

Casual Employment in Australia: Growth, Characteristics, A Bridge or a Trap?

John Burgess and Iain Campbell*

Abstract

About one in every four Australian employees is a casual. The casual share has doubled over the past decade and continues to expand. This paper catalogues the growth of casual employment and discusses the characteristics of casual jobs and of those in casual jobs. The key analytical issue discussed is whether casual employment is a transitional employment arrangement on the road towards permanent employment conditions. Alternatively, is it a trap which is associated with job insecurity, low earnings and spells outside of employment? Although the evidence is partial and circumstantial, casual employment is a bridge for some and a trap for others. In particular, for those who wish to break out of unemployment, casual employment is unlikely to be a transitional point on the road to a permanent job. This finding has important implications for the design of labour market programs.

Introduction

One of the most dramatic workforce developments over the past decade has been the growing numbers and growing workforce share for casual employees. Indeed, Australia stands out across the OECD as an extreme in terms

* Department of Economics, University of Newcastle and National Key Centre in Industrial Relations, Monash University.

of its dramatic casual employment growth (OECD, 1996). While much policy attention has centred upon wage flexibility and on the market impediments generated by trade unions and the award system (eg Budget Statements 1996/1997), most of the media and policy attention centres on the alleged restrictive working practices and militant behaviour of male, full-time, permanent, unionised trade employees in such sectors as mining and stevedoring. These are hardly representative of the workforce characteristics and arrangements that have evolved in Australia over the past two decades. Increasingly new jobs are located in the service sector, are part-time and/or casual, non unionised and filled by women. At the same time the workforce has evolved towards non-standard employment arrangements (Brosnan and Campbell, 1995) together with more flexible working time arrangements (Campbell and Mathews, 1998; Heiler, 1998). Indeed, there is a direct link between the shift towards non-standard employment and the deregulation of working time, with 'standard' working hours dissolving in unison with standard employment arrangements.

This article attempts to explore a theme and debate associated with the development of temporary employment arrangements in Europe (Buchtemann and Quack, 1989; Natti, 1994). Namely, whether such arrangements constitute a bridge from which temporary workers can proceed to more secure and longer term employment arrangements. Or, do they represent a trap, into which incumbents are forced to accept many insecure and low paying jobs, without non-wage benefits (eg holidays) which are perhaps interspersed with spells in unemployment or outside of the labour market. Given the growing prominence of casual employment in Australia it is time to investigate this question, which has not only analytical interest, but also policy interest. If casual employment is a bridge, then it is an employment form which should be encouraged and developed, especially for job seekers, who can progress into secure jobs with career paths and non-wage benefits. Casual employment placement, especially for disadvantaged job seekers, can generate benefits for employers (screening, fewer overheads and non wage benefits, exemption from employment protection) and employees (work experience and on-the-job training) which improves their opportunities for acquiring better paid and more secure employment. On the other hand, if it is a trap it can perpetuate a cycle of marginal employment attachment, low earnings, ongoing employment insecurity, minimal skill acquisition and reinforce the polarisation that is developing within the Australian labour market (Brosnan, 1996).

In the past the consideration of such an important policy question has been limited through the lack of comprehensive longitudinal labour force

data. However, this short coming is gradually being overcome by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) through its development of a new longitudinal data base of employment and unemployment patterns (Catalogue 6286.0). To date the longitudinal observations are limited, but it does provide a starting point, and together with other fragmentary data sources we are able to shed some light on the bridges or traps debate for Australia.

The paper is organised as follows. The following section outlines the fundamental restructuring of employment arrangements in Australia over the past 25 years. In particular we highlight the decline in full-time and permanent waged employment as the 'standard' employment arrangement. Following, we discuss the meaning and nature of casual employment, highlighting its regulatory distinctiveness in the Australian context. We then briefly catalogue the characteristics of casual workers and casual jobs. From this we outline the bridges or traps debate and consider its application to Australian casual employment utilising the available fragmentary evidence. Finally, we consider the policy implications of the evidence.

The Restructuring of Employment in Australia

The full-time permanent employment contract has been the crucial pivot in the development of labour regulation, social welfare policy and trade union action. Over the course of much of the twentieth century, and in particular during the 'thirty glorious years' after the end of World War II, employment protection for full-time permanent employees was consolidated and further rights, benefits and forms of protection came to be attached in a steady accretion to the permanent employment contract. The result was a narrowing of the contractual sphere, which served to open up a realm of status-linked rights for a particular form of employment (Muckenberger, 1989; Streeck, 1992). The pace and extent of this accretion varied across countries, with the result that 'permanency' acquired different meanings in each country in accordance with labour regulatory systems, the sphere and types of trade union organisation and the methods of labour co-ordination. Nevertheless, in each country the full-time permanent employment contract – with a varied set of attendant rights and benefits – came to be the central element in a concept of 'standard' employment, which in turn came to constitute the foundation for an influential norm for employees wages and employment conditions, including working-time arrangements, as well as serving as a norm in national social security (including retirement) arrangements.

Standing outside the framework of the permanent employment contract are varied forms of non-permanent waged work or 'temporary employment', eg seasonal and casual employment, fixed-term contracts, training contracts, and some forms of agency employment. These arrangements encompass both full-time and part-time work. Though also waged work, they involve rights, benefits and forms of protection that differ – often quite radically – from those associated with a permanent employment contract. Political and economic pressures in the 1980s and 1990s, including pressures associated with globalisation and persistent high unemployment rates across many OECD economies, have acted to challenge the historically-inherited form of permanent employment. This challenge proceeds in two main ways. First are the pressures to strip away some of the framework conditions supporting this form of employment and to redefine (wind back) the specific rights and benefits associated with permanent employment. Second, this pressure in turn is reinforced through the expansion in traditional forms of temporary waged work in combination with emerging new forms (eg as new forms of contract designed to assist the unemployed). These pressures are expressed most powerfully in the political philosophy of neoliberalism and the purported need for policy to encourage greater 'labour market flexibility' (Campbell, 1993), but they can also be seen as drawing support from changes in the specific economic conditions facing many individual enterprises, changes in labour market conditions and indeed changes in the needs and preferences of many individual employees.

