



ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL

Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>

Vol. 5 No. 01 Jan-Mar 2026. Page#. 7742-7754

Print ISSN: [3006-2497](#) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](#)

Platform & Workflow by: Open Journal System

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22110436>

The Social Meaning of Informal Work: Dignity, Stigma and Survival beyond the Formal-Informal Divide

Sonia Asghar

Lecturer, Department of Social Sciences, Rashid Latif Khan University, Lahore

sonia.asghar@rlku.edu.pk

Roheen Zafar

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Pakistan Studies, Qurtuba University of Science & Information Technology, Peshawar

roheenzafar@gmail.com

Abstract

Informal work is usually measured as a residual category defined by the absence of contracts, registration, and statutory protection. That residual view has produced a durable policy binary in which formality stands for progress and informality stands for deficit. This article argues that the binary conceals the social meanings through which workers themselves interpret labour, worth, and belonging. Drawing on an interpretive synthesis of published ethnographies, labour statistics, and recognition theory, the article shows that informal work is simultaneously a site of stigma, a repertoire of dignity claims, and a practical architecture of household survival. Dignity is not granted by legal status alone. It is assembled through hard work narratives, moral comparison, occupational reframing, kinship obligation, and claims to social usefulness. Stigma is not a side effect of informality. It is produced by caste like occupational ranking, gender norms, dirty work taint, welfare deservingness, and the public equation of real work with registered wage employment. Survival is not only an income story. It is a social process that binds workers to patrons, relatives, neighbourhood, and informal insurance. The article concludes that development policy which treats informal workers only as objects of formalization will keep missing the recognition struggles that shape whether people enter, remain in, or refuse particular jobs. A hybrid social contract is required that protects livelihoods without demanding that workers first become formally employed in order to be treated as fully social persons.

Keywords: *Informal Work, Dignity, Stigma, Recognition, Dirty Work, Social Meaning, Survival, Labour, Development, Global South*

Introduction

The majority of the world's workers still labour outside the protective circle of written contracts, contributory social insurance, and enforceable labour standards. Official estimates continue to place informal employment near three fifths of global employment, with far higher shares in low income countries and in South Asia (International Labour Organization, 2024). In Pakistan the most recent labour force evidence places informal work at about four fifths of total employment, a figure that has proved stubborn across survey rounds (Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, 2025). These magnitudes are now familiar. What remains poorly understood is how workers themselves assign meaning to this condition. Policy documents still speak as if informality were chiefly a regulatory gap waiting to be closed. Workers speak as if informality were a social world in which honour, shame, usefulness, and obligation are negotiated every day.

The intellectual origin of the informal sector concept already contained this tension. When Hart described the income opportunities of Accra's urban poor, he asked whether the so called

reserve army of the underemployed was only a passive mass or whether their activities contained an autonomous capacity to generate livelihood (Hart, 1973). Subsequent decades folded that question into competing schools. Dualists treated informal work as a waiting room for modern jobs. Legalists treated it as a rational response to costly regulation. Structuralists treated it as a functional cheap labour reserve for formal capital. Voluntarists treated it as a chosen exit from state institutions (Chen, 2012). Each school captured part of the material story. None of them adequately asked what informal work means to those who do it, how stigma attaches to particular tasks and bodies, and how dignity is defended when the state and the middle class refuse to count the work as real employment.

That omission matters because labour is never only a factor of production. Work is one of the principal institutions through which modern societies distribute respect, blame, and membership. In recognition theory, paid and useful activity is a central route to social esteem (Honneth, 1995). When societies define genuine work as registered wage employment, they simultaneously produce disrespect toward those who work without papers, those who work in tainted occupations, and those who cannot work in approved ways. Informal workers therefore confront a double bind. They work, often for long hours and under harsh conditions, yet they are socially coded as not quite workers. They feed cities, clean streets, build houses, stitch garments, and care for households, yet they remain incomplete citizens of the labour contract.

This article advances a sociological reading of informal work that places dignity, stigma, and survival in one frame. Dignity refers to the sense of worth that workers claim for themselves and demand from others. Stigma refers to the discrediting evaluations that attach to occupations, bodies, and legal statuses. Survival refers to the practical arrangements through which households keep going when wages are irregular and public protection is thin. These three processes do not sit on opposite sides of a formal and informal divide. They operate across that divide and often inside the same working life. A construction labourer may hold a brief formal contract on one site and cash work on the next. A woman may combine unpaid family labour, home based piecework, and occasional factory shifts. A sanitation worker may be employed by a municipal contractor yet remain socially marked as polluted. Legal status does not automatically confer honour, and the absence of a contract does not automatically empty work of meaning.

