (Reference: no training qualification)	-.007
Net monthly household income	-.029
Officially unemployed (Reference: officially not unemployed)	-.010
Social class (self-classification)	.085*
Socio-structural group: retirees (Reference: no retiree)	.110*
Minijob as side job (Reference: exclusive minijob)	.054
Minijob in private household (Reference: commercial)	-.022
Duration of current minijob: 1 year + (Reference: <1 year)	.007
Monthly income in minijob	.036
Hourly wage in minijob	.008
Fixed-term contract (Reference: permanent contract)	-.024
Actual working hours per week	-.076
Night work: often/always (Reference: seldom/never)	-.033
Weekend work: often/always (Reference: seldom/never)	-.077*
Granting of paid holiday: yes (Reference: no/do not know)	.059
Granting of continuity of payments in case of illness: yes (Reference: no/do not know)	-.023
Evaluation of job quality: security and development dimension	.191***
Evaluation of job quality: intrinsic dimension	.139***
Evaluation of job quality: social dimension	.267***
Evaluation of job quality: salutogenic dimension	.004
Adjusted R ²	.301***

Levels of significance: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

Own calculation and visualisation; $n=742$; dependent variable: global job satisfaction on an 11 point scale; age in years; net monthly household income in euros; self-classification of social class ascending from lower class to upper class; monthly income and hourly wage in minijob in euros; actual working hours per week in hours; evaluation of job quality based on

additive and equally weighted indices in respective dimension (1=all aspects of dimension totally unfulfilled to 5=all aspects of dimension totally fulfilled)

Also with respect to the predictors from the group of the 'objective' working conditions, the analysis shows that most of the variables do not significantly predict the job satisfaction of minijobbers. This is true for minijobs as side jobs (standardised β of .054), minijobs in a private household (-.022) or minijobs which have been ongoing for longer than one year (.007). These findings also apply to the monthly income in minijobs (.036) and the hourly wage (.008). Also, a fixed-term contract (-.024) is not significantly related to the job satisfaction of minijobbers. Regarding the actual working hours per week (-.076), the analysis indicates a negative but statistically insignificant correlation. The same is true for night work (-.033). In contrast to that, the multiple linear regression reveals weekend work as a significant predictor for minijobbers' job satisfaction (-.077). Employees who report often or always working at weekends show a lower job satisfaction than employees who only seldom or even never work at weekends. This correlation cannot be verified with respect to the granting of employment rights. As problematic as violations of employment rights are, they are not significant predictors for the job satisfaction of employees in minijobs. All in all, the vast majority of variables from the group of the 'objective' working conditions are not significant predictors of the overall job evaluation of minijobbers.

This finding is complemented by a look to the empirical findings regarding the relationship between the perceived job quality and employees' job satisfaction. For this, additive and equally weighted indices of the four core dimensions were used. The regression model shows that three out of four core dimensions are significant predictors of minijobbers' job satisfaction. The only exception is the evaluation of job quality in the salutogenic dimension, where a correlation is almost non-existent (.004). On the contrary, the other three dimensions of job quality are the strongest and most significant predictors of all 23 independent variables of the regression model. The strongest predictor of the global job satisfaction of minijobbers is the evaluation of job quality in the social dimension (.267). This finding underlines the outstanding importance of social aspects in work for the subjective evaluation of work situations by employees: as seen above, not only are the social aspects rated most important and most fulfilled by minijobbers, but it is also this dimension of work where the strongest correlation to their overall job evaluation can be observed. The second strongest predictor is the evaluation of job quality in the security and development dimension (.191), followed by the intrinsic dimension (.139). All three job quality predictors are significant on a 0.001 level.

All in all, the empirical findings show that neither minijobbers' socio-demographic and socio-structural characteristics nor their objective working conditions are significant predictors of their job satisfaction – here, a few exceptions prove the general rule. Rather, the perceived job quality in minijobs is the strongest and most sig-

nificant predictor of the overall job-evaluation. The findings underline the importance of subjective perceptions and evaluations for employees' job satisfaction. This is also evident when taking into account the adjusted R^2 of the regression model. In models only including the socio-demographic characteristics of the minijobbers, the adjusted R^2 is .037, while it slightly increases up to .080 when the 'objective' working conditions are integrated. Still, both models are unsuitable for actually explaining variance in minijobbers' job satisfaction. In contrast to that, the inclusion of the evaluation of job quality leads to an increase of the adjusted R^2 to .301, which means that 30 % of the variance of minijobbers' global job satisfaction can be explained with this model.