These common pressures have had varied outcomes on the employment structure at the national level. The outcomes can be usefully theorised in terms of the erosion of standard employment (cf Muckenberger, 1989; Matthies et al, 1994; Brosnan and Campbell, 1995) and the unfolding of processes of 'labour market fragmentation' (eg Standing, 1993). At the same time, it remains noteworthy that the outcomes at the national level have been surprisingly diverse, not only in terms of the extent of change but also in terms of the channels of change. The diversity is particularly marked if we focus on the main forms, the extent and the patterns of growth in temporary employment. Each country appears to display a distinctive pattern of change in this area. Indeed, in comparison with the relative homogeneity of the recent past, OECD countries appear to be setting out on divergent paths of change in terms of the evolution of non-standard employment arrangements (OECD, 1994).

In Australia change has been very extensive over the past fifteen years, involving alterations in the wages and conditions of many permanent employees as well as major increases in many forms of non-permanent

waged work (Burgess, 1994a; Brosnan and Campbell, 1995). Perhaps the major channel of change has been through casual employment – a form of employment that is deprived of most standard benefits, rights and forms of protection and that is marked by substantial levels of precariousness (Campbell, 1996a, 1996b). The official statistics suggest that casual employment in Australia has expanded steadily and steeply since the early 1980s. The number of employees who were casual in their main job more than doubled in the period from 1982 to 1997. Casual employees increased from around 13.3 per cent to 25.2 per cent of all employees over this period (Table 1). This is a startling increase, described as ‘arguably... the most dramatic development in the labour market in recent times’ (Dawkins and Simpson, 1993, 30). To put this development in perspective, of the 1.56 million employee positions that were created in Australia between 1984 and 1997, 945 thousand, or just over 60 per cent were casual jobs. Casual employment arrangements have become ‘typical’ of the new jobs being created over the course of the 1990s.

Table 1 Casual Employees as a Percentage of Total Employees and by Full-time/ part-time status, 1984–1997

Year a)	Full-time employees		Part-time employees		Total casual employees	
	Total '000	Casual %	Total '000	Casual %	'000	as % of total
1984	4443.4	6.2	914.7	62.4	848.2	15.8
1985	4544.2	6.3	968.8	61.9	887.3	16.1
1986	4657.6	7.0	1025.7	63.7	979.3	17.2
1987	4678.7	7.1	1138.9	64.4	1064.2	18.3
1988	4920.9	7.5	1181.0	66.4	1152.9	18.9
1989c	5099.6	6.3	1295.5	68.5	1210.6	18.6
1990	5200.1	7.2	1365.5	65.7	1271.8	19.4
1991	4919.1	6.8	1398.1	67.5	1280.0	20.3
1992	4768.0	7.4	1566.8	67.7	1415.0	22.3
1993	4790.2	8.4	1533.3	67.2	1435.1	22.7
1994	4872.7	9.1	1653.1	67.0	1549.1	23.7
1995	5104.6	9.5	1777.7	65.8	1653.3	24.0
1996	5162.6	10.8	1899.6	67.5	1833.7	26.3
1997	5055.8	10.6	1916.4	65.6	1795.3	25.8

Source: Campbell (1996b, 106); ABS Catalogue 6310.0 (1997)

Defining and Measuring Casual Employment

For much of the post-war period the official labour statistics in Australia, as in most countries, were content with broad divisions of the employed labour force according to status in employment and whether full-time or part-time worker. The 'labour force' taxonomy corresponded with growing prosperity, full employment and the ascendancy of Keynesian views on economic regulation (Moir and Robinson, 1984). There was a correspondence between labour force statistics and the dominance of the standard employment model; non-standard employment arrangements received only cursory attention in the workforce typology and data (Burgess, 1994a). More recently (since 1994), in supplementary topics and special supplementary surveys associated with the Monthly Population Survey, the ABS has begun to publish figures that disaggregate data on employees according to whether they are 'casual' or 'permanent' (in their main job) when presenting data on supplementary labour force surveys on such issues as earnings dispersion and trade union membership.

In disaggregating the data on employees, the ABS builds on the legal conception of a casual employment contract as entailing a lack of entitlement to standard employment benefits. Thus 'casual employees' are usually defined as 'employees who were not entitled to either annual leave or sick leave in their main job', whereas 'permanent employees' are defined in opposition to casuals as 'employees who were entitled to annual leave or sick leave in their main job' (eg ABS Catalogue 6325.0, August 1996). Persons currently employed as employees are classified into these categories according to their responses to questions about employer provision (in their main job) of paid holiday leave and of paid sick leave.

Casual employment is a practice that is firmly anchored in features of the labour regulation system. The basic definition of a casual employee is to be found in the common law, where casual employees are presumed to have a contract of employment that is of 'so minimal duration as to barely exist' (Carter, 1990, 9; Creighton and Stewart, 1994, 136-137). They are seen as employees who are used 'as and when required', with each engagement being seen as a separate engagement. Whereas permanent employees have a period of notice (of at least a week), casual employees can be dismissed – or perhaps more exactly fail to be re-engaged – at any time. Most important, since the contract of employment is presumed to be of short duration, casual employees are seen as lacking any entitlement to employment benefits tied to continuous service, eg annual leave (and annual leave loading), sick leave, long service leave, parental leave, bereavement leave and severance pay. Similarly, they are not entitled to payment for public

holidays or other periods of non-work time. In addition they have only limited protection against unfair dismissal.

The common law provides the foundation for the development of casual employment as a form of employment with inferior rights and levels of protection. However, the distinctiveness of the Australian case derives not from the common law as such but rather from the way in which other forms of external labour regulation have developed to overlay, supplement, and – to some extent – even supplant the common law understanding. The most important channel of external labour regulation has been through the system of compulsory conciliation and arbitration, characterised at both federal and state levels by independent tribunals and by legally binding awards (Creighton and Stewart, 1994). Though currently in the process of being dismantled as a result of labour market deregulation, this award system has been highly influential in shaping the development of forms of employment, including casual employment.

The floor of minimum labour standards laid down in awards primarily supports and protects employees in standard employment. Indeed, the history of the award system is one in which trade unions in the main have attempted to quarantine standard employment from non-standard employment arrangements, especially part-time and casual employment. Most provisions in awards are couched in terms of continuing ('permanent') full-time, waged employment, and the rights and levels of protection that they specify are largely confined to employees in such employment. The majority of awards also contain provisions relating to the casual employee (generally defined just as 'one engaged and paid as such'). But the thrust of award provisions for casual employees is quite different to that of the provisions for permanent employees. Casual employees are rarely granted any of the benefits that are awarded in the central body of the award text to full-time permanent employees, and they are granted few specific protective measures, apart from isolated safeguards such as minimum daily hours or minimum start times. In return for their exclusion from standard employment benefits and protection (eg notice of termination), casuals are paid an hourly loading which is part compensation for benefit exclusion. In contrast to award provisions for permanent employees, award provisions for casual employees are oriented not towards providing protection and benefits but rather towards sanctioning the denial of standard protection and benefits. The primary function of such provisions is to provide employers – within certain limits – with official dispensations from the need to offer standard benefits and forms of protection to certain employees. Regulation does not in this case signal protection; it merely ratifies the absence of protection

and it has been rightly described by one international observer as 'the most peculiar feature of the Australian system' (Bieback, 1992, 24).

