



SUSTAINABLE LABOUR MANAGEMENT IN THE EU: REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR INCLUSIVE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

GESTÃO SUSTENTÁVEL DO TRABALHO NA UNIÃO EUROPEIA: ENQUADRAMENTOS REGULATÓRIOS E IMPLICAÇÕES POLÍTICAS PARA UM DESENVOLVIMENTO INDUSTRIAL INCLUSIVO

JOSÉ NORONHA RODRIGUES

Professor of Law at School of Business and Economics, University of the Azores - CEDIS – Centro de I&D sobre Direito e Sociedade, Faculdade de Direito, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Campus de Campolide, 1099-032 Lisboa, Portugal. Email: jose.n.rodrigues@uac.pt; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7729-4954

SUMANTA BHATTACHARYA

Ph.D scholar in Asian International University, and Policy Analyst, M. Tech, MA in Development Studies, M. Sc in Environmental Science, LLB, MA in Security and Defence Law, MA in Economics, MBA DIA & D, DGand GS, PGDEDS, PGDHUR, MPI (Oxford University). Email: sumanta.21394@gmail.com ; ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2563-2787

DORA CRISTINA RIBEIRO CABETE

Professor of Law at School of Business and Economics, University of the Azores - CEDIS – Centro de I&D sobre Direito e Sociedade, Faculdade de Direito, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Campus de Campolide, 1099-032 Lisboa, Portugal. Email: dora.cr.rodrigues@uac.pt; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0117-8818

ABSTRACT

Objectives: This article aims to analyse how sustainable labour management can promote inclusive economic growth within the European Union. It examines the regulatory frameworks and institutional mechanisms that shape EU labour governance. The study seeks to understand how labour strategies can reconcile competitiveness, social justice, and environmental responsibility. Additionally, it positions sustainable labour management within broader social policy paradigms such as social investment and flexicurity.

Methodology: The research adopts a qualitative methodological approach based on an extensive literature review and analysis of EU regulatory frameworks. It examines key directives and policy instruments shaping labour governance at the supranational and national levels. A comparative case study method is applied to Germany, Sweden, and Denmark. This approach allows the identification of best practices and structural challenges in sustainable labour management.





Results: The findings demonstrate that sustainable labour management operates as a hybrid governance model integrating economic, social, and environmental dimensions. Germany's dual vocational training system enhances productivity and reduces youth unemployment. Sweden's gender equality and work-life balance policies strengthen inclusive participation. Denmark's flexicurity model combines labour flexibility with strong social protection, although it presents certain trade-offs for vulnerable workers.

Conclusions: The study concludes that sustainable labour management requires coordinated multilevel governance aligned with digital and green transitions. EU labour policy must integrate lifelong learning, social protection, and ecological responsibility to ensure long-term resilience. A hybrid framework combining social investment and flexicurity paradigms provides a viable path forward. Ultimately, inclusive prosperity in the EU depends on cohesive, forward-looking labour strategies.

Keywords: Sustainable labour management; European Union; Green transition; Digitalisation; Labour policies

RESUMO:

Objetivos: O artigo tem como objetivo analisar de que forma a gestão sustentável do trabalho pode promover o crescimento económico inclusivo na União Europeia. Examina os enquadramentos regulatórios e os mecanismos institucionais que estruturam a governação laboral da UE. Procura compreender como as estratégias laborais podem conciliar competitividade, justiça social e responsabilidade ambiental. Adicionalmente, posiciona a gestão sustentável do trabalho no âmbito dos paradigmas de investimento social e flexigurança.

Metodologia: A investigação adota uma abordagem metodológica qualitativa, baseada numa revisão bibliográfica aprofundada e na análise dos enquadramentos regulatórios da UE. São examinadas diretivas e instrumentos políticos fundamentais para a governação laboral supranacional e nacional. Aplica-se um método comparativo com estudos de caso da Alemanha, Suécia e Dinamarca. Esta estratégia permite identificar boas práticas e desafios estruturais na gestão sustentável do trabalho.

Resultados: Os resultados demonstram que a gestão sustentável do trabalho funciona como um modelo híbrido de governação que integra dimensões económicas, sociais e ambientais. O sistema dual de formação profissional da Alemanha reforça a produtividade e reduz o desemprego jovem. As políticas suecas de igualdade de género e conciliação trabalho-família promovem participação inclusiva. O modelo dinamarquês de flexigurança combina flexibilidade laboral com forte proteção social, embora apresente desafios para trabalhadores mais vulneráveis.

Conclusões: Conclui-se que a gestão sustentável do trabalho exige uma governação multinível coordenada e alinhada com as transições digital e ecológica. As políticas laborais da UE devem integrar aprendizagem ao longo da vida, proteção social e responsabilidade ambiental para garantir resiliência de longo prazo. Um enquadramento híbrido que articule investimento social e flexigurança constitui um caminho viável. Em última instância, a prosperidade inclusiva na UE depende de estratégias laborais coesas e orientadas para o futuro.





Palavras-chave: Gestão sustentável do trabalho; União Europeia; Transição verde; Digitalização; Políticas laborais

1 INTRODUCTION

The labour market in the European Union (EU) is one of the most complex and diverse in the world as much as it is multiple and is formed with reference to the specifics of its member nations' markets. The organisations of the EU are highly legalistic in the supply of labour aimed at catering for the worker and employers' interest as well as job creation and economic growth and justice. This article assesses the labour market and its dynamics in the EU up to the current times after the formation of the European Economic Community (EEC) better known as the EU in 1957. In the first instance, economic assimilation was dominant, and policies toward labour were mainly oriented toward the creation of a free movement of workers within the EU, based on the Treaty of Rome. It would also include freedom of movement which was considered vital for development of a common market was accompanied with policies aimed at protecting workers in the countries of the common market. (European Commission, 2023)

Thus, the two decades of the eighties and nineties were marked by programmatic initiatives in the EU labour market policies because of mounting concerns of unemployment and social exclusion. The facts are that the Single European Act signed in 1986, and the Maastricht Treaty signed in 1992 created the strong basis for more powerful labour policies achieved with the signing of the European Social Charter and the adoption of European Employment Strategy (EES) (Rodrigues et al., 2024). They were intended to achieve the coordination of standards of employment and social security, encourage employment and ensure social protection in the EU.

The EU's 2004 and 2007 enlargements, which added several countries from Central and Eastern Europe, further increased the diversity of the labour market. Integration was challenging because the economic profiles and labour market structures of these new member states were different from those of the pre-accession countries. Furthermore, the global financial crisis of 2008 had a profound effect on employment across the EU, particularly among young people, and sparked a wave of neoliberal austerity measures and labour market flexibility reforms (Rodrigues,





Bhattacharya and Cabete, 2025). In the years since the crisis, the EU labour market has been characterised by both stability and continuous volatility: while average unemployment has declined, disparities among member states persist. While some nations, like Spain and Greece, continue to struggle with higher unemployment rates, others, like Germany and the Netherlands, maintain low rates (Kahanec and Pytliková, 2017).