Discussion

This article examined the perceived job quality in German minijobs and especially concentrated on the relationship between employees' work values and their experienced work situation. The main results support the need for multidimensional approaches to job quality (Hauff & Kirchner, 2013, 2014; Findlay et al., 2013). Using the example of a flexible form of employment on the German labour market, it can be seen that approaches to job quality which focus exclusively on 'objective' working and employment conditions are likely to produce blind spots. As previous research has already suggested, job quality can be understood as a jigsaw puzzle with many different pieces (Munoz de Bustillo et al., 2011a, 2011b). The study underlines the complexity of job quality's multidimensional character because there does not need to be a causal, linear relationship between different dimensions of work in a particular job. There are without a doubt many critical aspects of work in minijobs, i.a. very low wages, widespread violations of employment rights, little chances for promotion as well as marginal social security for employees. These risks and problems need scientific discussion as well as political action. They also require answers from the bargaining partners who too often do not play any role in the regulation of labour in these segments of the labour market.

However, such problematic aspects do not naturally lead to subjective dissatisfaction or frustration of employees (for discourses on different ways of coping with precarious jobs see Gefken et al., 2015; Rademacher & Lobato, 2008). The reason for this is that minijobs are not only a fitting form of employment for many employees (Eichhorst et al., 2012), but obviously fulfil many aspects of a job which employees consider as important in working life. Hence, this study supports the literature which suggests including subjective perceptions and evaluations in the analysis of job quality (Kalleberg, 2011; Holzer et al., 2011). Not all employees share the same ideas of a 'good' job; instead, work values as well as the evaluation of the experienced work situation may vary between different individuals (Kalleberg, 2007; Findlay et al., 2013).

Moreover, the analysis indicates that many authors hastily diagnose a low job quality in minijobs. This is not only due to rather narrow perspectives which leave out important dimensions of work, but also due to work in standard employment relationships (SER) as the benchmark for 'good work'. However, in times of work and employment becoming more flexible both structurally as well as qualitatively, a reduction of 'good work' to SER seems out-of-date. Instead, multidimensional and subjective approaches to work in flexible forms of employment offer productive instruments for job quality research, enabling both the analysis of various dimensions of work and the question how employees judge their work. Regarding the many debates on minijobs, the findings suggest the need for a nuanced critique of this form of employment which has to differentiate between the institutional regulation, the objective working conditions and employees' subjective perception. The findings also raise the question how objective working conditions and the subjective perception of jobs are correlated. Minijobs are without a doubt low-quality jobs regarding objective indicators, but subjectively seem to offer positive intrinsic, social and health-related job features. It will be a challenge for future research to analyse how, why and to which extent bad objective working conditions may be outweighed by employees' positive perceptions of jobs.

With respect to future research on minijobs in particular and flexible forms of employment in general, the inclusion of personality traits into the examination of job quality and job satisfaction may prove productive (Fietze, 2011; Neuberger, 1985). Regarding research on job quality in flexible forms of employment, the study offers a conceptualisation of job quality which may also be used for examining the quality of work in other forms of employment. This might be helpful insofar as the presented study was limited to a specific and in many ways special form of employment and thus needs further contextualisation and validation.

This study solely focussed on minijobs and thus lacks a reference group of employees working in other forms of employment. It is important to note that the presented analysis is explorative and needs further validation by future research. This study is the first to actually take a deeper look into the relationship between work values, experienced work situation and job satisfaction of employees in minijobs and is of relevance for the debates on job quality and precarious working conditions in this form of employment. With respect to job quality research in general, the findings give first insights into the relationship between objective working conditions and their subjective perception in flexible forms of employment. However, since a reference group is lacking, more research is needed in this field in order to control whether the study's findings are verified in analyses comparing employees in different forms of employment. Through this, it will also be possible to evaluate if and to which extent minijobbers are a special group regarding work values and experienced work situations.

Moreover, further job quality research may also benefit from qualitative approaches which may explore other important aspects and dimensions of work which are important for employees' ideas of a good job. Although this study has taken a multidimensional approach, the conceptualisation of perceived job quality and its dimensions are not set in stone and require continuous complement (Solow & Wanner, 2010).

