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This paper contributes data about women and part-time employment in Australia. “Part-time” is defined as one or more, but less than thirty-five hours per week.

Findings from a survey conducted throughout the City of Waverley, Melbourne (1977) are given against a background of similar data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (1977-1996) and the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain (1980).

Aspects of part-time employment are reported for part-time working women and for women who had no paid work, but “would... like to work part-time now”. These aspects include range of hours, pattern and number of hours by school level of youngest child, number of weekdays worked, trade union membership, casual work, travel time to work, work at home, employment benefits (including promotion) and work preferences.  
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Preamble

The increase in the participation of women in the labour force and an associated increase in part-time employment have been two key features of the Australian labour market during the past twenty years. However, in relation to part-time employment, writers have commented upon the paucity of data (Eccles [1984, p.713]; Lewis [1990, p. 80]; Romeyn [1992, p.10]).

In September 1977, a survey was conducted throughout the City of Waverley, Melbourne. One of the aims of the survey was to document various aspects of part-time employment, with the goal of giving women a voice in the development of policies relating to the labour market – and particularly the part-time labour market – of Australia.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) designed the sample – a multi-stage area sample of 602 private, occupied dwellings, based upon 1976 Census Subdivision and Collection Districts. There was an 82% response rate to the self-enumerated questionnaire; people "in scope" were women aged 18 years and over.

"Part-time" was defined as "one or more but less than 35 hours a week", in line with the definition used by the ABS, which followed that of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Geneva (1954).

The aim of this paper is to report upon findings for two subsamples of the Waverley Survey population, against a background of data for similar variables from the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain (1980), the Canadian Commission of Inquiry into Part-Time Work (1983) and the Australian Bureau of Statistics (1977 to 1996).

These two subsamples in the Waverley Survey were:

1) 142 women who were currently working part-time.

2) 99 "unemployed" women who had no paid work and "would ... like to work part-time now". These women are described as "unemployed" in the everyday sense of the word. Most had not actively looked for a part-time job "in the past four weeks" and would therefore tend to be described by the ABS as "marginally attached to the labour force" rather than "unemployed". The
definitional problem of unemployment for these women will be explored in a subsequent publication of data from the Waverley Survey.

Only a selection of findings for these two subsamples are reported in the Executive Summary, and these should be viewed against the background of the text. The phrase "to work" in this Summary means "to work for pay".

**Findings**

1. **Diversity of Hours and Days**
   
   The Waverley Survey documented a great diversity in regard to patterns of days and hours of part-time employment. In 1993, the ABS documented a similar diversity in regard to days of part-time work for all part-time employees, aged fifteen years and over, throughout Australia.

2. **Range of Part-Time Hours**
   
   Women who currently worked part-time were employed for virtually the whole range of part-time hours – from two up to thirty-three hours. A similar finding was reported from the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain in 1980, and the ABS throughout Australia in 1977, 1983 and 1995.

3. **Number of Part-Time Hours**
   
   In the Waverley Survey, 28% of part-time working women were employed for 10 hours or less a week, 44% for 15 hours or less a week, 67% for 20 hours or less a week and 29% for 21-34 hours a week. Similar patterns for married part-time working women were documented by the ABS throughout Australia in 1983 and 1995.

   In the Waverley Survey, 6% of unemployed women were prepared to work less than 10 hours a week, 26% less than 15 hours a week and 56% for less than 20 hours a week.

   These findings have implications for industrial awards, where a minimum of 15 or 16 hours per week may be stipulated for part-time employment. They also have relevance for guidelines relating to entry to government labour market programs. In 1994, the policy for the Commonwealth Government Job Compact program, which provided a subsidised job placement for the long-term unemployed, was that "some jobs will be part-time ... provided they offer at least 20 hours work per week".
4. **Casual Work**

In the Waverley Survey, 39% of unemployed women wanted part-time employment which was "casual for a few weeks or months with periods of no work in between". If "casual", "relief", "on call at short notice" and "varied" are grouped together, then half of these women preferred an irregular pattern of part-time employment.

The definition of "casual" adopted here means "intermittent" or "discontinuous". It differs from that used by the ABS, where a lack of paid annual leave is the main criterion for determining whether employment is "casual" or not. Further research is required to confirm whether this demand for an intermittent or discontinuous pattern of employment, amongst women who are employed part-time, unemployed, or marginally attached to the labour force still exists. If so, there could be ramifications for union policies that aim to transfer part-time employees from "casual" to "permanent" (regular) part-time status. It would also have relevance in regard to the equitable access of women to labour market programs. In 1994-95 the Commonwealth Government’s Job Compact program had a budgeted outlay of $538 million. The policy was, however, that "Temporary casual positions will not be considered".

5. **Workers and Family Issues**

The following findings, based on the chi-squared test, may provide a data base for policy makers interested in the issue of workers and family responsibilities and/or a "managing diversity" approach to implementing merit and equity in employment.

*(a) Part-time employment 9 am – 3.30 pm and school level of youngest child*

Relatively more part-time working women with a youngest child at primary school worked between 9 am and 3.30 pm compared with part-time working women who did not have a child in this category.

Unemployed women with a youngest child at primary school had the strongest preference for part-time employment between 9 am and 3.30 pm; women with no dependent child had the weakest preference for this pattern of hours.
(b) Part-time employment for 20 hours or more a week, and school level of youngest child

Relatively fewer part-time working women with a youngest child "not yet at school" worked 20 hours or more a week, compared with part-time working women who did not have a child in this category.

Relatively fewer unemployed women with a youngest child at primary school were prepared to work 20 hours or more a week compared with unemployed women who did not have a child in this category.

(c) Part-time employment, school holidays, and school level of youngest child

Relatively fewer unemployed women with a youngest child at primary school were prepared to work during school holidays, compared with unemployed women who did not have a child in this category.

(d) Part-time employment at home, and school level of youngest child

One quarter of part-time working women were employed partly or wholly at home. Relatively more part-time working women with a youngest child "not yet at school" worked partly or wholly at home, compared with those who did not have a child in this category.

One third of unemployed women who wanted to work part-time preferred to work partly or wholly at home. This preference was strongest for women with a child "not yet at school".

(e) Childcare for a child "not yet at school"

Whilst a woman worked part-time, most care arrangements for a child "not yet at school" were made with relatives, friends or neighbours rather than a creche, care centre or kindergarten. A similar finding was revealed by an ABS survey of childcare throughout Australia in 1993.

(f) Employers attitude to time off work for sick child

Where a part-time working woman needed to take time off work in order to provide constant care for a sick child, in almost all cases her employer was completely or fairly co-operative about the matter.
6. **Travel Time To Work**

The majority (70% and 80% respectively) of part-time working and unemployed women either travelled or were prepared to travel less than half an hour one way to work.

7. **Employment Benefits, including Promotion**

In 1977 the “work” or employment benefits least available to all female part-time employees in the Waverley Survey were superannuation (3%), long service leave (16%) and promotion (12%).

In regard to superannuation, the ABS (1994) reports that from 1988 to 1993, "coverage" rates improved for female part-time employees throughout Australia from 19% to 65%. This was no doubt due to the introduction of the Superannuation Guarantee Levy by the Commonwealth Government in 1992. The coverage rate, however, masks the disadvantage that female part-time employees still experience in superannuation pensions and/or lump sum payouts, due to a life and career pattern which may include periods of unpaid work as well as paid work and lower "final average salaries" than those received by males.

According to an ABS survey in 1994, a smaller percentage of female part-time employees received long service leave (32%) than holiday leave (38%) or sick leave (39%).

In published results of ABS surveys that were carried out in South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, in 1986, 1988 and 1991 respectively, approximately 23% of part-time workers had career or promotion opportunities available to them. In a 1990 ABS survey, 22% of female part-time workers in Tasmania had promotion opportunities available to them.

Thus long service leave, and particularly promotion, still appear to be the employment benefits in which females are most disadvantaged when they are employed part-time.

8. **Trade Union Membership**

In the Waverley Survey, 22% of female part-time employees aged eighteen years and over were members of a trade union. The ABS recorded a 32% membership rate for female part-time employees aged fifteen years and over throughout Australia in 1982. This membership rate declined to 24% in 1995. In the Waverley Survey, the reason most women gave for non-membership was that
"they had not thought of it" rather than the fact that they disapproved of trade unions. This may provide a starting point for research and analysis into the reasons for low levels of union membership amongst female part-time employees.

9. Work Preferences

Of all women in the Waverley Survey, 28% were currently working part-time, but 46% preferred to be employed part-time.