From the EU tenets, this article finds that social market economy principles exposed the EU to policies that aim at achieving economic growth, but at the same time, enhancing the level of social welfare. Continuing the discussion of the labour market trends, one should mention that at the moment both digitalization of the economy and transition to the green economy are recognised as key priorities. Particularly due to technological advancements, platform-based and gig work have given rise to new job types that frequently lack conventional labour protections. Updated regulatory standards are necessary in light of these developments to guarantee equitable treatment in the changing workplace. (Dundar Aravacik, 2019)

Furthermore, through lockdowns, temporary closures, and remote work, the COVID-19 pandemic revealed how susceptible the EU labour market is to systemic shocks. To help preserve jobs and protect workers, the EU responded by introducing financial support programs like SURE (Support to mitigate Unemployment Risks in an Emergency). However, the EU's Green Deal, which aims to make the world climate neutral by 2050, offers the labour market both opportunities and challenges. In order to ensure a fair transition for workers in carbon-intensive industries and to align the workforce with the new demands of the green economy, significant retraining and reskilling efforts will be necessary (Eurofound, 2020).

In view of these developments, this article seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How can inclusive economic growth in the EU be facilitated by sustainable labour management?
2. Which regulatory frameworks and institutional mechanisms affect labour policy across the EU?
3. How can labour strategies be synchronised to preserve social justice and environmental responsibility while preserving competitiveness?

Although the concept of sustainable labour management is essential, it must also be positioned within more general scholarly discussions about social investment and





the transformation of the welfare state (Ferrera, 2005; Morel, Palier, and Palme, 2012; Hemerijck, 2013). These collections of work provide insight into how, despite growing precarity, demographic changes, and technological disruption, EU member states are increasingly pursuing forward-looking, activation-based strategies aimed at preparing people for the future labour market.

The article is organised as follows: The concepts and procedures of sustainable labour management are outlined in Section 2. The EU regulatory framework and the labour governance subsidiarity principle are examined in Section 3. The function of European institutions in establishing and implementing labour laws is examined in Section 4. The gig economy, demographic ageing, wage inequality, unemployment, and technological disruption are some of the main obstacles to sustainable labour management that are listed in Section 5. Case studies from Sweden, Denmark, and Germany that highlight creative national strategies are presented in Section 6. Key outlooks for sustainable labour strategies in the context of demographic, digital, and green shifts are presented in Section 7. The findings are summarised and their implications for long-term EU labour governance are discussed in Section 8.

This article adds to a better understanding of how the EU can create and execute strategic, inclusive, and forward-looking labour policies for long-term prosperity by revisiting the development and complexity of the EU labour market and placing it within current discussions—such as digitalisation, the green transition, and post-pandemic recovery.

2 PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF SUSTAINABLE LABOUR MANAGEMENT

In the European Union (EU), sustainable labour management is a multifaceted strategy that strikes a balance between social justice, economic efficiency, and environmental responsibility. Along with fostering economic stability and industry expansion, it is crucial for social cohesion, protecting worker rights, and advancing green transitions among member states. As the EU struggles with quick changes in technology, population pressures, and environmental demands, this integrated approach becomes more and more important.

This expands upon previous iterations of the social investment approach that highlight the twin objectives of efficiency and equity, particularly in relation to the labour





market activation and early childhood education (Cantillon, 2011; Morel et al., 2012). However, as Clegg (2007) argues, sustainable labour management still needs to resolve unresolved conflicts between social protection and activation.

From a social perspective, dealing with demographic issues like population ageing and boosting the labour market participation of women and other vulnerable groups depend on sustainable labour management. Pro-employment laws that support gender equality, work-life balance, and lifelong learning can increase the number of people in the workforce and lower dependency rates, which will increase social and economic resilience (Edge et al., 2017).

In order to address the emerging issues surrounding the gig economy and non-standard employment, sustainable labour relations are essential. The transformation of work through digital platforms presents challenges for labour protections, social security, and job stability, as highlighted by Rodrigues, Bhattacharya, and Cabete (2022), who examine the evolving dynamics and risks of gig work in the EU and beyond. Digital platforms have fuelled the growth of gig work, which provides flexibility and income access but frequently lacks social protections and job security. The EU can create a more equitable and inclusive labour market that stops the deterioration of workers' rights by creating new regulatory frameworks and extending social protection programs (IIBS, 2024). By giving a more precise definition of employment status, the proposed Platform Work Directive aims to give platform-based workers access to fair pay, benefits, and workplace protections (European Parliament, 2019). Work-life balance is a related aspect of sustainable labour policy that enhances wellbeing and increases participation from under-represented groups. The Work-Life Balance Directive (2019/1158/EU) introduced flexible work schedules and minimum requirements for paternity, parental, and carers' leave to encourage gender equality in the workplace (European Commission, 2022). The directive went into effect in 2022.

Additionally, environmental concerns are becoming more and more important in EU labour policy. In order to achieve climate neutrality by 2050, the European Green Deal calls for the creation of new "green" jobs in industries such as renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, and energy efficiency. Carbon-intensive industries are also experiencing a downturn, which calls for retraining and reskilling of impacted employees. Accordingly, a just transition to a green economy that doesn't exacerbate inequality, or marginalisation requires effective labour management (Hanna et al., 2024). By encouraging telecommuting, energy-efficient workplaces, and green





business models like the circular economy, sustainable labour management also helps to lower employment-related carbon footprints. By aligning labour policies with environmental objectives, these strategies lessen ecological harm while creating new economic opportunities (Fallah Shayan et al., 2022). Throughout the EU, a number of best practices have emerged to operationalise these principles:

- **Fair Wages and Social Dialogue:** Governments, employers, and trade unions participate in robust social dialogue frameworks in nations like Sweden and Denmark. This ensures that wage agreements reflect cost-of-living standards and uphold equitable living conditions for all workers. Directive 2018/800 promotes equitable minimum wages across the EU to fight poverty and social exclusion.
- **Safe and Healthy Working Conditions:** Strict occupational safety regulations are mandated by EU directives. In order to lower workplace injuries and absenteeism, nations like Finland and Germany are leaders in putting in place thorough workplace risk assessments, employee training, and participatory safety planning (Moshood et al., 2021).
- **Work-Life Balance:** Minimum requirements for parental, paternity, and carers' leave are mandated by the Work-Life Balance Directive (2019/1158/EU). The Work-Life Balance Directive (2019/1158/EU) establishes minimum standards for parental, paternity, and carers' leave. For instance, Sweden and the Netherlands excel at offering flexible work arrangements that promote gender equality and help workers balance their commitments to their families and their jobs (European Commission, 2022).
- **Mental health and well-being** are becoming more widely acknowledged as essential components of social sustainability. The EU encourages member states to provide workplace counselling, create supportive organisational cultures, and implement mental health training programs. Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs) and psychosocial risk prevention strategies have been demonstrated to enhance productivity and mental health (Chellam and Divya, 2022; Bonde, 2008; Stansfeld and Candy, 2006). To mainstream mental well-being across the labour, education, digital, and environmental domains, the European Commission's 2023 Communication on Mental Health introduces 20 flagship initiatives, such as "tackling psychosocial risks at work" and financing awareness campaigns through EU OSHA (Eurofound and EU-OSHA, 2020). Additionally, precarious employment is recognised as a significant social determinant of mental health, linked to increased psychosocial risks and poorer mental health outcomes (Benach et al., 2014; Niedhammer et al., 2021). Accordingly, the Council's October 2023 conclusions urge member states to take coordinated action on the impact of precarious work on mental health, including psychosocial risk prevention, improved public systems, and reintegration assistance.
- **Lifelong Learning and Skills Development:** The EU backs programs for continuous learning in response to the green transition and technological disruption. Strong vocational training programs in nations like Germany and Austria integrate classroom instruction with on-the-job training, facilitating easier transitions for employees (European Commission, 2023).





