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ABSTRACT

In this literary review, the concept of work intensification has been discussed. Work intensification has been defined in several different ways in the past. This review provides clarity about the definition of work intensification. High-Involvement Work Systems were found to be a cause of work intensification. These findings are in line with the Ability Motivation Opportunity (AMO) theory. Based on the existing literature, the aimed effect of work intensification on performance is portrayed. Literature is inconsistent when it comes to the effect of work intensification on performance, whereas some researchers found health issues to negatively influence the effect. Job security is an influential factor for the effect of work intensification on performance. Job security stimulates employees to work harder, accepting a higher level of work intensification through the employer-employee exchange relationship. Aligned with the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, job security is a resource which acts as a buffer to the negative effects of demands such as work intensification. Consequently, job security has a positive effect on performance. Overall, employees accepting work intensification is often a way of them reciprocating organizational inducements. Literature was gathered through several different databases based on multiple criteria. At last, implications and recommendations for future research are presented.
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INTRODUCTION

In the current economy, organizations are continuously evolving due to factors such as technological advancements, globalized markets, increased pace of life, and accelerated social change (Cascio, 1995; Rosa, 2013; Kubicek, Korunka, Paškvan, Prem, & Gerdenitsch, 2014). Therefore, organizations strive towards a greater level of efficiency to keep up with these changes (Gintis & Ishikawa, 1987), thus creating a competitive advantage (Kubicek & Tement, 2016; Burchell, 1999). As a consequence of these demands, the workforce is influenced to make sure employees are able to keep up with these changes, meaning working conditions change accordingly (Kubicek, Korunka, Paškvan, Prem, & Gerdenitsch, 2014). A greater amount of work effort is expected from the employee, thus they are expected to work harder, better and faster in order to keep up with these changes (Gintis & Ishikawa, 1987). In other words, employees are faced with higher levels of work intensification (Kubicek, Korunka, Paškvan, Prem, & Gerdenitsch, 2014).

Work intensification aims to increase both employee productivity and economic profitability (Green, 2004A; Valeyre, 2004). The feeling of work intensification is experienced by the employee whenever they feel pressure from the organization to complete an increasing amount of tasks within their working day (Kubicek, Korunka, Paškvan, Prem, & Gerdenitsch, 2014). Thus, the aimed improvement in organizational benefits is supposedly accomplished through greater discretionary effort from their employees (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000). Additionally, work intensification is often associated with the increasing speed of work, the reducing of idle time, or the performance of several tasks simultaneously (Green, 2004A; Paškvan, Kubicek, Prem, & Korunka, 2016). Moreover, increasing work hours might result in higher levels of work intensification (Green, 2001; Green, 2004B).

Since the expectations of employee performance have risen, the level of work intensification has increased over the last few decades (Green, 2004A; Valeyre, 2004). Thus, it appears that organizations have faith in the positive outcomes of work intensification. However, even though organizations implement work intensification and researches have been dedicated to this subject (Paškvan, Kubicek, Prem, & Korunka, 2016), the definition of work intensification remains unclear. Especially phenomena on the work floor, such as work demands and workload, tend to get mistaken for work intensification. Therefore, it is important to note the difference between these phenomena, in order to truly understand the concept of work intensification. Thus, the main difference, based on the existing literature, will be discussed in greater detail. Furthermore, work intensification remains a phenomena
surrounded by many unanswered questions and contradicting information, thus gaining more knowledge about work intensification and its effect on performance can be detrimental for the practices within an organization. Therefore, several relationships surrounding this question will be discussed in order to clarify this topic. Thus, this research attempts to create a clear picture of the existing literature surrounding work intensification.

Based on the above-mentioned, the following research questions are formulated:

1. How is work intensification conceptualized?
2. What are the causes of work intensification?
3. What is the influence of work intensification on performance, and what are the underlying conditions influencing this relationship?

Thoroughly discussing the causes and consequences of work intensification could be beneficial from a scientific and a societal point of view. First of all, the theoretical contribution of this study can be found in the fact that work intensification is a relatively unknown phenomenon. Even though researchers such as Paškvan, Kubicek, Prem, and Korunka (2016) have focused on work intensification, there is hardly any literature surrounding this subject. Thus, many questions about work intensification are still unanswered. This literary review provides an overview of the definition of work intensification implemented in the existing literature. Secondly, the origin of work intensification remains unclear, just as its effects on different aspects of the organization and the employees. This lack of clarity exists because many contradicting results are presented. On the one hand, Green (2004A) stated that employee productivity and economic profitability would rise through work intensification. On the other hand, Wood, Van Veldhoven, Croon, and De Menezes (2012) stated that work intensification results in negative outcomes due to employees’ experience of high work demands and pressure. This study could possibly clarify the effect of work intensification, particularly on performance, by comparing several scientific sources. Finally, research appears to be lacking when it comes to the conditions of work intensification. Therefore, this study provides an overview of conditions influencing the effects of work intensification. Therefore, the role of High-Involvement Work Systems (HIWS) and job security will be clarified. HIWSs might increase the level of work intensification, since HIWSs illustrate the process of employee outcomes and business performances (Godard, 2004). Moreover, according to Beham, Präg, and Drobnič (2008), job security can be used as an indication of the working conditions of an employee. These factors have not been combined with work intensification in previous literary reviews. Therefore, this
study could provide insights supporting these relationships. Based on the definitions, consequences and conditions highlighted in this review, further research will be able to investigate work intensification from a different point of view.

As for the practical relevance of this study, all kinds of organizations will be able to benefit from the overview provided. Firstly, since work intensification is often utilised within organizations in order to improve the performance level (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000), knowing whether this approach is beneficial for the profit of the organization could change the entire perspective of the organization towards the employee. Balancing the needs of the employee with the needs of the organization might be beneficial for the performance level of the organization as a unit. Therefore, organizations can change their strategy based on this perspective. Secondly, managers could use this information to their advantage when it comes to reaching higher profits. The overview provided in this research helps them indicate the effectiveness of work intensification for the employee. Since work intensification has become more common over the last couple of decades (Green, 2004A; Valeyre, 2004), these managers will be made more aware of the up- and downsides of work intensification. Thus, they are better able to respond to this trend and adjust their leadership strategy.

Thus, this literary review contributes in fivefold. Firstly, this review provides an overview to clarify the definition of work intensification. Secondly, this study compares results of the effect of work intensification on performance. Thirdly, this study combines High-Involvement Work Systems and job security with work intensification, factors which have not been combined in previous literary reviews. Fourthly, organisations will be able to adapt their strategy to an effective level of performance. Finally, managers can utilise the overview provided to change their leadership style and respond to the trend of work intensification. The next paragraph presents the process of data collection for this review, including a list of articles chosen to help create insights into work intensity and the research question overall.

**METHOD**

Relevant literature has been gathered through computer searches within several databases. The databases utilised are WorldCat Discovery, Web of Science, JSTOR, and Google Scholar. These first three databases mentioned were utilised because they contain a broad range of articles geared specifically towards the social and behavioural sciences. Most
of their articles are present in the Tilburg University Online Library. Furthermore, Google Scholar has been utilised in case the articles mentioned in the different data bases were unavailable there, since this data base contains a broader range of scientific literature through several different sources. Furthermore, the Web of Science database indicates the impact factor of the journals publishing the articles. A journal impact factor represents the annual citation rate of papers within scientific literature (Seglen, 1997). Therefore, they are utilised as a quality ranking for scientific journals.

In order to collect relevant information for this review, several articles about work intensification have been studied. The most striking relationships mentioned in these articles have been studied in depth. This resulted in the use of several different key words, which can be found in Table 1. Moreover, these keywords have been linked to each other by using the search comments “AND” and “OR”. This way, the keywords were combined to make several different matches, which in turn resulted in a narrowed selection of useful articles. Additionally, the ‘snowballing’ effect has been used, meaning interesting articles cited by the original article were used as well (Jalali & Wohlin, 2012). The two articles collected through snowballing effect are the articles of Mariappanadar (2014) and Green (2014B). An important criteria for the articles utilised through snowballing was that they should be cited in several of the original articles, as well as containing plenty of insightful information regarding work intensification which has not been presented in the original articles. Mostly, these articles were included due to their thorough explanation of the concepts.

