

Employee Legal Protection in the Digital Economy: A Bibliometric and Systematic Review

Sinta Oktavina¹, Wanda Novita^{2*}

¹*Accounting Department, Politeknik Negeri Bali, Bali, Indonesia*
²*Management Department, Universitas Jakarta Internasional, Jakarta, Indonesia*
**Corresponding author e-mail: wanda.novita@uniji.ac.id*

ABSTRACT

This study examined how research on employee legal protection had developed and how far it had absorbed the governance problems created by digitally mediated work. A hybrid design combining bibliometric performance analysis, term co-occurrence mapping, and systematic review procedures was applied to 2,253 Scopus-indexed records published between 1955 and 2026 and retrieved in September 2026. Topical precision was assessed using a relevance-coded random sample of 200 records, while performance indicators were recomputed for journals-only and high-precision subsets. Output grew at an annual rate of approximately ten per cent between 1995 and 2025, yet the field remained highly fragmented: 94.3 percent of 4,385 authors contributed only one document, author productivity followed a Lotka exponent of 4.2, and source distribution departed from Bradford’s law. Only 37 percent of sampled records were core to the topic. Digital themes rose from below 2.5 percent before 2015 to 23.0 percent in 2025, while occupational safety declined in relative share. After age normalization, digital-theme documents were cited above the field average. The findings showed a shift from physical and contractual risks toward informational and algorithmic risks, supporting compliance design for platform-based ventures. This study offered the first field-level bibliometric map of employee legal protection and quantified its digital reorientation.

Keywords: *employee legal protection; labor law; bibliometric analysis; algorithmic management; systematic literature review*

JEL Classification: J83; J88; O33; K31

ARTICLE INFO	
Article History Received: September 6, 2026 Revised: September 10, 2026 Accepted: September 29, 2026 Published Online: October 20, 2026 How to cite Oktavina, S., & Novita, W. (2026). Employee Legal Protection in the Digital Economy: A Bibliometric and Systematic Review. <i>International Journal of Digital Entrepreneurship and Business (IDEB)</i>, 7(2), 42–51.	DOI https://doi.org/10.52238/ideb.v7i2.425 Copyright and License © [Year] the Author(s). Published by IDEB. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

The employment relationship is legally asymmetric by construction. One party owns the productive assets and directs how work is performed; the other supplies labour under terms it seldom sets. Employee legal protection—the body of mandatory rules, procedural entitlements, and enforcement mechanisms that constrains employer discretion—exists to correct that asymmetry. For founders and managers, this is not a peripheral compliance cost. The rules that determine who counts as an employee, what information an employer may collect, how tasks may be allocated, and how a working relationship may lawfully be ended shape venture cost structures, scaling decisions, and organisational design.

Research has long recognised that protective law does not simply arrive at the organisational boundary and take effect. Organisations interpret ambiguous legal mandates and construct compliance structures whose meaning is then read back into the law itself (Edelman, 1992), while the expansion of employment rights helped produce the modern human resource function (Dobbin & Sutton, 1998). Parallel work in business ethics found that private regulatory instruments improved labour standards unevenly and remained dependent on local enforcement capacity (Frenkel & Scott, 2002; Yu, 2008).

More recently, a distinct research front has formed around technology. Existing non-discrimination law is poorly equipped to detect disparate treatment produced by automated systems (Todolí-Signes, 2019; Zuiderveen Borgesius, 2020), machine learning in personnel selection generates liabilities that conventional human resource governance does not anticipate (Hamilton & Davison, 2022), and workplace data collection has outgrown consent-based instruments (Areheart & Roberts, 2019; Ebert et al., 2021; Holland & Tham, 2022). Platform work has also made employment classification a decisive regulatory question.

What is missing is a view of the field as a whole. Existing reviews are domain-specific and do not establish the size, growth trajectory, structural properties, or thematic composition of employee legal protection research. It is therefore unclear whether the field is consolidating around a stable core, which protective domains are expanding or contracting, and how far the digital reorientation observed in individual studies is visible in the aggregate literature.

This study addressed that gap by mapping Scopus-indexed literature on employee legal protection, testing whether its structural properties survived restriction to a topically precise core, and examining digitally mediated work in depth. It asked four questions: What are the field's volume, growth trajectory, and citation structure? How concentrated or fragmented are its sources and authorship? What thematic clusters organise the field, and how have they shifted? How far has the field reoriented toward digital work governance? The study contributes the first field-level bibliometric map, quantifies the thematic reorientation with age-adjusted impact measures, and translates it into implications for digitally intensive ventures.