- **Diversity and Inclusion:** To guarantee that everyone can make a significant contribution to the workforce, anti-discrimination laws and diversity initiatives are essential. For instance, diversity committees and gender quotas have been advanced in France and Belgium, encouraging fair representation in positions of leadership (Woodward, 2008).

Aligning human resources with long-term business and societal objectives is another aspect of sustainable labour management from a systems perspective. As technology, demographics, and the environment change in the future, it guarantees that employment structures will continue to be flexible, promotes inclusive decision-making, and supports professional advancement (Matei et al., 2024; Antunes et al., 2023; Rodrigues, Cabete & Vissing, 2025; Rodrigues, Medina & Cabete, 2024; Rodrigues, Bhattacharya & Cabete, 2024; Bhattacharya, Schadev, Rodrigues & Cabete, 2025). Overall, sustainable labour management enhances not only industry performance but also the EU's broader commitment to resilient, inclusive, and balanced development by integrating the values of justice, flexibility, and environmental stewardship, as illustrated in Table 1 below.

Dimension	Principle	Key practices	Country examples / EU measures	Impact
Economic	Productive and adaptable labour	Skills development, fair wages, safe conditions	Germany's dual vocational training; EU Skills Agenda	Higher productivity, innovation, reduced unemployment
Social	Inclusive employment and equity	Gender equality, work-life balance, social dialogue	Sweden's parental leave policies; EU Work-Life Balance Directive (European Commission, 2022)	Social cohesion, increased labour force participation
Environmental	Green transition and sustainable work	Green jobs, circular economy practices, green skills	EU Green Deal; reskilling for climate-neutral economy	Climate mitigation, industrial restructuring
Health & Well-being	Mental and physical health at work	Risk assessments, mental health services, ergonomic design	UK's EAP programs; Finland's workplace safety culture	Reduced absenteeism, improved work satisfaction
Governance	Institutional cooperation and regulation	Labour law directives, subsidiarity, stakeholder engagement	UK's EAP programs; Finland's workplace safety culture	Reduced absenteeism, improved work satisfaction
Adaptability	Lifelong learning and reskilling	Apprenticeships, digital literacy, ageing workforce integration	Austria and Germany's training models; EU Digital Education Plan	Workforce resilience, career mobility, active ageing





Precarious Work	Regulating non-standard employment	Platform worker protections, minimum standards for gig work	Platform Work Directive; policy proposals on digital labour (IIBS, 2024)	Inclusion of gig workers, social protection expansion
------------------------	------------------------------------	---	--	---

Table 1: Summary of Sustainable Labour Management Principles and Practices in the EU

3 THEORETICAL POSITIONING: CONNECTING SOCIAL POLICY PARADIGMS WITH SUSTAINABLE LABOUR MANAGEMENT

A number of fundamental frameworks in European social policy, including the social investment paradigm, flexicurity, and the post-industrial welfare state transformation, are extended and intersected by the idea of sustainable labour management. According to Ferrera (2005), Morel et al. (2012), and Hemerijck (2013), social investment places a strong emphasis on proactive, activation-based policies that improve human capital and get people ready for future employment. By incorporating environmental sustainability and long-term workforce adaptability into the investment logic, sustainable labour management expands its purview beyond employability to encompass climate-conscious labour transitions and inclusive participation across all age and social groups. Building on Hein & Lavoie (2024) and Dow, Hein & Lavoie (2025), we extend the analysis of income distribution effects of macro-financial policy to EU labour regulation under green transition, thereby reinforcing the integration of economic governance and distributive equity into sustainable labour strategies.

Similarly, the Danish model of flexicurity (Madsen, 2006; Jensen, 2011) strikes a balance between active labour market policies (ALMPs), robust social protections, and labour market flexibility. This dual logic is incorporated into sustainable labour management, which shows a shift towards a more comprehensive and systemic model by emphasizing environmental resilience, mental health, and demographic sustainability. This approach reinforces the importance of lifelong learning and re-skilling, but it also integrates regulatory innovations to address non-standard employment, as seen in recent EU initiatives such as the proposed Platform Work Directive (European Parliament, 2019).

Finally, the notion of sustainability challenges traditional post-welfare narratives by insisting that social policy must not only accommodate economic change but also actively shape it through ecological and intergenerational considerations (Krein and Aigner, 2022). Therefore, a normative shift in EU labour governance is reflected in





sustainable labour management, which seeks to balance environmental responsibility, productivity, and fairness within a cogent policy framework.

When combined, these factors imply that rather than being a completely separate policy paradigm, sustainable labour management is best understood as a hybrid governance model. It introduces a transversal logic that connects labour regulation with climate goals, digitalisation, and demographic planning, while combining ideas from the social investment state, flexicurity, and green political economy. This multifaceted approach suggests more than just a continuation of welfare instruments.

4 MULTILEVEL GOVERNANCE AND EU REGULATORY ARCHITECTURE

4.1. THE EU'S LABOUR REGULATION FOUNDATIONS

To encourage fair labour standards and social protection among its member states, the European Union (EU) has created a strong legal framework. This regulatory framework, which offers both uniformity and flexibility, is made up of legally binding directives and non-binding policy tools that influence national labour laws.

The Working Time Directive (2003/88/EC), which sets a weekly maximum of 48 working hours, requires daily and weekly rest periods, and guarantees at least four weeks of paid yearly leave, is the cornerstone of this framework. Although member states may implement exemptions or opt-outs in particular sectors, these standards safeguard worker health, promote work-life balance, and prevent exploitation (Ghosheh, 2016).

The European Pillar of Social Rights, proclaimed in 2017, complements binding directives by outlining 20 principles grouped under equal opportunities, fair working conditions, and social protection (European Commission, n.d.). It promotes adequate wages, gender equality, and work-life balance, and has inspired legislation such as the Work-Life Balance Directive (2019/1158/EU), which sets standards for parental, paternity, and carers' leave (European Commission, 2022).