Table 1. Keywords.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work intensification</th>
<th>Adaptive performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Involvement Work Systems</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-role performance</td>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To make sure the results of these searches were of enough quality for this study, several selection criteria have been applied. First of all, these articles should be included in a scientific journal with an impact factor above 1. This number has been chosen to make sure the articles utilised had some influence within their field, through being cited by others. Based on the scientific journal ranking of Scimago (2017), an impact factor above 1 includes the top 15% of scientific journals numbers published. Secondly, the articles included had to be reviewed by a peer. A peer review indicates that a college or research committee, specialised
in a specific research field, has judged the scientific merit of the study (Wennerás & Wold, 2001). Thirdly, the articles had to be published in either Dutch or English. In practice, all articles used turned out to be written in English. Finally, the articles had to be published in the last five years, meaning in the years of 2012 up until 2017. Based on the search results from the different databases, it became apparent that most scientific literature revolving around work intensification has been published in these last five years. Thus, it can be concluded that the most recent insights and the most in-depth information about this subject can be gathered within this timeframe. However, an exception are the articles based on the concept of work intensification. Due to the high amount of literature published in the last 5 years, the choice has been made to just include literature published in 2016 and 2017. The same counts for the articles about job security and adaptive performance, which due to the high amount of literature published only include literature published in the year 2017. The opposite goes for the relationship between work intensification and High-Involvement Work Systems. Due to the small amount of articles published about this effect a time frame has not been applied, meaning the oldest article from this section was published in 2007. The number of results, after all criteria have been applied in sequence, can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Literature search results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No filter</th>
<th>Last 5 years</th>
<th>Peer Review</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Work intensification”</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 and 2017: 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“High-Involvement Work Systems” AND “work intensification”</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All years: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In-role performance”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Adaptive performance”</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017: 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Work intensification” AND performance</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Work intensification” AND “job security”</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Job security” AND performance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Job security”</td>
<td>2332</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017: 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After selecting these criteria, the results of the searches were examined. Therefore, the abstracts of the articles were studied. If the abstract indicated the study of one or several of the keywords, the article was read in its entirety. Based on these steps, 21 articles were selected. Two articles are included twice in Table 2, which are the articles of Paškvan, Kubicek, Prem, and Korunka (2016) and of Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, and Meyer (2013), due to their relevance for two different topics. Most of these articles used secondary data-analysis, both quantitative and qualitative, with the exception of one meta-analysis and three literature reviews. These articles are portrayed in Table 5 (Appendix 1).

RESULTS

When discussing the effects of work intensification and its causes and conditions, it is important to have some knowledge concerning work intensification in order to put these elements into perspective. In the existing literature, there appears to be a lack of unity when it comes to defining work intensification. Therefore, this review will provide an overview of the several definitions used for work intensification, which will be discussed and clarified into greater detail below. Furthermore, the causes of work intensification will be discussed, with its main focus being the High-Involvement Work System. Thereafter, the aim of work intensification to increase performance will be discussed in greater detail. Since organizations are adopting higher levels of work intensification (Green, 2004A; Valeyre, 2004), knowing the actual effect of work intensification becomes relevant. Finally, the conditions of work intensification will be introduced prior to their relationship with work intensification, with its main target being job security. Thus, the concepts are introduces before discussing the relationships in greater detail, making the transition into the different relationships more apparent.

Work intensification

There appears to be some division and indistinctness in the literature when it comes to work intensification. Several articles hint to work demands and pressure when talking about work intensification, such as the article of Wood, Van Veldhoven, Croon, and De Menezes (2012). In contrast to Wood and colleagues (2012), Koolhaas, Bartolomucci, Buwalda, De Boer, Flügge, Korte, and Fuchs (2011) stated that work intensification has a dynamic character, meaning it has unpredictable conditions and is ever changing. Thus, work intensification is a process, whereas factors such as work demands are invariable. Therefore, work intensification differentiates itself from stable factors such as prolonged work hours,
work intensity or workload (Franke, 2015). In addition, Franke (2015) noted that it is important to realise that work intensification is in fact not the same as work demands, because work intensification portrays the perception of the employee involving the increase in work intensity.

Now that the difference between work intensification and work demands has been established, the definition of work intensification can be clarified. Work intensification has been defined in many different ways by several researchers, such as White, Hill, McGovern, Mills, and Smeaton (2003) who defined work intensification as the level of work effort put in by an employee compared to their experience of high work demands and pressure. Therefore, work intensification occurs whenever employees are feeling “pressed to complete more tasks within one working day” (Kubicek, Korunka, Paškvan, Prem, & Gerdenitsch, 2014, p.26). Employees are expected to work harder, better and faster in order to keep up with these changes (Kubicek & Tement, 2016), thus resulting in work intensification. Furthermore, Green (2004B) mentioned the extent to which jobs require working under a great deal of tension as a part of work intensification. Moreover, Green (2001) added that work intensification can occur through increasing work hours. Additionally, Ogbonnaya, Daniels, Conolly, and Van Veldhoven (2017) defined work intensification as the feeling that work is more demanding and intense. Overall, most authors think of work intensification as an increase in work effort due to rising work demands (White, Hill, McGovern, Mills, & Smeaton, 2003; Ogbonnaya, Daniels, Conolly, & Van Veldhoven, 2017).

Based on these diverse aspects of work intensification, it remains difficult to understand which definition of work intensification is used in different scientific sources. Therefore, Green (2001) added to the existing literature by splitting work intensification in two dimensions. These two different dimensions are the extensive effort dimension and the intensive effort dimension. Increases in work effort are categorised as the intensive effort dimension (Green, 2001). Some employees are forced to take several job tasks amongst themselves, along with a rapid work speed and idle time (Green, 2004A; Paškvan, Kubicek, Prem, & Korunka, 2016). Consequently, employees have to perform more tasks in the same period of time (Kubicek, Korunka, Paškvan, Prem, & Gerdenitsch, 2014) and increase their level of task flexibility (Green, 2004B). Moreover, work intensification has been detected in cases of up-skilling and task discretion (Gallie, White, Cheng, & Tomlinson, 1998). Furthermore, in some cases another indicator of work intensification is the trend of increasing work hours (Green, 2001; Green, 2004B), which is categorised as the extensive effort dimension. Table 3 provides an overview of the definitions of work intensification mentioned
in different sources. These definitions are divided amongst the two dimensions of Green (2001): intensive effort and extensive effort.

Table 3. Definitions of work intensification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensive effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koolhaas, Bartolomucci, Buwalda, De Boer, Flügge, Korte, &amp; Fuchs (2011)</td>
<td>Process with a dynamic character: it has unpredictable conditions and is ever changing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franke (2015)</td>
<td>Unstable, in contrast to stable factors such as prolonged work hours, work intensity or workload. Portrays the perception of the employee involving the increase in work intensity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Hill, McGovern, Mills, &amp; Smeaton (2003)</td>
<td>The level of work effort put in by an employee compared to their experience of high work demands and pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubicek, Korunka, Paškvan, Prem, &amp; Gerdenitsch, (2014)</td>
<td>The pressed feeling of employees to complete more tasks within one working day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubicek &amp; Tement (2016)</td>
<td>Employees working harder, better and faster to keep up with changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (2004B)</td>
<td>The extent to which jobs require working under a great deal of tension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogbonnaya, Daniels, Conolly, &amp; Van Veldhoven (2017)</td>
<td>The feeling of employees that work is more demanding and intense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paškvan, Kubicek, Prem, &amp; Korunka (2016)</td>
<td>Taking on several job tasks, along with a rapid work speed and idle time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extensive effort</strong></td>
<td>Green (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since organizations are adopting higher levels of work intensification (Green, 2004A; Valeyre, 2004), more employees are expected to work harder, better and faster (Kubicek & Tement, 2016). Due to this trend, it is relevant to gain insight into the aims of work intensification. Organizations strive towards efficiency, which requires greater work effort from the employee (Gintis & Ishikawa, 1987). Therefore, Kubicek, Korunka, Paškvan, Prem, and Gerdenitsch (2014) noted that this focus on efficiency results in a higher level of work intensification. In addition, Green (2004B) mentioned rising efficiency as a cause of work intensification. However, other researchers such as Green (2004A) and Valeyre (2004) focused on the fact that work intensification aims to increase both employee productivity and economic profitability. Therefore, work intensification aims to improve organizational benefits through greater discretionary effort from its employees (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000). Moreover, work intensification is utilised as a way of creating a competitive advantage for the organization (Kubicek & Tement, 2016), meaning work intensification is the result of increased competitive pressure passed on to employees (Burchell, 1999). In short, the aims of work intensification are working efficiently, productively, and profitably in order to create a competitive advantage (Kubicek, Korunka, Paškvan, Prem, & Gerdenitsch, 2014; Green, 2004B; Green, 2004A; Valeyre, 2004; Kubicek & Tement, 2016).

The causes of work intensification

As previously stated, work intensification is a serious matter due to its increasing presence within organizations (Green, 2004A; Valeyre, 2004). However, knowing what causes work intensification can help the parties involved with responding to this phenomenon. Therefore, an overview is provided to become acquainted with several different causes of work intensification.