With respect to the many debates on the socio-economic risks of minijobs – especially social security gaps – the findings of the study may add a new perspective to the academic and political discussion. Previous research has shown that minijobs – contrary to the political intention of their reform in 2003 – rarely build a bridge into better paid and secure work (Böhnke et al., 2015; Brülle, 2013; Berge et al., 2016). This is problematic because the German Welfare State and its institutions are highly SER-centred and require continuous full-time employment participation for full social insurance claims (Offe, 2019). However, previous research also suggests that many minijobbers do not aim for changing their job situation (RWI, 2016; Körner et al., 2013). This paradox is often explained by family and household contexts and institutional factors, such as misleading incentives in fiscal and social security law (for examples see Bosch & Weinkopf 2017; BMFSFJ 2012). The findings of this study may be of relevance for these discourses as they show that minijobbers evaluate many aspects of their job positively and that the vast majority are satisfied with their job. The blind spot of previous research is that the job situation and its subjective perception have not yet been taken into account as a possible pull factor of minijobs. It seems reasonable that a job situation which is perceived as satisfying may reduce the willingness to change the minijob for (regular) part-time or full-time employment relationships – especially with institutional and private factors as additional multipliers. Hence, any political reform needs to consider that it is a complex link between the institutional setting, minijobbers life phases, their household contexts and the subjective perception of their job which frames individual job-related intentions and preferences.

In general, the analysis of perceived job quality in German minijobs suggests that a greater inclusion of subjective approaches in labour research can produce additional value, be it with respect to research on 'good work' or current changes of labour. One example is the ongoing discourse on the digitalisation of work, in which to date the subjective perceptions of employees are also only marginally included into labour research. With respect to the manifold changes of work, approaches combining the analysis of institutional frameworks of labour, 'objective' employment conditions and employees' subjective perceptions seem promising.

Conclusion

This article examined the perceived job quality in minijobs, a special form of part-time employment on the German labour market. As shown, previous research has

mainly focused on the institutional regulation, the labour market effects and the 'objective' – and often precarious – working and employment conditions in mini-jobs (Bosch & Weinkopf, 2017; Bäcker & Neuffer, 2012; Klenner & Schmidt 2012). However, hardly anything is known about minijobbers' perception and evaluation of their work situation. Thus, the article concentrated on the question how minijobbers evaluate their job quality and which predictors are of importance for the overall job evaluation.

Based on a conceptual approach operationalising job quality as a subjective, multi-dimensional, evaluative and relational construct, the empirical analysis focused on the relationship between desired and experienced work situations as well as employees' global job satisfaction. Regarding the perceived job quality in minijobs, the study underlines that a differentiated analysis of different dimensions of work is necessary. The most negative evaluation of job quality in minijobs can be observed in the 'security and development dimension'. Here, mismatches between desired and experienced work situations are not only widespread but of strong quality. The majority of minijobbers reports that their ideas of 'good work' regarding pay, job security and career prospects are not fulfilled in their current employment relationship. The findings show that several aspects of work in minijobs which are also known to be 'objectively' precarious are perceived negatively by employees. The results underline that minijobbers do know of the objective insecurities that this form of employment produces, especially with respect to low wages, comparatively low job security and career prospects. At the same time, many of the intrinsic and especially social and health-related aspects in work are evaluated much more positively. Despite the bad objective working conditions, minijobs are evaluated as jobs which offer autonomy in work, a good working atmosphere with good relationships to colleagues and supervisors, chances for participation and an equal treatment of all employees. In addition, the employees value the good work-life balance minijobs provide and judge the work in minijobs as not exceeding physical or mental limits.

Consequently, the findings also show that the vast majority of minijobbers are satisfied with their job. The multiple linear regression analysis of the overall job evaluation shows most of employees' socio-demographic and socio-structural characteristics as well as their objective working conditions are not significant predictors of their job satisfaction. Instead, the evaluation of job quality in the security and development-, the intrinsic and the social dimension show significant correlations to minijobbers' satisfaction with the job. Hence, the analysis indicates that minijobs may be poorly paid, offer little career prospects and produce social security gaps but at the same time can be evaluated positively regarding intrinsic, social or health-related aspects. These findings may seem paradox, but they underline the necessity for both multidimensional and subjective approaches to job quality as objective working conditions and employees' perceptions may differ from one another.

Acknowledgements

I thank the guest editors and the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments. An early draft of this paper has been presented at the workshop “What Makes a Job Good or Bad? Standards of Good Work Revisited” in Dubrovnik in April 2018, and I thank all participants for their professional, helpful and cooperative feedback.