Other foundational directives include:





- Equal Treatment in Employment Directive (2000/78/EC): Prohibits discrimination in hiring, pay, and working conditions based on religion, disability, age, or sexual orientation (Howard, 2018).
- Temporary Agency Work Directive (2008/104/EC): Ensures agency workers receive the same pay and conditions as direct employees (Kullmann, 2024).
- Posting of Workers Directive (96/71/EC, revised by 2018/957/EU): Establishes equal remuneration for workers temporarily posted across borders (Rennuy, 2020).
- Information and Consultation Directive (2002/14/EC): Requires employers to consult workers on significant changes in operations (Dundon et al., 2014).
- Health and Safety Framework Directive (89/391/EEC): Mandates risk assessments, training, and employee participation in safety decisions (Walters et al., 2022).

The EU is responsive to new forms of work, as evidenced by the proposed Platform Work Directive, which seeks to define employment status and provide gig workers with labour protections in response to the platform economy (European Parliament, 2019).

By establishing minimum standards and permitting contextual flexibility, these directives and instruments collectively establish the legal parameters that member states use to formulate their national labour policies.

4.2. MULTILEVEL GOVERNANCE AND SUBSIDIARITY IN PRACTICE

The EU's approach to labour governance operates through a multilevel system that balances supranational coordination with national autonomy. Directives, which establish minimum requirements to be implemented through national legislation, make up the majority of EU labour laws. Subsidiarity, which holds that decisions should be made as close to the people as possible and that EU-level action should only be taken when absolutely required, is supported by this format (Maciejewski, 2025).

This flexibility allows for national adaptation of EU standards. For example, the Working Time Directive permits variations in reference periods and includes an opt-out clause for individual workers, accommodating national labour market models and economic conditions (Bárd, 2021).





However, differences in legal traditions, economic development, and administrative capacities can complicate harmonization. For example, workers in Eastern and Southern Europe are paid substantially less for equivalent work than those in Western and Northern Europe, demonstrating the persistence of wage disparities throughout the EU (Iwasaki and Satogami, 2023). These disparities impede unity and may lead to less wealthy member states opposing EU-wide minimum standards (Forster-van Aerssen and Spital, 2023).

The European Semester, an annual policy coordination cycle, provides a mechanism to align national labour reforms with EU strategic goals. It allows for mutual monitoring and exchange of best practices while respecting domestic prerogatives. Despite this, disparities in enforcement and legal interpretation remain. EU directives may be unevenly transposed, and some member states lack the institutional capacity to ensure compliance, creating a patchwork of labour protections (Mulder, 2019).

Conflicts between national and EU regulations are frequently adjudicated by the European Court of Justice (ECJ), which clarifies the scope of obligations and ensures conformity with EU law. Such decisions improve legal coherence, but they can also lead to discussions about national sovereignty and the validity of supranational intervention.

Ultimately, the success of the EU's regulatory framework depends on sustained dialogue and coordination among national governments, social partners, and EU institutions. A careful balance between advancing common labour standards and taking into account the various socioeconomic realities of member states must be struck by this multilevel governance structure.

Figure 1 summarizes the EU's labour governance framework, highlighting core directives on working time, equal treatment, platform work, posted workers, and work-life balance. These are grounded in principles of subsidiarity and flexible harmonization. The figure also reflects key challenges, including regional wage gaps, uneven enforcement, and tensions between national autonomy and EU integration. The European Semester is shown as a central tool for coordinating national labour reforms with EU priorities.

EU REGULATORY ARCHITECTURE AND GOVERNANCE





Figure 1: Overview of EU Labour Governance Instruments and Principles

5 ROLE OF EUROPEAN INSTITUTIONS IN SHAPING AND ENFORCING LABOUR POLICIES

Following the discussion of the EU's legal instruments and the interplay between national and supranational governance in labour regulation, this section focuses on the core European institutions that design, enact, and enforce labour policy. In order to shape the regulatory environment and guarantee policy coherence among member states, the European Commission, European Parliament, and European Court of Justice each have unique but related roles to play.

The European Union is a supranational organisation with separate institutions in charge of establishing and carrying out labour laws in each of its member states. The European Commission, the European Parliament, and the European Court of Justice are the three main bodies that share important decision-making authority. These organisations also guarantee national compliance and supervise the application of EU labour laws. With relation to promoting workers' rights, the Commission enters the legislative process by developing suggested directives and regulations in regard to the numerous sides of labour law, including working conditions, health and safety. Consultations with employers' groups, trade unions, member states, and other non-state actors led to these recommendations. Rodrigues and Cabete (2024) argue that





the Council of Europe has played a catalytic role in shaping EU legislative development, particularly regarding human rights and social standards, which underpin many labour-related directives. The Commission also uses and creates the legislative impact assessment, which examines the potential effects of proposed policies on the economy, society, and environment.

The European Commission (EC), the European Parliament (EP), and the European Court of Justice (ECJ) each play distinct but interconnected roles in shaping and enforcing EU labour policies. The EC is responsible for monitoring the implementation of agreed-upon proposals within member states. It ensures that national governments adhere to deadlines for incorporating EU directives into their legal frameworks. When a member state fails to enact or implement a directive properly, the Commission provides guidance and, if necessary, initiates infringement procedures that may result in proceedings before the European Court of Justice (Van Den Brink, 2017).

The European Parliament, whose members are directly elected by EU citizens, shares legislative authority with the Council of the European Union. It reviews and amends labour policy legislation proposed by the Commission. In both committees and plenary sessions, Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) evaluate these proposals while considering public concerns. Parliament's power to approve, amend, or reject legislation grants it considerable influence over labour policy. Generally, more attuned to social justice and workers' rights, the EP has often advocated for stricter labour laws than those proposed by the Commission, such as improving rights for women in the workplace and temporary agency workers. Additionally, it oversees the Commission to ensure compliance with EU labour laws and adherence to social justice principles enshrined in the treaties (Van Den Brink, 2017).

The ECJ, the judicial authority of the EU, interprets and applies EU laws uniformly across member states, including labour legislation. Its rulings shape the interpretation and content of EU directives and regulations, thereby establishing legal standards for all members. When a state fails to observe EU labour laws, the Commission may refer the case to the ECJ, whose judgments can mandate legislative adjustments to ensure compliance. Moreover, the ECJ adjudicates actions brought by individuals, companies, or trade unions challenging national measures that may violate EU labour laws. It has been instrumental in developing key principles of EU labour law, such as equal pay for equal work and the protection of workers under service provision arrangements.





Collectively, the Commission, Parliament, and Court uphold the quality of labour rights, safeguard employment protections, and promote cohesive social and economic integration across the Union (Bux and Maciejewski, 2025).

6 CHALLENGES TO SUSTAINABLE LABOUR MANAGEMENT

Although, advancing in the encouragement of sustainability in labour practices, there are several major factors that pose a threat to the sustenance of labour management within the European Union. It is, therefore, important to tackle these challenges in order to maintain fair, inclusion and stability, in the labour market.