The data indicate not only a preference for part-time employment, but a mismatch between hours worked and the hours of employment preferred. Of the women who currently worked part-time, 80% preferred to continue in part-time employment; 35% of women with no paid work and 28% of full-time working women preferred to be employed part-time.

Most of the 35% of women with "no paid work" who wanted "to work part-time now" had not actively looked for employment in the four weeks prior to the survey week, and would be categorised as "marginally attached to the labour force" by the ABS. One could argue that in the past 20 years the increase in women’s participation in the labour market and the associated increase in part-time employment would have absorbed this excess supply of labour. However, ABS data for September 1996 indicate that 65% of females aged 20 years and over, who were marginally attached to the labour force, preferred to be employed part-time rather than full-time. Additionally, in September 1996, 39% of unemployed married females aged 20 years and over were actively looking for part-time employment rather than full-time employment. These data are consistent with the fact that the participation of women in the Australian labour market and the level of part-time employment are both predicted to rise – at least up to the year 2005.

Conclusion

However, the concept of part-time employment within a policy framework is a complex one. For women, it is often bound up with unpaid work of the household and/or childcare. Unionists are justifiably concerned that part-time employment does not provide a "living wage". Others draw attention to the view that a widening distribution of paid work is associated with the widening distribution of private income – and the growth of part-time employment, as well as unemployment, must play a part in that.
There have been suggestions for several years for the need to change the nexus between income and paid employment. The predictions of a continued growth in part-time employment and in the participation of women in the labour market may force us to examine these issues more closely.

Blandy (1992, p. 8) maintains that "women ... will play an important leadership role in the emerging post-industrial order". Perhaps "women's issues" of the eighties and nineties will become – or need to become – "people's issues" of the new century.
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INTRODUCTION

Part-time employment was first recorded in Australia by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) in the Census of 1966.

Between 1966 and 1977 there was a marked increase in the participation of women, and especially married women, in the labour force of Australia. There was also a marked growth in part-time employment.

In Australia, these two phenomena have been closely associated. However, as Beechey and Perkins (1987, pp. 41-44) explain, in other countries a high rate of labour force participation by women does not necessarily mean a high rate of part-time employment.

Finland, for instance, has a very high female activity rate but a low level of part-time working among women, whereas the United Kingdom has a female activity rate which is closer to the OECD average and a high level of part-time working. France and Japan have female activity rates similar to those of the United Kingdom, but significantly lower levels of part-time working among women, although the extent of part-time working is growing in both countries... The figures... suggest that the different levels of part-time work in different countries is a complex phenomenon which requires explanation. An analysis of State policies (not only concerning...
childcare provision but also State benefits and employment legislation), trade union practices, ideological assumptions and cultural norms, as well as the changing industrial structure, are all critical factors in explaining the different patterns.

In Australia, from 1966 to 1977 there was a steady increase in both part-time employment and the participation of women – and especially of married women – in the labour force. Since 1977 this trend has continued, with a slight faltering in recent years. This increase in part-time employment and the associated increase in the participation of women in the labour force have been two key features of the Australian labour market over the past twenty years.

Wooden, Sloan, Kennedy, Dawkins and Simpson (1994, p. 12), also note that "Australia is one of the larger employers of part-time labour. Among OECD countries, for example, only the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark and Sweden are more intensive employers of part-time labour". Despite these facts, Lewis (1990,

---

4 The Bureau of Labour Market Research (1985, p. 43) points out, for instance, that between 1966 and 1984:

Female labour force participation increased rapidly from 36.4 per cent in August 1966 to 45.9 per cent in April 1984. However, almost all (90 per cent) of the increase in the female participation rate since 1966 has been among part-time workers...

Married females accounted for all the increase in female participation since participation among other females actually fell. Married females increased their participation in the labour market on both a full-time and part-time basis, although there are significant differences in trends between these two markets. Whereas full-time participation peaked at around 1974 and has since declined, the part-time participation rate increased throughout the period.

5 DEET (1995, p. 26, fig. 2.11).

6 Male part-time employment as a proportion of total male employment has been increasing markedly in recent years. The ratio has increased from 4.9% of total male employment in June 1978 to 7% in mid 1988, but since then has shown a more rapid rate of increase to 10.8% in June 1995. For females, the ratio of part-time to total employment has also increased, but at a lesser rate than for males, following strong gains in female full-time employment. The ratio now stands at 42% in June 1995, having risen from 33% in June 1978. (ABS, 1995d, p. 2).

7 In Australia, in September 1996, of all part-time workers aged 20 years and over in Australia,

- 23% were males
- 77% were females
- 58% were married females.

Of all married, employed women aged 20 years and over

- 54% were employed full time
- 46% were employed part-time (ABS, 1996c, p. 22, Table 16).
p. 80) reports that there is a paucity of information on a range of issues related to part-time and casual employment in Australia.

The official source of data is the ABS Monthly Population Survey. This comprises the monthly labour force survey, and additionally, in certain months, a supplementary survey for a labour-related topic. Also, at times, special supplementary surveys, based on a larger sample, are undertaken for topics such as National Nutrition. One of these latter surveys, the Survey of Employment and Unemployment Patterns (SEUP), is a longitudinal survey which provides information in three "waves" from September 1994 to September 1997. However, published ABS statistics are often not available by a breakdown of sex and/or part-time. Where they are available, a cross-tabulation by age may not be readily available, so that one cannot easily separate female part-time workers aged 20 years plus from the teenage cohort of 15-19 years, where part-time work is often combined with education.

The Australian Longitudinal Survey (ALS) Area Sample collected data from the same respondents from 1985 to 1991 and the Australian Youth Survey (AYS) began collecting data in 1989 and is still ongoing. These two longitudinal surveys are both rich sources of data, but in 1996 information is limited to females aged in their early to mid thirties.

---

8 See also Eccles (1984, pp. 7-13).
9 In a longitudinal survey, information is collected from the same individuals (referred to as a "panel") over a number of years (referred to as "waves"). ABS (1997d, p. 2).
10 See ABS (1997c, p. v and pp. 27-28) for information about each of these three "waves" of data collection.
11 Where unpublished cross-tabulations are available, the cost may prove to be prohibitive. This has been compounded by the fact that since June 1996, the ABS has ceased to publish data from several supplementary surveys; they are now available on a consultancy basis.
12 In June 1995, 78% of part-time workers aged 15 to 19 were full-time students at school or at a tertiary educational institution (ABS, 1995d, p. 3).
15 In both these longitudinal surveys "part-time" is defined as less than 30 hours per week; information on patterns of hours and days of part-time employment has not been collected.
Another longitudinal study, titled the Australian Family Formation Project\textsuperscript{16} (AFFP), has been conducted by the Australian Institute of Family Studies in 1981 and 1991. The second wave of this survey "included questions on current labour market participation of both respondent and spouse... hours worked... and preferences for working full-time, part-time or not at all" (Wolcott and Glezer, 1995, p. 29).

Other sources of primary research data for part-time employment are cross-sectional or "one-time"\textsuperscript{17} studies. Eyland, Mason and Lapsley (1982, 1984) conducted two sample surveys in the Sydney\textsuperscript{18} suburb of Eastwood in 1977, and the Sydney suburbs of Eastwood, Neutral Bay, Concord and Bankstown in 1980. Ross (1982, 1984a, 1986) undertook a survey of married women in the Sydney metropolitan region in 1980. These three surveys all sought an understanding of the participation of women in the labour force.

Baxter and Gibson with Lynch–Blosse (1990) undertook a survey in 1986 titled "The Class Structure of Australia Project" – the Australian contribution to an international project on class structure and class consciousness. Their report \textit{Double Take} provides insights into the relationship between the domestic division of labour and labour market activity – including part-time employment – of married respondents\textsuperscript{19} in the survey.

A cross-sectional survey was conducted by the present writer throughout the City of Waverley\textsuperscript{20} in Melbourne\textsuperscript{21} during one week of September 1977. The aims were:

- to test whether a perceived lack of "part-time work" did in fact exist
- to identify factors that affected the participation of women in part-time work

\textsuperscript{16} The sample for this national study constituted respondents born between 1947 and 1963.
\textsuperscript{17} "One-time" is a term used by the Social Science Data Archives at the Australian National University, Canberra.
\textsuperscript{18} Sydney is the capital city of the State of New South Wales.
\textsuperscript{19} Female respondents were women aged 18 years and older, and working at least 15 hours a week in paid employment.
\textsuperscript{20} The City of Waverley at the time of the 1976 Census measured 58.57 square kilometres. Since 1986, this spatial unit for the Census has been renamed Statistical Local Area, and the City of Waverley has been, since 1994, incorporated into the City of Monash.
\textsuperscript{21} Melbourne is the capital city of the State of Victoria.
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• to give women a voice in the development of employment policies that related to the labour market – and particularly the part-time labour market – of Australia.