Awards have been the most important channel of external labour regulation. Statutory regulation plays only a limited role in the Australian system. In cases where statutory regulation – generally at state level – does define minimum conditions for employees, it tends to follow the lead of award regulation and to specify exemptions in the case of casual employees (Brooks, 1991, 48ff). The substantive provisions in awards have shaped the evolution of casual employment in Australia. They have been important in legitimating the use of casual employment. They have helped to create a distinctly modern form of casual employment. Award regulation allows a wide variety of employees to be designated as casual employees. The designation extends well beyond the group of workers who may be regarded as 'true casuals', that is those such as day labourers in agriculture or construction, whose work is short-term or irregular. In most awards there is no necessary implication that casual employment should be short-term (or irregular).

Many casual employees are employed according to the terms of award provisions. However, it would be incorrect to assume that this is true of all casual employees (cf. Dawkins and Norris, 1990, 156; 1995, 4). For many casual employees, even the meagre benefits of award provisions, in particular the casual loading on the hourly rate of pay, are missing. The 1997 ABS survey of part-time, temporary and casual employment in NSW found that only 30 per cent of such workers received a casual loading (Catalogue 6247.1). In addition to the officially-sanctioned gap in protection, two additional gaps in protection are associated with award regulation. As a result, in addition to casual workers who are fully within the sphere of effective regulation, two other groups of casual employees can be distinguished.

The first group comprises casual employees who are nominally covered by awards but who are only ineffectively or poorly regulated. Enforcement of award regulations in Australia has been poor, with widespread avoidance and evasion of award conditions by private sector management, especially in small workplaces (Bennett, 1994, 131-164; McCallum, 1994). This poorly regulated sector includes many who are casual employees (and who would be recorded as 'casual employees' in the aggregate statistics). Evasion of award conditions on the employment of casuals can take varied forms. For example it may include defiance of the quantitative limits on casual employment. From the point of view of the individual employee, evasion of award conditions frequently takes the form of underpayments.

The second group comprises casual employees who are not covered by specific labour regulation. Although pressed back in the course of the development of award regulation, the unregulated sphere never disappeared, and indeed it has recently once again begun to expand. Even before the full impact of labour market deregulation, it was possible to observe a growth in the proportion of employees outside award regulation, from 12 per cent in 1974 to 15 per cent in 1985 and then to 20 per cent (27.6 per cent in the private sector) in 1990 (ABS 6315.0, May 1990). While recent estimates suggest that those dependent on award coverage has fallen to around one third of employees (ACIRRT, 1996), and while this has to be tempered by the fact that awards still serve as the basis or the framework for many enterprise agreements, there are over 30 per cent of workers who are employed under individual contracts (ACIRRT, 1996). Lack of coverage means that the determination of wages and conditions is subject to informal arrangements, including individual bargaining and unilateral management decision-making. It appears likely that many of these employees are casual employees – appearing as casual employees in the aggregate statistics – who are subject not only to the common features of casual employment but also to low hourly rates of pay set according to the fancies of their employers.

Characteristics of Casual Jobs and Casual Workers

The characteristics and conditions of casual employment in Australia have been discussed by Campbell (1996b, 1998), De Ruyter (1997), Romeyn (1992), Simpson, Dawkins and Madden (1997), and Sweet (1995). Likewise, analysis of the determinants of casual employment can be found in Campbell (1996b), De Ruyter (1997) and Simpson, Dawkins and Madden (1997). Detailed discussion of the data questions can be found in Campbell (1996b) while Australia's extreme position in terms of temporary employment densities across the OECD is discussed in Campbell and Burgess (1997). This section briefly summarises the characteristics of casual jobs and of the workers in casual jobs.

Full-time and part-time status

In Australia, there is a substantial minority of full-time casual employees (559,100), but most casual employees in Australia are part-time (1,282,200). Casual employees currently represent 10.6 per cent of all full-time employees, but they represent an overwhelming 65.6 per cent of all part-time employees (ABS 6310.0, August 1997). It is true that the

differential in the share of casual employees within full-time and part-time employment is slowly narrowing. Both full-time and part-time casual employees have experienced similar rates of rapid growth in the period since 1984. However, this has occurred in a context where the number of full-time employees has expanded more slowly than the number of part-time employees (and indeed where an absolute decrease in the number of full-time employees is evident in the most recent period). As a result, the share of casual employees amongst full-time employees has increased rapidly, while the share of casual employees amongst part-time employees has remained largely stable since the late 1980s

Occupational and industrial distribution

Casual employees are much more strongly concentrated in the private sector, where they represented 30 per cent of all employees in 1992, than in the public sector, where they represented only 9.9 per cent in 1992 (Simpson, 1994, 10). Casual employees are also spread – though unevenly – amongst all occupations. Casual employees are most concentrated in the elementary clerical, sales and service workers group (where they represent 52 per cent of all employees) and in the labourers and related workers group (where they constitute 42.8 per cent of all employees). On the other hand the lowest levels of concentration are recorded for managers and administrators (15 per cent) and professionals (15.7 per cent) (ABS 6325.0, August 1996).

Casual employees are found in all industry sectors. The industry divisions with the highest casual densities are accommodation, cafes and restaurants, agriculture, forestry and fishing, cultural and recreation services, and retail trade. Construction appears as an industry division with moderate levels of casual density, while casual density is lowest in electricity, gas and water. We can note that casual density appears to be increasing in all industry divisions. From 1984 to 1993 casual density rose sharply in almost all industry divisions – both in industry divisions where casual employees were already an important component of the workforce (such as wholesale and retail trade) and in industry divisions where casual employees had been only a minor component in 1984 (such as manufacturing and transport and storage) (Campbell, 1996b, Table 3, 63-64). The more recent data for 1994 to 1996 under the new ANZSIC (Australia and New Zealand Standardised Industry Classification) system indicate a continuation of this rise in casual density across most industry divisions (Table 2).