Unemployment: In many EU member states, unemployment is still a major issue, especially for young people. Job losses were made worse by the COVID-19 pandemic's economic effects, particularly in nations with inflexible labour and product markets. Because it leads to a high rate of poverty, social exclusion, and injustice, high unemployment undermines social sustainability. It also raises economic concerns because unemployed people might not be able to acquire the skills that employers will need in the future, which would lead to unemployment and slowed economic growth. Policies aimed at creating jobs, particularly in sectors that are most likely to grow in the future, like the digital economy and green energy technologies, should be part of specific strategies to combat unemployment. (Ando et al., 2022).

According to Eurostat (2023a), youth unemployment was 13.9% (2.68 million young people), while overall unemployment in the EU was 6.1%. The 2.1% long-term unemployment rate suggests that the labour market recovery is beset with structural issues.

Wage Inequality: Wage disparity is another problem that impacting the sustainable labour management in the EU. Although the EU has made an effort to negotiate for its citizens to receive fair wages, income inequality is still a significant issue at both the macro and micro levels. Regional employment, training minimum qualifications, and the gender pay gap are the primary causes of wage disparities. For instance, regardless of the kind and nature of the work being done, workers in Eastern and Southern Europe are paid significantly less than those in Western and Northern Europe. In addition to impeding social cohesion and the fight against poverty in the Union, wage inequality also contributes to dissatisfaction and the inefficiency of the





social-economic system. In order to reduce wage disparity, member states must work together to establish efficient wage determination systems and structures, encourage social discourse, and ensure that all workers receive the same compensation for doing the same work (Iwasaki and Satogami, 2023).

The Gig Economy: The emergence of the gig economy can be viewed as the potential and threats for the effective and sustainable labour management. The main themes that were identified are freedom and the generation of new employment opportunities which are associated with concerns over employment insecurity, workers' rights and social protection. Freelancers, most of whom are self-employed, also do not receive worker privileges including, medical provisions, pension, and jobless benefits. Also, the working conditions in the gig economy are insecure because gig workers have irregular working hours and wages. These are some of the challenges that the EU has identified and is still trying to come up with policies and means of addressing platform work, the working conditions of gig workers, their rights, and means of extending basic protection to them (Huđek and Širec, 2023).

This expansion of platform-based and insecure work aligns with what Standing (2011) terms the “precariat”—a growing class of workers facing chronic uncertainty, income volatility, and exclusion from social protections.

Ageing Workforce: The growing number of senior citizens in Europe poses a significant challenge to sustainable labour management. Concerns include the working population, employment opportunities, population ageing, rising healthcare costs, and the viability of pension funds. The first is that many employees, particularly the elderly, might find it difficult to adopt new technological paradigms and collaborative styles, which could lead to a mismatch between supply and demand. The EU and its member states are developing strategies to improve active ageing, boost educational participation, and encourage the retention of older workers in the workforce in order to address this problem. Furthermore, the need to make workplaces age friendly as well as guaranteed flexibility at working places to the ageing workers is crucial for a sustainable population (Cylus and Al Tayara, 2021).

Eurostat data from 2023 shows the employment rate ranges drastically across EU regions—from 86.5% in Warsaw to just 48.4% in Calabria—demonstrating the unequal integration of older and inactive populations into the labour force. (Eurostat, 2023a)





Technological Disruption: Sustainable labour management is under pressure as a result of high levels of innovation and rapidly growing technology use, such as robotics in the workplace. As is well known, technology helps businesses become more efficient and creates new job opportunities, but it can also lead to job losses, particularly in businesses with repetitive and insignificant jobs. This problem is especially prevalent in industries like manufacturing, transportation, and retail. The EU has therefore decided to implement policies aimed at boosting digital literacy, encouraging more inventions, and retraining and equipping workers for new jobs in the rapidly expanding fields in order to lessen the risks and negative effects of the technological transformation (Bürgisser, 2023).

A critical policy consideration arises from Denmark's flexicurity model, which, while offering flexibility for employers and strong unemployment benefits, may inadvertently create insecurity for younger and low-skilled workers. Some scholars argue that without robust active labour market policies and effective training systems, flexibility can reinforce segmentation rather than reduce it (Jensen, 2011; Madsen, 2006). These trade-offs are increasingly central to the debate on sustainable and inclusive employment strategies in the EU.

7 CASE STUDIES

There are EU member states that have achieved sustainable labour policies that have incorporated pertinent changes that make the working environment among industries better while at the same time promoting industry growth as well as economic strength. These cases bring out the various strategies of managing labour and are useful lessons for other countries.

7.1 GERMANY: THE TOTAL OF THE DUAL VOCATIONAL TRAINING SYSTEM

The German dual vocational education and training model stands out among all non-US systems of sustainable labour management because it has played a significant role in the industrial development of the nation. This system comprises the provision of course work that will aid in the development of skills and knowledge, followed by the provision of more practical experience through work where one gains more knowledge





about practical issues. Companies and organisations from a variety of industries, including manufacturing, engineering, and information technology, participate in the training process and make investments in human capital that is in high demand in these sectors. The advantages of increased economic activity in this system are multifaceted. To workers, it serves as a clear path to long-term quality and decent employment. To industries, it guarantees the industries plenty of highly qualified workers that is instructive in increasing competitiveness in an international market. Germany's low youth unemployment rate and its position as one of the world's top producers of high-quality automobiles, machinery, electronics, and a host of other goods are widely credited to the dual vocational system (Fürstenau, Pilz, and Gonon, 2022).

Typology alignment: This model contributes most directly to the economic and adaptability dimensions of sustainable labour management through productivity, skills development, and low youth unemployment.

Critical reflection: However, it has been critiqued for its limited flexibility across sectors and for reinforcing early specialization, which may constrain mobility and lifelong learning later in life.

7.2 SWEDEN: THE WORK RELATIONSHIP AND GENDER EQUITY

Sweden has progressive labour laws because it wants to advance work-family balance and workplace equity for women. With 480 days of paid leave that can be split between the parents, it offers progressive parental leave provisions. Additionally, childcare is highly supported in Sweden, which enables both men and women to work. The industrialisation effort has also benefited from these policies in a number of ways. As a result, Sweden has benefited from giving women access to a greater number of jobs, which has raised productivity and improved the qualifications of the population. Corporations enjoy the positive effect of diverse personnel as well as less cases of people missing work due to family issues. They therefore foster on talent attraction where for instance gender equality, work life balance has placed Sweden as an attractive employment hub in areas of technology, health care and education among others (Lane and Jordansson, 2020).





Typology alignment: Sweden exemplifies the social and health and well-being dimensions of sustainable labour management, especially in relation to gender equity, family policy, and inclusive participation.

Critical reflection: Despite its strengths, Sweden's model still faces criticism for persistent gender segregation in the labour market and the concentration of women in part-time and lower-paid care sector jobs.