The argument proceeds through the sections requested for a complete article. The literature review reconstructs how informality, dirty work, and workplace dignity have been theorized in largely separate conversations. The theoretical framework joins recognition theory, dirty work analysis, and the sociology of moral boundaries. The problem statement specifies the analytical cost of remaining inside the binary. Objectives and research questions then guide an interpretive methodology based on qualitative synthesis of published studies and official statistics rather than on a new primary survey. Findings are organized as four thematic results. Informal work carries internally generated meanings of usefulness and responsibility. Stigma is stratified by gender, caste like ranking, and taint rather than by informality as such. Dignity is assembled through moral comparison and occupational reframing. Survival is socially organized through kinship, patronage, and informal insurance. The discussion draws implications for decent work policy. The conclusion calls for a hybrid social contract in which protection and recognition are not postponed until formalization is complete.

The contribution is threefold. First, the article treats informal work as a meaning making institution rather than as a statistical remainder. Second, it shows that dignity and stigma are not psychological afterthoughts but organizing principles of labour markets in the Global South. Third, it relocates Pakistan and comparable settings from the margin of theory to the centre of

evidence, because these are the societies in which most of the world's informal workers actually live. A further clarification is required at the outset. This article does not argue that informal work is good because it is meaningful. Meaning can attach to exploitation. A bonded kiln worker may take pride in endurance while remaining unfree. A home based embroiderer may value skill while being paid a fraction of the export price. The sociological task is to understand those meanings without converting them into a romance of the slum or into an excuse for state withdrawal. Policy that ignores meaning will be rejected by the people it claims to help. Policy that celebrates meaning while leaving wages and safety untouched will become an apology for inequality.

Literature Review

The first generation of informal sector research was preoccupied with definition and size. After Hart's field account, the International Labour Office popularized the informal sector as a set of small, unregistered, low productivity units. Later statistical revisions shifted the unit of analysis from the enterprise to the job. Informal employment came to mean work without legal or social protection, whether located inside informal units or inside formal firms (Chen, 2012). That shift was decisive because it revealed informal wage labour inside registered companies, including subcontracted construction gangs, homeworkers tied to export chains, and domestic workers employed by affluent households. Informality is therefore not a separate economy. It is a set of employment relations that cut across the apparent boundary between modern and traditional production (Castells & Portes, 1989).

Four theoretical families still dominate the policy debate. The dualist family, associated with early modernization theory, expects informality to shrink as industry absorbs surplus labour. The legalist family, associated with de Soto, treats informality as a rational evasion of costly bureaucracy and insecure property rights (de Soto, 1989). The structuralist family insists that formal firms actively produce informality by outsourcing risk and labour costs. The voluntarist family, associated with some labour economics, treats many informal jobs as chosen because they offer flexibility or escape from payroll tax (Maloney, 2004). Chen later argued that these families describe different segments of a heterogeneous workforce and that policy must distinguish own account operators, unpaid family workers, informal employees, and employers of tiny units (Chen, 2016). The Recommendation concerning the transition from the informal to the formal economy restated that heterogeneity and called for integrated strategies rather than punishment of the poor (International Labour Organization, 2015).

These debates improved measurement and policy design. They did not, however, explain why some informal jobs are socially respected while others are treated as shameful, nor why workers sometimes refuse better paid work that would stain family honour. The missing literature sits in the sociology of work. Hodson defined workplace dignity as the ability to establish self worth and to enjoy the respect of others, and he showed that workers defend that dignity through resistance, citizenship, meaning making, and coworker solidarity even in abusive settings (Hodson, 2001). Sayer insisted that dignity at work requires treating persons as ends rather than as instruments and that everyday courtesy, recognition of contribution, and autonomy are not luxuries (Sayer, 2007). Bolton gathered a related British debate that linked dignity to both material security and respectful social relations (Bolton, 2007). These texts were written mainly about formal workplaces in affluent economies. Their questions travel poorly if they are left there, because the majority of workers who struggle for dignity do so without an employment contract at all.

A second stream concerns dirty work. Hughes observed that societies assign physically, socially, or morally tainted tasks to particular groups and then look away (Hughes, 1958). Ashforth and Kreiner asked how members of tainted occupations still construct positive identities. They

answered that occupational cultures reframe the work as noble or necessary, recalibrate standards of success, refocus attention on clean or skilled aspects of the job, and weight insider opinion more heavily than public contempt (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Later reviews confirmed that occupational stigma is a discrediting social evaluation that can attach to tasks, to workers, or to both, and that it varies by culture and history (Zhang et al., 2021). Empirical studies of waste pickers in Brazil show that informal conditions intensify dirty work taint because workers cannot point to a regular contract as proof of respectable status, yet they still recast collection as environmental service and urban necessity (Coletto & Carbonai, 2023). The dirty work tradition is indispensable for informal labour because so many informal occupations handle waste, bodies, streets, and servile proximity.