Firstly, according to Kroon, Van de Voorde, and Van Veldhoven (2009), a High-Performance Work System (HPWS) is one of these causes. HPWSs provoke a continuous experience of higher work demands and pressure, leading the employee to experience job strain. Secondly, Kelliher and Anderson (2010) mention the introduction of self-managed working time (SMWT) as a cause of work intensification, stating that employees reciprocate through increasing their work effort when given the chance to work flexibly. Even though recording working hours is supposed to protect workers from exploitation, employees presumably would feel pressured to meet the employers’ expectations through intensifying work effort (Beckmann, Cornelissen, & Kräkel, 2017). Finally, both Green (2004B) and Weitzman and Kruse (1990) suggest contingent pay arrangements as another cause of work intensification.
intensification. For example, a profit-sharing arrangement may result in greater work effort of employees due to the goal of enhanced labour output (Weitzman & Kruse, 1990). However, employees might put too much effort in their work due to them working too hard and too much, resulting in work-related stress or poor well-being (Ogbonnaya, Daniels, & Nielsen, 2017). Therefore, even though individual-based incentives are able to higher the level of motivation from employees, their experience of work intensification can rise accordingly (Green, 2004B). However, one other factor has become prominent as a cause of work intensification: High-Involvement Work Systems (Bailey, Berg, & Sandy, 2001).

High-Involvement Work Systems (HIWSs) are a variation on High-Performance Work Systems, which describes “the main thrust of management’s approach to work organization in respect of a particular work domain” (Boxall & Macky, 2009, p. 8). HIWSs identify the way in which HPWSs are meant to influence employee outcomes and business performance (Godard, 2004). Since work intensification aims to increase both employee productivity and economic profitability (Green, 2004A; Valeyre, 2004) through increased competitive pressure passed on to employees (Burchell, 1999), this aligned best with the description of HIWSs, rather than HPWSs. Furthermore, Edwards and Wright (2001) as well as Macky and Boxall (2008) found that the main target area for HIWSs are Taylorized or low-discretion production systems, which exert a process of centralising decision making and problem solving in the hands of management. For low wage workers, implementing a HIWS means a higher level of personal development, problem solving and use of employee capacities for self-management (Boxall & Macky, 2009). Therefore, one of the practices involved in HIWSs is trusting the employee with greater decision-making autonomy, both on the job and in problem-solving groups (Boxall & Macky, 2007). This is important, since Macky and Boxall (2008) found that a greater level of employee involvement is beneficial for the quality, creativity and flexibility of an organization. Therefore, MacDuffie (1995) notes that HIWSs result in improvements in skill formation, often through training, and a range of incentives which motivate employees to acquire knowledge and skills through taking part in new work practices.

Important to acknowledge is the fact that, according to Boxall and Macky (2007), even though HIWS started off as a system concerning Taylorized production processes, several organizations within other sectors have started to apply this system. Since all sectors are characterised by significant core features, the specific practices used to generate higher employee involvement should be aimed towards these core features. Furthermore, Gollan (2005) complements this statement by adding that the management processes and the leadership of the organization have to support the HIWSs in order to be used successfully.
Thus, knowing the organizational context is crucial when applying the HIWSs (Boxall & Macky, 2007).

After establishing the definition of High-Involvement Work Systems, the question remains in what way HIWSs are tied to work intensification. The AMO theory of Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, and Kalleberg (2000) illustrates this phenomena. The ability, motivation and opportunity (AMO) components combined can create a positive exchange relationship between employer and employee when stimulated through performance enhancing practices (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000; Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, & Meyer, 2013). The employees’ skills are improved through practices such as traineeships, in order to improve their abilities (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000). Furthermore, motivation from the employee can be improved through motivation enhancing practices such as promotions or reward systems, either individual or team based. Finally, employees get the chance to fully utilise their knowledge and skills through opportunities such as communication fora, information sharing and employee involvement measures. As summarised by Boxall and Macky (2009, p.17), “changes in the opportunities (O) created by work redesign lead logically to implications for the ability (A) and motivation (M) dimensions without the need to appeal to eclectic, decontextualized lists of ‘best practice’”. The AMO theory is based on the social-exchange theory from Blau (1964), which states that the employee-employer exchange relationship is formed when organizational inducements lead employees to contribute (Rousseau, 1990; Shore, et al., 2004). The core message of this theory is particularly important, which is that employees reciprocate an offer from their employer through greater work effort (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). The social-exchange theory will be discussed in greater detail later on in this review.

The AMO theory is relevant for HIWSs, since Bauer (2004) noted that practices are introduced through HIWSs to create smarter working. Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, and Kalleberg (2000) studied what happens whenever organizations put the time and effort in introducing practices contributing to the ability, motivation and opportunity of the employee. As a consequence, the employee feels valued due to the investment of the employer. Furthermore, employees tend to feel obliged to reciprocate the effort put in by the employer (Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, & Meyer, 2013). Moreover, Kelliher and Anderson (2010) found that employees intensify their own work due to reciprocity whenever the employer introduces practices which benefit the employee. Overall, the AMO theory illustrates that investing in employees through HIWS means these employees intensify their own work as a response (Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, & Meyer, 2013; Kelliher &
Since HIWSs are supposed to have a positive influence on the workforce, through practices such as providing greater decision-making autonomy for the employees (Boxall & Macky, 2007), the combination with work intensification is striking. Therefore, Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, and Meyer (2013) conducted a research consisting of an employee survey with 196 UK based plant workers, and 58 interviews with employees within the same plant. According to them, the positive high involvement effects for employees can coexist along with the intensification effect, e.g. work pressure, stress and higher workloads. Moreover, Macky and Boxall (2008) produced similar findings, stating that managerial practices aimed towards creating high employee involvement do not automatically act parallel to practices aimed towards intensifying work. Even though they found that High-Involvement Work Practices and work intensification do not act simultaneously at all times, it remains a possibility. However, a difference between the two is that Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, and Meyer (2013) include the finding that it appears employees reciprocate positive influences such as rewards, job autonomy, and skill accumulation through accepting the increased workload.

This coexisting of HIWSs and work intensification can be explained through the AMO theory, since the ability, motivation and opportunity (AMO) components combined can create a positive exchange relationship between employer and employee when stimulated through performance enhancing practices (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000). These performance enhancing practices are provided through HIWS, thus leading to the exchange of work effort from the employee (Godard, 2004). Furthermore, the additional expectations through HIWSs towards the employee, such as training and new work practices, can increase the experienced level of work intensification (MacDuffie, 1995). Therefore, work intensification through HIWSs can be accepted by the employee, if the organization keeps the components of the AMO theory in mind (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000). However, in an ideal situation, HIWS would lead to higher levels of employee involvement while keeping the intensification level to a minimum (Boxall & Macky, 2009). This is in line with the findings of Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, and Kalleberg (2000), who stated that greater employee involvement does not match with intensification or speed-up. However, based on findings of Delbridge (2007), several cases have been noted in which involvement was used as an excuse to increase demands without increasing the level of empowerment for the
employees. Therefore, Boxall and Macky (2009) acknowledge a change in the balance of involvement and intensification in their literary review, leaving a Traditional Taylorist approach with fake attempts at involvement and a high level of work intensification. Their analysis shows that positive high involvement effects for employees can act alongside intensification effects simultaneously. Linking this to the current relationship, focussing on involvement amongst employees can be beneficial unless it is taken too far, resulting in higher levels of work intensification and its negative outcomes accordingly.

To summarize this paragraph, the literature seems to be likeminded when it comes to the effect of High-Involvement Work Systems. Many researches, such as Boxall and Macky (2008; 2009), state that HIWSs do in fact cause work intensification. This is in line with the AMO theory from Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg (2000). If the employee gets the chance to implement new practices (Opportunity), possibly through HIWSs, the employee will be more motivated due to the trust the organization puts into them (Motivation) and thus is able to increase their knowledge and skills (Ability). Thus, the AMO theory hints to the reciprocity in effort of the employee whenever employers introduce practices such as HIWSs. However, according to Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, and Meyer (2013), both positive and negative results of High-Involvement Work Systems can coexist alongside each other. Thus, HIWS can lead to higher levels of job satisfaction (Macky & Boxall, 2008) whilst simultaneously leading to higher levels of work intensification (Boxall & Macky, 2008).

**The consequences of work intensification**

As previously mentioned, higher organizational performance has been stated as one of the main aims of work intensification (Ramsay, Scholarios, & Harley, 2000). In fact, Wood and De Menezes (2011) found that work intensification leads to a higher level of performance. Therefore, several studies have investigated this specific relationship. In order to clarify the exact effect of work intensification within an organization, it should be noted that performance is divided in a variety of measurable sorts. Therefore, it is important to provide an overview of these different sorts, thus clarifying the interpretation of work intensification when it comes to performance.