7.3 DENMARK: THE FLEXICURITY MODEL

One example of "flexicurity" is Denmark, where policies are relatively liberal for businesses and organisations but heavily incorporate social protection for workers. In actuality, this is a strong point of the aforementioned model since it makes it easy for businesses to hire and fire staff members, a feature that helps businesses adapt to changing market conditions. At the same time, Denmark offers a wide range of unemployment benefits in addition to proactive workforce development initiatives like training and placement centres. It has done so in a way that has maintained and enhanced Denmark's strong economic stability and high employment rates. It is through establishing job security to the workers and job mobility, this flexicurity model create benefits that are essential in, a changing economy. Therefore, Denmark has experienced constant industrial development over time which is mantle in new innovation such as renewable energy, Biotechnology where flexibility and capability to adopt new technology is a valuable thing. (Bubak, 2018)

Typology alignment: Denmark's flexicurity model embodies a hybrid economic-social approach and supports the governance and adaptability dimensions through coordinated institutional frameworks and a dynamic labour market.

Critical reflection: However, critics argue that its high flexibility can lead to insecurity among low-skilled and younger workers, particularly during downturns when employment protections are minimal and training systems are under strain, as illustrated in Table 2 below.

Country	Model Focus	Typology alignment	Key contributions	Critical reflections
Germany	Dual Vocational training	Economic Adaptability	High skill development, low youth unemployment,	Early specialization limits career flexibility; weak permeability across





			strong industrial competitiveness	sectors; lower academic pathways for vocational students
Sweden	Gender equity & Work-life balance	Social Health & Well-being	Generous parental leave, high female participation, work-life balance, inclusive policies	Labour market remains gender-segregated; women overrepresented in part-time and care work
Denmark	Flexicurity model	Economic Social Adaptability Governance	Combines flexibility for firms with strong unemployment protection and training	Flexibility can increase insecurity for low-skilled and young workers; model depends on strong public investment and functioning ALMPs

Table 2: Case studies and the dimensions of sustainable labour management

8 FUTURE OUTLOOK

Therefore, as the EU becomes more involved in the ever-changing global environment, a number of trends and challenges will determine the priorities of sustainable labour management. These are more related to the digitisation of the industry, the changing nature of work, the ageing and shrinking population, and the global climate. The EU's ability to adapt its labour laws to these new circumstances will be crucial to its social cohesion, environmental performance, and economic stability and sustainability.

This study promotes a strategic hybrid model of sustainable labour management that combines new demands for digital and green transitions with important ideas from the social investment approach (Hemerijck, 2013; Morel et al., 2012). Such a model must support lifelong learning, inclusive participation, decent working conditions, and adaptability while ensuring social protection across both standard and non-standard employment forms.

Digital transformation is an ongoing process reshaping many industries across Europe, creating new opportunities for growth while simultaneously disrupting traditional employment markets. In order to prevent labour market segmentation and strengthen worker protections, the rise of automation, artificial intelligence, and platform-based work necessitates comprehensive policy responses (Standing, 2011; Bürgisser, 2023). Watanabe (2025) illuminates how inflation expectations and bank





credit dynamics affect industrial investment—suggesting complementarities with policies aimed at labour flexibility and upskilling. These needs can be addressed by the EU's Digital Education Action Plan and European Skills Agenda, but they will only be successful if lifelong learning and reskilling are consistently funded, as recommended by the social investment paradigm (Morel et al., 2012). In order to guarantee that social protection and rights are extended to new forms of employment, the growth of gig and platform work also necessitates strong regulatory mechanisms, such as the proposed Platform Work Directive (European Parliament, 2019; IIBS, 2024).

The European Green Deal, which embodies the green transition, emphasises the necessity of integrated labour strategies. Significant changes in the makeup of the workforce and industrial structure will be necessary to achieve climate neutrality by 2050. This calls for equitable green job creation, targeted regional support via programs like the Just Transition Fund, and proactive retraining policies (Hanna et al., 2024; Fallah Shayan et al., 2022). Following the proposal by Heimberger & Lichtenberger (2024) for an EU investment vehicle to bypass restrictive fiscal rules, we model how regulatory reforms in labour markets can leverage such funds to promote just industrial development. Thus, sustainable labour management supports eco-social governance by coordinating social justice, environmental sustainability, and economic growth (Kreinin and Aigner, 2022). Additional structural challenges are brought about by demographic change, especially the ageing of the population. To maintain labour supply and productivity, active ageing strategies, workplace adaptation, and intergenerational integration will be crucial (Edge et al., 2017; Cylus and Al Tayara, 2021). The need for inclusive and territorially responsive strategies is further supported by Eurostat data (2023b), which already shows significant regional differences in labour market participation.

The EU must address enduring labour market disparities, such as gender inequality, precarious employment, and wage gaps, while navigating these transitions. Further upward convergence of labour standards will be required to ensure cohesion, even though policy tools like the Work-Life Balance Directive and anti-discrimination measures already exist (European Commission, 2022; Iwasaki and Satogami, 2023).

To ensure that social policy keeps up with structural economic changes, Bonoli and Palier (1998) emphasise the significance of institutional recalibration. Social





investment runs the risk of fragmenting or regressing in the absence of strong recalibration mechanisms.

Achieving this vision will require a flexible but coordinated approach. At the EU level, the principle of subsidiarity remains essential, allowing for national discretion while promoting convergence through best practices and shared objectives (Maciejewski, 2025; Mulder, 2019). The European Semester offers a valuable coordination mechanism, but its effectiveness will depend on enhanced capacity for implementation and stronger institutional cooperation (Moş, Maciejewski and Bux, 2024).

In this context, sustainable labour management emerges as a hybrid governance framework, responding to the limitations of existing paradigms while integrating economic, social, and environmental goals. It signals a shift toward a more anticipatory and systemic model of labour policy—one that reflects the EU's commitment to inclusive prosperity and long-term resilience.

9 CONCLUSION

A new, inclusive, and resilient model of labour governance is needed to navigate the EU's many transitions, including social inequality, demographic changes, digitalisation, and climate change. However, new paradigms like digitalisation, the green transition, demographic issues, and social inclusion necessitate that the EU implement policies that promote social inclusion, economic stability, and environmental responsibility. The EU can create the ideal labour market for all of its citizens by addressing the century's challenges with lifelong learning, green jobs, demographic shifts, and equitable and sustainable labour market growth. The results of these initiatives will be crucial to ensuring the Union's long-term prosperity.

According to this analysis, a hybrid governance model that synchronises social policy with ecological and technological advancements is what sustainable labour management is. By integrating labour regulation into larger sustainability frameworks, it strategically expands and integrates existing paradigms—particularly social investment and flexicurity—instead of replacing them. As noted, integrating growth, inclusion, and sustainability objectives into a single policy framework is a challenge for the next generation of EU labour policy (Cantillon and Van Lancker, 2013; Clegg,





2007). This change is a reflection of the EU's changing labour governance strategy in the face of complex, long-term issues.

REFERENCES

ANDO, S., BALAKRISHNAN, R., GRUSS, B., et al. (2022). *European labor markets and the COVID-19 pandemic: Fallout and the path ahead* (Departmental Paper No. 004). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400200960.087>

ANTUNES, F., PEREIRA, L. F., DIAS, Á. L., et al. (2023). Flexible labour policies as competitive advantage. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 24, 563–590. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-023-00352-1>.