A third stream concerns moral boundaries and working class worth. Lamont showed that working men in the United States and France draw moral fences around honesty, hard work, and responsibility in order to claim dignity against both the idle poor and the ungenerous elite (Lamont, 2000). Parallel findings appear among service workers in Iran who equate personal worth with effort and thereby create microsystems of ethical ranking (Hashemi, 2018). Rural American men outside formal employment likewise narrate themselves as workers by pointing to under the table jobs, kin care, and household labour, thereby claiming dignity even when official statistics code them as nonemployed (Halpern-Meeke & Sidle, 2024). These studies demonstrate that the meaning of work is produced in comparison. Informal workers do not simply receive stigma from above. They also allocate stigma downward and sideways.

South Asian scholarship makes the comparison more severe because ranking is often inherited. Research on toilet cleaners of low caste status in Lahore found that social identity theory's usual assumption of worker agency in reconstructing a positive self does not travel cleanly to settings where caste like hierarchy, religious marking, and spatial exclusion lock people into tainted tasks (Zulfiqar & Prasad, 2022). Amnesty International documented how sanitation workers in Pakistan face discrimination that is at once occupational, religious, and contractual, with precarious hiring amplifying social contempt (Amnesty International, 2025). Beauty workers and other public facing women in urban Pakistan manage a triad of occupational, class, and gendered stigmas, a strategy that only partly succeeds because public femininity remains policed. Frontline women in health, police, and airlines navigate what Husain calls a stigma matrix in which globalized service work collides with local honour codes (Husain, 2024). These studies establish that informality in South Asia is not a colourless legal status. It is braided with gender seclusion, inherited pollution beliefs, and public respectability.

A fourth stream treats informal work as socially organized survival rather than as isolated market choice. Breman has long argued that India's informal economy is a regime of labour circulation, contractor control, and household pooling rather than a collection of microentrepreneurs (Breman, 2013). In urban Pakistan, construction labour is governed through subcontractors who appear as patrons, so that extra economic dependence and cultural idioms of loyalty organize exploitation (Akhtar, 2011). HRCP analysis of labour rights notes that informal safety nets based on kinship and neighbourhood trust both cushion risk and discipline workers through gendered and ethnic obligation (Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, 2023). Williams and colleagues have shown across many countries that informal work is rarely only exclusion or only exit. Motives mix necessity, discrimination, flexibility, and social ties (Williams & Round, 2008). That mixed motive finding is crucial. If informal work were only exclusion, dignity talk would be mere consolation. If it were only exit, stigma would be self inflicted. The evidence supports neither purity.

The platform and gig literature has recently restated these older problems in a digital idiom. Crowdwork and app mediated delivery are frequently classified as self employment even when a platform sets prices, ratings, and access to customers. Coverage of pensions and health insurance among platform workers remains thin in many countries, and the classification contest itself becomes a dignity contest because workers want to be seen as employed persons rather than as disposable contractors (Behrendt et al., 2019). In labour markets that were already informal, the platform does not invent precarity. It reorganizes it, adding algorithmic evaluation to the older disciplines of the contractor and the household. The social meaning of such work is therefore mixed. Some young workers treat gigs as skill display and urban membership. Others treat them as last resort hustling that they hide from relatives. The same legal form can carry opposite moral weights.

Standing's account of the precariat described a class in the making defined by insecurity, fragmentary identities, and missing occupational narrative (Standing, 2011). The description fits many informal wage workers. It fits less well those own account traders who possess a strong occupational story and a local public. The precariat thesis is therefore useful as a warning about insecurity and weak if it flattens all informal lives into one class experience. Meagher has similarly cautioned against treating African informal economies as either heroic entrepreneurship or simple failure, arguing that institutions, networks, and state practice structure what informal actors can do (Meagher, 2013). Kanbur noted the conceptual clutter that follows when researchers switch among enterprise, job, and activity definitions without notice (Kanbur, 2009). Conceptual clutter is not a pedantic complaint. It produces policy that targets the wrong unit, for example registering micro firms while leaving informal employees of those firms unprotected. Taken together, the literature reveals three gaps. Informality research underestimates meaning. Dignity research underestimates informality. Dirty work research underestimates the Global South, where taint is often organized by caste, religion, and gender rather than by occupational choice alone. This article sits in those gaps.