Table 2 Casual Employees and Casual Density by Industry, 1994–1996

	Casual employees ('000) 1996	Casual density (%)		
		1994	1995	1996
Agriculture, forestry, fishing	85.6	47.6	47.9	53.9
Mining	10.0	9.3	8.7	11.7
Manufacturing	159.4	13.3	14.6	15.0
Electricity, gas, water	4.4*			
Construction	127.2	30.2	28.7	34.4
Wholesale trade	75.8	14.5	15.5	17.1
Retail trade	457.2	44.0	44.6	44.4
Accommodation, cafes, restaurants	191.2	54.4	53.9	56.0
Transport and storage	62.9	16.9	19.7	19.4
Communication services	12.8	7.5	9.6	8.4
Finance and insurance	23.8	6.8	8.3	7.8
Property and business services	198.6	26.9	25.2	29.5
Government administration and defence	51.2	8.4	8.4	13.8
Education	97.3	15.9	17.0	16.9
Health and community services	153.8	21.2	19.3	21.5
Cultural and recreation services	72.2	44.2	43.3	46.7
Personal and other services	57.8	21.4	21.6	24.6
Total	1841.2	23.7	24.0	26.1

Note: * As this estimate has a relative standard error of greater than 25 per cent care should be exercised when using it.

Source: ABS, *Trade Union Members Australia*, August 1994, Product No. 6325.0.40.001, August 1996, Cat. No. 6325.0; unpublished data from ABS *Weekly Earnings of Employees (Distribution) Australia*, August 1995.

Gender and age

A bias of employed women to casual employment is apparent, with 31.7 per cent of female employees and 20.9 per cent of male employees recorded as casual employees in their main job (ABS 6310.0, August 1997). However, male casu- als are more likely to be full-time, whereas female casu- als are predominantly part-time. The proportion of female casual employees to total casual employees is slowly decreasing (from 64.2 per cent in 1984 to 55.3 per cent in 1997). This reflects the fact that although the significance of casual employment has increased for both females and males, the increase has occurred at a faster rate for males. The proportion of male employees who are casual has grown rapidly since 1984, with the result that the gender gap in participation in casual employment – though still large – appears to be closing (Table 3).

Table 3 Casual Employees as Percentage of Total Employees by Gender

Year	Male	Female	Total
1984	9.4	25.7	15.8
1985	9.4	26.1	16.1
1986	Na	Na	17.2
1987	11.5	27.9	18.3
1988	11.7	28.8	18.9
1989c	12.2	27.3	18.6
1990	12.7	28.2	19.4
1991	13.5	29.0	20.3
1992	15.6	30.9	22.3
1993	16.4	30.6	22.7
1994	18.1	30.8	23.7
1995	18.5	30.8	24.0
1996	21.2	32.0	26.1
1997	20.9	31.7	25.8

Source: Campbell (1996b, 105); ABS Catalogue 6310.0 (1997).

A weighting of young workers to casual employment is evident, though a substantial presence of prime age and older workers in casual employment can also be readily detected. Data from 1994 suggest that 58.7 per cent of all employed 15 to 19 year olds were in casual employment, joined by 26.1 per cent of all employed 20 to 24 year olds but also 19.5 per cent of those aged 25 years and over (OECD, 1996, 8; see also Wooden, 1996b).

Whether casual employment is full-time or part-time plays a significant role in defining both the workforce groupings that participate in casual employment and the main forms of their participation. The category of full-time casual employees is predominantly (71.8 per cent) male. It appears to have an age profile similar to that for all wage and salary earners, with young workers 15 to 24 constituting 22.2 per cent of all full-time casual employees in 1993 (calculated from Wooden, 1996b, 155). By contrast the category of part-time casual employees is predominantly (66.6 per cent) female. The age profile for this group is mixed, with a substantial proportion of male and female workers under 24 years of age on the one hand and a large group of women from middle age groups on the other hand. In 1993 young workers 15 to 24 constituted 40.2 per cent of all part-time casual employees (females 15 to 19 were 14.5 per cent; males 15 to 19 were 10.3 per cent; females 20 to 24 were 9.2 per cent; and males 20 to 24 were 6.1 per cent) (calculated from Wooden, 1996b, 155). The majority of these young workers engaged in part-time casual employment are secondary or tertiary students. The 1997 NSW estimates (ABS Catalogue 6247.1) indi-

cates that those still at school account for around 12 per cent of total part-time casual employees, with the bulk of school attendees in casual employment (around three quarters) being employed under regular casual conditions.

The increase in female labour force participation is overlaid by other labour market changes, including increased withdrawal of older male workers from the workforce and a major transformation of the youth labour market. The latter change appears particularly marked in Australia, emerging out of a confluence of factors including a sharp increase in participation by young people in education, a collapse of full-time employment amongst young people, a growth in part-time employment and high levels of youth unemployment (Wooden, 1996b). The incidence of casual employment between 1983 and 1994 has increased dramatically for younger workers: for the 16 to 19 years group from 29.8 to 58.7 per cent, and for the 20-24 years group, 14 to 26.1 per cent (OECD, 1996, 8). An awareness of the age composition of casual employees helps to throw further light on the changes indicated in Table 3. Data from 1984 and 1993 suggest that much of the increase in the figures for female casual employees as a percentage of total female employees is due to the increased propensity of young females to engage in casual employment (for 25 to 44 year old females there has been almost no change over this period). The much steeper increase for male casual employees as a percentage of total male employees is partly due to the increased propensity of young males to engage in casual employment but also to the sharp change amongst 25 to 44 year old males towards an increased participation in casual (and predominantly full-time casual) employment (Wooden 1996b, 150).

Training, earnings, union status

In consideration of the earnings of casuals three qualifications have to be considered: first, some casuals receive a loading to compensate them for a lack of non-wage benefits. Second, it follows that any casual/permanent earnings comparison has to consider the exclusion of casuals from non-wage benefits. Third, casuals are subject to irregular hours and continuity of employment, hence weekly earnings data does not reflect the regularity or predictability of earnings. Campbell (1998, ch.2) has challenged the view (Dawkins and Norris, 1990) that casuals do receive a loading. He argues that many casuals fall outside of award coverage, hence the loading is non operational. The earnings data (ABS Catalogue 6310.40.001) demonstrates that median weekly earnings for full-time casuals are 85 per cent of the

median earnings for full-time permanent employees. This of course excludes non-wage benefits.