The sample design for the Waverley Survey was calculated by the Statistical Services Section of the Victorian Office of the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The method employed\(^\text{22}\) was that of a multi-stage area sample of private, occupied dwellings, based upon 1976 Census Sub-Divisions and Collection Districts. The aim of the procedure was to make the responses as representative as possible for the 36,000 women aged 18 years and over in the City of Waverley.

The self-enumerated questionnaire\(^\text{23}\) went to all women aged 18 years and over in each selected dwelling. There was an 82% response rate based upon the sample unit of dwellings; 602 dwellings were approached, and 515 responses collected.

"Part-time" in the Waverley Survey was defined as "one or more but less than 35 hours per week".\(^\text{24}\) This was in line with the definition used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), which follows the definition of the International Labour Organisation, Geneva (1954).

The present paper reports upon a selection of findings\(^\text{25}\) about part-time employment for two subsamples of the survey population:

1. 142 women\(^\text{26}\) who were currently working part-time, and

---


\(^{23}\) In addition to information about current and preferred patterns of employment and voluntary work, the demographic variables of birthplace, age, marital status, number of children, school level of children, and educational qualifications/skills were collected for all women in the survey. This information is not reported in this paper.

\(^{24}\) For a review of different international definitions of "part-time", see Commission of Inquiry into Part-Time work (1983, pp. 38-42).

\(^{25}\) For these two subsamples, the questionnaire also collected information on job histories, job hunting experiences, study-training experiences and preferences, and reasons for wanting part-time employment. These data are not reported in this paper.

\(^{26}\) Ninety-five per cent of these part-time working women were "now married" 29% had been born overseas, 83% were aged between 25 and 50 years and 81% were mothers or guardians of children aged less than eighteen years old and living at home. The women currently working part-time tended to be better educated than the unemployed women.
(2) 99 women\textsuperscript{27} who had no paid work and who indicated that "Yes" they "would .... like to work part-time now". These women will be described as "unemployed" throughout the paper. However, most of them had not actively looked for part-time work "in the past four weeks" and would therefore tend to be described by the ABS as "marginally attached to the labour force".\textsuperscript{28} The definitional problem of unemployment\textsuperscript{29} for these women will be explored in a subsequent publication of data from the Waverley Survey.

Findings for the two subsamples of women are given for the range of hours, number of hours, number of hours and school level of youngest child, diversity of days, number of weekdays, weekend work, casual work, pattern of hours, Monday to Friday; pattern of hours, Monday to Friday, and school level of youngest child; shiftwork, childcare, suburb of work, travel time to work, work at home and work preferences. For part-time working women, additional data are provided for employment status, occupational groups, employment benefits (including promotion) and trade union membership.

The findings are given against a background of data for similar variables from the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain (1980), the Canadian Commission of Inquiry into Part-Time Work (1983) and the ABS (1977 to 1996).

Statistical analyses are interspersed throughout the paper, where relationships are of particular interest and the population sizes are sufficiently large for analysis. The test applied was the chi-squared test for contingency tables.

Policy implications and suggestions for further research are given at the end of each section of data.

\textsuperscript{27} Ninety-two per cent of these unemployed women were "now married", 30\% were born overseas, 78\% were aged between 25 and 50 years and 79\% were mothers or guardians of children aged less than eighteen years old and living at home.

\textsuperscript{28} The ABS (1994m, p. 23) defines people who had a "marginal attachment" to the labour force as "Persons who were not in the labour force in the reference week, wanted to work and -

(a) were actively looking for work but did not meet the criteria to be classified as unemployed; or

(b) were not actively looking for work but were available to start work within four weeks or could start work within four weeks if childcare was available."

\textsuperscript{29} The main criterion for "unemployment" is that one has actively looked for work in the 4 weeks prior to the survey week. (ABS 1984, p. 5; 1995g, p. 3 and p. 5).
The Conclusion reviews some of the main findings and policy implications of the Waverley Survey data and draws attention to the complexities that surround the concept of part-time employment within a policy framework.

**FINDINGS**

1. **Range of Part-Time Hours**

In the Waverley Survey, part-time working women worked virtually the whole range of "part-time" hours, from two to thirty-three hours. These data are shown in Table 1.

**TABLE 1: PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN: TOTAL NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED, IF WORKED LAST WEEK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Worked Last Week</th>
<th>Number of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-response</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Of the 142 part-time working women, 110 worked "last week".
31 The full range of "part-time" hours is from one up to thirty-five hours a week.

**TABLE 2: ABS SURVEY RESULTS**

**FULLY EMPLOYED PART-TIME WORKING FEMALES**

**HOURS WORKED**

**AUSTRALIA, JUNE 1995.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours worked</th>
<th>Married females (per cent)</th>
<th>All females (per cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS (1995d, p. 28, Table 21).

In terms of this wide range of hours of part-time employment an "average" number of hours is not a very informative measure. The range of hours also reminds us that, in Australia, the terms "part-time" and "full-time" together constitute a spectrum of work hours. The cut-off point of thirty-five hours for

---

32 ABS (1978, p. 11, Table 8).
33 ABS (1984, p. 16, Table 2.5)
34 ABS (1995d, p. 28, Table 21).
35 Persons who did not work in the reference week (ie "last week") have been excluded from these calculations.
36 In recent years the ABS has collected information about "underemployment" – situations where people are "not fully employed" and would prefer to work more hours (ABS 1983a, 1984, 1988, 1991a, 1994f, 1995d). Data are collected on part-time workers. However, where a breakdown by sex is available (e.g., "married females"), as in ABS (1995d) *The Labour Force, Australia, June 1995* there is no indication of how many extra hours the part-time worker would prefer, and whether the total number of hours would then put that worker into the part-time or full-time labour market. In other cases, such as ABS (1991a, p. 9) *Underemployed Workers, Australia, May 1991* we are given the preferred number of extra hours, but there is no breakdown of data on "married females" – data are given instead for "husband or wife" with dependants present/not present.
37 The category "married females" probably excludes those who combined part-time employment with education. Cross-tabulations of hours worked by females aged 20 years and over are not available in these published results. They may, however, be available as unpublished data at a charge.
38 The "average" (mean) of part-time hours in the Waverley Survey was 16 hours per week.
part-time employment is an arbitrary one. It is not, however, a meaningless one in regard to the historical development of industrial awards in Australia, and the employment benefits and tenure that have subsequently been available to "full-time" and "part-time" employees.

Junor, Barlow and Patterson (1993, p. 108) contend that "segmentation\(^{39}\) will only disappear when there is full freedom to move, in practice as well as on paper, between full-time and part-time work, with no loss of entitlements or career opportunities", and that "the segregation of part-time workers is a barrier to the realisation of the full productive potential of the labour force".

### 2. Number of Part-Time Hours

**Women Employed for 10 Hours or Less a Week**

In the Waverley Survey, 28% of part-time working women\(^{40}\) were employed for 10 hours or less a week (see Table 1); 6% of unemployed women\(^{41}\) were prepared to work less than 10 hours a week.\(^{42}\)

In an ABS survey of 1995, 28% of married females were employed for 10 hours or less a week (see Table 2). In 1983 the corresponding figure\(^{43}\) was 29%.

**Women Employed for 15 Hours or Less a Week**

In the Waverley Survey 44% of part-time working women were employed for 15 hours or less a week (see Table 1). Twenty-six per cent of unemployed women were prepared to work less than 15 hours a week.

---

\(^{39}\) "Segmentation is the division of the economy wide labour market into non competing and unequal work forces often on the basis of gender or full-time/part-time status" (Junor et al. 1993, p. 104).

\(^{40}\) In the Waverley Survey, 95% of part-time working women were "now married".

\(^{41}\) The unemployed women were asked: "What TOTAL NUMBER of HOURS each week would you be prepared to work? (Exclude travelling time.)"

The replies were as follows:

- 6% prepared to work under 10 hours per week
- 20% 10 – under 15 hours
- 30% 15 – under 20 hours
- 27% 20 – under 25 hours
- 9% 25 – under 30 hours
- 4% 30 – under 35 hours
- 3% did not answer the question.