BÁRD, P. (2021). In courts we trust, or should we? Judicial independence as the precondition for the effectiveness of EU law. *European Law Journal*, 27(1–3), 185–210. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/eulj.12425>

BENACH, J., VIVES, A., AMABLE, M., et al. (2014). Precarious employment: Understanding an emerging social determinant of health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 35, 229–253. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-032013-182500>

BONOLI, G., & PALIER, B. (1998). Changing the politics of social programmes: Innovative change in British and French welfare reforms. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 8(4). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/095892879800800403>

BONDE, J. P. (2008). Psychosocial factors at work and risk of depression: A systematic review of the epidemiological evidence. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 65(7), 438–445. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.2007.038430>

BUBAK, O. (2018). Flexicurity and the dynamics of the welfare state adjustments. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, 24(4), 387–404. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1024258918781732>

BHATTACHARYA, S., SACHDEV, B. K., RODRIGUES, J. N., & CABETE, D. C. R. N. (2025). Green technologies and policies for forest conservation in South and Southeast Asia. *Actualidad Jurídica Ambiental*, 15, sección “Artículos doctrinale”. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.56398/ajacieda.00409>.

BÜRGISSE, R. (2023). *Policy responses to technological change in the workplace* (JRC Working Papers Series on Social Classes in the Digital Age, 2023/04). European Commission. Retrieved from: <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC130830>

BUX, U., & MACIEJEWSKI, M. (2025). *Competences of the Court of Justice of the European Union*. European Parliament. Retrieved from:





<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/12/competences-of-the-court-of-justice-of-the-european-union>

CANTILLON, B. (2011). The paradox of the social investment state: Growth, employment and poverty in the Lisbon era. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 21(5), 432–449. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928711418856>

CANTILLON, B., & VAN LANCKER, W. (2013). Three shortcomings of the social investment perspective. *Social Policy and Society*, 12(4), 553–564. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746413000080>.

CLEGG, D. (2007). Continental drift: On unemployment policy change in Bismarckian welfare states. *Social Policy & Administration*, 41(6), 597–617. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2007.00574.x>

CHELLAM, N., & DIVYA, D. (2022). The effect of promoting mental health through employee assistance program. *Journal of Education Society & Multiculturalism*, 3(2). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.2478/jesm-2022-0017>.

CYLUS, J., & AL TAYARA, L. (2021). Health, an ageing labour force, and the economy: Does health moderate the relationship between population age-structure and economic growth? *Social Science & Medicine*, 287, Article 114353. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114353>

DUNDAR ARAVACIK, E. (2019). Social policy and the welfare state. In B. Açıkgöz (Ed.), *Public economics and finance*. IntechOpen. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.82372>.

DUNDON, T., DOBBINS, T., CULLINANE, N., et al. (2014). Employer occupation of regulatory space of the Employee Information and Consultation (I&C) Directive in liberal market economies. *Work, Employment and Society*, 28(1), 21–39. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017012466688>

EDGE, C. E., COOPER, A. M., & COFFEY, M. (2017). Barriers and facilitators to extended working lives in Europe: A gender focus. *Public Health Reviews*, 38(2). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-017-0053-8>

EUROFOUND, & EU-OSHA. (2020). *Psychosocial risks in Europe: Prevalence and strategies for prevention*. Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from: <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/en/publications/2014/psychosocial-risks-europe-prevalence-and-strategies-prevention>.

EUROFOUND. (2020). *Living, working and COVID-19 (COVID-19 series)*. Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from: <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/system/files/2020-10/ef20059en.pdf>.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION. (2022). *New rights to improve work-life balance in the EU enter into application today* (Press release). Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_22_4785





EUROPEAN COMMISSION. (2023). *Labour market and wage developments in Europe 2023*. Retrieved from: <https://op.europa.eu/webpub/empl/lmwd-annual-review-report-2023/chapter1/general-labour-market-in-eu.html> . Accessed on: 25 January. 2026.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION. (2023). *Labour market and wage developments in Europe 2023*. Retrieved from: <https://op.europa.eu/webpub/empl/lmwd-annual-review-report-2023/chapter1/general-labour-market-in-eu.html>.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION. (n.d.). *Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion: The European Pillar of Social Rights Action Plan*. Retrieved from: <https://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1607&langId=en>

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT. (2019). *Gig economy: How the EU improves platform workers' rights*. Retrieved from: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/en/article/20190404STO35070/gig-economy-how-the-eu-improves-platform-workers-rights>

EUROSTAT. (2023a). *Labour market statistics at regional level*. Retrieved from: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Labour market statistics at regional level](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Labour_market_statistics_at_regional_level).

EUROSTAT. (2023a). *Labour market statistics at regional level*. Retrieved from: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Labour market statistics at regional level](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Labour_market_statistics_at_regional_level).

EUROSTAT. (2023b). *Labour market slack – Employment supply and demand mismatch*. Retrieved from: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Labour market slack - employment supply and demand mismatch](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Labour_market_slack_-_employment_supply_and_demand_mismatch)

FALLAH SHAYAN, N., MOHABBATI-KALEJAH, N., ALAVI, S., et al. (2022). Sustainable development goals (SDGs) as a framework for corporate social responsibility (CSR). *Sustainability*, 14(3), Article 1222. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031222>.

FERRERA, M. (2005). *The boundaries of welfare: European integration and the new spatial politics of social protection*. Oxford University Press.

FORSTER-VAN AERSEN, K., & SPITAL, T. (2023). *The impact of Brexit on UK trade and labour markets*. European Central Bank. Retrieved from: https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/economic-bulletin/articles/2023/html/ecb.ebart202303_01~3af23c5f5a.en.html

FÜRSTENAU, B., PILZ, M., & GONON, P. (2022). The dual system of vocational education and training in Germany – What can be learnt about education for (other) professions. In S. Billett et al. (Eds.), *International handbook of research in professional and practice-based learning*. Springer. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8902-8_16





GHOSHEH, N. (2016). **Remembering rest periods in law: Another tool to limit excessive working hours** (Conditions of Work and Employment Series No. 78). International Labour Office. Retrieved from: <https://www.ilo.org/publications/remembering-rest-periods-law-another-tool-limit-excessive-working-hours>

HANNA, R., HEPTONSTALL, P., & GROSS, R. (2024). Job creation in a low carbon transition to renewables and energy efficiency: A review of international evidence. **Sustainability Science**, 19, 125–150. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-023-01440-y>

HEIMBERGER, P., & LICHTENBERGER, A. (2024). A permanent EU investment fund to promote the green transition in light of EU fiscal rules. **European Journal of Economics and Economic Policies: Intervention**. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.4337/ejeep.2024.0134>

HEIN, E., & LAVOIE, M. (2025). “Central banks, whether they like it or not, affect the distribution of income”: Interview with Sheila Dow. **European Journal of Economics and Economic Policies: Intervention**, 22(1), 1–8. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.4337/ejeep.2025.0145>

HEIN, E., & LAVOIE, M. (2024). “Profit margins are determined by the need for companies to generate enough internal finance to pay for their investment”: Interview with Adrian Wood. **European Journal of Economics and Economic Policies: Intervention**, 21(3), 363–369. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.4337/ejeep.2024.0128>

HEMERIJCK, A. (2013). **Changing welfare states**. Oxford University Press.