Theoretical Framework

The framework used here joins three theoretical resources. The first is recognition theory. Honneth argued that a successful relation to self depends on love in intimate life, legal respect as a rights bearing person, and social esteem for one's contributions (Honneth, 1995). Informal workers commonly receive partial love inside families, weak or absent legal respect from the state, and contested esteem from the public. The struggle of informal labour is therefore a struggle over which activities count as contributions worthy of esteem. When societies institutionalize wage labour as the privileged contribution, they manufacture disrespect toward unpaid care, own account street work, and tainted service. Fraser later warned that recognition must not be separated from redistribution, because cultural insults often track material deprivation (Fraser, 2000). The present framework keeps both sides in view. A street vendor denied trading space suffers a recognition injury and an income injury at once.

The second resource is the dirty work and stigma tradition. Goffman defined stigma as an attribute that reduces a person from a whole and usual participant to a discounted one (Goffman, 1963). In labour markets the relevant attributes include legal invisibility, physical contact with waste or bodies, servile posture, and gendered publicity. Workers respond with the cultural techniques identified by Ashforth and Kreiner, but those techniques are unequally available. A skilled artisan can reframe craft as art. A hereditary sanitation worker may find reframing blocked by a status order that treats the task as proof of essence rather than as a job. Status construction theory therefore supplements social identity theory in the Global South,

because rankings are taught as natural long before an individual enters an occupation (Zulfiqar & Prasad, 2022).

The third resource is the sociology of moral worth and social reproduction. Bourdieu's idea of symbolic capital helps explain why some earnings cannot buy respect (Bourdieu, 1986). Money from a stigmatized job may feed a household while lowering the family's standing in the marriage market. Polanyi's reminder that labour is a fictitious commodity explains why treating work as a mere contract always collides with the fact that the commodity is a human life (Polanyi, 1944). Scott's account of everyday resistance shows that dignity claims often appear as small refusals, jokes, moral lectures, and selective effort rather than as strikes (Scott, 1985). Social reproduction feminism adds that unpaid household labour subsidizes both formal and informal production and that women's informal earnings are interpreted through honour codes before they are interpreted through wage rates (Kabeer, 2000).

Rayman's three pillars of livelihood, self respect, and social responsibility offer a concise bridge between these traditions and everyday worker talk (Rayman, 2001). Livelihood without respect is subsistence without standing. Respect without livelihood is honour that cannot feed children. Responsibility without power is a moral burden placed on the weak. Informal workers continually try to keep the three pillars upright with inadequate materials. Dukes and Streeck have recently restated a related institutional point for post industrial labour law. If labour is humanity itself being traded, then contract alone cannot be the measure of justice. Some status based protection must limit what the contract may do to the person (Dukes & Streeck, 2023). That argument was written with warehouses and platforms in view. It applies with even greater force where most labour has never been inside a stable contract.

From these resources the article derives a simple proposition. Informal work is a social field in which dignity, stigma, and survival are jointly produced. Legal formality is one source of recognition among others. It is not the master key. Policy that waits for formalization before offering respect will reproduce the very disrespect it claims to overcome.

Problem Statement

Development agencies, labour ministries, and many academic models still treat the formal and informal divide as the central organizing distinction of labour markets in poor countries. The distinction is administratively useful. It is sociologically insufficient. It cannot explain why two workers with identical legal status experience opposite degrees of honour. It cannot explain why some households refuse higher informal earnings that would compromise respectability. It cannot explain why formal subcontracting often reproduces the same indignities found in unregistered work. It cannot explain why workers defend occupations that official discourse describes only as deficits. The problem is therefore not that informality exists. The problem is that public knowledge about informality has been captured by a binary that erases social meaning. As long as informal workers appear only as units to be formalized, their dignity struggles will be coded as culture, their stigma will be coded as attitude, and their survival arrangements will be coded as inefficiency. Research and policy will continue to design transitions that workers experience as status threats rather than as emancipation.

Objectives

1. To reconstruct the social meanings that informal workers attach to their labour across published ethnographic and qualitative studies.
2. To explain how dignity and stigma are produced together rather than as opposites, with particular attention of gender, inherited occupational ranking, and dirty work taint.
3. To show how survival strategies operate as social institutions that both protect and constrain workers.

4. To draw implications for a decent work agenda that can protect informal livelihoods without treating legal formality as the sole gateway to social personhood.