References

- Bäcker, G. (2006). Was heißt hier „geringfügig“? – Minijobs als wachsendes Segment prekärer Beschäftigung. *WSI-Mitteilungen* 5, 255–262.
- Bäcker, G. & Neuffer, S. (2012). Von der Sonderregelung zur Beschäftigungsnorm. Minijobs im deutschen Sozialstaat. *WSI-Mitteilungen* 1, 13–21.
- Beckmann, F. (2019). *Minijobs in Deutschland. Die subjektive Wahrnehmung von Erwerbsarbeit in geringfügigen Beschäftigungsverhältnissen*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- BDA – Bundesvereinigung der Deutschen Arbeitgeberverbände (ed.) (2017). *Fakten statt Zerbilder. Die Realität auf dem deutschen Arbeitsmarkt*. Berlin.
- Bellmann, L., Grunau, P., Leber, U., & Noack, M. (2013). *Weiterbildung atypisch Beschäftigter*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Benkhoff, B. & Hermet, V. (2008). Zur Verbreitung und Ausgestaltung geringfügiger Beschäftigung im Einzelhandel. Eine explorative Studie aus der Perspektive von Management und Beschäftigten. *Industrielle Beziehungen* 15 (1), 5–31.
- Berge, P. v., Kaimer, S., Copestake, S., Croxton, D., Eberle, J., Klosterhuber, W. & Krüger, J. (2016). *Arbeitsmarktspiegel. Entwicklungen nach Einführung des Mindestlohns (Ausgabe 2)*. IAB-Forschungsbericht 12/2016, Nürnberg: Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung.
- BMFSFJ – Bundesministerium für Familien, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (eds.) (2012). *Frauen im Minijob. Motive und (Fehl-)Anreize für die Aufnahme geringfügiger Beschäftigung im Lebenslauf*. Berlin.
- Böhle, F. (ed.) (2017). *Arbeit als Subjektivierendes Handeln. Handlungsfähigkeit bei Unwägbarkeiten und Ungewisheiten*. Unter Mitarbeit von Katrin Baumgärtner. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Böhnke, P., Zeh, J. & Link, S. (2015). Atypische Beschäftigung im Erwerbsverlauf: Verlaufstypen als Ausdruck sozialer Spaltung? *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 44 (4), 234–252.
- Bosch, G. & Weinkopf, C. (2017). Gleichstellung marginaler Beschäftigung. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Juristinnenbundes* 3, 127–128.
- Bruggemann, A., Groskurth, P., & Ulich, E. (1975). *Arbeitszufriedenheit*. Bern: Hans Huber.
- Brenke, K. (2015). Die große Mehrzahl der Beschäftigten in Deutschland ist mit ihrer Arbeit zufrieden. *DIW-Wochenbericht* 32+33, Berlin, 715–722.
- Brülle, J. (2013). Unterschiede in den Arbeitsmarktchancen von atypisch Beschäftigten: Effekte von Beschäftigungsformen oder Erwerbspräferenzen? *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 42(2), 157–179.
- Bude, H. & Staab, P. (eds.) (2016). *Kapitalismus und Ungleichheit. Die neuen Verwerfungen*. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- Bundesagentur für Arbeit (eds.) (2017). *Beschäftigte nach Wirtschaftszweigen (WZ 2008) (Monatsszahlen). Deutschland, Länder und Regionaldirektionen, Stichtag 31. Juli 2017*. Nürnberg.