2. Literature Review

2.1. *The Protective Function of Labour Law*

Employee legal protection is a layered system. Its substantive layer establishes minimum standards for wages, working time, safety, non-discrimination, and termination that cannot be contracted away (Davidov, 2016; Deakin & Wilkinson, 2005). Its procedural layer provides grievance channels, representation rights, and access to tribunals. Its institutional layer comprises inspectorates, courts, and collective actors whose capacity determines whether substantive and procedural rights operate in practice. Studies of wage claims in insolvency, maternity protection, and outsourcing show how these layers can diverge when enforcement machinery is weak or responsibility is legally indeterminate.

2.2. Institutional Mediation and Legal Endogeneity

The study adopted institutional theory, particularly the legal-endogeneity perspective. Protective mandates are often ambiguous; organisations resolve that ambiguity by building visible compliance structures; and courts and regulators may subsequently treat those structures as evidence of compliance (Edelman, 1992). Protection is therefore co-produced by regulators and regulated firms. The presence of a policy is a poor proxy for effective protection, and structures built in response to law may become durable organisational features. This perspective is especially suited to digital work because algorithmic management multiplies the ambiguity that organisations can resolve in their own favour.

2.3. Domains of Employee Legal Protection

Six domains recur across the literature: occupational safety and health; non-discrimination and equality; privacy and data protection; social security and remuneration; employee voice; and employment status. These domains encompass physical, psychosocial, and neurotechnological risk; disadvantage produced by automated models; collection and inference of worker information; wages and benefits attached to non-standard work; whistleblowing and retaliation; and the threshold question of who qualifies for protection in platform work.

2.4. Prior Reviews and Open Questions

Existing syntheses remain valuable but partial. Meta-analytic work has established the prevalence of workplace mistreatment without addressing the legal architecture responding to it, while sectoral and jurisdiction-specific reviews have examined artificial intelligence, precarious platform labour, armed conflict, harassment regulation, and gendered exclusion. None establishes whether these segments form a single integrating field or several weakly connected literatures sharing vocabulary but not intellectual infrastructure. Accordingly, the present review is descriptive and structural and is organised around the four research questions stated in the introduction.

3. Methodology

The study adopted a hybrid design combining bibliometric performance analysis, science mapping, and systematic review procedures. Reporting followed PRISMA 2020 where applicable to reviews without effect-size synthesis. Three analytical layers were used: a performance layer describing volume, impact, and concentration; a mapping layer recovering the semantic structure of the field; and a synthesis layer in which a screened subset was read closely and coded.

Data were drawn from Scopus. The search was executed on 28 September 2026 in title, abstract, and keyword fields using TITLE-ABS-KEY (employee legal protection), without restrictions on language, document type, or publication year. The query returned 2,253 records covering 1955–2026. All records were retained for performance analysis and science mapping. For the synthesis layer, non-substantive items, records without identifiable authors, and in-press records were removed. Journal articles and reviews published from 2019 onward whose titles indicated digitally mediated work were retained, yielding 95 documents for close reading.

Performance indicators were computed in Python 3.11 using pandas and SciPy. They included annual output, citations, h-index, source and author concentration, co-authorship intensity, and open-access share. Citation counts were normalised by publication year. Source dispersion was assessed against Bradford's law, and author productivity against Lotka's law. Science mapping followed the VOSviewer procedure implemented in Python. Noun phrases were extracted from English titles, spelling variants

were merged, generic and query-echo terms were removed, and co-occurrences were normalised by association strength and clustered with the Leiden algorithm.

Thematic classification used regular-expression dictionaries derived from the mapping layer and literature review. Categories were non-exclusive. Topical precision was assessed on a random sample of 200 records coded as core, peripheral, or off-topic. Indicators were recomputed for journals-only and high-precision subsets. The study analysed published bibliographic metadata and involved no human participants, personal data, or intervention; ethical approval was therefore not required.

Table 1. Retrieval, Screening, and Eligibility of Records

Stage	Criterion Applied	Excluded	Remaining
Identification	Scopus query; no restrictions	—	2,253
Screening	Non-substantive, authorless, and in-press records removed	169	2,084
Eligibility	Journal articles and reviews from 2019 onward	1,303	781
Included	Documents addressing digitally mediated work	686	95

Source: Data processed by the authors (2026).