Research Questions

1. What meanings do informal workers assign to their labour when official categories define that labour as residual or deficient?
2. How do dignity claims and stigma processes operate across different informal occupations, especially those marked by gender norms or inherited taint?
3. In what ways do kinship, patronage, and neighbourhood institutions organize survival, and how do those institutions shape the experience of worth?
4. What follows for labour and social policy if informal work is understood as a field of recognition rather than only as a regulatory gap?

Methodology

This article does not report a new household survey. It conducts an interpretive qualitative synthesis of published empirical research and official labour statistics. The method is appropriate because the research questions concern meaning, ranking, and moral experience, phenomena that are poorly captured by participation rates alone and that have already been documented in a substantial but scattered qualitative literature.

The corpus was assembled in three layers. The first layer comprises theoretical and definitional texts that established the informal employment concept, the dignity at work agenda, and the dirty work tradition. The second layer comprises ethnographic and interview based studies of informal or tainted occupations in the Global South, with concentrated attention to Pakistan and South Asia because those settings combine very high informality with intense status ranking. The third layer comprises official statistical reports that locate the qualitative cases in a demographic frame, including ILO global estimates and the Pakistan Labour Force Survey 2024 to 2025.

Inclusion required that a study address at least one of the three focal processes, namely dignity, stigma, or socially organized survival, and that it rest on identifiable empirical material rather than on commentary alone. Studies were read for workers' own vocabularies of worth, for the social audiences that confer or withhold respect, and for the institutional arrangements that make tomorrow's meal possible. Analysis followed a thematic synthesis logic. Codes were developed around usefulness, hard work, pollution, honour, servility, patronage, household pooling, and legal invisibility. Themes were then compared across occupations rather than treated as properties of a single trade.

The approach has limits that should be stated plainly. Secondary synthesis cannot recover tone, silence, or contradiction with the same fidelity as new fieldwork. Published studies overrepresent some occupations, notably street vending, waste work, domestic service, construction, and beauty work, and underrepresent others. Official statistics still undercount unpaid family labour and home based production. The article therefore claims analytic generalization about social processes, not statistical generalization about all informal workers. Ethical use of secondary material requires that workers' quoted experiences in source studies not be sensationalized and that stigmatized groups not be reduced to illustrations of theory.

Findings and Results

The Meaning of Informal Labour

Across the synthesized studies, workers rarely describe their activity as the mere absence of a proper job. They describe it as feeding children, keeping a stall alive, finishing a wall before night, clearing a lane that the city would otherwise leave foul, or standing in for a sick relative. Hart's original question about autonomous capacity therefore still has force. Informal activities generate not only income but also narratives of usefulness. In Brazilian research on workers

without contracts, participants associated decent work with dignity, participation, and freedom even when legal protection was missing, and several clusters of meaning organized around autonomy, family balance, social contribution, and employability (Zaghetto et al., 2026). Contribution talk is especially common among waste pickers and street vendors who insist that cities depend on them even as municipal officers treat them as clutter (Chen, 2019).

This finding does not romanticize hardship. Hours are long, earnings are volatile, and injury is common. The point is that deficit language fails as description. People do not inhabit a vacuum between formal jobs. They inhabit occupations with skill, rhythm, customers, tools, and moral accounts. When policy addresses them only as the not yet formal, it insults the very competence through which they survive.

Stratified Stigma in Informal Work

If stigma were simply the shadow of missing papers, all informal workers would be equally dishonoured. They are not. Own account artisans and successful traders often command local respect. Unpaid family workers may be honourable inside the household and invisible outside it. By contrast, sanitation workers, some categories of domestic servants, and women whose jobs require public bodily contact accumulate layered taint. Amnesty International's evidence on Pakistani sanitation workers shows contempt that targets community identity as much as contract status (Amnesty International, 2025). Zulfiqar and Prasad show that low caste toilet cleaners cannot easily perform the identity repair predicted by dirty work theory because the wider status order treats the task as proof of who they are (Zulfiqar & Prasad, 2022). Husain shows that even public sector women on the front line must manage honour threats that male colleagues do not face in the same form, and that a stigma matrix organizes those threats across class and gender (Husain, 2024).

Gender is a powerful stratifying force. Female labour force participation in Pakistan remains near one quarter, and urban rates are lower than rural rates despite better average schooling in cities (Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, 2025). That pattern is unintelligible if work is treated only as an income decision. It becomes intelligible when public paid work for women is read as a potential stain on family respectability. Informal home based work then appears not as a second best job but as a socially licensed compromise. The same compromise keeps earnings low and bargaining weak. Stigma here precedes the labour contract. It decides which contracts are thinkable.