HOWARD, E. (2018). EU anti-discrimination law: Has the CJEU stopped moving forward? **International Journal of Discrimination and the Law**, 18(2–3), 60–81. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1358229118788454>

HUĐEK, I., & ŠIREC, K. (2023). Unveiling the impact of the gig economy on sustainable development. In V. Bevanda (Ed.), **ERAZ Conference – Knowledge Based Sustainable Development: Selected papers** (Vol. 9, pp. 125–133). Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.31410/ERAZ.S.P.2023.125>

IIBS. (2024). **The gig economy's impact on traditional employment**. Retrieved from: <https://www.iibs.edu.in/news/the-gig-economys-impact-on-traditional-employment-1249>

IWASAKI, I., & SATOGAMI, M. (2023). Gender wage gap in European emerging markets: A meta-analytic perspective. **Journal of Labour Market Research**, 57(9). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12651-023-00333-y>

JENSEN, S. (2011). The flexibility of flexicurity: The Danish model reconsidered. **Economic & Industrial Democracy**, 32(4), 721–737. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X11401928>





KAHANEC, M., & PYTLIKOVÁ, M. (2017). The economic impact of east–west migration on the European Union. *Empirica*, 44, 407–434. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10663-017-9370-x>

KREININ, H., & AIGNER, E. (2022). From “decent work and economic growth” to “sustainable work and economic degrowth”: A new framework for SDG 8. *Empirica*, 49, 281–311. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10663-021-09526-5>

KULLMANN, M. (2024). The “temporariness” of temporary agency work assignments. *European Labour Law Journal*, 15(1), 4–16. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/20319525241227854>

LANE, L., & JORDANSSON, B. (2020). How gender equal is Sweden? An analysis of the shift in focus under neoliberalism. *Social Change*, 50(1), 28–43. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049085719901067>

MACIEJEWSKI, M. (2025). *The principle of subsidiarity*. European Parliament. Retrieved from: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/7/the-principle-of-subsidiarity>

Madsen, P. K. (2006). How can it possibly fly? The paradox of a dynamic labour market in a Scandinavian welfare state. In J. L. Campbell et al. (Eds.), *National identity and the varieties of capitalism: The Danish experience* (pp. 321–355). McGill-Queen’s University Press.

MATEI, M.-C., ABRUDAN, L.-C., & ABRUDAN, M.-M. (2024). Financial perspectives on human capital: Building sustainable HR strategies. *Sustainability*, 16, Article 1441. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16041441>

MOREL, N., Palier, B., & Palme, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Towards a social investment welfare state? Ideas, policies and challenges*. Policy Press.

Moş, A.-G., MACIEJEWSKI, M., & BUX, U. (2024). *Intellectual, industrial and commercial property*. European Parliament. Retrieved from: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/36/wlasnosc-intelektualna-przemyslowa-i-handlowa>

MOSHOOD, T. D., NAWANIR, G., MAHMUD, F., et al. (2021). Green and low carbon matters: A systematic review of the past, today, and future on sustainability supply chain management practices among manufacturing industry. *Cleaner Engineering and Technology*, 4, Article 100144. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clet.2021.100144>

MULDER, J. (2019). (Re)conceptualising a social market economy for the EU internal market. *Utrecht Law Review*, 15(2), 16–31. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.18352/ulr.508>

NIEDHAMMER, I., BERTRAIS, S., & WITT, K. (2021). Psychosocial work exposures and health outcomes: A meta-review of 72 literature reviews with meta-analysis.





Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health, 47(7). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3968>

RENNUY, N. (2020). Posting of workers: Enforcement, compliance, and reform. *European Journal of Social Security*, 22(2), 212–234. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1388262720931658>

RODRIGUES, J. N., & CABETE, D. (2024). The Council of Europe, the motor of the European Union's legislative development in matter of promotion of human rights. *Janus.net, e-journal of international relations*, 15(1), 133–154. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.26619/1647-7251.15.1.8>

RODRIGUES, J. N., BHATTACHARYA, S., & CABETE, D. C. R. (2022). The new work culture of the gig economy: An analysis of how the gig economy is altering employment prospects and extending talent pools. *Janus.net, e-journal of international relations*, 13(2), 87–395. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.26619/1647-7251.13.2>

RODRIGUES, J. N., BHATTACHARYA, S., & CABETE, D. (2025). Impact of financial terrorism in global economic, counter feeding currency and other digital cyber crimes. *Relações Internacionais no Mundo Atual*, 1(47), 15–38. Retrieved from: <https://revista.unicuritiba.edu.br/index.php/RIMA/index>

RODRIGUES, J. N., SILVA, F., MEDEIROS, N., et al. (2024). Employment support policies: The case of the Azores, Portugal. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *Fourth international handbook of globalisation, education and policy research* (pp. 323–345). Springer. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-67667-3_17

RODRIGUES, J. N., CABETE, D. C. R., & VISSING, Y. (2025). Global injustice: The universal basic income. *Veredas do Direito*, 22(6), e223631. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v22.n6.3631>.

RODRIGUES, J. N., MEDINA, J. C., & CABETE, D. C. R. (2024). Artificial intelligence in the face of the normative silence of international law: A look at the European Union and MERCOSUR. *Brazilian Journal of International Law*, 21(3), 305–318. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.5102/rdi.v21i3.9361>

RODRIGUES, J. N., BHATTACHARYA, S., & CABETE, D. (2024). The economics of location and space: Urbanisation in South Asia. *Veredas do Direito*, 21. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v21.2638>

STANDING, G. (2011). *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. Bloomsbury Academic.

STANSFELD, S. A., & CANDY, B. (2006). Psychosocial work environment and mental health: A meta-analytic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 32(6), 443–462. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.1050>

VAN DEN BRINK, T. (2017). The impact of EU legislation on national legal systems: Towards a new approach to EU–member state relations. *Cambridge Yearbook of*





European Legal Studies, 19, 211–235. Retrieved from:
<https://doi.org/10.1017/cel.2017.2>

WALTERS, D., & WADSWORTH, E. (2022). Work arrangements, welfare and preventing ill-health at work: A comparative analysis of policy in EU countries. *European Journal of Social Security*, 24(4), 357–373. Retrieved from:
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13882627221121640>

WATANABE, T. (2025). Bank credit, expected inflation rate, and financial dynamics. *European Journal of Economics and Economic Policies: Intervention*, 22(1), 9–31. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.4337/ejeep.2024.0130>

WOODWARD, A. E. (2008). Too late for gender mainstreaming? Taking stock in Brussels. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 18(3), 289–302. Retrieved from:
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928708091056>