According to Roe (1999), performance involves activities completed in order to reach a certain goal. Therefore, performance involves the utilization of cognitive, physical, and energetic resources. Mastenbroek, Jaarsma, Scherpber, Van Beukelen, and Demerouti (2014) stated that performance can be utilised as an outcome measure. Moreover, Benoliel and
Somech (2014) added that performance is an important indicator for the functioning of the organization, since the level of performance affects the competitiveness of the organization. Due to changes involving the organization, such as globalization, increased competition and new technologies, the expected performance level increases (Landsbergis, 2003).

Benoliel and Somech (2014) continued by categorizing performance in two sections: in-role performance and extra-role performance. On the one hand, in-role performance is involved with the literal description of the job based on findings of Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994), meaning it covers the behaviour and objectives which are in line with the goals of the organization. Van Dyne, Cummings and McLean Parks (1995) add that these behaviours are required or expected as part of the responsibilities and duties of the assigned role. Therefore, in-role performance is based on the employees’ abilities and experience (Bakker, Demerouti, De Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003). Consequently, higher levels of in-role performance for employees means they reflect upon a situation, search for information and feedback, analyse other options and specify an effective practice (Schön, 1983; Mastenbroek, Jaarsma, Scherpbi, Van Beukelen, & Demerouti, 2014), thus making better analytical decisions (Gordon, Demerouti, Bipp, & LeBlanc, 2011). In-role performance is most often used by organizations as the indicator for the functioning of the organization (Benoliel & Somech, 2014).

On the other hand, extra-role performance is involved with the actions of the employee which are not involved in the literal description of the job, therefore it covers altruistic behaviour of an employee (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Morrison (1994) added that extra-role performance is most commonly displayed whenever an employee wants to help his or her colleagues or the organization as a whole. Therefore, extra-role performance is greatly depended on the motivation level of the employee (Bakker, Demerouti, De Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003). Finally, Mastenbroek, Jaarsma, Scherpbi, Van Beukelen, and Demerouti (2014) mentioned the fact that extra-role performance is becoming more important due to the increase in teamwork within larger groups. Employees often believe extra-role performance to be a better indicator for the organizational functioning, since it takes worker psychological strain into account (Wright, 2003).

Other definitions of performance, focussing on different aspects of the concept, have been given by authors such as Renn and Fedor (2001) who focussed on task performance specifically. According to them, task performance represents the quality of work regarding the job responsibilities of the employee. Therefore, task performance covers elements of the job such as the number of errors made or carelessness of the employee (Vergauwe, Wille,
Hofmans, & De Fruyt, 2017). Thus, task performance covers the quality standards of the duties performed. Another definition of performance comes from Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996), whom mentioned contextual performance. Contextual performance represents the interpersonal facilitation dimension. Thus, contextual performance covers cooperative acts which further the performance of fellow employees without them being obliged to do so (Vergauwe, Wille, Hofmans, & De Fruyt, 2017). Moreover, employees with a higher level of contextual performance can make other employees feel good about themselves or the work group.

Finally, Joung, Hesketh, and Neal (2006) defined adaptive performance as the ability of the employee to adapt to dynamic work situations. Thus, adaptive performance occurs whenever employees are confronted with changes within the organization (Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, and Plamondon (2000) categorised adaptive behaviour in eight different sections, which are: handling emergencies or crisis situations, handling work stress, solving problems creatively, dealing with uncertain and unpredictable work situations, learning work tasks, technologies, and procedures, demonstrating interpersonal adaptability, demonstrating cultural adaptability, and demonstrating physically oriented adaptability (Javed, Bashir, Rawwas, & Arjoon, 2017, p.650). Thus, according to Javed, Bashir, Rawwas, and Arjoon (2017) noted that adaptive performance includes maintaining effective working relationships with peers with different characters. Furthermore, Vergauwe, Wille, Hofmans, and De Fruyt (2017) included taking effective action when necessary without learning all the facts. An overview of the different definitions of performance mentioned can be found in Table 4.

### Table 4: Definitions of performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benoliel &amp; Somech (2014)</td>
<td>- Inrole performance: covers the behaviour and objectives which are in line with the goals of the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renn &amp; Fedor (2001)</td>
<td>Task performance: represents the quality of work regarding the job responsibilities of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As portrayed in Table 4, performance is divided in several different parts. However, work intensification focusses specifically on employee productivity and organizational profitability (Green, 2004A; Valeyre, 2004). Furthermore, since work intensification occurs whenever employees are feeling “pressed to complete more tasks within one working day” (Kubicek, Korunka, Paškvan, Prem, & Gerdenitsch, 2014, p.26), it appears to be focussing on the job demands as stated in the job description. Therefore, work intensification aims to a greater level of performance, which Mastenbroek, Jaarsma, Scherpbier, Van Beukelen, and Demerouti (2014) describe clearly as an outcome measure for the organization. This definition of performance utilised by work intensification resembles in-role behaviour as described by Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994), meaning it covers the behaviour and objectives which are in line with the goals of the organization. Therefore, factors such as extra-role performance and contextual performance are not included in this review.

The challenge-hindrance framework of Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, and Boudreau (2000) illustrates that through the use of work intensification the increased demands for employees are expressed. They distinguish two kinds of demands, which are challenge and hindrance demands. Firstly, challenge demands are stressful but dependent on the motivation level of an employee whether or not the pressure can be overcome (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005; Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000). Secondly, hindrance demands are work-related demands that cannot be overcome. As a results, they harm the motivation and work achievements of employees. According to Podsakoff, LePine, and LePine (2007), hindrance demands decrease work outcomes such as performance, and increase the level of strain. As stated by Paškvan, Kubicek, Prem, and Korunka (2016, p.126), work intensification can be categorised as a hindrance demand, “since it promotes strain and is negatively related to positive work outcomes such as job satisfaction”. Since hindrance demands decrease work outcomes such as performance (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007), this would indicate that the strain promoted through work intensification leads to a lower
performance level (Paškvan, Kubícek, Prem, & Korunka, 2016). However, since performance is the main aim of work intensification (Green, 2004A; Valleyre, 2004), literature hints to the ability of employees to overcome the work pressure (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005). Therefore, some might consider work intensification to be a challenge demand rather than a hindrance demand, since it is possible to perform even under high amounts of pressure. Thus, whether intensification can be categories as a challenge or a hindrance demand depends on the ability of employees to overcome the pressure they are put under (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005; Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000).

Additionally, Paškvan, Kubícek, Prem, and Korunka (2016) analysed these demands in two studies, a mediation analyses of two-wave panel data with 253 Austrian bank employees, and a cross-sectional data-collection with 932 Austrian employees of two information and communication technology companies. They stated that work intensification is categorised as a hindrance demand, due to the strain it causes and its negative influence on work outcomes. However, results of LePine, Podsakoff, and Lepine (2005) state that hindrance demands tend to lead towards a lower level of performance and motivation.

In Ogbonna and Harris’ (2004) study, with data collected from 54 interviews with academics from several different universities, they found that work intensification can be utilised in order to improve both employees’ performance and the entire organizational profit. Therefore, they added, organizations often utilise work intensification as a tool to express the desired performance level to the employee. Furthermore, Ehrnrooth and Björkman (2012) collected data revolving around this statement in their study of 152 subordinate consultants within 62 Swedish or Finnish management and Investor Relations consultant companies. Consequently, they found that, due to HRM practices accompanied by work intensification, employees identify themselves more with their work and compete for their career opportunities and employment in general. Additionally, Macky and Boxall (2008) state that strong indications of desired behaviours result in better identification with the job and a higher level of competition for further employment and career progress. Thus, Ogbonna and Harris (2004), Ehrnrooth and Björkman (2012) and Macky and Boxall (2008) all state that work intensification can help clarify the expectations of the employee, which in turn helps them to raise their performance level.

Next to clarification of expectations, another factor can be acknowledged through which work intensification leads to an increase in performance. According to the literary review of Boxall and Macky (2014), work intensification emerges through HRM, thus questioning whether HRM outcomes are positive for employers and employees both. In line
with this point of view, Ramsay, Scholarios, and Harley (2000) noted that organizational performance is more beneficial for employers. They continued by stating that focusing on performance could even be harmful for the wellbeing of the employee, meaning that work intensification has a negative result on performance. According to Heffernan and Dundon (2016), whom collected data from 187 employees among 3 companies in Ireland, the positive outcomes of HRM and work intensification specifically are not mutually beneficial for the employer and the employee. Thus, they note their findings are in line with the finding of Godard (2010), who states that outcomes of work intensification are uncertain. Therefore, both Heffernan and Dundon (2016) and Godard (2010) question whether work intensification results in higher performance levels. On the contrary, in a largely qualitative study collecting data from 2066 workers from three private sector organizations in the UK, Kelliher and Anderson (2010) found evidence for increased work intensification and conclude that employees reciprocate by exerting additional effort whenever given opportunities, thus increasing their performance level. However, in their annual longitudinal survey of about 22,000 individuals from about 12,000 different households containing data from five different years, Beckmann, Cornelissen, and Krakel (2017) find no sign of reciprocity as a result of work intensification. This would indicate that work intensification does not lead to an increase in performance. Therefore, finding the balance between increasing work intensity and releasing human potential is crucial for performance increase (Boxall & Macky, 2014).