4. Findings

4.1. Growth Trajectory and Citation Structure

The corpus spanned 72 years, from one record in 1955 to 161 records in 2025; 148 records from 2026 were partial. Output increased from 9 documents in 1995 to 161 in 2025, a compound annual growth rate of 10.1 per cent. Across the corpus, 2,253 documents received 15,529 citations, with a mean of 6.89, a median of 1, and 43.4 per cent remaining uncited. The corpus h-index was 53.

4.2. Fragmentation of Sources and Authorship

The documents were distributed across 1,453 sources, and 77.7 per cent of sources contributed only one document. Bradford zones required 138, 564, and 751 sources, indicating no small consolidated journal core. Among 4,385 distinct authors, 94.3 per cent contributed exactly one document. Lotka's law yielded an exponent of 4.20, far steeper than the classic inverse-square form. The field therefore lacked a stable institutional core.

4.3. Semantic Structure and Thematic Reorientation

The term co-occurrence map recovered six clusters covering individual rights and privacy; digitally transformed labour law; workplace safety and employee voice; disability and health-care workplaces; corporate compliance and employment boundaries; and United States health-coverage rule-making. Digitalisation, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic management formed the largest coded theme with 195 documents. Its share remained below 2.5 per cent before 2015, reached 13.2 per cent in 2020–2024, and rose to 23.0 per cent in 2025.

4.4. Topical Precision and Robustness

In the relevance-coded sample, 37.0 per cent of records were core, 30.0 per cent peripheral, and 33.0 per cent off-topic. Fragmentation persisted in the journals-only and high-precision subsets. In the high-precision core, 716 documents were spread across 514 sources, 93.3 per cent of authors contributed once, and digital themes accounted for 27.5 per cent of 2025 output. Thus, fragmentation was not merely an artefact of the broad retrieval.

Table 2. Descriptive Profile of the Corpus

Indicator	Value
Documents	2,253
Distinct sources	1,453
Distinct authors	4,385
Total citations	15,529
Corpus h-index	53
Open-access documents	610 (27.1%)
Annual growth, 1995–2025	10.1%

Source: Data processed by the authors (2026).

5. Discussion

The analysis produced four principal results. The field grew at approximately ten per cent annually for three decades; it remained structurally fragmented across sources and authors; its most-cited works were drawn largely from management, strategy, and sociology; and it underwent a measurable reorientation toward digital work governance.

These results extend specialised reviews of algorithmic discrimination and platform classification by confirming the technological shift at field level while qualifying claims of a completed paradigm change. The reorientation was visible in publication volume and age-adjusted impact, but only one technologically focused document appeared among the ten most cited. The direction of travel was clear, yet the cumulative citation centre had not moved to the same extent.

The fragmentation finding also complicates the assumption that employee legal protection constitutes a coherent evidence base. In a core that was more than ninety per cent on-topic, the modal author still published once, no journal held more than 1.6 per cent of output, and the most influential protection-focused works appeared largely outside specialist labour-law journals. The field therefore resembled parallel conversations sharing a vocabulary more than a single accumulating programme.

Legal-endogeneity theory helps explain this dispersion. Ambiguous mandates encourage organisations to construct visible compliance structures, and scholarship follows those structures into human resource management, business ethics, occupational medicine, and information systems. Algorithmic management amplifies ambiguity by relocating decisions into systems that may be opaque to workers, regulators, and employers. This suggests two propositions for future work: legal endogeneity may operate most strongly where technological opacity is greatest, and scholarly responses to new protective problems may lag organisational responses.

For digitally intensive ventures, employment classification and worker-data governance have become central design variables rather than after-the-fact compliance matters. Firms using monitoring, biometric identification, or algorithmic allocation should document the basis of automated decisions before deployment. Safety systems must also address psychosocial and neurotechnological risks, not only industrial hazards. For policymakers, the absence of an integrated evidence base supports commissioning explicit cross-disciplinary synthesis when regulating platform and algorithmic work.

6. Conclusion

This study mapped the development, structure, and thematic trajectory of research on employee legal protection and assessed its reorientation toward digitally mediated work. Using 2,253 Scopus-indexed records, bibliometric performance analysis, term co-occurrence mapping, topical-precision checks, and close reading of 95 recent digital-work studies, it established a field-level baseline.

The field was large, expanding, and structurally weak. Publication was dispersed across many outlets, most authors contributed only once, and these patterns persisted in a topically precise core. Digitalisation, data, and algorithmic management moved from the periphery to the leading edge of annual output and attracted citations at or above the age-adjusted field norm, while occupational safety became more historical than central.