In terms of trade union membership, the density for casuals (13 per cent) is well below that of permanent employees (37 per cent – ABS Catalogue 6325.0). While this reflects gender, age, occupational and industry differences between permanent and casual, the simple fact is that casuals are highly unlikely to belong to a trade union. This may explain why loadings are not universal and it may also reinforce earnings differentials in the context of enterprise bargaining given that casuals are less likely to be represented in the bargaining framework.

With respect to training the fragmentary evidence points towards less access to training for casuals as compared to permanent employees (Campbell, 1998). This differential applies to both internal and external training funded by employers, and structured and unstructured training. In turn these training differentials reflect the relatively low earnings position of casuals together with their general lack of access to a career path. The ABS NSW survey (Catalogue 6247.1) revealed that only 38 per cent of casuals received any formal training from their employer while only 28 per cent had access to a career path or progression.

Casual Employment: A Bridge or a Trap?

Is casual employment a respite from unemployment and/or labour force exclusion, or is it a medium towards more secure and permanent employment arrangements? The question of bridge and trap has already been explored in relation to several European economies (Buchtemann and Quack, 1989; Natti, 1993). The results of Buchtemann and Quack (1989) analysis for West Germany were inconclusive, with differences being recorded for different demographic groups and in accordance with the different type of temporary employment. Natti (1993) concluded from Scandinavian data that there were elements of both bridges and traps for different groups of workers. In particular age, educational qualifications, gender and previous employment status all impinge on the outcome. Those least at risk were young workers who were also attending education, for these workers temporary employment was a voluntary choice and largely in occupations and industries unrelated to eventual career choices. Also, for female workers who had previous job experience and professional qualifications, temporary employment was often the outcome of the constraints imposed by family responsibilities. For these women, temporary employment was often related to previous employment experience and regarded as

an intermediate arrangement before re-entering the workforce on a permanent basis. Those most at risk included those who were previously unemployed, older males seeking full-time employment, and those with limited training and work experience. For them, temporary employment was a trap from which the only escape was into unemployment or exiting the labour force.

With respect to flow data for Europe the OECD (1996, 13) study demonstrated that the incidence of temporary employment among the previously unemployed is much higher than the national average rate of temporary employment (55 per cent in France, 49 per cent in Ireland, 90 per cent in Spain). This may reflect labour market conditions (high unemployment and the lack of permanent job vacancies), it may also reflect the integration of temporary employment with labour market programs for the unemployed (especially in Britain and Ireland). The OECD (1996, 20) observed 'a disproportionate flow from unemployment to temporary jobs.' Clearly within this context temporary employment is an alternative to unemployment, reflects a lack of choice by participants and indicates that regulatory and labour market policies can impact on the workforce structure. The OECD (1996, 17) also reported that in Germany, Spain and Great Britain of those in temporary employment 12 months previously, temporary employment was the most likely employment arrangement 12 months later.

Evidence for the USA is likewise fragmentary. Kalleberg et al (1997) reported that only 3.2 per cent of males and 4.7 per cent of female employees worked for their current employer in a non standard job immediately prior to obtaining a standard job. However, this excludes those who may have worked in a non-standard job for another employer. It does suggest that transition for non-standard to standard employment within the same enterprise is unlikely. Mishel et al (1997, ch.4) catalogues a connection between what they call 'contingent' jobs, low earnings, increasing hours and growing multiple job-holding. They suggest a cycle of low pay and employment insecurity associated with contingent jobs which leads to an extension of working hours and multiple job holding in order to make ends meet.

It is difficult to conclusively answer the bridge or trap question in Australia for a number of reasons. First, there is heterogeneity across casual employment with respect to motivation, conditions and duration. For some casuals such as those participating in education, casual employment is regarded as a transitory arrangement until graduation. In this sense it is a bridge, generating income supplementation and providing work experience. However, for this group of workers the ultimate career destination is in general located within another occupation and another industry. For other

casuals, especially job seekers there are fewer options, for them the expectation is a bridge. Second, longitudinal and preference data with respect to casual employment in Australia is very fragmentary, any analysis can only be largely speculative, however, it is possible to connect the available fragmentary data. For example, the youth longitudinal survey (NBEET, 1992) demonstrated a strong connection between unemployment and casual employment, and suggested that those in casual employment were more likely than those in permanent employment to be unemployed or still in casual employment 12 months later. Indeed, a subsequent NBEET report suggested that the bulk of casual jobs were unlikely to constitute a stepping stone, but rather acted as a dead-end (NBEET, 1992, 67).

The NBEET findings are complemented by other fragmentary evidence and more recent, though limited, longitudinal data. First, casual employment is disproportionately important as a destination for flows in the labour force. Data on accumulated job tenure for February 1993 reveal that around one half (51.9 per cent) of all employees had been with their employer for less than 3 months and were classified as casual employees (Wooden, 1996a). This suggests, in accordance with the static workforce estimates, that casual employment constitutes an important destination for flows into employment and that at any one time the majority of vacancies are likely to be casual. The inflow into casual employment is even more important for the unemployed. It seems that there is some dualism in employment destination, flows into permanent jobs are likely to be accounted for by those already with permanent jobs or by those finishing graduating from educational courses. Other categories of job seekers, the unemployed in particular, are more likely to be funnelled into casual employment. The ABS SEUPDATE longitudinal survey indicates that over two thirds of job seekers who obtain work end up in casual jobs (ABS, 1997).

Second, and again using the SEUPDATE reports (ABS, 1997), there are many long-term casual jobs. About one third of those in casual jobs have been in them for over 12 months; with average hours of employment being 20.4. That is, there are many part-time jobs which persist over 12 months under casual conditions. This gives credence to the enormous gaps present in the Australian employment regulation system. In terms of the status of successful job seekers, of those who had permanent jobs, 55 per cent found a permanent job. Of those who previously held a casual job, 76 per cent acquired a casual job. That is, job seekers who were previously in casual employment are very likely to return to casual employment. For successive job spells, cessations because of temporary jobs are likely to lead to a subsequent cessation due to the termination of a temporary job. Of those

whose previous job ceased because it was temporary or seasonal, 67 per cent are likely to exit their next job since it also is casual or temporary. For job seekers, the duration of jobs was typically short-term, around 90 per cent of the jobs from the SEUPDATE surveys lasted less than 12 months (ABS, 1997).

The flow data for job seekers is particularly revealing. Those who enter into casual and/or part-time employment are unlikely to graduate to permanent employment. Table 4 summarises the flow data from May 1995 to September 1996.