However, some studies have shown that work intensification has several side effects altering its influence on performance. In the literary review of Mariappanadar (2014), the findings of Beckers, Van der Linden, Smulders, Kompiera, Tarisa, and Geurts (2008) are brought to the attention. They state that employees might start performing on a lower level, since their psychological harm is keeping them from rising to the organizations performance expectations. Other researches specify this psychological harm in greater detail. According to Bakker, Demerouti, and Verbeke (2004), some side effects of work intensification are emotional exhaustion and employees’ disengagement, which mediate the negative relationship between work intensification and employee performance. Finally, the high workload linked to work intensification results in problems with decision making and thinking clearly among skilled employees, according to Albertsen, Rugulies, Garde, and Burr (2010).

To sum up these findings, it becomes evident that the literature is not in agreement when it comes to the effect of work intensification on performance. Kelliher and Anderson (2010) found that employees intensify their own work due to reciprocity whenever the
employer introduces practices which benefit the employee. Thus, Green (2001) and Valeyre (2004) state that work intensification leads to increased productivity and economic profitability. Based on the challenge-hindrance framework of LePine, Podsakoff, and LePine (2005), these findings are in line with the perception of work intensification as a challenge demand. This means that when employees feel motivated, possibly through reciprocity, they can be able to accept work intensification as something they can overcome. In contrast, Beckers, Van der Linden, Smulders, Kompiera, Tarisa, and Geurts (2008) state that the negative effects on employees might alter the effect of work intensification on performance for the worse. In this case, based on the challenge-hindrance framework, work intensification can be categorised as a hindrance demand (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005). Therefore, work intensification is a demand which cannot be overcome, leading to lower performance rates.

The role of conditions

Due to the pressure of uncertain economic conditions and increasing global competitions (Lu, Du, Xu, & Zhang, 2016), organizations strive towards a competitive advantage in order to differentiate themselves from the competition (Burchell, 1999). As a consequence, Kubicek and Tement (2016) state that employees are expected to work harder, better and faster in order to keep up with these organizational changes. However, over the course of the last few years having a job with fixed daily working hours has become more rare (Beckmann, Cornelissen, & Kräkel, 2017). In Germany alone, fifty-seven percent of the employees are confronted with some kind of flexible working arrangement. Thus, job security for the employee has become scarce. This is remarkable, since the Society of Human Resource Management (2011) noted that job security was one of the main motivators of employees during the economic recession. Therefore, Beham, Präg, and Drobnic (2008) stated that job security can be used as an indication of the working conditions of an employee in which they perform. Additionally, due to the ever-changing economic conditions, job security might be an important factor when it comes to coping with work intensification and performing.

A definition of job security has been given by Davy, Kinicki and Scheck (1997), Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) and Kraimer, Wayne, Liden, and Sparrowe (2005). They all define job security as the expectations of an employee concerning the longevity and stability of their job within an organization. Furthermore, Darçin (2016) defined job security as the fear from an employee of an uncertain future. Moreover, Macky and Boxall (2008)
looked at job security as the likelihood of becoming redundant or losing a job through changes such as organizational downsizing or restructuring. Additionally, Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) mention that employees differ in their perception of job security when confronted with the same organizational practices. Even though employees perceive job security differently, Beham, Präg, and Drobnič (2008) showed that it is in fact important for an organization to provide job security. They noted that job security can be used as an indication of the working conditions of an employee. Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel, and Lee (2001), as well as Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy (2013) complemented this statement by adding that job security is a representation of working life in general. Thus, it should come as no surprise that several authors, such as Huang, Zhao, Niu, Ashford, and Lee (2013), SHRM (2011) and Wang, Lu, and Siu (2015) noted job security as the most important consideration for a job by employees. This all illustrates the importance of job security as perceived by the employee and the necessity of organizations to provide this, since a higher level of job security provides a more stable future for the employee (Darčin, 2016). Moreover, having organisations provide job security can lead to more employee trust and effort, according to Liu, Guthrie, Flood, and MacCurtain (2009).

In practice, Fu, Kleinberg, Lavi, and Smorodinsky (2017) note that high levels of job security often mean that employees have contracts for an indefinite amount of time. Due to these indefinite contracts, the employer is faced with more difficulty and higher costs whenever they attempt to terminate an employment contract. Furthermore, they note that indefinite contracts are the standard in most European countries, however this is not necessarily the case outside of Europe. Some countries try to regulate the level of job security in their country through laws. Thus, Emmenegger and Marx (2011) note that the 1951 Dismissal Protection Act from Germany is still prevalent, in which the right of the employee to keep their job is acknowledged. Moreover, the Act regulates the length of fixed term contracts, meaning these can only be utilised for a period of up to 18 months. However, Fu, Kleinberg, Lavi and Smorodinsky (2017) continued by portraying the two sides of job security. On the one hand, job security means that fewer employees are being fired. On the other hand, employers will put more thought into their hiring process, meaning they can become reluctant in employing new employees. Thus, many parties believe in the importance of job security, yet there are downsides acting simultaneously (Fu, Kleinberg, Lavi, & Smorodinsky, 2017; Emmenegger & Marx, 2011).

The relationship between work intensification and performance, as discussed above, is depending on the functioning of several conditions. One of these is the level of job security
present. The influence of job security can be illustrated through the use of the social-exchange theory from Blau (1964). This theory states that the employee-employer exchange relationship is formed when organizational inducements lead employees to contribute, as mentioned by Rousseau (1990) and Shore, et al. (2004). Both Blau (1964) and Gouldner (1960) stated that, based on the social-exchange theory, employees reciprocate a low offer from the employer. Furthermore, the employee-employer exchange relationship counts employee job security expectations as one of its critical components (Colquitt, Baer, Long, & Halvorsen-Ganepola, 2014; Kraimer, Wayne, Liden, & Sparrowe, 2005; Parks & Schmedemann, 1994). Based on these findings, job security can be categorised as an organizational inducement offered by the employer to the employee (Rousseau, 1990). This would lead to a higher contribution of the employee, meaning they cope with work intensification and raise their level of performance (Kraimer, Wayne, Liden, & Sparrowe, 2005). Consequently, Campbell (2002) noted that job insecurity can be a reason employees accept work intensification without resistance. Therefore, providing long-term job security might even be one of the most important inducements for the employer.

However, many scientific articles looked into the results of lower levels of job security, such as the articles of Ashford, Lee, and Bobko (1989), Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (2010) and Keim, Landis, Pierce, and Earnest (2014). Thus, they concluded that whenever job security is low, employees experience this as an unequal exchange on the employers’ part. However, Keim, Landis, Pierce, and Earnest (2014) continued their findings by stating that therefore, employees experiencing high levels of job security perform better when put under pressure of stringent job demands. In contrast, Lu, Du, Xu, and Zhang (2016) present contrary results in their study, containing data from 513 questionnaires filled out by Chinese part-time MBA students working full time, a two-wave survey with data from 237 employees from an insurance company and another two-wave survey with data from 236 employees from a Chinese manufacturing company. Based on these data, they found that low levels of job security are punished by the employee through lower levels of performance. Complementary findings were reported by Kraimer, Wayne, Liden, and Sparrowe (2005), Martin, Staines, and Pate (1998) and Shaw, Dineen, Fang, and Vellella (2009). Their findings stated that for the employee, working hard, coping with work overload and working overtime are considered to be their inducement towards the employer in cases of an equal exchange in which both parties show effort.

Furthermore, literature shows that job security can have an influence on the relationship between work intensification and performance. Job security represents an
organization’s long-term commitment to the employee (Liu, Guthrie, Flood, & MacCurtain, 2009). Therefore, an employee’s trust in the organization, resulting in a positive reciprocal employment relationship between the employee and the organization, is depending on this sense of job security. This in turn may lead to a higher level of performance. Thus, the performance level achieved through work intensification can be moderated by job security. In line with this statement, Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, and Meyer (2013) found in their research consisting of an employee survey with 196 UK based plant workers, and 58 interviews with employees within the same plant, that employees felt as if the performance target from the organization was better accessible when their level of job security had risen. Therefore, the perceived benefits of job security can work as a buffer when it comes to the negative outcomes of work intensification, such as workload. Job security helps employees to put their faith in the organization whenever work intensification occurs, thus maintaining their work effort and increasing the performance level (Liu, Guthrie, Flood, & MacCurtain, 2009).