Moral Comparison and the Making of Dignity

Workers defend worth by drawing boundaries. They contrast themselves with the idle, the dishonest, the ungenerous rich, and sometimes with co workers thought to lack craft. Hashemi found Iranian service workers converting hard work into symbolic capital that justified a claim to middle class moral membership (Hashemi, 2018). Lamont's comparative portrait of working men showed the same grammar of honesty and discipline (Lamont, 2000). Halpern Meekin and Sidle found that men excluded from formal jobs still presented themselves as workers by listing informal tasks and care duties (Halpern-Meekin & Sidle, 2024). These comparisons produce dignity for the speaker and stigma for the foil. They are therefore double edged. They protect the self and they reproduce ranking among the poor.

Reframing is the second technique. Waste pickers present themselves as environmental actors. Construction gangs present danger as proof of toughness and masculinity. Beauty workers present taste and care as skill. Occupational cultures teach members which parts of the job to display and which to hide, exactly as Ashforth and Kreiner predicted (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Yet reframing requires an audience willing to hear it. Where inherited pollution beliefs are strong, the audience may refuse the new script. Dignity work then becomes exhausting because it must be performed again each day against a status order that does not reset.

Responsibility talk is the third technique. Workers say they do not beg, they do not steal, they show up, they send money home. In recognition terms they are claiming esteem on the basis of contribution and character when legal respect is denied. Hodson's wider point that workers create meaning even under abuse holds outside the factory gate (Hodson, 2001). The factory gate, however, is not the only site of abuse. The street, the house, the kiln, and the salon are workplaces too.

Kinship, Patronage, and Informal Survival

Informal workers almost never survive as isolated individuals. Households pool irregular incomes. Relatives advance cash after injury. Neighbours share information about sites that are hiring. Contractors offer advances that create debt and loyalty at once (Akhtar, 2011). Kinship based safety nets reduce hunger while they also police women's mobility and young men's political independence (Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, 2023). Patronage is therefore not a cultural leftover. It is the practical welfare state of the informal world.

This finding revises the exclusion versus exit debate. Many workers are excluded from formal jobs by slim demand, discrimination, and missing credentials (Williams & Round, 2008). Many also remain inside informal arrangements because those arrangements supply credit, childcare, and a known boss. Formalization that destroys the known boss without replacing the credit and the childcare will be experienced as abandonment. Survival institutions explain why workers sometimes defend relationships that look purely exploitative to outsiders. The relationship is a bundle. It contains wage theft and it contains tomorrow's loan.

A further survival pattern is occupational multiplicity. Workers stitch together several short engagements because no single engagement pays a living. Recent work on precarious multiple employment argues that dignity must then be understood in, out, and between jobs, because humiliation in one site can be offset or compounded in another (Manolchev et al., 2025). Informal lives are sequential and simultaneous. The binary snapshot of formal versus informal misses that movement.

Climate stress now enters the same survival field. Outdoor and workshop labourers in Pakistan describe heat that sickens the body while contractors punish rest and withhold information about symptoms (Climate Rights International, 2025). Informal status makes refusal costly because there is no sick pay and another worker is waiting at the gate. Dignity talk about toughness then becomes dangerous. It helps men present themselves as capable, and it helps employers demand endurance that medical sense would forbid. The social meaning of informal work therefore includes a moralization of bodily risk. What looks like worker pride can be an adaptation to a market that treats the body as a disposable tool.

Child labour and very young entry into informal trades belong to the same field although they are often siloed in separate literatures. Households deploy children's time when adult earnings collapse or when a trade is learned through watching rather than through school. The social meaning attached to that deployment is not always identical with official condemnation. Relatives may call it training, contribution, or the only alternative to idleness. A dignity framework must record those local meanings and still insist that they do not cancel harm. The point of studying meaning is not to ratify every local justification. It is to understand why legal bans fail when they ignore the household arithmetic and the honour codes that make children's work thinkable.

Discussion

The four findings support the central claim that the formal and informal divide is too thin to carry the social weight placed upon it. Formality can increase legal respect, and that increase is valuable. It does not automatically deliver esteem, and it does not automatically dissolve taint.

Conversely, informality can coexist with local honour when the occupation is seen as skilled, male, or community serving. Development discourse that treats formalization as moral promotion and informality as moral failure therefore misdescribes the field.

Recognition theory helps specify what policy must add. Legal inclusion addresses one sphere of recognition. It does not by itself reform the cultural ranking of tasks, the gendering of public work, or the inherited assignment of polluted labour. A transition agenda that issues identity cards but leaves sanitation work as a community prison will have changed paperwork more than personhood. Fraser's insistence on joining recognition to redistribution is practical here (Fraser, 2000). Wage floors, public procurement for worker cooperatives, and access to urban space are material reforms that also signal that the work counts.