Table 4 Part-time Job Starts After May 1995, Destination September 1996

Destination Sept 1996	Job Seekers	All (m.)
Starts May 1995	419 300	2.585
Same part-time job	168 100	1.383
Destinations looking for work	145 700	0.295
In full-time work	26 200	0.337
Another part-time job	40 700	0.275
Not in labour force	35 300	0.296
Total destinations	251 200	1.202

Source: SEUPDATE (1997)

Table 4 provides some revealing evidence about casual employment since 87 per cent of the part-time jobs were casual jobs. For job seekers, of those who entered into part-time employment after May 1995 only 26 000 or over six per cent were in full-time work in September 1996. For the general population, of 2.285m. part-time starts, 337 thousand, or 13 per cent had progressed to a full time job. More revealing was the finding that of job seekers in part-time work, 44 per cent desired a full-time job and 18 per cent desired additional hours. Only 38 per cent found the part-time status and working hours acceptable.

The ABS evidence reveals a high proportion of non-standard destinations for job seekers after May 1995. Table 5 indicates that some 16 months later only 21.7 per cent of job seekers had obtained permanent employment, 19.5 per cent were in casual employment and 6.3 per cent were in non-employee positions. Even more worrying is the finding that over a half were either in unemployment or had ceased searching for employment. Table 5 does not reveal preferences or the route taken to achieve these outcomes, nevertheless it is clear that for job seekers at least, permanent employment remains a destination for only a fifth of job seekers.

Table 5 Job Seekers in May 1995 by Destination (and %) in September 1996

Total Job Seekers May 1995	875 000	100.00
Destination Sept 1996		
Permanent employees	190 000	21.7
Casual employees	171 000	19.5
Non-employees	55 000	6.3
Looking for work	303 000	34.6
Not in labour force	150 000	17.1

Source: ABS Catalogue 6286.0, Australia's Employment and Unemployment Patterns

What we can conclude from the data is that casual and or part-time arrangements are an important job destination of job seekers. Only a small minority of job seekers make it into a permanent job. Those who end up with a part-time job are likely to be involuntary part-timers and employed under casual conditions, moreover they are unlikely to proceed into either full-time or permanent employment arrangements.

For job seekers, casual employment is unlikely to serve as a bridge into a permanent job. They are likely to remain in a (long-term) casual job, or if they move into another job, it is likely to be a casual job. The policy implication is clear, syphoning job seekers into temporary jobs is not in itself sufficient to break the unemployment cycle. Recent policy developments such as Work for the Dole, Landcare and the privatisation of employment placement services all place an emphasis on work experience and attitudinal conditioning of the unemployed (Biddle, 1998). The view is that a job will provide work experience, training and boost confidence, and allow job seekers to proceed into more secure and better paid employment. The Federal Government's pre-election promise to create 'real' jobs (Liberal Party, 1996) for the unemployed looks more and more rhetorical in the face of the characteristics of the new jobs that are being generated. The fragmentary flow evidence suggests otherwise. For job seekers, casual jobs are unlikely to lead to permanent jobs, indeed, casual employment is just another form of exclusion and precariousness that encompasses unemployment and income deprivation (Brosnan, 1996).

Casual employment is no aberration, indeed the majority of new jobs being generated in Australia are part-time and/or casual. As such being located in a casual job is, especially for job-seekers, likely to be an enduring, not a temporary, feature. It is also clear that many casual jobs are on-going, and not temporary, and that many casual employees do not receive casual loadings. For trade unions the challenge is twofold; first, to re-regulate casual employment and ensure that casuals are casuals and do receive a

loading in lieu of non-wage employment entitlements; and second, to extend membership coverage among casuals since they represent the emerging workforce structure. As the casual workforce share grows, the trade union density further declines. While governments can claim that jobs are jobs and that a job is better than no job, and that casual jobs exhibit considerable labour flexibility, there are a series of policy questions that will have to be addressed. First, a cycle of casual employment and unemployment is only going to intensify inequality and place pressure on the federal government for income supplementation. If the wage system is no longer to provide an income floor, then this job will fall on the social welfare system. Second, low paid and temporary jobs are hardly the answer to boosting productivity growth and international competitiveness. Third, channelling the unemployed into casual jobs is not going to be effective in reducing unemployment if these jobs only lead participants back to unemployment.

Conclusions

Casual employment arrangements continue to expand in Australia as a result of regulatory gaps in the award and common law system governing employment. The majority of new jobs currently created are casual. The share of casual employment is increasing across both occupational and industrial classifications. It is also increasing for both male and female workers, and accounts for a large share of employment in the youth and older age employment groups. Casual jobs are associated with fewer benefits, lower earnings, less training, lower unionisation and limited progression opportunities as compared to permanent jobs. There are groups of workers who do prefer casual employment arrangements, for example, those participating in full-time education, those with caring responsibilities and those with multiple jobs. However, casual jobs appear to be an important destination for job seekers. The evidence suggests that very few progress from casual into permanent employment. Casual jobs become part of a cycle of low earnings, involuntary employment arrangements and insecure and irregular employment. For this group of workers casual employment is a trap from which it is very difficult to escape. The current Federal government has given a pledge to both job creation and the creation of quality jobs, especially for the unemployed (Liberal Party, 1996). While the evidence on job creation is less than flattering (Burgess, Mitchell and Watts, 1998), the evidence on the 'real' jobs or quality issue is clear cut, for job seekers casual jobs are an important destination (albeit involuntary for

many) from which many will not progress into a permanent job. Indications are that the industrial relations system will be further deregulated and more regulatory gaps will be opened up in order to facilitate unprotected (casual type) employment arrangements. In this context it will become very difficult for not only job seekers, but for more employed workers, to escape from the trap of rising employment insecurity.