\(^{42}\) The groupings of hours for part-time working women (e.g. "10 hours or less") and unemployed women (e.g. "under 10 hours") are not strictly comparable. The data have been given in this format so that information for part-time working women in the Waverley Survey can be aligned with that from the ABS in 1995. Readers can make their own calculations for part-time working women (e.g. "under 10 hours") from Table 1 if they wish.

\(^{43}\) ABS (1984, p. 16, Table 2.5). Persons who did not work "last week" have been excluded from these calculations.
In ABS surveys of 1995 (see Table 2) and 1983,44 44% of married females in Australia were employed for 15 hours or less per week.

**Women Employed for 20 Hours or less a Week**

In the Waverley Survey, 67% of part-time working women were employed for 20 hours or less a week (see Table 1), and 56% of unemployed women were prepared to work for under 20 hours per week.

In an ABS survey of 1995, 65% of married females in Australia were employed for 20 hours or less a week (see Table 2).45 In 1983, the corresponding figure46 was 64%.

**Women Employed for more than 20, but less than 35 Hours a Week**

In the Waverley Survey, 29% of part-time working women were employed for more than 20 but less than 35 hours per week (see Table 1). In the ABS survey of 1995, 35% of married females were employed for 21-34 hours a week (see Table 2). In 1983, the corresponding figure47 was 32%.

These data are relevant to policies where clauses in industrial awards or enterprise agreements set minimum and maximum hours of part-time employment per week. The Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU [1990, p. 9]) for instance, has suggested in the past the following wording for negotiation in regard to minimum and maximum hours of part-time employment:

Part-time employees shall be employed not less than 16 hours per week and not more than 30 hours per week, and not less than 4 hours and not more than 8 hours (ordinary time) per day.

Data reported here are particularly relevant in regard to the ACTU recommended minimum (16) hours of part-time employment. As noted above, in the Waverley Survey, and the ABS survey of 1995, 44% of married women were employed for less than 16 hours a week. In the Waverley Survey, 26% of "unemployed" women were prepared to work less than 15 hours a week. In the view of some writers such as Dawkins and Norris (1990, p. 161) and Romeyn

44 Ibid.
45 In contrast, Sundström (1991, p. 168) reports that in Sweden in 1989, 86% of female part-time workers were employed for 20-34 hours per week.
46 ABS (1984, P. 16, Table 2.5).
47 Ibid.
(1992, p. 68) a stipulation of a minimum number of hours of part-time employment has "pushed" part-time workers who want less than the minimum hours into arrangements for casual employment with no tenure and few employment benefits.

In regard to the recommended ACTU maximum (30) hours of part-time employment, in the ABS published survey results of 1995 one cannot disaggregate "more than 30 hours"; however 12% of married females were employed for 30-34 hours. In the Waverley Survey, 5% of part-time working women were employed for more than 30 but less than 35 hours a week.

The data reported here for part-time working women and unemployed women also have relevance for the development of policies in regard to government labour market programs. The following is an extract from the Commonwealth Government’s White Paper on Employment, Working Nation, which outlined policies to assist the long-term unemployed:

It is expected that the majority of Job Compact places will be full-time jobs. However, part-time work is an expanding sector of work. It can provide significant income and be a pathway to longer hours and higher pay. And it can provide a boost in income and morale for individuals who may not be able, for the time being, to do full time work. In the Job Compact some jobs will be part-time where it appears to be the most appropriate option, provided they offer at least 20 hours work per week.

The budgeted outlay for Job Compact programs in 1994-5 was $538 million. Access to these programs appears to have been restricted for people who preferred to be employed for less than 20 hours a week. Similarly, in 1993 the Commonwealth Jobstart Program excluded people who preferred to work for pay for less than 20 hours per week.

49 The emphasis is the writer’s.
50 For a summary of all budgeted outlays, see Appendix B.
51 The Job Compact was "targeted at the long term unemployed" and provided "individual case management and access to a range of labour market programs leading to a firm offer of a job placement for 6 to 12 months". (ABS, 1995f, para 3).
In the Waverley Survey, 58% of part-time working women were employed for less than 20 hours a week (see Table 1) and 56% of unemployed women were prepared to work for less than 20 hours a week.\textsuperscript{54} In the ABS survey of 1995 (see Table 2) it is not possible to disaggregate the published data on part-time working married females into a category of "less than 20 hours";\textsuperscript{55} but 44% of married women were employed for 15 hours or less.

3. \textbf{Number of Hours and School Level of Youngest Child}

Bittman (1992, p. 3) in his Report on the Secondary Analysis of the 1987 Pilot Survey of Time Use \textsuperscript{56} in Australia, commented that “the highest levels of unpaid work (and the lowest levels of paid work) are found among women with pre-school children”. This pattern can be seen in the Waverley Survey where relatively fewer part-time working women with a youngest child not yet at school worked 20 hours or more a week, compared with part-time working women who did not have a child in this category.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline
School Level of Youngest Child & Worked more than 20 hours a week & Worked less than 20 hours a week \\
\hline
Not yet at school & 25\% & 75\% \\
At primary school & 42\% & 58\% \\
At secondary school & 65\% & 35\% \\
No dependent child\textsuperscript{57} & 29\% & 71\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN: WORK FOR 20 HOURS A WEEK AND SCHOOL LEVEL OF YOUNGEST CHILD}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{54} It is not currently possible to obtain from published ABS data the percentages of females (aged 20 years and over) who are unemployed or marginally attached to the labour force by their preferred number of hours for part-time employment.

\textsuperscript{55} The hours are grouped as "16-20".

\textsuperscript{56} “The intention of the 1987 Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Pilot Survey of Time Use in the Sydney Statistical Division was to provide detailed information about the diverse range of activities that occupy people outside the paid work force” (Bittman, 1992, p. 2).

\textsuperscript{57} The majority of women with “no dependent child” were older women. “Dependent child” in the Waverley Survey means a child aged less than 18 years and living at home.

\textsuperscript{58} The chi-squared test was used to test the underlying association between variables: \( p = 0.1 \) indicates there is a 10\% degree of probability that the relationship occurred by chance; \( p = 0.01 \) indicates there is a 1\% degree of probability that the relationship occurred by chance; \( p = 0.001 \) indicates there is a 0.1\% degree of probability that the relationship occurred by chance.
Three quarters of the part-time working women with a child "not yet at school" were employed for less than 20 hours a week. In the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain, there was a similar finding that women with a youngest child aged less than five years were more likely to be employed for less than 16 hours a week than women with a youngest child aged 5-10 years (Martin and Roberts, 1984, p. 18).

In the Waverley Survey, relatively fewer unemployed women with a youngest child at primary school were prepared to work 20 hours or more a week compared with unemployed women who did not have a child in this category.

**TABLE 4: UNEMPLOYED WOMEN WHO WANT PART-TIME WORK: PREPARED TO WORK FOR 20 HOURS A WEEK AND SCHOOL LEVEL OF YOUNGEST CHILD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level of Youngest Child</th>
<th>Prepared to work 20 hours or more a week</th>
<th>Not prepared to work 20 hours or more a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child not yet at school</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child at primary school</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child at secondary school etc.</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dependent child$^{59}$</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p = 0.05 \]

One needs to keep in mind Beechey and Perkins' (1987, p. 41) comment that the relationship between part-time employment and women's participation in the labour market is a "complex phenomenon". This phenomenon would presumably alter if one or more factors changed over time. For this reason, further research to test these patterns would be helpful.

$^{59}$ The majority of women with "no dependent child" were older women.
In the meantime, these findings may provide a data base for policy makers interested in the issue of workers and family responsibilities, and the adoption of a “managing diversity”\textsuperscript{60} approach to human resource management.

4. Diversity of Days

In the Waverley Survey “part-time employment” was represented by a great diversity of days and hours of paid work.

Accurate recall of information diminishes with time. Therefore, for the 142 women who were currently working part-time, data concerning days and hours of work were analysed only in regard to 110 women who worked for pay part-time in the previous week\textsuperscript{61}.

Of the 110 women\textsuperscript{62} who worked part-time “last week”:

(a) 67% worked only weekdays i.e. from Monday to Friday (74 women)
(b) 15% worked a combination of weekdays and weekends (16 women)
(c) 8% worked only at the weekend (9 women)
(d) 7% indicated a varied\textsuperscript{63} or flexible pattern, but did not indicate whether it was weekday or weekend (8 women)
(e) 3% did not indicate their work pattern (3 women).