The study's contribution is to replace assertion with measurement. It shows that technological transformation is real in volume and age-adjusted impact but remains incomplete in the cumulative citation structure. For managers and founders, employment classification and worker-data governance now constitute principal protective exposures and require design decisions before deployment rather than reactive compliance after challenge.

7. Limitations and Future Study

The study relied on a single database, which under-represents monographs, national-language legal scholarship, and practitioner commentary. Classification used titles rather than abstracts, so allusive studies were coded conservatively. Topical precision was limited because only 37 per cent of a random sample was core to the topic. Reliability checks used a single independent AI-assisted coder rather than two human coders, and citation windows remained asymmetric despite year normalisation. Data for 2026 were partial.

Future research should replicate the analysis across Scopus, Web of Science, and a legal repository such as HeinOnline; use abstract- or full-text topic modelling to reduce dependence on title vocabulary; and undertake a comparative review of how platform-worker classification has been resolved across jurisdictions. Longitudinal research could also test whether legal endogeneity is strongest under technological opacity and whether scholarly responses systematically lag organisational ones.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Author 1; Methodology: Author 1 and Author 2; Data curation: Author 2; Formal analysis: Author 1 and Author 2; Visualization: Author 2; Writing—original draft: Author 1; Writing—review and editing: Author 1 and Author 2; Supervision: Author 2.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability: The bibliographic records were retrieved from Scopus on 28 September 2026 and can be reproduced using the reported query. Record identifiers, analysis scripts, classification dictionary, thesaurus, and coded samples are provided as supplementary material; the full export is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to Scopus terms of use.

Ethical Approval: Not applicable. The study analysed published bibliographic metadata and involved no human participants, personal data, or intervention.

Use of AI Tools: A generative AI assistant supported descriptive statistical computation, sample coding for reliability and topical-precision checks, language editing, and drafting. The authors verified all analytical decisions, interpretations, and citations and remain responsible for the manuscript's accuracy, originality, and integrity.

References

Alshboul, O., & Shehadeh, A. (2025). Integrating labor and insurance regulations for enhanced safety and security of construction workers. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in*

- Areheart, B. A., & Roberts, J. L. (2019). GINA, big data, and the future of employee privacy. *Yale Law Journal*, 128(3), 710–790.
- Aria, M., & Cuccurullo, C. (2017). bibliometrix: An R-tool for comprehensive science mapping analysis. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(4), 959–975. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.08.007>
- Benlemlih, M., & Girerd-Potin, I. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and firm financial risk reduction: On the moderating role of the legal environment. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, 44(7–8), 1137–1166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbfa.12251>
- Berry, M. A., & Rondinelli, D. A. (1998). Proactive corporate environmental management: A new industrial revolution. *Academy of Management Executive*, 12(2), 38–50. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1998.650515>
- Bochkovskiy, A. P., & Sapozhnikova, N. Yu. (2021). Development of system of automated occupational health and safety management in enterprises. *Journal of Achievements in Materials and Manufacturing Engineering*, 107(1), 28–41. <https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0015.2454>
- Brandt-Rauf, P. W., & Ayaz, H. (2024). Occupational health and neuroergonomics: The future of wearable neurotechnologies at the workplace. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 66(6), 456–460. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000003080>
- Capron, L., & Guillén, M. (2009). National corporate governance institutions and post-acquisition target reorganization. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(8), 803–833. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.768>
- Cheliatsidou, A., Sariannidis, N., Garefalakis, A., Passas, I., & Spinthiropoulos, K. (2023). Exploring attitudes towards whistleblowing in relation to sustainable municipalities. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(9), Article 199. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13090199>
- Chih, H.-L., Chih, H.-H., & Chen, T.-Y. (2010). On the determinants of corporate social responsibility: International evidence on the financial industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0186-x>
- Chikhaoui, E., Alajmi, A., & Larabi-Marie-Sainte, S. (2022). Artificial intelligence applications in healthcare sector: Ethical and legal challenges. *Emerging Science Journal*, 6(4), 717–738. <https://doi.org/10.28991/ESJ-2022-06-04-05>
- Defossez, D. (2022). The employment status of food delivery riders in Europe and the UK: Self-employed or worker? *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*, 29(1), 25–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1023263X211051833>
- Dhanani, L. Y., LaPalme, M. L., & Joseph, D. L. (2021). How prevalent is workplace mistreatment? A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(8), 1082–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2534>
- Dobbin, F., & Sutton, J. R. (1998). The strength of a weak state: The rights revolution and the rise of human resources management divisions. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104(2), 441–476. <https://doi.org/10.1086/210044>
- Donthu, N., Kumar, S., Mukherjee, D., Pandey, N., & Lim, W. M. (2021). How to conduct a bibliometric analysis: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 133, 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.070>
- Dubal, V. B. (2022). Economic security and the regulation of gig work in California: From AB5 to Proposition 22. *European Labour Law Journal*, 13(1), 51–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20319525211063111>