Notes

- 1 Walsh (1989, 4) captures these developments: 'the model of a full-time and continuous relationship between employer and employee is no longer an accurate or typical description of the employment relationship for a large and growing section of the labour force.'
- 2 A more detailed presentation of the cross-sectional data would also have to take into account multiple job-holders, who have increased rapidly to 5.1 per cent of the employed labour force in August 1994 (ABS 6203.0, February 1995). Many of the second or third jobs are likely to be casual. We can also note that cross-sectional data measure the employed labour force at one point in time and miss the implications of the flows in and out of the employed labour force. Casual employment can entail rapid turnover, both of jobs and of the individuals in the jobs, with the result that such employment will be disproportionately influential as a departure point and a destination in labour flows. Casual employment can figure as part of a cycle of intermittent employment, involving numerous persons who may be classified at any one point in time as in unemployment or outside the labour force. The numbers of persons involved in casual employment over a period of say a year can therefore be much higher than a count of casual employees at any one point in time suggests.
- 3 The labour force approach embodied the following methodology (Moir and Robinson, 194, 64):
 - a) three mutually exclusive labour force categories
 - b) application for a set and limited time period
 - c) priority ordering of categorisation as follows: employment, unemployment, not in the labour force
 - d) a minimum definition of economic activity
 - e) person based, not jobs or hours based units of measurement
- 4 The monthly Labour Force Survey still does not include the component temporary (casual) in its labour force typology or in its set of questions in the survey.
- 5 The award system has peculiar features, but it resembles in its effects the systems of external labour regulation found in most other OECD countries. Thus award regulation acts primarily as a system of protection for individual employees against the untrammelled operations of the free market, supplementing the much more partial protection offered by individual trade unions. It acts to establish a floor of minimum labour standards underpinning the wages and conditions of employees.
- 6 Traditionally trade unions have seen non-standard employment as a threat to standard employment conditions and as such many awards explicitly sought to

exclude or limit the extent to which part-time and casual employees could be utilised (see Lever-Tracy, 1988; Bray, 1991).

- 7 The limits take two forms. On the one hand, awards commonly specify proportional limits or quotas on the use of casual employees (calculating casual employees as a proportion of the workforce or casual hours as a proportion of total workforce hours) or establish restrictions on how casual employees can be used, eg when, under what circumstances, and in particular for how long – setting maximum numbers of hours per week and/or a maximum number of weeks or days of an engagement (see Lewis, 1990). On the other hand, awards usually also specify a 'casual loading' on the hourly rate of pay. The casual loading can be variously specified, eg as a single loading on a proportion (often 1/38) of weekly award rates for full-time permanent employees, as a loading on the hourly rate for full-time permanent employees doing work at equivalent times of the day or week, or as a series of separate loadings according to the time when casual employees are expected to work. The general percentage loading varies, ranging from 10 per cent to 50 per cent but in federal awards in the mid 1980s it was most commonly 20 per cent, e.g. in the Metal Industry Award (Lewis, 1990, 23-24, 108; cf the discussion of NSW awards in Carter, 1990, 12). The casual loading is justified in different ways, most frequently as an additional barrier against reliance by employers on casual workers at the expense of permanent workers and as compensation for workers for the lack of standard entitlements. In this sense it represents both a limit to employers and a benefit to employees that purports to 'cash out' standard rights and benefits (Owens, 1993).
- 8 The overall figures for casual density may of course mask important differences in the orientation to full-time or part-time and to male or female casual employees. In industry divisions such as agriculture, forestry and fishing, and construction the proportion of male full-time casuals is high. In industry divisions such as retail trade and accommodation, cafes and restaurants the orientation is to the employment of part-time casual employees – predominantly female but also some males.
- 9 For example, labour force participation rates for males in 1975 and 1995 respectively were as follows for the older aged groups: 45 to 54 years (93.9 to 88.7), 50 to 59 years (87.8 to 74.0) and 60 to 64 years (50.2 to 45.3). Source: Foster, 1996, p.183.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Catalogue References Cited
- 6203.0, The Labour Force, Australia. Monthly
 - 6247.1, Part-time Casual and Temporary Employment, NSW. Irregular.
 - 6286.0, Australia's Employment and Unemployment Patterns, 1994-1996. Irregular.
 - 6310.0, Weekly Earnings of Employees, Australia. Annual.
 - 6315.0, Award Coverage, Australia. Discontinued.
 - 6325.0, Trade Union Members, Australia. Annual (discontinued).
 - 6325.0.40.001, Trade Union Members, Australia. Irregular.
 - 6334.0, Employment Benefits, Australia. Annual (discontinued).
 - 6341.0, Alternative Working Arrangements, Australia. Annual.

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1997) SEUPDATE. Nos. 2, 3, Canberra.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1998) Job Seekers Who Found Part-time Work: A Longitudinal Perspective. Survey of Employment and Unemployment Patterns, Working Paper 2/98, Canberra.
- Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Teaching (ACIRRT, 1996) Agreements Database and Monitor (ADAM), June.
- Bennett, L. (1994) *Making Labour Law in Australia: Industrial Relations, Politics and Law*, North Ryde, The Law Book Company.
- Biddle, D. (1998) Labour Market Programs in Australia. Back to the Future Conference: Labour Market and Industrial Relations Policies of the Howard Government. University of Newcastle.
- Bieback, K.-J. (1992) 'The Protection of Atypical Work in Australian and West German Labour Law', *Australian Journal of Labour Law* 5,1, 17-39.
- Bray, M. (1991) Conclusions. In M. Bray and V. Taylor (eds), *The Other Side of Flexibility: Unions and Marginal Workers in Australia*, ACIRRT Monograph no. 3, Sydney, ACIRRT, University of Sydney, 191-205.
- Brooks, A. (1991) 'Marginal Workers and the Law' in M. Bray and V. Taylor (eds), *The Other Side of Flexibility: Unions and Marginal Workers in Australia*, ACIRRT Monograph no. 3, Sydney, ACIRRT, University of Sydney, 44-74
- Brosnan, P. (1996) 'Labour Markets and Social Deprivation', *Labour & Industry*, 7, 2, 3-34.
- Brosnan, P. and Campbell, I. (1995) Labour Market Deregulation in Australia: Towards New Forms of Workforce Division? Paper for the 17th Annual Meeting of the International Working Party on Labour Market Segmentation, Siena, Italy, July.
- Buchtemann, C. and Quack, S. (1989) 'Bridges or Traps? Non-standard Employment in the Federal Republic of Germany', in G. Rodgers and J. Rodgers (eds), *Precarious jobs in labour market regulation: The growth of atypical employment in Western Europe*, Geneva, ILS, 109-148.
- Budget Statements (1996) Statements 1-4, 1996/97. AGPS, Canberra.
- Burgess, J. (1994a) 'Restructuring the Australian Labour Force: From Full Employment to Where?', *Journal of Australian Political Economy* 34, 103-127.
- Burgess, J. (1994b) 'Non-Standard and Precarious Employment: A Review of Australian Workforce Data', *Labour Economics and Productivity* 6, 2, 118-129.
- Burgess, J., Mitchell, W. and Watts, M. (1998) The Labour Market. In P. Kriesler (ed) *The Australian Economy: The Essential Guide* 3. Macmillan, Melbourne (forthcoming).
- Campbell, I. (1993) 'Labour Market Flexibility in Australia', *Labour & Industry*, 5, 3, 1-32.
- Campbell, I. (1996a) 'Casual Employment, Labour Regulation and Australian Trade Unions', *Journal of Industrial Relations* 38, 4, 571-599.
- Campbell, I. (1996b) 'The Growth of Casual Employment in Australia: Towards an Explanation', in J. Teicher (ed), *Non-Standard Employment in Australia and New Zealand*, NKCIR Monograph no. 9, Melbourne, NKCIR, Monash University, 43-107.
- Campbell, I. (1998) Labour Restructuring and the Growth of Casual Employment in Australia, 1982-1996. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Melbourne.