- Castel, R. (2000). *Die Metamorphosen der sozialen Frage. Eine Chronik der Lohnarbeit*. Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Castel, R. & Dörre, K. (eds.) (2009). *Prekarität, Abstieg, Ausgrenzung. Die soziale Frage am Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts*. Unter Mitarbeit von Peter Bescherer. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- Clark, A. E. (2005). What Makes a Good Job? Evidence from OECD Countries. In: S. Bazen, C. Lucifora & W. Salverda (eds.), *Job Quality and Employment Behaviour* (pp. 11–30). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cooke, G. B., Donaghey, J. & Zeytinoglu, I. U. (2013). The nuanced nature of work quality: Evidence from rural Newfoundland and Ireland. *Human Relations* 66 (4), 503–527.
- Deutsche Rentenversicherung Knappschaft-Bahn-See/ Minijob-Zentrale (ed.) (2016): *Aktuelle Entwicklungen im Bereich der geringfügigen Beschäftigung. II. Quartal 2016*. Essen.
- Dingeldey, I., Sopp, P. & Wagner, A. (2012). Governance des Einkommensmix: Geringfügige Beschäftigung im ALG-II-Bezug. *WSI-Mitteilungen* 1, 32–40.
- Dornes, M. (2016). *Macht der Kapitalismus depressiv? Über seelische Gesundheit und Krankheit in modernen Gesellschaften*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch.
- Dütsch, Matthias & Struck, Olaf (2014). Atypische Beschäftigungen und berufliche Qualifikationsrisiken im Erwerbsverlauf. *Industrielle Beziehungen*, 21 (1), 58–77.
- Eichhorst, W. (2013). Vom kranken Mann zum Vorbild Europas: Kann Deutschlands Arbeitsmarkt noch vom Ausland lernen? In: H. Hinte & Klaus F. Zimmermann (eds.), *Zeitenwende auf dem Arbeitsmarkt. Wie der demografische Wandel die Erwerbsgesellschaft verändert* (pp.451 – 468). Bonn: Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung.
- Eichhorst, W., Hinz, T., Marx, P., Peichl, A., Pestel, N., Sieglöcher, S., Thode, E., & Tobsch, V. (2012). *Geringfügige Beschäftigung: Situation und Gestaltungsoptionen*. Studie im Auftrag der Bertelsmann Stiftung. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Erlinghagen, M. (2010). *Mehr Angst vor Arbeitsplatzverlust seit Hartz? Langfristige Entwicklung der Beschäftigungsunsicherheit in Deutschland*. SOEP Papers 279. Berlin.
- European Commission (2008). *Employment in Europe 2008*. Luxembourg.
- Felfe, J. & Six, B. (2006). Die Relation von Arbeitszufriedenheit und Commitment. In: L. Fischer (ed.): *Arbeitszufriedenheit. Konzepte und empirische Befunde* (pp. 37–60). 2., vollständig überarbeitete und erweiterte Aufl. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Fietze, S. (2011). Arbeitszufriedenheit und Persönlichkeit. „Wer schaffen will, muss fröhlich sein“, SOEPpapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research 388, Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung.
- Findlay, P., Kalleberg, A. L., & Warhurst, C. (2013). The challenge of job quality. *Human Relations*, 66 (4), 441–451.
- Florack, M. (2010). *Wirkungen atypischer Beschäftigung auf Arbeitszufriedenheit und Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Eine Untersuchung aus der Perspektive der Netzwerkanalyse*. München und Mering: Rainer Hampp Verlag.
- Fuchs, T. (2006). *Was ist gute Arbeit? Anforderungen aus Sicht der Erwerbstätigen. Konzeption und Auswertung einer repräsentativen Untersuchung*. Herausgegeben von der Geschäftsstelle der Initiative Neue Qualität der Arbeit (INQA). Dortmund, Berlin, Dresden.
- Gallie, D. (2007). Production Regimes, Employment Regimes, and the Quality of Work, in: D. Gallie (ed.), *Employment Regimes and the Quality of Work* (pp. 1–33). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Gefken, A., Stockem, F. & Böhnke, P. (2015). Subjektive Umgangsformen mit prekärer Erwerbsarbeit – Zwischen Orientierung am und Ablösung von der Normalarbeitsgesellschaft. In: *Berliner Journal für Soziologie*, 25 (1), 111–131.
- Green, Francis & Mostafa, Tarek (2012). *Trends in job quality in Europe. A report based on the fifth European Working Conditions Survey*. Dublin: Eurofound.
- Gundert, S. (2013). Qualität der Arbeit im Wandel. In: R. Haubl, B. Hausinger & G.G. Voß (ed.), *Riskante Arbeitswelten. Zu den Auswirkungen moderner Beschäftigungsverhältnisse auf die psychische Gesundheit und die Arbeitsqualität* (pp. 17–41). Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- Hammermann, A. & Stettes, O. (2013). Qualität der Arbeit – zum Einfluss der Arbeitsplatzmerkmale auf die Arbeitszufriedenheit im europäischen Vergleich. *IW- Trends – Vierteljahresschrift zur empirischen Wirtschaftsforschung aus dem Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft Köln*, 40 (2), 1–18.
- Hauff, S. & Kirchner, S. (2012). *Changes in person-organization fit over time. Match and mismatch of workplace situation and work values in six countries from 1989 to 2005*. Diskussionspapiere des Schwerpunktes Unternehmensführung am Fachbereich BWL der Universität Hamburg. No. 11, November 2012. Hamburg.
- Hauff, S. & Kirchner, S. (2013). Wandel der Arbeitsqualität. Arbeits- und Beschäftigungsbedingungen zwischen 1989 und 2006 in einer evaluativ-relationalen Perspektive. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 42 (4), 337–355.
- Hauff, S. & Kirchner, S. (2014). Changes in workplace situation and work values. Relations and dynamics within different employment regimes. *Management Revue*, 25 (1), 27–49.
- Heinze, R. G. (2011). *Die erschöpfte Mitte. Zwischen marktbestimmten Soziallagen, politischer Stagnation und der Chance auf Gestaltung*. Weinheim, Basel: Juventa.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland: Ty Crowell Co.
- Holman, D. (2013). Job types and job quality in Europe. *Human Relations*, 66 (4), 475–502.
- Holzer, H., Lane, J., Rosenblum, D., & Andersson, F. (2011). *Where are all the good jobs going?* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- IAB – Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung (2015). *Situation atypisch Beschäftigter und Arbeitszeitwünsche von Teilzeitbeschäftigten. Quantitative und qualitative Erhebung sowie begleitende Forschung*. Endbericht. Nürnberg.
- Kalina, T. & Weinkopf, C. (2017). Niedriglohnbeschäftigung 2015 – bislang kein Rückgang im Zuge der Mindestlohneinführung. *IAQ-Report 06/2017*. Duisburg.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (2007). *The mismatched worker*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (2011). *Good jobs, bad jobs*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Keupp, H. & Dill, Helga (eds.) (2010). *Erschöpfende Arbeit. Gesundheit und Prävention in der flexiblen Arbeitswelt*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Klenner, C.; Schmidt, T. (2012). Minijobs – Eine riskante Beschäftigungsform beim normativen Übergang zum ‚Adult-Worker-Model‘, *WSI-Mitteilungen* 1, 22–31.
- Knox, A., Warhurst, C., Nickson, D. & Dutton, E. (2014). More than a feeling: Using hotel room attendants to improve understanding of job quality. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26 (12), 1547–1567.
- Körner, T., Meinken, H., & Puch, K. (2013). Wer sind die ausschließlich geringfügig Beschäftigten? Eine Analyse nach sozialer Lebenslage. In: Statistisches Bundesamt (ed.), *Wirtschaft und Statistik*. Januar 2013 (pp. 42–61), Wiesbaden.