However, studies came up with different results involving work intensity and job security. Darçin (2016) used data from the European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions in 27 countries from 2005. Based on a specific sample within this data, data from 29,766 employee interviews and 43,636 household member interviews through multi-stage, random sampling, was evaluated. Darçin (2016) found a negative correlation between work intensity and job security. Darçin (2016) found a negative correlation, whereas Green (2006) found no sign of a linear correlation between the two. Yet literature appears to be in agreement on the fact that there is a link between work intensity and emotional strain (Darçin, 2016), poor physical and psychological working conditions, since both Darçin (2016) and Eurofound (2009) presented results supporting these statements. These elements are known to be results of job insecurity as well (Mak & Mueller, 2000; Näswall, Sverke, & Hellgren, 2005; Darçin, 2016). This is in line with the Job Demands Resource (JD-R) model from Bakker and Demerouti (2007), in which job demands are described as the elements of work which act as a burden to the psychological and physiological capacities of the employee. The JD-R model illustrates that resources act as a buffer when it comes to the negative effects of job demands on the well-being of the employee (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007). Furthermore, job demands are noted to require a lot of energy, which can result in negative outcomes (Bakker, 2011). Looking at the JD-R model, work intensification can be categorised as a demand, since authors such as Ogbonnaya, Daniels, Conolly, and Van Veldhoven (2017) described work intensification as an increase in work effort due to rising work demands. Therefore, job
security can be categorised as a resource, since greater job security indicates better working conditions for the employees (Beham, Präg, & Drobnič, 2008). Therefore, job security can act as a buffer for the negative effects of work intensification (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007).

In conclusion, due to the amount of findings revolving around job security it is hard to tell what the exact influence on work intensification and performance is. Campbell’s (2002) results, stating that job insecurity can be a reason employees accept work intensification without resistance, might be the clearest indication of the actual process aligned with job security and work intensification. These findings are based on the social-exchange theory, which state that an employee-employer exchange relationship is formed when organizational inducements lead employees to contribute (Rousseau, 1990). The social-exchange theory can be aligned with the Job Demands-Resources model, which states that resources such as job security act as a buffer when it comes to the negative effects of job demands, such as work intensification, on the well-being of the employee (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007). Even though this process appears to be lacking research, literature does seem to be aligned when looking at the effect of job security on performance. Researchers such as Lu, Du, Xu and Zhang (2016) all show a lower level of performance whenever the employer offers lower levels of job security.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In the ever changing economy, organizations are trying to secure their position through creating a competitive advantage (Kubicek & Tement, 2016). Consequently, increased competitive pressure is passed on to employees, resulting in work intensification (Burchell, 1999). Work intensification aims to improve organizational benefits through greater discretionary effort from its employees (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000). Since work intensification is claimed to increase the level of performance, it is useful to know the exact consequences of introducing work intensification. Therefore, this literary review provides an overview of the existing literature on the definition of work intensification, as well as the causes, consequences and conditions of work intensification.

Firstly, the definition of work intensification has been discussed. Work intensification has been defined as the level of work effort put in by an employee compared to their experience of high work demands and pressure (White, Hill, McGovern, Mills, & Smeaton, 2003). Although the main definitions of work intensification within the literature appear to align, in practice their interpretation of work intensification tends to differ. Some researchers
hint to work demands and pressure when talking about work intensification (e.g. Wood, Van Veldhoven, Croon, & De Menezes, 2012). However, it is important to realise that work intensification is in fact not the same as work demands because work intensification is a process, thus having a dynamic character and being prone to change (Koolhaas, Bartolomucci, Buwalda, De Boer, Flügge, Korte, & Fuchs, 2011). Therefore, this review aimed to clarify the definition of work intensification through an overview of the diverse, existing literature. Overall, most authors think of work intensification as an increase in work effort due to rising work demands (e.g. White, Hill, McGovern, Mills, & Smeaton, 2003).

Secondly, the causes of work intensification are discussed. Even though factors such as Self-Managed Working Time (Kelliher & Anderson, 2010) and contingent pay arrangements (Green, 2004B; Weitzman & Kruse, 1990) are mentioned as possible causes, the main focus lies on High-Involvement Work Systems. The literature seems to be likeminded when it comes to the results of High-Involvement Work Systems. Many researches state that HIWS do in fact cause work intensification (Boxall & Macky, 2008; Boxall & Macky, 2009). This is in line with the AMO theory (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000), which states that if the employee gets the chance to implement new practices (Opportunity), possibly through HIWSs, the employee will be more motivated due to the trust the organization puts into them (Motivation) and thus is able to increase their knowledge and skills (Ability). The AMO theory hints to the reciprocity in effort of the employee whenever employers introduce practices such as HIWSs. However, some researchers found that both positive and negative results of High-Involvement Work Systems can coexist alongside each other (e.g. Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, & Meyer, 2013). Thus, HIWS can lead to higher levels of job satisfaction (Macky & Boxall, 2008) whilst simultaneously leading to higher levels of work intensification (Boxall & Macky, 2008).

Thirdly, the consequences of work intensification are highlighted. Since the aim of work intensification is to improve the level of performance (Green, 2004A; Valeyre, 2004), both from the employee and the organization as a whole, the consequence discussed in great length is performance. The challenge-hindrance framework was utilised to discuss this matter (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005). Based on this framework work intensification can either be categorised as a challenge demand, which are work-related demands that can be overcome, or as a hindrance demand, meaning these work-related demands cannot be overcome. Employees perceive work intensification as a challenge demand when the intensification occurs due to reciprocity, meaning whenever the employer introduces practices which benefit the employee (e.g. Kelliher & Anderson, 2010). Therefore, work intensification
portrayed as a challenge demand leads to higher levels of performance (LePine, Podsakoff, & Lepine, 2005). However, the negative effects on employees alter the effect of work intensification on performance (Beckers, Van der Linden, Smulders, Kompiera, Tarisa, & Geurts, 2008). In that case, work intensification is perceived as a hindrance demand, through which work intensification leads to a lower performance rate (LePine, Podsakoff, & Lepine, 2005). Therefore, it becomes evident that the literature is not in agreement when it comes to the effect of work intensification on performance.

Finally, conditions were discussed, which could influence the effect of work intensification on performance. This is where the social-exchange theory was introduced, which states that an employee-employer exchange relationship is formed when organizational inducements lead employees to contribute (Rousseau, 1990). An important organizational inducement discussed was job security, which is defined as the expectations of an employee concerning the longevity and stability of their job within an organization (e.g. Kraimer, Wayne, Liden, & Sparrowe, 2005). The social-exchange theory can be aligned with the Job Demands-Resources model, which states that resources act as a buffer when it comes to the negative effects of job demands on the well-being of the employee (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007). Therefore, if the employer provides resources such as job security, in return the employee will be able to handle job demands such as work intensification more easily, thus reciprocating the organizational inducement from the employer (Rousseau, 1990; Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007). Job insecurity has been mentioned as a reason employees accept work intensification without resistance (Campbell, 2002). This finding might be the clearest indication of the actual process aligned with job security and work intensification, since literature seems to be lacking when it comes to this relationship. However, literature appears to be in consent when it comes to the effect of job security on performance. Researchers show a lower level of performance whenever the employer offers lower levels of job security (Lu, Du, Xu, & Zhang, 2016). Thus, it is probable that job security influences the effect of work intensification on performance, since job security motivates employees to contribute and perform even when put under greater pressure (Rousseau, 1990; Lu, Du, Xu, & Zhang, 2016).

**LIMITATIONS**

Even though this study provides several findings surrounding the topic of work intensification, there are still several limitations which should be mentioned. Therefore, these limitations will be discussed in the following section.
For starters, there are several authors dominating the field. For one, Boxall and Macky (2007; 2008; 2009; 2014) have invested a lot of their effort in discussing and researching work intensification and its conditions in their jointly written articles. Therefore, the literature used in the section linking work intensification to High-Involvement Work Systems is mostly written by these authors. Three out of the four articles utilised were written by them, with the fourth article from Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, and Meyer (2013) still mentioning the findings of Boxall and Macky. Therefore, the knowledge surrounding the relationship between High-Involvement Work Systems and work intensification is strongly depended on the opinions of these authors, thus influenced by their opinions and possible bias. Even though Boxall and Macky conducted several researches as well as written literary reviews, the fact remains that their views are paramount when discussing High-Involvement Work Systems and work intensification. Thus, the ability to include several different authors could help gain more insights when discussing this relationship and reduce the level of authors biases.