- Campbell, I. and Burgess, J. (1997) Temporary Employment in the OECD: the Extreme Case of Australia. Conference of the International Working Party on Labour Market Segmentation, Porto, Portugal.
- Campbell, I. and Mathews, J. (1998) 'Research the Model of Standard Working Time in Australia: Theoretical Preliminaries', in R. Harbridge, C. Gadd and A. Crawford (eds) *Current Research in Industrial Relations*. Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, 477-485.
- Carter, S. (1990) *Casual Employment and Industrial Democracy*, Canberra, AGPS.
- Creighton, B. and Stewart, A. (1994) *Labour Law: An Introduction*, 2nd ed., Sydney, The Federation Press.
- Dawkins, P. and Norris, K. (1990) 'Casual Employment in Australia', *Australian Bulletin of Labour* 16, 156-173.
- Dawkins, P. and Norris, K. (1995) 'The growth of part-time employment in Australia and the United Kingdom, 1978-93', *Labour Economics and Productivity* 7,1, 2-27.
- Dawkins, P. and Simpson, M. (1993) *Work, Leisure and the Competitiveness of Australian Industry*, Institute for Research into International Competitiveness, Discussion Paper 93: 02.
- De Ruyter, A. (1997) A Shift-Share Analysis of the Growth of Casual Employment, 1988-1995. B. Ec. Hons Program. Department of Economics, University of Newcastle.
- Foster, R. (1996) *Australian Economic Statistics*. Reserve Bank of Australia, Sydney.
- Heiler, K. (1998) 'The Petty Pilfering of Minutes or What Has Happened to the Length of the Working Day in Australia', in R. Harbridge, C. Gadd and A. Crawford (eds) *Current Research in Industrial Relations*. Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, 166-176.
- Kalleberg, A., Rasell, E., Hudson, K., Webster, D., Reskin, B., Cassirer, N. and Appelbaum, E. (1997) *Non Standard Work, Substandard Jobs*. Economic Policy Institute, Washington.
- Lever-Tracy, C. (1988) 'The Flexibility Debate: Part-time Work'. *Labour & Industry*, 1, 2, 210-241.
- Lewis, H. (1990) *Part-time Work: Trends and Issues*. AGPS, Canberra.
- Liberal Party of Australia (1996) *Pathways to Real Jobs: The Federal Coalition's Employment and Training Policy*. Melbourne.
- Matthies, H., Mückenberger, U., Offe, C., Peter, E. and Raasch, S. (1994) *Arbeit 2000: Anforderungen an eine Neugestaltung der Arbeitswelt*, Hamburg, Rowohlt.
- McCallum, R. (1994) 'The Imperfect Safety-Net: The Enforcement of Federal Awards and Agreements', in R. McCallum, G. McCarry and P. Ronfeldt (eds), *Employment Security*, Sydney, The Federation Press, 201-226.
- Mishel, L., Bernstein, J. and Schmitt, J. (1997) *The State of Working in America, 1996-1997*. Economic Policy Institute, Washington.
- Moir, H. and Robinson, C. (1984), 'Labour Market Measures: A Review of Some Popular Labour Market Measures', in R. Blandy and O. Covick (eds), *Understanding Labour Markets*. Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 61-83.
- Mückenberger, U. (1989) 'Non-standard forms of employment in the Federal Republic of Germany: The role and effectiveness of the State', in G. Rodgers and J. Rodgers (eds) (1989) *Precarious jobs in labour market regulation: The growth of atypical employment in Western Europe*, Geneva, ILS, 267-285.

- Natti, J. (1993) 'Temporary Employment in the Nordic Countries: A "Trap" or a "Bridge"?' *Work, Employment and Society* 7, 3, 451-464.
- National Board of Employment, Education and Training (NBEET) (1992), *Disadvantaged Job Seekers: Casual, Part-time and Temporary Work*. Report no. 18, Canberra.
- OECD (1996) *Employment Outlook, July 1996*, Paris, OECD.
- Rodgers, G., Gore, C. and Figueiredo, J. (eds) (1995) *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality, Responses*, Geneva, ILO Publications.
- Romeyn, J. (1992) *Flexible Working-time: Part-time and Casual Employment*. Industrial Relations Research Series no. 13, Department of Industrial Relations, Canberra.
- Schumann, K., Rogowski, R. and Kruppe, T. (1995) *Fixed-Term Contracts and Labour Market Efficiency in the European Union*, WZB Discussion Paper FS I 95-207, Berlin, WZB.
- Simpson, M. (1994) *An Analysis of the Characteristics and Growth of Casual Employment in Australia, 1984-1992*, The Western Australian Labour Market Research Centre, Perth, Curtin University of Technology, Discussion Paper 94/5.
- Simpson, M., Dawkins, P. and Madden, G. (1997) *Casual Employment in Australia: Incidence and Determinants*, *Australian Economic Papers*, 36, no. 69, 194-204.
- Standing, G. (1993) 'Labor Regulation in an Era of Fragmented Flexibility', in C. Buechtemann (ed), *Employment Security and Labor Market Behavior: Interdisciplinary Approaches and International Evidence*, Cornell, ILR Report no. 23, Ithaca, ILR Press, 425-441.
- Streeck, W. (1992) *Social Institutions and Economic Performance: Studies of Industrial Relations in Advanced Capitalist Economies*, London, Sage.
- Sweet, R. (1995) *What Do We Know About Casual Work?* Dusseldorp Skills Forum, Sydney.
- Walsh, T. (1989) *Part-time Employment and Labour Market Policies*. *National Westminster Quarterly Review*, May, 43-55.
- Wooden, M. (1996a) 'The Australian Labour Market – March 1996', *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 22, 1, 3-27.
- Wooden, M. (1996b) 'The Youth Labour Market: Characteristics and Trends', *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 22, 2, 137-160.
- Wooden, M. (1997) *The Labour Market for Young Australians*. National Institute of Labour Studies, Flinders University of South Australia.