- Leschke, J. & Watt, A. (2009). Arbeitsplatzqualität in Europa. In: E. Kistler & F. Mußmann (eds.), *Arbeitsgestaltung als Zukunftsaufgabe. Die Qualität der Arbeit* (pp. 85–121). Hamburg: VSA.
- Marchert, O. (ed.) (2013). *Facetten der Prekarisierungsgesellschaft. Prekäre Verhältnisse. Sozialwissenschaftliche Perspektiven auf die Prekarisierung von Arbeit und Leben*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Munoz de Bustillo, R., Fernandez-Macias, E., Esteve, F., & Anton, J.-I. (2011a). E pluribus unum? A critical survey of job quality indicators. *Socio-Economic Review* 9, 447–475.
- Munoz de Bustillo, R., Fernandez-Macias, E., Anton, J.-I./ Esteve, F. (2011b). *Measuring More than Money. The Social Economics of Job Quality*. Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Nachtwey, O. (2016). *Die Abstiegs-gesellschaft. Über das Aufbegehren in der regressiven Moderne*. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Neuberger, O. (1985). Arbeitszufriedenheit: Kraft durch Freude oder Euphorie im Unglück? Ein Sammelreferat, *DBW – Die Betriebswirtschaft*, 45 (2), 184–206.
- Offe, C. (2019). Sozialstaat. In: C. Offe, *Der Wohlfahrtsstaat und seine Bürger. Ausgewählte Schriften von Claus Offe, Band 2* (pp. 67–77), Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Olsen, K. M., Kalleberg, A. L., & Nesheim, T. (2010). Perceived job quality in the United States, Great Britain, Norway and West-Germany, 1989–2005. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 16 (3), 221–240.
- Pusch, T. & Seifert, H. (2017). Mindestlohngesetz. Für viele Minijobber weiterhin nur Minilöhne. *WSI Policy Brief* 01/2017. Düsseldorf: Hans-Böckler-Stiftung.
- Rademacher, C. & Ramos Lobato, P. (2008). ‘Teufelskreis oder Glücksspirale?’ Ungleiche Bewältigung unsicherer Beschäftigung. In: R. Eickelpasch, C. Rademacher & P. Ramos Lobato (eds.), *Metamorphosen des Kapitalismus – und seiner Kritik* (pp. 118–147), Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Respondi AG Online a. *Panelbook*. Retrieved 14.8.2018, from <https://www.respondi.com/downloads>.
- Respondi AG Online b. *Unsere Antworten auf die 28 ESOMAR-Fragen zur Bestimmung der Qualität von Online Samples und Online Panels*. Retrieved 14.8.2018, from <https://www.respondi.com/downloads>.
- RWI – Leibniz-Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (2016). *Nachfolgestudie zur Analyse der geringfügigen Beschäftigungsverhältnisse (Minijobs) sowie den Auswirkungen des gesetzlichen Mindestlohns. Endbericht*. Gutachten im Auftrag des Ministeriums für Arbeit, Integration und Soziales des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. Essen.
- Schäfer, H., Schmidt, J., & Stettes, O. (2013). *Qualität der Arbeit*. Beiträge zur Ordnungspolitik aus dem Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft Köln. Köln.
- Scherschel, K. & Booth, M. (2012). Aktivierung in die Prekarität: Folgen der Arbeitsmarktpolitik in Deutschland. In: K. Scherschel, P. Streckeisen, & M. Krenn (eds.), *Neue Prekarität. Die Folgen aktivierender Arbeitsmarktpolitik – europäische Länder im Vergleich* (pp. 17–46). Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- Seifert, H. (2017). Wie lassen sich Entwicklung und Strukturen atypischer Beschäftigungsverhältnisse erklären? *WSI-Mitteilungen* 1, 5–15.
- Seifert, H. & Tangian, A. (2009). Wie gut ist gute Arbeit in Europa? In: E. Kistler & F. Mußmann (eds.), *Arbeitsgestaltung als Zukunftsaufgabe. Die Qualität der Arbeit* (pp. 68–84), Hamburg: VSA.