\textsuperscript{60} Managing diversity is concerned with maximising the potential of all employees within an organisation which in turn assists the overall achievement of core business goals. It is seen by many as an extension of EEO or merit and equity approaches and programs. (Department of Treasury and Finance, 1996, p. 32).

\textsuperscript{61} In the Waverley Survey, 142 women classified themselves as part-time workers – that is, as people who worked for pay for less than 35 hours a week. They were then asked: “Did you work last week?”
• 78% responded “Yes” (110 women)
• 11% responded “No” (16 women)
• 11% did not answer the question (16 women).

\textsuperscript{62} For part-time working women, this paper provides information as follows:
• Number of Weekdays, Monday to Friday: 90 women in text categories (a) and (b)
• Weekend patterns of work: 25 women in text categories (b) and (c)
• Pattern of Hours, Monday to Friday: 90 women in text categories (a) and (b).
• Range of hours: 110 women in text categories (a) to (e).

\textsuperscript{63} Of the 8 women who had a varied pattern of work, 5 worked completely at home, 2 worked half at home and half outside the home, and 1 woman worked completely outside the home.
ABS data\(^{64}\) in *Working Arrangements, Australia, August 1993* also reveal a diversity of work patterns for all\(^{65}\) part-time employees (male and female) aged fifteen years and over\(^{66}\) in Australia, in regard to days of employment:

- 21% usually worked on each of the days Monday to Friday
- 32% usually worked weekdays only (not including those who work Monday to Friday)
- 22% worked varying days each week
- 19% usually worked a combination of weekdays and weekends
- 7% usually worked weekends only.

5. **Number of Weekdays, Monday to Friday**

In the Waverley Survey the 90 part-time working women who worked from Monday to Friday "last week" worked the whole range of weekdays – from one to five days a week:

- 14% worked 1 day
- 22% worked 2 days
- 13% worked 3 days
- 17% worked 4 days
- 32% worked 5 days
- 1% did not answer the question.

The highest percentage (32%) worked all 5 weekdays.

The 99 unemployed women in the Waverley Survey were also asked to indicate their preferred number of days of part-time employment from Monday to Friday. It should be recalled that the situation to which these women were asked to respond is a hypothetical one. They were not yet actually in a job, in a certain location, for a particular pattern of days and hours of work. For instance they were asked firstly:

"If you were working for an employer, HOW MANY DAYS from Monday to Friday would you be prepared to work?"

---

\(^{64}\) ABS (1994k, p. 4).

\(^{65}\) A breakdown of data for females only is not available.

\(^{66}\) People "in scope" for the Waverley Survey were women aged 18 years and over.
They were then asked whether they would be prepared to work early or late evening shifts or on weekends. We do not know whether, if they answered "Yes" to weekends and if they were offered a job with substantial weekend hours this would then affect their preparedness to work Monday to Friday. However, within these limits of interpretation, the following data are interesting and the broad patterns may be useful in human resource planning.

The percentage of unemployed women and their preferred number of weekdays (Monday to Friday) of part-time employment was as follows:

- 1% were prepared to work 1 day
- 10% were prepared to work 2 days
- 47% were prepared to work 3 days
- 21% were prepared to work 4 days
- 17% were prepared to work 5 days
- 4% did not answer the question.

Nearly half (47%) of these unemployed women were prepared to work three days a week from Monday to Friday. Fifty-eight per cent were prepared to work part-time, Monday to Friday, between one and three days a week. This latter finding is consistent with an ABS Survey\(^67\) of 1986, where 58% of married females and 57% of all females who were looking for work and preferred part-time employment preferred to work between one and three days a week. (See Table 5).

TABLE 5: ABS SURVEY RESULTS: FEMALES LOOKING FOR WORK WHO PREFERRED TO WORK LESS THAN 35 HOURS
(Per cent of Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of days per week preferred</th>
<th>Married females</th>
<th>All females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and more</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{67}\) ABS (1988, p. 20, Table 24).
6. **Weekend Work**

Nearly a quarter of the 110 women in the Waverley Survey who worked part-time "last week" undertook at least some of their work during the weekend.\(^{68}\) The weekend work patterns for these women are shown in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern of weekend work</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday morning</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday day shift</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday early evening</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday late night</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday day shift</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday and Sunday day shift</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday early evening</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday and Sunday early evening</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparison, a smaller percentage (10%) of the unemployed women in the Waverley Survey who wanted to work part-time were prepared to work during the weekend.

Published data on patterns of weekend work for female part-time workers do not appear to be available from the ABS.

7. **Casual Work**

In the Waverley Survey, 39% of unemployed women preferred employment that was "casual for a few weeks or months with periods of no work in between".\(^{69}\) The term "casual" here means "intermittent" or "discontinuous".

---

\(^{68}\) In Victoria, in November 1976, 31% of female part-time employees aged 15 years and over worked on one or both days of the weekend (ABS 1977b, p. 15, Table 13).

\(^{69}\) Q. 60 of the questionnaire asked these unemployed women:

"What sort of work would you prefer?"

- Regular work
- "Relief" or "on call at short notice"
- Casual for a few weeks or months, with periods of no work in between
- Other (Specify)..........................
Of these women:

- 48% preferred a pattern of regular work
- 39% preferred "casual for a few weeks or months, with periods of no work in between"
- 3% preferred a pattern that was "relief" or "on call at short notice"
- 5% of the women indicated that the pattern could vary
- 5% did not answer the question.

If "casual for a few weeks or months, with periods of no work in between", "relief", "on call at short notice" and "varied" are grouped together, then half of these unemployed women preferred an irregular pattern of part-time employment.

In contrast, 4% of the women who were currently employed part-time had work that was "casual for a few weeks or months"; if "casual for a few weeks or months", "relief", "on call at short notice" and "varied" are grouped together, then one quarter of these part-time working women had an irregular pattern of work. Their responses are as follows:

- 67% part-time working women had "regular" part-time work70
- 12% had work that was "relief" or "on call at short notice"
- 9% had a "varied" pattern of work
- 4% had work that was "casual for a few weeks or months"71
- 9% did not answer the question.

In the Waverley Survey, the definition of "casual" refers only to a pattern of work. It does not encompass the concept of paid holiday leave or a "steady" income or not. Moreover, it refers only to part-time workers – those who worked less than 35 hours per week. For problems that are encountered in regard to a definition of the term "casual", please see Appendix C.

---

70 The questionnaire did not ask these women who had "regular" part-time employment whether they preferred to continue with a regular or irregular pattern of paid work.

71 In the "search phase" of the Waverley Survey, no information was collected about how many women were employed full-time for only part of the year.
The ABS has conducted four main surveys to document casual work. These were undertaken in the States of South Australia in 1986, Victoria in 1988, Tasmania in 1990 and New South Wales in 1991. In these surveys, the definition of "casual" hinges upon workers having no paid holiday leave. The casual workers are then broken down into "regular" or "irregular" categories, depending on whether income is received in a "steady" manner or not. The ABS definition of "casual", unlike that of the Waverley Survey, also includes full-time workers, who are described as "temporary full-time" and "casual full-time".

In these ABS surveys, 14%, 9% and 11% of part-time working females in South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales respectively were described as "irregular casual". These females received an irregular income, which presumably indicated an irregular pattern of employment.

The assumption has been in recent years (Campbell 1996, p. 4; Lever-Tracy 1989, pp. 226, 232) that "casual work", with an irregular income, lack of employment benefits and insecurity of tenure, has been an undesirable aspect of the Australian part-time and casual labour market. However, the demand for a discontinuous or intermittent pattern of part-time employment by the unemployed women of the Waverley Survey raises the question as to whether there may still be a demand for a discontinuous/intermittent pattern of employment amongst women who currently work part-time. If the answer is

---

73 ABS (1989).
74 ABS (1991b).
75 ABS (1992c).
76 To complicate this definition further, the ABS criteria for "casual employees" include paid sick leave, in addition to paid holiday leave, in surveys of Employment Benefits from 1989 onwards (ABS, 1990).
77 "Steady income" meant that persons were paid at regular intervals and received approximately the same amount of money each pay (ABS [1989, p. 2]). A large number of part-time workers in the two ABS surveys were classified as "regular casuals" who received a "steady" income.
78 These females were aged 15 years and over. Information for females aged "20 years and over" or else "married", to roughly exclude those who are full-time students, may be available as unpublished data, at a charge.
79 ABS (1987, p. 8, Table 1).
80 ABS (1989, p. 4).
81 ABS (1992c, p. 2, Table 2).
82 In the Tasmania Survey (ABS, 1991b, p. 2, Table 1) the corresponding figure was 17.6%).
"Yes" there are implications for union policies of decasualisation, whereby "casual" workers who are employed for 15 hours or more a week are shifted to permanent part-time status, with pro rata or proportional employment benefits and increased job security.