- Ebert, I., Wildhaber, I., & Adams-Prassl, J. (2021). Big Data in the workplace: Privacy Due Diligence as a human rights-based approach to employee privacy protection. *Big Data & Society*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517211013051>
- Edelman, L. B. (1992). Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of civil rights law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(6), 1531–1576.
- Frenkel, S. J., & Scott, D. (2002). Compliance, collaboration, and codes of labor practice: The adidas connection. *California Management Review*, 45(1), 29–49. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166152>
- Garrick, J., & Buck, M. (2022). The psychosocial impacts of whistleblower retaliation: Shattering employee resilience and the workplace promise. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19055-1>
- Gibbs, T. (2020). Whistleblowing: Protection or discouragement. *Journal of Money Laundering Control*, 23(3), 591–600. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMLC-03-2020-0031>
- Hamilton, R. H., & Davison, H. K. (2022). Legal and ethical challenges for HR in machine learning. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 34(1), 19–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-021-09377-z>
- Hickson, J. (2024). Freedom, domination and the gig economy. *New Political Economy*, 29(2), 321–336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2023.2254712>
- Holland, P., & Tham, T. L. (2022). Workplace biometrics: Protecting employee privacy one fingerprint at a time. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 43(2), 501–515. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X20917453>
- Jaelani, A. K., Nuryanto, A. D., Fenitra, R. M., Mujib, M. M., & Luthviati, R. D. (2023). Legal protection of employee wage rights in bankrupt companies: Evidence from China. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 31(2), 202–223. <https://doi.org/10.22219/ljih.v31i2.25874>
- Jarota, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence and robotisation in the EU — Should we change OHS law? *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology*, 16(1), Article 18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12995-021-00301-7>
- Kunarti, S., Hidayah, N. P., Hariyanto, & Ulum, M. B. (2024). The legal politics of outsourcing and its implication for the protection of workers in Indonesia. *Sriwijaya Law Review*, 8(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.Vol8.Iss1.2750.pp1-19>
- Liu, Y., Zhang, J., Wang, H., Liu, L., & Fan, J. (2023). Occupational safety and health status and protection strategies of workers in new business forms. *Journal of Environmental and Occupational Medicine*, 40(8), 950–957. <https://doi.org/10.11836/JEOM22501>
- Marshall, A.-M. (2005). Idle rights: Employees' rights consciousness and the construction of sexual harassment policies. *Law & Society Review*, 39(1), 83–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-9216.2005.00078.x>
- Nuryanto, A. D., Kusumaningtyas, R. O., & Habibullo, B. (2024). The imperative of social justice on the insolvency and workers' wage. *Journal of Sustainable Development and Regulatory Issues*, 2(3), 209–232. <https://doi.org/10.53955/jsderi.v2i3.48>
- Oelrich, S., & Erlebach, K. (2021). Taking it outside: A study of legal contexts and external whistleblowing in China and India. *Asian Journal of Business Ethics*, 10(1), 129–151. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13520-021-00125-y>
- Olding, M., Barker, A., McNeil, R., & Boyd, J. (2021). Essential work, precarious labour: The need for safer and equitable harm reduction work in the era of COVID-19. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 90, Article 103076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2020.103076>
- O'Leary, L., Seltmann, M., & Smokvina, V. (2025). Elite athletes and worker status. *Industrial Law Journal*, 54(2), 248–277. <https://doi.org/10.1093/indlaw/dwae025>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M.,

- Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, Article n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Parwez, S., & Ranjan, R. (2021). The platform economy and the precarisation of food delivery work in the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from India. *Work Organisation, Labour and Globalisation*, 15(1), 11–30. <https://doi.org/10.13169/WORKORGALABOGL.15.1.0011>
- Pereira-Kotze, C., Malherbe, K., Faber, M., Doherty, T., & Cooper, D. (2022). Legislation and policies for the right to maternity protection in South Africa: A fragmented state of affairs. *Journal of Human Lactation*, 38(4), 686–699. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08903344221108090>
- Purwanti, A., Wijaningsih, D., Mahfud, M. A., & Natalis, A. (2022). Gender inequality against women fishers in Indonesia. *Indonesia Law Review*, 12(3), 121–136.
- Rahman, R. A., Hajdú, J., & Prabowo, V. N. (2024). Digital labour platformer's legal status and decent working conditions: European Union and Indonesian perspective. *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Konstitusi*, 7(1), 157–175. <https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v7i1.10366>
- Rezvorovych, K., Gorinov, P., Sokol, M., Kutsyk, K., & Opatskyi, R. (2023). Peculiarities of the legislative regulation of the protection of rights of workers on the background of Russian military aggression (the Ukrainian experience). *Review of Economics and Finance*, 21, 584–591. <https://doi.org/10.55365/1923.x2023.21.60>
- Ribstein, L. E., & O'Hara, E. A. (2009). *The law market*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195312898.001.0001>
- Sari, H., Yildiz, İ., Baloglu, S. Ç., Özel, M., & Tekalp, R. (2023). The frequency of workplace violence against healthcare workers and affecting factors. *PLoS ONE*, 18(7), Article e0289363. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0289363>
- Scheid, T. L. (2005). Stigma as a barrier to employment: Mental disability and the Americans with Disabilities Act. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 28(6), 670–690. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2005.04.003>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Subramanian, H., Sengupta, A., & Xu, Y. (2024). Patient health record protection beyond the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act: Mixed methods study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 26, Article e59674. <https://doi.org/10.2196/59674>
- Taufiqurrohmah, A. H. A., Wibowo, D. E., & Victoria, O. (2024). The regulation on sexual harassment in ASEAN workers: Evidence from several countries. *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System*, 4(2), 538–568. <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v4i2.198>
- Todolí-Signes, A. (2019). Algorithms, artificial intelligence and automated decisions concerning workers and the risks of discrimination: The necessary collective governance of data protection. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, 25(4), 465–481. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1024258919876416>
- van der Toorn, J., Bracco, S. E., Gaitho, W., Ryan, W. S., Horne, S. G., Anderson, J. R., & Leskinen, E. A. (2024). Inclusion and protection in tension: Reflections on gathering sexual orientation and gender identity data in the workplace. *Journal of Social Issues*, 80(3), 947–972. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12632>
- van Eck, N. J., & Waltman, L. (2010). Software survey: VOSviewer, a computer program for bibliometric mapping. *Scientometrics*, 84(2), 523–538. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-009-0146-3>
- Vanacker, T., Collewaert, V., & Zahra, S. A. (2017). Slack resources, firm performance, and the institutional context: Evidence from privately held European firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(6), 1305–1326. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2583>

- Wanda Novita, Sinta Oktavina, & Siwi Putri Andini. (2026). How Organizational Culture And Digital Transformational Leadership Affect Employee Performance: A Study On Job Satisfaction As A Mediator. *International Journal of Social Science, Educational, Economics, Agriculture Research and Technology (IJSET)*, 5(7), 4477–4488. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21058061>
- Yaroshenko, O. M., Lutsenko, O. Ye., Melnychuk, N. O., Zhygalkin, I. P., & Demenko, O. Ye. (2023). Payment for non-standard forms of labor and their impact on the economy and social status of employees. *Theoretical and Practical Research in the Economic Fields*, 14(2), 233–245. [https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v14.2\(28\).04](https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v14.2(28).04)
- Yaroshenko, O. M., Vitvitskyi, S. S., Nesterovych, O. S., Sereda, O. H., & Yakovlyev, O. A. (2025). Legal protection of employee privacy in the workplace. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*, 17(2), Article 04525003. <https://doi.org/10.1061/JLADAH.LADR-1202>
- Yu, X. (2008). Impacts of corporate code of conduct on labor standards: A case study of Reebok's athletic footwear supplier factory in China. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(3), 513–529. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9521-2>
- Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. J. (2020). Strengthening legal protection against discrimination by algorithms and artificial intelligence. *International Journal of Human Rights*, 24(10), 1572–1593. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2020.1743976>
- Zupic, I., & Čater, T. (2015). Bibliometric methods in management and organization. *Organizational Research Methods*, 18(3), 429–472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114562629>