Furthermore, the effect of work intensification on performance remains somewhat unspecified. Even though several different types of performance have been introduced, such as in-role and extra-role performance (Benoliel & Somech, 2014), the literature seems to be lacking information on these specific types of performance when linked to work intensification. Therefore, when talking about this effect of work intensification in this review, performance has been discussed in its entirety. This description of performance matches in-role performance, which looks at the execution of the tasks mentioned in the job description (Benoliel & Somech, 2014). However, looking into other performance descriptions, such as task performance, can shed a different light on the relationship between work intensification and performance. Furthermore, it is plausible that authors from different articles have divergent ideas about what topics performance covers. Thus, there is more difficulty in comparing articles to each other. Future research should try to include a specific outcome of work intensification in order to clarify the phenomenon.

Additionally, the researches included in this literary review appear to be conducted in specific countries. Since several articles from Boxall and Macky are included, who are currently located in New-Zealand, it is not surprising that a couple of researches included were conducted in this country. Other than New-Zealand, some researches were originated in different parts of Asia. However, the majority of the researches have been done in European countries. Thus, African and South-American countries have been excluded from this review. Therefore, the focus lies on western countries and their cultures simultaneously.
Consequently, generalising the causes, consequences and conditions of work intensification to a global level is almost impossible, since there appears to be a lot of diversity between different countries. Therefore, including researches on a global skill or focussing on the different continents could be beneficial for future researches. Additionally, looking into the differences of work intensification between different countries could be a topic for future research.

Moreover, the number of literary sources utilised for this literary review is limited. Only twenty-one articles have been included. Therefore, only little knowledge surrounding work intensification, its conditions, causes and consequences have been included in this study. One of the reasons for this limited amount of information gathered are the filters used when searching for data. For one, the condition of articles being written in the last five years influenced the number of articles available in a major way. The same goes for the fact that articles had to be reviewed by peers. As can be seen in Table 2, the quantity of information lowered greatly due to the filters used, even though this presumably resulted in higher quality output. However, chances are many relevant literary sources left out of this review. Including more sources could help gain broader knowledge of the phenomena work intensification. This could be done for example by using different filters, such as a wider time span, or different databases. Therefore, it might be useful for future studies to include a broader range of literary sources.

Furthermore, this review has focussed on specific causes and conditions of work intensification. For the cause of work intensification, several causes have been mentioned, yet the main focus lies on the High-Involvement Work Systems. Furthermore, when looking at the influence of work intensification and its aimed performance increase, only job security has been mentioned as a condition for this relationship. When looking at the interviews conducted with two HR professionals (see Appendix 2), several other causes of work intensification come to mind. Interviewee 1 mentions the economic crisis as a reason for employers to economize their employment budget, thus leaving more work to be completed by the remaining employees. Interviewee 2 hinted towards the reduction of costs in general. She also mentioned activities, such as promotions or renovations, in an effort to attract more customers, thus resulting in more tasks for the staff members. Therefore, considering different causes and conditions could help create more thorough knowledge about work intensification, thus being useful to consider in future research.

Moreover, increasing the performance level has been introduced as the main aim of work intensification (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000). While this is true, work
intensification appears to have several side effects as well. One of these effects mentioned is
the state of well-being from the employee. According to Beckers, Van der Linden, Smulders,
Kompiera, Tarisa, and Geurts (2008), employees might start performing on a lower level,
since their psychological harm is keeping them from rising to the organizations performance
expectations. Therefore, future research might benefit from this knowledge by focussing on
the mental state of their employees, thus making sure employees are able to cope with this
increase in work intensification.

Finally, the main topic of work intensification studied here still appears to be left with
some uncertainties. Studies are not always clear on which definition of work intensification
they utilise when conduction their research. Some articles focus on workload, while others
focus on the working hours. As Franke (2015) stated, work intensification portrays the
perception of the employee involving the increase in work intensity, thus deferring from
regular work demands. Moreover, work intensification has a dynamic character, thus
containing unpredictable conditions and being sensitive to change (Koolhaas, Bartolomucci,
Buwalda, De Boer, Flügge, Korte, & Fuchs, 2011). Since the literature does not always utilise
work intensification as a distinct phenomenon, the results of researches can hint to different
elements of this phenomena. Therefore, it is hard to compare results with each other.

IMPLICATIONS

This study contributes in fivefold to the literature and the organizational field. Therefore, both theoretical and practical implications can be made.

The theoretical implication of this literary review must be its contribution to the
existing literature surrounding work intensification. This review provides an overview of the
existing literature and thus clarifies work intensification, its causes, conditions and
consequences. Firstly, since work intensification is a fairly new phenomenon in the
workplace, there was still some discussion about its definition. The extensive effort dimension
and the intensive effort dimension (Green, 2001) of work intensification were used
interchangeably, even though these indicate very different work demands. Therefore, this
study has provided an overview of the different definitions presented, in order to provide a
clear picture of the factors which work intensification include. Secondly, when discussing the
influence of work intensification on performance the majority of literary sources suggested
employee well-being as an condition, through factors such as burn-out (Kroon, Van der
Voorde, & Van Veldhoven, 2008) and emotional exhaustion (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke,
2004). However, not a lot of literature has studied the effect of job security on this
relationship. In this literary review, the main focus is the consequence of introducing work intensification to employees. Through creating an overview of this relationship, including its causes and conditions, the consequences of work intensification are discussed. Therefore, this study creates added value to the literature.

Moreover, the practical implications of this literary review can be found in several different factors. First of all, organizations become more aware of High-Involvement Work Systems and its effect on work intensification. Since HIWSs implement practices such as more autonomy for the employees, employees tend to feel valued thus reciprocating the effort of the employer (Bauer, 2004). Therefore, the employees intensify their own work as a reaction to the investments of the employer (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000; Kellíher & Anderson, 2010). Thus, organizations are more aware of the impact of HIWSs on their employees. Second of all, organizations are more aware of the difference between challenge and hindrance demands for the employees. Work intensification is perceived by some employees as a challenge demands, a demand which can be overcome (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005). Other employees perceive the same amount of work intensification as a hindrance demand, which cannot be overcome. Therefore, the opinion of the employee is highlighted, since this makes an obvious impact on their performances and the way they handle work intensification (Beckers, Van der Linden, Smulders, Kompiera, Tarisa, & Geurts, 2008). Thus, organizations can recess the feelings of employees regarding the demands they are confronted with and the consequential work effort necessary. Finally, the current trend of flexibility has an influence on the work force (Beckmann, Cornelissen, & Kräkel, 2017). Organizations are made aware of the fact that job security is an important motivator of employee effort (SHRM, 2011). Furthermore, job security can act as a buffer for the negative effects of work intensification (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007), meaning that job security aligns with higher levels of employee performance (Lu, Du, Xu & Zhang, 2016). Thus, organizations need to reconsider the current trend of flexibility, since providing job security can help them get the best performance from their employees.
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Table 5: Summary of main articles used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Key items</th>
<th>Sample characteristics</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
<th>Journal/Impact factor (5 year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green, 2004B</td>
<td>Technological innovations, organizational change, work environment, employment (economic theory), personnel management</td>
<td>N = 2191 manager interviews, N = 947 worker representative interviews</td>
<td>Work intensification is the result of reduced union power and a rise in the use of temporary agency workers and contractors</td>
<td>Industrial Relations. Impact factor: 1.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckmann, Cornelissen, &amp; Krakel, 2017</td>
<td>Self-managed working time, worker autonomy, employee effort, reciprocity, intrinsic motivation, complementarity</td>
<td>N = 42790, data collected through an annual longitudinal survey. The data used was from the years 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009 and 2011</td>
<td>SMWT employees show more effort than employees with fixed working hours, reciprocal work intensification is not influencing extra effort</td>
<td>Journal of Economic Behavior &amp; Organization. Impact factor: 1.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogbannaya, Daniels, &amp; Nielsen, 2017</td>
<td>Contingent pay, job satisfaction, commitment, trust in management, work intensification</td>
<td>N = 13657 employees, data collected through a survey, N = 1923 managers, organizational-</td>
<td>Performance-related pay has a direct positive relationship with employee attitudes (job satisfaction, employee</td>
<td>Human Resource Management Journal. Impact factor: 2.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>High-performance work practices, human resource management, employee health, well-being, work intensification</td>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
<td>HPWP have a greater combined (rather than isolated) effect on employee health, well-being and work intensification. Work intensification mediates several linkages.</td>
<td>Journal of Occupational Health Psychology. 4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogbannaya, Daniels, Connolly, &amp; Van Veldhoven, 2017</td>
<td>level data collected through face-to-face interviews and is linked to work intensification</td>
<td>Ogbannaya, Daniels, Connolly, &amp; Van Veldhoven, 2017</td>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
<td>HPWP have a greater combined (rather than isolated) effect on employee health, well-being and work intensification. Work intensification mediates several linkages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubicek &amp; Tement, 2016</td>
<td>Work intensification, work-home conflict, work-home enrichment, work-home integration and segmentation</td>
<td>Kubicek &amp; Tement, 2016</td>
<td>N = 201, data collected through questionnaires via a paper-pencil approach and work-home segmentation were related to work-to-home conflict.</td>
<td>Journal of Personnel Psychology. 1.902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Macky & Boxall, 2008            | High-performance work systems, high-                                             | Macky & Boxall, 2008                                                          | N = 775 New Zealand Organizations that can foster Asia Pacific Journal of                                                                 | Asia Pacific Journal of Health}\n

involvement work processes, job satisfaction, stress, work intensification

employees, data collected through computer-assisted telephone interview

smarter working without undue pressure to work harder are likely to enhance employee well-being