Additionally, if a demand for a discontinuous/intermittent pattern of part-time employment still exists amongst women who are unemployed or marginally attached to the labour force, there is significance for guidelines that relate to labour market programs. These aim to assist the long-term unemployed, by means of subsidised job placement and training programs, to re-enter the labour market. In 1994-95 the Commonwealth Government of Australia budgeted $538 million for the Job Compact program. The policy was, however, that "Temporary casual positions will not be considered".

If the demand for a discontinuous or intermittent pattern of work still exists, it would also be interesting to probe the reasons why – whether it be on account of pay loadings or some other factor.

8. **Pattern of Hours, Monday to Friday**

The unemployed women in the Waverley Survey who wanted to work part-time were asked to indicate their preferred pattern of hours.

The results were as follows:

- 72% preferred to work between 9 am and 3.30 pm
- 7% preferred an early evening shift
- 1% preferred to finish by 3.30 pm
- 5% preferred an 8 hour day or longer starting from as early as 8 am

---

83 Please see Appendix C for more detail.
84 This information does not appear to be available from ABS published data. See, for instance, ABS (1994h).
86 The fact that the term "casual" is not defined in this White Paper complicates the issue further.
87 The emphasis is the writer’s.
88 Pay loadings (e.g. 20%) are commonly paid to casual part-time employees in lieu of pro-rata or proportional employment benefits.
89 Initially they were asked: "If you were working for an employer, HOW MANY DAYS from Monday to Friday would you be prepared to work?" They were then asked: "On those days, what TIMES would you prefer to start and finish?"
• 10% preferred a 6-7 hour working day
• 4% did not indicate their preference.

The following patterns of hours were documented for the 90 women in the Waverley Survey who currently worked part-time at least one of the five weekdays (Monday to Friday):

• 49% worked between 9 am and 3.30 pm
• 12% worked early evening shift, finishing about 11 pm
• 11% started before 9 am, and finished before 3.30 pm
• 10% worked 8 hours or longer, starting at 8 am at earliest
• 6% worked a 6-7 hour working day, starting at 9-10 am, and finishing at 4-5 pm
• 6% worked a late night shift, starting about 11 pm and going past midnight
• 4% had a varied or flexible pattern
• 2% worked between 9 am and 3.30 pm, plus early evening shift.

In summary, half of these part-time working women were employed between 9 am and 3.30 pm, while the other half displayed a great diversity in their hourly patterns of work. Ten per cent worked in part-time employment for 8 consecutive hours or longer; two thirds were employed for a "shortened" day.

In the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain, the most common pattern was for women to work a reduced number of hours per day (a "shortened day") rather than a reduced number of days per week. According to Martin and Roberts (1984, p. 74) the priorities of part-time working women in this British survey were different to those of full-timers:

They often face such considerable domestic constraints on the kind of job they can take that factors such as convenient hours become of overriding importance. For many part-time workers the choice is not between this job or that job but between working in any job that fits in with these constraints and not working at all.

90 “last week”.
91 Martin and Roberts (1984, p. 36).
9. **Pattern of Hours, Monday to Friday, and School Level of Youngest Child**

In the Waverley Survey, relatively more part-time working women with a youngest child\(^{92}\) at primary school were employed between 9 am and 3.30 pm\(^{93}\) compared with part-time working women who did not have a child in this category.

### TABLE 7: PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN; WORK 9 AM - 3.30 PM AND SCHOOL LEVEL OF YOUNGEST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level of Youngest Child</th>
<th>Work between 9 am and 3.30 pm</th>
<th>Work outside 9 am - 3.30 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not yet at school</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At primary school</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At secondary school etc.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dependent child(^{94})</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{p} = 0.05\)

Similarly, unemployed women with a youngest child at primary school had the strongest preference for employment between 9 am and 3.30 pm whereas women with no dependent child had the weakest preference for this pattern (see Table 8).

### TABLE 8: UNEMPLOYED WOMEN WHO WANT PART-TIME WORK: PREFERENCE TO WORK 9 AM - 3.30 PM AND SCHOOL LEVEL OF YOUNGEST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level of Youngest Child</th>
<th>Preference to work 9 am - 3.30 pm</th>
<th>Preference not to work 9 am - 3.30 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child not yet at school</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child at primary school</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child at secondary school</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dependent child(^{95})</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{p} = 0.001\)

---

\(^{92}\) The ABS (1993c, p. 134, Table 5.8) gives percentages of part-time working wives and lone mothers by age of youngest child for June 1992, but a cross-tabulation of actual hours worked is not available.

\(^{93}\) In Australia, 9 am – 3.30 pm corresponds approximately to school hours.

\(^{94}\) The majority of women with no dependent child were older women.

\(^{95}\) Ibid.
In 1990, the Australian Government ratified International Labour Organisation Convention No. 156, Workers with Family Responsibilities (ILO C156). The Convention makes it an aim of national policy to enable persons with family responsibilities who are engaged or wish to engage in employment to exercise their right to do so without being subject to discrimination and to the extent possible without conflict between their employment and family responsibilities (Commonwealth DIR 1994, p. 1).

The findings above may provide a useful data base for policy makers interested in the issue of workers and family responsibilities and the adoption of a “managing diversity” framework for implementing merit and equity in employment.

10. Shiftwork

Relatively more part-time working women with a youngest child not yet at school worked some shiftwork, compared with women who did not fall into this category. Martin and Roberts (1984, p. 38) note that in the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain (1980), 38% of evening workers had a child under five years old.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level of Youngest Child</th>
<th>Shift work</th>
<th>No Shift work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child not yet at school</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child at primary, secondary school etc.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dependent child</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p = 0.05 \]

For other data relevant to workers and family responsibilities, see Section 3 (Number of Hours and School Level of Youngest Child).

This framework involves the main-streaming and integration of merit and equity into overall human resource management, and the development of an organisational culture which capitalises on the diverse talents of all employees. (Department of Treasury and Finance, 1996, p. 34).

Shiftwork means here “9am – 3.30pm plus early evening shift”, “early evening shift”, and “late night shift”.

The majority of women with “no dependent child” were older women.
In the Waverley Survey, 12% of unemployed women who wanted to work part-time were prepared to work early evening shift\textsuperscript{100} and 3% were prepared to work late night shift.

In ABS (1994k) Working Arrangements, Australia, August 1993, definitions of shifts vary from those used in the Waverley Survey. Cross-tabulations of data for female shiftworkers aged 20 years and over, who work part-time, are not available in these published figures.

11. Childcare

(a) School Holidays

(b) Time Off Work for Sick Children

(c) Childcare Arrangement for Child Not Yet at School.

The findings in this section may have relevance for human resource managers who are interested in family-friendly policies and diversity awareness training.

(a) School Holidays

The 142 part-time working women in the Waverley Survey were asked to indicate whether they worked during the school holidays:

- 32% answered "Yes"
- 20% answered "No"
- 17% answered "Sometimes"
- 32% did not answer the question.\textsuperscript{101}

Of the unemployed women who wanted to work part-time 25% were prepared to work during school holidays.

Relatively fewer unemployed women with a youngest child at primary school were prepared to work during school holidays compared with unemployed women who did not have a child in this category.

\textsuperscript{100} Finishing about 11pm.

\textsuperscript{101} There was a much higher "non response" to this question than usual. This was probably due to the wording of the question. A certain number of women probably left the answer blank and did not specifically tick "no" when "no" was the actual answer. The actual percentage of "no" answers was probably more likely to be about 40%. 
TABLE 10: UNEMPLOYED WOMEN WHO WANT PART-TIME WORK: PREPARED TO WORK SCHOOL HOLIDAYS AND SCHOOL LEVEL OF YOUNGEST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level of Youngest Child</th>
<th>Prepared to work school holidays</th>
<th>Not prepared to work school holidays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youngest Child not yet at school</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest Child at primary school</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest Child at secondary school</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dependent child</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = 0.001

(b) Time Off Work for Sick Children

The 115 women who worked part-time and had children aged less than 18 years of age and living at home were asked:

"Do you personally need to take time off work if a child is sick enough to need constant care?"

• 49% answered "Yes"
• 24% answered "Sometimes"
• 16% answered "No"
• 11% did not indicate.

If the woman answered "Yes" or "Sometimes", and worked for an employer, she was then asked:

"What is your employer's attitude towards your taking time off work under these circumstances?"