Dirty work theory helps specify the limits of self help. Ideological reframing is a real worker skill, but it is not a substitute for changing the audience that assigns taint. Municipal recognition of waste pickers as environmental service providers, for example, alters the public script in a way that individual pride cannot. Where taint is bound to caste like ranking, recognition must confront that ranking directly. Silence in the name of cultural sensitivity leaves the lowest workers to perform endless dignity labour against a closed status order.

The survival finding warns against a punitive road to formality. If kinship and contractors are the existing social protection system, abrupt enforcement without portable benefits will strip insurance faster than it creates rights. Chen's call for a hybrid economy that values informal production alongside formal production remains the most realistic institutional horizon (Chen, 2016). Hybridity here does not mean perpetual precarity. It means extending protection, voice, and public services to people where they already work, rather than inviting them to become different people first.

For Pakistan the implications are sharp. An economy in which about four fifths of employment is informal cannot treat decent work as a minority privilege of the registered sector. Women's low urban participation will not rise through training schemes that ignore honour costs. Sanitation reform that modernizes equipment but keeps the same communities in the same social position will reproduce stigma with better tools. Construction regulation that ignores the contractor as patron will miss the real employer. These are not implementation details. They are the social structure of the labour market.

Comparative evidence from other regions supports the same caution. Eastern Caribbean tourism research shows that a sector can dominate national output while remaining dense with informality and decent work deficits, so that productivity talk without rights talk will not deliver inclusion (International Labour Organization, 2026). Colombian policy decomposition of informality shows that aggregate declines can hide different mechanisms, such as better bookkeeping among own account workers versus higher pension affiliation among employees (Chacaltana & Villarreal-Fuentes, 2026). If the social meaning of those mechanisms differs, then a single formalization slogan will misfire. Bookkeeping changes how a trader sees the business. Pension affiliation changes how a wage worker sees the future. Both matter. They are not the same reform.

The discussion also qualifies worker voice. Informal workers are not voiceless, but their voice is often organized through associations of vendors, picker cooperatives, kinship panchayats, or religious charities rather than through industrial unions. Chen has argued that organizations of street vendors and waste pickers must have a place in the governance of urban commons because those commons are their workplaces (Chen, 2016). Excluding those organizations from planning meetings is a recognition injury with material effects, because eviction and confiscation

follow from plans that never heard the people who use the space. Dignity policy is therefore institutional design, not a training module in self esteem.

Conclusion

Informal work is one of the principal social institutions of the contemporary world. It is where most labour is done, where most urban services are produced, and where most poor households piece together survival. To describe that institution only as the outside of formality is to misunderstand it. Workers assign meaning to what they do. They claim dignity through usefulness, effort, and responsibility. They suffer stigma that is organized by gender, inherited ranking, and occupational taint. They survive through social ties that protect and constrain at the same time.

The formal and informal divide remains a necessary statistical device. It is a poor theory of society. Dignity does not begin on the day a contract is signed. Stigma does not end when a firm is registered. Survival does not wait for a social insurance number. A high standard research agenda should therefore study informal labour as a field of recognition, ranking, and household reproduction. A high standard policy agenda should extend legal protection and social insurance without demanding cultural conversion as the price of entry. The social meaning of informal work is not a soft topic at the edge of development studies. It is the ground on which any credible decent work project must stand.

Future research should do three things that this synthesis could not do. It should collect new comparative interviews that ask workers, in their own languages of worth, what would count as respectful reform rather than only what would count as higher pay. It should link those narratives to panel data on moves between own account work, informal wage labour, and rare formal jobs, so that meaning and mobility can be studied together. It should treat unpaid family labour as work in the full sociological sense, not as a residual inside household surveys. Until those steps are taken, the formal and informal divide will continue to organize official knowledge while everyday labour continues to organize society through dignity, stigma, and survival.