---

**Boxall & Macky, 2009**

High-performance work systems, bundling, strategic HRM, job satisfaction, trust, commitment

High-involvement work systems usefully ground HPWS studies, focussing on the employee experience rather than ‘best practices’

---

**Boxall & Macky, 2007**

High-performance work systems, high-involvement work systems

Links the HPWS to the role of intervening management and employee variables of any kind of HR system

---

**Tregaskis, Daniels, Glover, Butler, & Meyer, 2013**

Organizational performance, high-performance work systems, employee rules, labour productivity

N = 58 longitudinal interviews, N = 401 & N = 611 survey reports, time series data recorded before

HPWS increases productivity and safety performance, yet other intermediary variables influence worker
and after the interview/survey welfare effects arising from work intensification as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Darçin, 2016</th>
<th>Working conditions, quality of society, trust, tension, work, canonical correlation</th>
<th>N = 29 766 employees interviewed through multi-stage, random sampling, N = 43 636 household members interviewed through multi-stage, random sampling</th>
<th>Working conditions, such as job stability, play a significant role in the lives of people and the quality of society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lu, Du, Xu, &amp; Zhang, 2016</td>
<td>Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, psychological contract, social-exchange, moderating role, citizenship behaviour, multiple-regression, management research, work engagement, mediating role</td>
<td>N = 513 Chinese part-time MBA students working full time, data collected through a questionnaire</td>
<td>Job demands significantly improve employee performance when there is a higher level of job security, this effect is stronger when there are higher levels of traditionality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Indicators Research. Impact factor: 1.789

Job demands significantly improve employee performance when there is a higher level of job security, this effect is stronger when there are higher levels of traditionality.

Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology. Impact factor: 3.5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fu, Kleinberg, Lavi, &amp; Smorodinsky, 2017</td>
<td>Matching stability, labor market, job security, efficiency</td>
<td>Conceptueel paper</td>
<td>Due to job security, the levels of stability and efficiency remain higher for a broader class of production functions</td>
<td>Theoretical Economics. Impact factor: 1.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastenbroek, Jaarsma, Scherpber, Van Beukelen, &amp; Demerouti, 2014</td>
<td>Exhaustion, Job Demands-Resources model, performance, personal resources, well-being, work engagement</td>
<td>N = 860 Dutch veterinary professionals and N = 170 colleagues, data collected through an online survey</td>
<td>Integrates personal resources at a behavioural level and performance measures in the JD-R model, personal resources mediate and initiate work engagement and performance</td>
<td>European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology. Impact factor: 2.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoliel &amp; Somech, 2014</td>
<td>Big five, conservation of resources theory, contingency approach, occupational strain, participative leadership</td>
<td>N = 153 employees and N = 77 managers, data collected through a questionnaire</td>
<td>Personal dimensions of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism moderate the relation between participative leadership and employee in-role</td>
<td>European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology. Impact factor: 2.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergauwe, Wille, Hofmans, &amp; De Fruyt, 2017</td>
<td>Charisma, Personality, FFM count technique, career outcomes, leadership</td>
<td>N = 38 leadership consultants from 9 countries, data collected through an online survey</td>
<td>Five-Factor Model charisma positively correlates with adaptive performance, and career roles relating to charismatic leadership</td>
<td>Journal of Vocational Behavior. Impact factor: 3.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javed, Bashir, Rawwas, &amp; Arjoon, 2017</td>
<td>Islamic work ethics, ethical leadership, innovative work behaviour, adaptive performance, services, Pakistan</td>
<td>N = 257 hotel employees in Pakistan, data collected through a questionnaire</td>
<td>Islamic Work Ethics predict adaptive performance through Innovative Work Behaviour, ethical leadership moderates the relationship between IWE and IWB</td>
<td>Current Issues in Tourism. Impact factor: 1.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paškvan, Kubicek, Prem, &amp; Korunka, 2016</td>
<td>Work intensification, cognitive appraisal, challenge-hindrance framework</td>
<td>N = 253, mediation analyses of 2-wave panel data</td>
<td>A participative climate in organizations helps manage work</td>
<td>International Journal of Stress Management. Impact factor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Authors and Year</td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Impact Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxall &amp; Macky, 2014</td>
<td>Employee well-being, high-involvement work processes, high-performance work systems, work intensification</td>
<td>N = 1016, a national population survey through computer-assisted telephone interviewing</td>
<td>High-involvement work processes affect employee well-being through greater experiences of autonomy and participation in decision-making</td>
<td>Work, Employment And Society. Impact factor: 2.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariappanadar, 2014</td>
<td>Sustainable HRM, harm of high performance work practices, stakeholder harm index, negative externality of HRM, social</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Critique on the mutual-gains perspective of HRM, stating outcomes for both employers and employees</td>
<td>Human Resource Management Review. Impact factor: 3.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrnrooth &amp; Björkman, 2012</td>
<td>Ability, control, creativity, HRM process, identity, mediation critical management studies, motivation, opportunity, performance, psychological empowerment, signalling, work intensification, workload</td>
<td>N = 152 Finnish and Swedish subordinate consultants, data collected through questionnaires</td>
<td>The stakeholder harm index shows the harm of HPWP through work intensification, based on the welfare loss for the stakeholders</td>
<td>Journal of Management Studies. Impact factor: 6.497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2.

In order to link the theory to practice, two interviews have been conducted. One of the interviewees is employed at Intratuin, a chain of garden centres located across The Netherlands and Belgium. The other interviewee works at Plus Retail Centre, one of the warehouses from the supermarket PLUS. PLUS is a chain of supermarkets across The Netherlands. The practices of the interviewees are linked to the HR department, where interviewee 1 is a company supervisor with HR tasks on the side, and interviewee 2 is an HR professional. The following section will summarise these interviews.

Interviewee 1:

Interviewee 1 is currently working at Intratuin Hendrik Ido Ambacht. Her official title is company supervisor; however she takes care of the HR practices within the branch simultaneously. She has been company supervisor at Intratuin Hendrik Ido Ambacht for almost 4 years, however she has been working for Intratuin for nearly 13 years. The interviewee mentions that work intensification has been prominent within the company for the last couple of years. She believes the economic crisis has played a major part in this development. Since the company made less revenue, the budget for employees shrunk simultaneously. Therefore, the employees within the company had to take care of the tasks which would otherwise be done by other employees. She adds that the employees do not tend to work overtime (at the most a couple of hours extra around Christmas or Mother’s Day), but their work effort does have to rise in order to keep up with the work demands. Furthermore, she believes that employees with more experience tend to notice a change in work demands more, Therefore, this group of employees suffers from work intensification more. However, she mentions that up until this moment, the level of work intensification has not caught up to the employee. They keep performing better, especially when they are under pressure.

Interviewee 2:

Interviewee 2 is currently working at Plus Retail Centre in Hendrik Ido Ambacht as an HR manager. She has been employed at Plus Retail from approximately 5 years. She has also noticed the development of work intensification within PLUS, specifically the increasing number of tasks performed by a single employee. An example of this is the renovation of several of their supermarkets. Furthermore, she notes that the number of promotions has increased over the past few years, such as collecting action figures or saving up for a trip.
resulting in a lot of extra work. These additional activities, meant to attract more customers, result in a lot of extra work for the employees. Per interviewee 2, the main cause of work intensification is the reduction of costs from the organization. Therefore, the organization does not invest in employees who can absorb the busy peak moments at work. Finally, she noticed that full-timers tend to suffer from work intensification more often, since these employees are present most of the time and therefore tend to feel responsible for the actions within the organization. These employees also feel the pressure of knowing everything that is happening within the organization.