One woman of this group commented: "I change my shift". Two others who worked completely or partly at home indicated that the question did not apply.

The remaining 50 women indicated that their employer's attitude was as follows:

• 68% – completely co-operative
• 26% – fairly co-operative
• 2% – completely unco-operative
• 2% – don’t know
• 2% – did not answer the question.
That is, where a part-time working woman had to take time off work in order to provide constant care for a sick child,\textsuperscript{102} in almost all cases her employer was completely or fairly co-operative about the matter.

(c) Childcare Arrangement for Child Not Yet at School

Of the 115 part-time working women who had a child aged less than 18 years of age and living at home, 37 had a child not yet at school.

The main childcare arrangement for these children not yet at school whilst a woman worked part-time was as follows:

- In 16\% of cases, the woman supervised the child by herself
- In 24\% of cases, the husband supervised the child by himself
- In 38\% of cases, there were combined arrangements that involved the woman, husband, relatives, friends, neighbours and/or babysitter
- In 8\% of cases, the child was cared for by a creche, care centre or kindergarten, and
- 14\% did not answer the question.

In summary, most care arrangements for a child not yet at school were made with relatives, friends or neighbours rather than a creche, care centre or kindergarten whilst a woman worked part-time.\textsuperscript{103}

In the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain (1980) the use of formal institutional care for a pre-school child, while a woman worked part-time,  

\textsuperscript{102} The ABS publication \textit{Childcare Australia June 1993} (Cat. No. 4402.0 p. 20) indicates that unpublished statistics are available for the following:

\textit{Sick Care}

- Number of days child sick in last six months from school or formal care
- Whether parent took time off work to care for child
- Type of leave parent took off work to care for child
- Whether any other arrangements other than time off work were used to care for child.
- Preferred childcare arrangements of working parents with sick children.

These unpublished statistics are available from the ABS at a charge. It would be helpful to request a breakdown of the above variables by female parents who work part-time.

\textsuperscript{103} In the Australian Living Standards Study (1991-2), Millward (1996, p. 15) found that the two most important predictors of the use of formal or informal care were the local supply of long day formal care places, and the weekly hours the mother worked.
was also relatively rare. Martin and Roberts (1984, p. 39) suggest that this may have been due to a limited availability of care.

In Australia, however, despite an increase in the availability of family day care, employer-sponsored and private child care centres, child care rebates and the introduction of policies such as the 48/52 ruling, personal carers' leave (family leave) and parental leave since 1977, the ABS documents that in 1993, three quarters of employees with a youngest child aged under three years did not use formal childcare.

In an examination of child care and part-time employment, one needs to remember Beechey and Perkins' (1987, p. 41) comment that in each country the level of part-time employment is a "complex phenomenon". Probert (1995, p. 3)

---

104 A Family Day Care Scheme, also referred to as Home Based Care, "is a network of individuals (caregivers) who provide care and activities in their own homes for other people's children. The network is organised and supported by a central co-ordination unit. Family day care is Commonwealth-funded, and usually operated by a local government authority or community organisation." Work and Childcare Advisory Service, Victoria (1994, Appendix I).

105 The Victorian Public Service since September 1991 has had an innovative leave arrangement whereby employees can (on a voluntary basis) take an extra 4 weeks annual leave and still be paid while on leave. The extra 4 weeks are "unpaid" but payment over the year is made by subtracting 4 weeks' pay from the employee's annual salary but spreading the remaining amount over 52 weeks so that the employee is paid for 52 weeks but on a slightly reduced fortnightly pay. This option is particularly useful for employees who need extra leave for school holidays, and is a method of saving on wages for the organisation. (Mathews 1992, p. 15).

106 The Australian Industrial Relations Commission ruled in 1995/96 that sick leave and bereavement leave would be blended into a single category of leave that workers could convert into family leave, to care for members of their household. This leave is limited to 5 days per year. See Kenna (1997, "Other Entitlements", para. 3) for more detail.

107 Under federal legislation, men and women are entitled to share unpaid leave of 52 weeks after the birth of a child, during its first year of life – and return to their same position. (DIR.1994). See Kenna (1997) for more detail.

108 "Overall, 80% of employees with children aged under 12 did not use formal child care, although this proportion varied according to the age of the youngest child. For employees with the youngest child aged 3 to 5 years, 69% did not use formal child care, compared with 75% of employees with youngest child aged under 3 years and 89% of employees with youngest child aged 6 to 12 years. The most common reason given for not using formal child care was 'No need' (78%), and the next most common reason was 'Cost' (6%)." (ABS, 1993d, p. 3).

109 In an ABS survey of childcare in Australia in 1996, (ABS 1997b), formal and informal care arrangements are given for children aged 0-4 years, and weekly hours worked are given for the mother, but no cross-tabulations of these variables are available in published results.

110 These employees were male and female, full and part-time.

111 McDonald (1993, p. 26) reports from the Australian Living Standards Study (1991-92) that the use of formal and informal care was very different in four different municipalities of Melbourne.
too, reminds us that "the link between marriage and part-time employment for women is not a natural one but a socially and politically determined one".

In this context, the recommendations of a Commonwealth Government Task Force regarding *Future Child Care Provision in Australia* (EPAC, 1996a) are relevant. The Task Force suggests that "government subsidies should be used to help families purchase whatever form of accredited child care best meets their needs" (p. xiii). It recommends the introduction of a Child Care Benefit, to be paid by means of a "smart card" or stored – value card, to parents "so that the dollars 'follow the child' rather than being directed to providers" (p. xii). A change of policy in regard to government subsidies for child care in this way, may affect not only patterns of childcare, but also possibly the mix of full-time and part-time employment of women.

Baxter *et al.* (1990, p. 98) suggest the following perspective:

... at an individual level, the choice being made by many women is between part-time work or no paid work, rather than between full-time and part-time work. To argue that these are all women who wish, or need, to be "freed" from their domestic responsibilities is to fail to do justice to the decisions being made by individual women in individual circumstances. These are decisions which may involve higher values attached to the traditionally female domain of the private sphere. And to present solutions that focus exclusively on ameliorating their domestic responsibilities is to ignore the very real likelihood that these are women who choose to give equal (at least) emphasis to the private sphere, rather than subjugate it to their public responsibilities. In other words, these are likely to be women who do not accept, for whatever reason, a male view of the social world. If such a radical set of priorities is to be respected, the need to upgrade part-time work options becomes a critical policy focus.

12. **Suburb of Work**

A little over half of the 142 women who were currently employed part-time\(^\text{112}\) worked within the City of Waverley or in a suburb adjoining Waverley. Details are as follows:

---

\(^{112}\) The ABS publication *Journey to Work and Journey to School* (ABS, 1976 pp. 20-21, Tables 15, 16) does not provide a breakdown of data for travel to work for
• 41% worked within the City of Waverley\textsuperscript{113} and about two thirds of these worked partly or wholly at home
• 12% worked in suburbs that adjoined the City of Waverley\textsuperscript{114}
• 21% worked in other suburbs that did \textit{not} adjoin the City of Waverley\textsuperscript{115}
• 11% worked in "varied" suburbs. The questionnaire did not document whether these were within the boundaries\textsuperscript{116} of the City of Waverley or not
• 6% worked within the Central Business District of Melbourne
• 9% did not indicate their suburb of work.

13. \textit{Travel Time to Work}

The survey results shed light on the amount of time part-time working women spent travelling one way to work:\textsuperscript{117}

• 13% worked completely at home, so had no travelling time
• 56% travelled for less than half an hour
• 16% travelled between half an hour and one hour
• 4% travelled for one hour or more
• 2% had a varied travelling time
• 9% did not answer the question.

Of the 142 women who worked part-time:

• 82% had a current car licence

\textsuperscript{113} In September 1977, the City of Waverley comprised 6 main suburbs or postal districts. They were Mt. Waverley, Glen Waverley (including Syndal and Wheeler's Hill), Mulgrave (including Springvale North), Oakleigh East, Ashwood and Notting Hill.

\textsuperscript{114} The adjoining suburbs included Clayton, Burwood, Springvale, Oakleigh, Chadstone, Scoresby and North Clayton.

\textsuperscript{115} The "other suburbs" included Prahran, Windsor, Malvern, Armadale, South Caulfield, Camberwell, Moorabbin, Dandenong, Hawthorn, Box Hill, South Box Hill, Keysborough, Footscray, Surrey Hills, St. Kilda, East Hawthorn, Clifton Hill, Caulfield and Noble Park.