- Sengenberger, W. (1987). *Struktur und Funktionsweise von Arbeitsmärkten. Die Bundesrepublik im internationalen Vergleich*. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- Solow, B., & Wanner, E. (2010). Foreword. In J. Gautie' & J. Schmitt (Eds.), *Low-wage work in the wealthy world* (pp. xv–xx), New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sperber, C. & Walwei, U. (2017). Treiber des Erwerbsformenwandels: Wer hat welchen Job? *WSI-Mitteilungen* 1, 16–26.
- Spoehr, F. (2015): Pfadwechsel in der Arbeitsmarktpolitik. Eine Analyse aktivierender Reformen in Großbritannien, Deutschland und Schweden anhand des Multiple Streams Ansatzes. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Stegmaier, J., Gundert, S., Tesching, K. & Theuer, S. (2015). In der Praxis besteht Nachholbedarf bei Minijobbern. Bezahlter Urlaub und Lohnfortzahlung im Krankheitsfall. *IAB-Kurzbericht* 18/2015. Nürnberg.
- Voss-Dahm, D. (2004). Geringfügige Beschäftigung und Segmentation auf innerbetrieblichen Arbeitsmärkten des Einzelhandels. *Arbeit – Zeitschrift für Arbeitsforschung, Arbeitsgestaltung und Arbeitspolitik* 13 (4), 354–367.
- Weber, E. (2017). Der Arbeitsmarkt im Überblick. In: J. Möller & U. Walwei (eds.), *Arbeitsmarkt kompakt. Analysen, Daten, Fakten*. Herausgegeben vom Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung (IAB) (pp. 10–12). Nürnberg, Bielefeld: Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung & W. Bertelsmann Verlag GmbH & Co. KG.
- Weinkopf, C. (2011). *Minijobs – politisch-strategische Handlungsoptionen*. Expertise. Erarbeitet im Rahmen des Projektes "Gesellschaftliche Wertschätzung von Dienstleistungen steigern! Dienstleistungsqualität – Arbeitsqualität – Zeitinnovationen", Berlin.
- Wiendieck, G. (1994). *Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie*. Berlin, München: Quintessenz.
- Wöhrmann, A.M., Brenscheidt, F. & Gerstenberg, S. (2019). Arbeitszeit in Deutschland: Länge, Lage, Flexibilität der Arbeitszeit und die Gesundheit der Beschäftigten. In: J. Rump & S. Eilers (eds.), *Arbeitszeitpolitik* (pp. 159–177), IBE-Reihe, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Gabler.
- Zimmer, R. (2010). Geringfügige Beschäftigung von Frauen – ein prekärer Zustand. In: C. Hohmann-Dennhardt, M. Körner & R. Zimmer (eds.), *Geschlechtergerechtigkeit. Festschrift für Heide Pfarr* (pp. 296–310), Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Appendix

A1. Comparison of Socio-Demographic Characteristics Between Population and Sample (Relative Frequencies, 2016)

	Population	Sample
Sex		
Male	39.7	37.7
Female	60.3	62.3
Age groups		
>20	7.9	7.9
20 – >30	19.0	18.8
30 – >40	14.5	13.4
40 – >50	18.4	18.4
50 – >60	19.2	19.7
60+	21.0	21.7
Occupational level		
Low: no training qualification	19.2	17.8
Medium: training qualification	48.4	59.8
High: university degree	6.4	22.4
Occupational level unknown	26.0	///

Own calculation and visualisation; data for population taken from statistics of the Federal Employment Office

A2. Work Values of Minijobbers (Relative Frequencies)