References

- Akhtar, A. S. (2011). Patronage and class in urban Pakistan: Modes of labor control in the contractor economy. *Critical Asian Studies*, 43(2), 159–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2011.570565>
- Amnesty International. (2025). "Cut us open and see that we bleed like them": Discrimination and stigmatization of sanitation workers in Pakistan (ASA 33/0120/2025). Amnesty International.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Kreiner, G. E. (1999). "How can you do it?": Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 413–434. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202129>
- Behrendt, C., Nguyen, Q. A., & Rani, U. (2019). Social protection systems and the future of work: Ensuring social security for digital platform workers. *International Social Security Review*, 72(3), 17–41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/issr.12212>
- Bolton, S. C. (Ed.). (2007). *Dimensions of dignity at work*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Breman, J. (2013). *At work in the informal economy of India: A perspective from the bottom up*. Oxford University Press.
- Castells, M., & Portes, A. (1989). World underneath: The origins, dynamics, and effects of the informal economy. In A. Portes, M. Castells, & L. A. Benton (Eds.), *The informal economy: Studies in advanced and less developed countries* (pp. 11–37). Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Chacaltana, J., & Villarreal-Fuentes, M. (2026). Unpacking informality: A multidimensional policy decomposition (ILO Working Paper 169). International Labour Organization. <https://doi.org/10.54394/00033193>
- Chen, M. A. (2012). The informal economy: Definitions, theories and policies (WIEGO Working Paper No. 1). Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing.
- Chen, M. A. (2016). The informal economy: Recent trends, future directions. *New Solutions*, 26(2), 155–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1048291116652613>
- Chen, M. A. (2019). Economic rights of the informal self-employed: Three urban cases. In J. Nickel (Ed.), *Economic liberties and human rights*. Routledge.
- Climate Rights International. (2025). They don't see what heat does to our bodies. Climate Rights International.
- Coletto, D., & Carbonai, D. (2023). What does it mean to have a dirty and informal job? The case of waste pickers in the Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 2337. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032337>
- de Soto, H. (1989). *The other path: The invisible revolution in the Third World*. Harper & Row.
- Dukes, R., & Streeck, W. (2023). *Democracy at work: Contract, status and post-industrial justice*. Polity.
- Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review*, 3, 107–120.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Prentice-Hall.
- Halpern-Meekin, S., & Sidle, A. (2024). The dignity of nonworking men. *Rural Sociology*, 89(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ruso.12570>
- Hart, K. (1973). Informal income opportunities and urban employment in Ghana. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 11(1), 61–89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022278X00008089>
- Hodson, R. (2001). *Dignity at work*. Cambridge University Press.
- Honneth, A. (1995). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. Polity.
- Hughes, E. C. (1958). *Men and their work*. Free Press.
- Human Rights Commission of Pakistan. (2023). *Reconceptualising labour and labour rights*. HRCP.
- Husain, F. (2024). *The stigma matrix: Gender, globalization, and the agency of Pakistan's frontline women*. Stanford University Press.
- International Labour Organization. (2015). *Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy Recommendation (No. 204)*. ILO.
- International Labour Organization. (2024). *World employment and social outlook: Trends 2024*. ILO.
- International Labour Organization. (2026). *Informality in the tourism sector in the Eastern Caribbean*. ILO.
- Kabeer, N. (2000). *The power to choose: Bangladeshi women and labour market decisions in London and Dhaka*. Verso.
- Kanbur, R. (2009). Conceptualising informality: Regulation and enforcement. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 52(1), 33–42.
- Lamont, M. (2000). *The dignity of working men: Morality and the boundaries of race, class, and immigration*. Harvard University Press.
- Maloney, W. F. (2004). Informality revisited. *World Development*, 32(7), 1159–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2004.01.008>
- Manolchev, C., et al. (2025). "We are the backbone of the community": Precarious multiple employment and the complex dynamics of dignity in, out, and between work. *Human Relations*. Advance online publication.

- Meagher, K. (2013). Unlocking the informal economy: A literature review on linkages between formal and informal economies in developing countries (WIEGO Working Paper No. 27). WIEGO. Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. (2025). Labour force survey 2024-25. Government of Pakistan.
- Polanyi, K. (1944). *The great transformation*. Farrar & Rinehart.
- Rayman, P. M. (2001). *Beyond the bottom line: The search for dignity at work*. Palgrave.
- Hashemi, M. (2018). Tarnished work: Dignity and labour in Iran. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 47(5), 741–756. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13530194.2018.1552116>
- Sayer, A. (2007). Dignity at work: Broadening the agenda. *Organization*, 14(4), 565–581. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508407078053>
- Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. Yale University Press.
- Standing, G. (2011). *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Williams, C. C., & Round, J. (2008). Retheorizing the nature of informal employment. *International Sociology*, 23(3), 367–388.
- Zhang, R., Wang, M. S., Toubiana, M., & Greenwood, R. (2021). Stigmatized work and stigmatized workers. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 9, 95–120. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-091423>
- Zagheto, J. A. V., dos Santos, N. R., Porto, J. B., & Pais, L. (2026). Workers without an employment contract: Decent work, resources and demands. *Current Psychology*, 45, Article 843. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-026-09341-w>
- Zulfiqar, G., & Prasad, A. (2022). How is social inequality maintained in the Global South? Critiquing the concept of dirty work. *Human Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267221097942>