	Not im- portant at all	Rather unimpor- tant	Neither nor	Rather important	Very impor- tant
Good income	2.0	4.3	16.8	40.9	36.0
Fair wages	1.9	3.1	13.3	40.9	40.7
A secure job	1.9	3.8	12.6	33.6	48.1
Good career prospects	9.2	19.5	31.6	26.1	13.6
Job useful to society	4.5	14.2	39.4	29.2	12.7
Interesting job	1.6	3.5	16.4	42.9	35.6
Autonomy	1.6	4.2	15.7	41.2	37.4
Variety of tasks	2.1	4.2	23.9	42.3	27.5
Fit of requirements and skills	2.2	4.9	17.6	42.8	32.5
Chances for learning	2.5	6.1	20.6	41.0	29.8
Good relationship to colleagues	2.7	2.6	10.7	35.6	48.4
Good relationship to supervisors	1.9	2.3	10.8	41.5	43.5
Equal treatment of employees	1.9	2.9	12.3	37.6	45.3
Valuation of one's work	1.1	1.9	9.5	36.0	51.5

	Not im- portant at all	Rather unimpor- tant	Neither nor	Rather important	Very impor- tant
Chances for participation	1.8	5.2	21.3	40.6	31.1
Absence of physical strains	2.4	10.2	27.6	30.8	28.9
Absence of psychological stress	2.9	11.3	29.6	30.4	25.7
Lack of dangers and risks	2.5	9.0	26.3	33.8	28.4
Work-life balance	1.4	3.0	12.1	34.0	49.6

Own calculation and visualisation; n=996–1.003

A3. Fulfilment of Work Values in Current Minijob (Relative Frequencies)

	Not ful- filled at all	Rather unful- filled	Neither nor	Rather fulfilled	Totally ful- filled
Good income	6.5	19.9	30.8	27.1	15.7
Fair wages	6.4	16.3	25.6	34.0	17.6
A secure job	4.8	10.0	21.2	35.6	28.4
Good career prospects	30.0	37.6	19.8	7.7	4.9
Job useful to society	9.1	17.2	31.4	23.2	19.1
Interesting job	5.1	12.2	24.2	33.2	25.3
Autonomy	1.2	4.0	16.8	30.9	47.1
Variety of tasks	5.9	15.8	29.0	29.3	20.1
Fit of requirements and skills	8.3	13.4	24.0	29.8	24.4
Chances for learning	8.3	20.6	28.9	25.5	16.7
Good relationship to colleagues	2.1	4.3	15.3	34.9	43.4
Good relationship to supervisors	1.6	4.8	15.8	33.9	44.0
Equal treatment of employees	2.6	8.6	21.3	34.1	33.4
Valuation of one's work	2.5	9.0	22.2	32.8	33.5
Chances for participation	3.9	10.5	24.7	33.6	27.3
Absence of physical strains	4.4	14.7	24.8	26.4	29.8
Absence of psychological stress	3.8	13.2	22.9	33.1	27.1
Lack of dangers and risks	3.9	11.3	23.1	29.2	32.6
Work-life balance	1.6	4.8	17.6	31.4	44.6

Own calculation and visualisation; n=894–991

A4. Matches and Mismatches Between Desired and Experiences Work Situation Amongst Minijobbers (Relative Frequencies)

	Maximal mismatch	Strong mismatch	Medium mismatch	Light mismatch	Match/ oversupply
Good income	3.1	8.6	17.4	24.2	46.6
Fair wages	3.5	8.5	13.8	26.7	47.6
A secure job	2.4	5.8	11.4	25.1	55.3
Good career prospects	4.7	9.4	19.5	25.7	40.7
Job useful to society	0.4	2.7	8.9	18.4	69.5
Interesting job	1.8	5.8	10.8	23.0	58.6
Autonomy	0.1	1.6	4.1	15.3	78.9
Variety of tasks	1.5	5.1	11.9	23.5	58.0
Fit of requirements and skills	3.3	5.8	11.4	19.3	60.2
Chances for learning	2.1	7.7	14.9	23.4	51.9
Good relationship to colleagues	1.0	1.5	5.4	18.7	73.5
Good relationship to supervisors	0.3	1.9	5.5	17.6	74.7
Equal treatment of employees	1.3	4.2	9.3	21.0	64.2
Valuation of one's work	1.7	5.7	11.1	22.4	59.1
Chances for participation	1.1	3.5	10.2	19.8	65.3
Absence of physical strains	1.4	2.6	8.9	17.8	69.3
Absence of psychological stress	1.0	3.5	8.0	17.3	70.2
Lack of dangers and risks	1.5	3.0	7.1	16.6	71.7
Work-life balance	0.8	2.1	7.4	19.7	69.9

Own calculation and visualisation; n=891–989; Mismatches computed as: work values minus experienced work situation; all items measured on a five-point-scale; cases of oversupply recoded as 'match'; range of final mismatch index: 4 (maximal mismatch), 3 (strong mismatch), 2 (medium mismatch), 1 (light mismatch), 0 (match/oversupply)