\textsuperscript{116} For the postcode boundaries of the City of Waverley at the time of the survey, see \textit{Melway Street Directory of Greater Melbourne, Geelong and Mornington Peninsula}. Melway Publishing Pty. Ltd., P.O. Box 38, Malvern, Victoria 3144. Edition 10, 1977, pp. 61, 62, 70, 71.

\textsuperscript{117} Information on travel to work for part-time workers in Victoria is not available from published ABS data (ABS, 1995e, 1985a).
• 11% did not have a current car licence
• 7% did not answer the question.

The women were asked "Do you regularly drive a car to work?" Nineteen women worked completely at home. The remaining 123 women responded as follows:

69% answered "Yes" – they regularly drove a car to work
20% answered "No"
11% did not answer the question.

The 99 unemployed women who wanted to work part-time "now" were asked "How much time would you be prepared to spend travelling to work?:"

• 10% were not prepared to travel at all; they wanted home-based work
• 70% were prepared to travel under half an hour one way to work
• 14% were prepared to travel between half an hour and one hour
• 1% were prepared to travel one hour or more
• 5% did not answer the question.

Of the unemployed women who wanted to work part-time, 71% had a current car licence, 24% did not, and 5% did not indicate. They were then asked whether a car would be available for them to drive to work for their preferred work hours:

• 62% answered "Yes"
• 12% answered "Sometimes"
• 20% answered "No"
• 1% answered "Don't know"
• 5% did not answer the question.

Of the 20 unemployed women for whom a car would not be available:

• 5 preferred to work completely at home
• 3 preferred to work partly at home
• 11 preferred not to work at home
• 1 had no preference.
In summary, in the Waverley Survey, about 70% of part-time working women and 80% of unemployed women who wanted part-time work either travelled or were prepared to travel less than half an hour one way to work.\textsuperscript{118}

This finding may be of interest to those involved with the location decisions of firms.

14. Work at Home

In the Waverley Survey, one quarter (36) of the 142 women who worked part-time for pay worked partly or wholly at home.

- 13% worked completely at home
- 1% more than half at home
- 5% half at home and half elsewhere
- 6% less than half at home
- 66% none at home
- 9% did not indicate.

The ABS (1996a, p. 3) documents that almost two thirds of people (males and females) employed at home in Australia in 1995 usually worked less than 35 hours a week, i.e. "part-time". However there are no published cross-tabulations of these data for females by part-time work hours.\textsuperscript{119}

In the Waverley Survey, relatively more part-time working women with a child not yet at school worked partly or wholly at home compared with part-time working women who did not have a child in this category.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{118} Martin and Roberts (1984, p. 36) report that in Great Britain many women, and particularly those who worked part-time, worked within very short distances of their homes.

\textsuperscript{119} ABS data on Persons Employed at Home, Australia (ABS Cat.No. 6275.0) were first issued in April 1989.

\textsuperscript{120} Comparable published data are not available from the ABS. In ABS data (1992a, p. 8, Table 9, and 1996a, p. 12, Table 7) we are given the fact that the largest number of females who worked "all hours" at home were employed for less than 20 hours a week. However, no cross-tabulation of females by the age or school level of child is recorded. This information may be available as unpublished data, at a charge.
TABLE 11: PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN: WORK AT HOME AND SCHOOL LEVEL OF YOUNGEST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level of Youngest Child</th>
<th>Work partly or wholly at home</th>
<th>Work outside the home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Child not yet at school</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = 0.1

Relatively more part-time working women in white collar occupations worked partly or wholly at home compared with women in other occupational groupings.

TABLE 12: PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN: WORK AT HOME BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP (Per cent of Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woman’s Occupational Group</th>
<th>Work partly or wholly at home</th>
<th>Work outside the home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Managerial</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Semi-skilled</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = 0.1

Of the 36 women who worked partly or wholly at home, 92% had a current car licence, but the questionnaire did not ask whether a car was available to them or not.

The six women who worked completely at home for an employer were in the following occupations:

"agent for teachers’ organisation"
"secretary"
"dressmaking manufacturer of children's wear"
"supervising distribution of advertising material"
"dress finisher"
"printing".

None of the six women was a financial member of a trade union.
A report of the Commonwealth Government (1992, p. 36) – The Lavarch Committee's Report *Half Way to Equal* – recorded Justice Riordan's concern for women "outworkers"\(^{121}\) in the clothing and textile industry, and referred to Dawson and Turner's study of home-based clerical workers, where "pay rates were poor even before costs incurred or award conditions forgone were taken into account".\(^{122}\)

In the Waverley Survey, two of the six women who worked fully at home – the "dress finisher" and "secretary" – possibly fell within Justice Riordan's concerns.

The subsample of 99 unemployed women in the Waverley Survey were also asked their preferences in regard to work at home:

- 12% preferred to work completely at home
- 8% more than half at home
- 11% half at home and half elsewhere
- 3% less than half at home
- 57% none at home – all elsewhere
- 4% were indifferent about the matter
- 5% did not answer the question.

In summary, one third (34%) of the unemployed women who wanted to work part-time preferred to work partly or wholly at home. This preference amongst unemployed women was strongest for the women who had a child "not yet at school".

\(^{121}\) An "outworker" is an employee who carries out work for a shop or factory at home.

\(^{122}\) For further information about the wages and conditions of "outworkers", see: Cusack and Dodd (1978), Booth (1984), Giles (1985) and TCFUA (1995).
TABLE 13:  UNEMPLOYED WOMEN WHO WANT PART-TIME WORK: PREFERENCE FOR WORK AT HOME AND SCHOOL LEVEL OF YOUNGEST CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level of Youngest Child</th>
<th>Preference to work partly or wholly at home</th>
<th>Preference to work outside the home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youngest Child not yet at school</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p = 0.1$

These data may be of interest to human resource managers in regard to family friendly policies. Further research is required to confirm whether these patterns relating to women and part-time employment at home have changed over time.

15. Part-Time Working Women – Employment Status

In the Waverley Survey, the 142 part-time working women were asked:

"How do you obtain your wage, salary, commission or profit?" The response was:

- 67% worked for an employer
- 16% worked in a family partnership
- 9% were self-employed
- 9% did not indicate.

For a cross-classification of these data from the Waverley Survey by occupation, suburb of work, travel time, work at home and pattern of days and hours of work, please see Appendix D.

123 80% of these women worked part-time in only one paid job (114 women), 7% had 2 part-time paid jobs (10 women), 1% had 3 part-time jobs (2 women), and 11% did not indicate how many part-time jobs they had (16 women).

For the 12 women (8%) who had 2 or 3 part-time jobs, the information documented throughout this paper refers only to their main part-time job – that is, the job in which they spent the most time.
16. **Part-Time Working Women – Occupational Groups**

The occupational\(^{124}\) groups for the 142 part-time working women in the Waverley Survey are shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Part-time working women and current occupations (grouped)\(^{125}\)](image)

If one examines the spread of these occupations, it is not surprising that there were no female part-time graziers, farmers, farm workers, miners or even labourers in the suburban environment of the City of Waverley.\(^{126}\) However, it is surprising that there were no part-time female police, drivers or owners (e.g. proprietors of shops). It is also surprising that there were no female part-time university lecturers, accountants, professional engineers, members of the clergy or pharmacists in the Upper Professional category, for five per cent of the part-time working women in the Waverley Survey had a university degree.

---

\(^{124}\) For a list of occupations for the women in each group, please see Appendix E.

\(^{125}\) The occupations were grouped in accordance with ANU 1 Scale, as outlined by Broom L, P. Duncan-Jones, F. Lancaster Jones and P. McDonnell (1977).

\(^{126}\) The City of Waverley is located approximately 20 kilometres east of the Central Business District of Melbourne. For a history of the area, see Priestley (1979) and Hattwell (1990).
The dominant occupational groups were

- clerical\textsuperscript{127} workers (32%)
- lower professional workers (20%)
- service workers (17%)
- shop assistants (11%).

Baxter \textit{et al.} (1990, p. 63) make the following comment about the occupational groupings of women in full and part-time employment in Australia.

Most women continue to work in a small range of occupational groups – clerical, sales and personal service categories account for 53% of female workers. Women are also segregated within categories: over half of the 18% of women in the professional and para-professional categories were teachers and registered nurses.

In the Waverley Survey, clerical, sales and personal service categories accounted for 60% of the \textit{part-time} female workers. In the "lower professional" category (which accounted for 20% of the part-time working women) 80% were teachers or nurses.

The concentration of either men or women in a narrow band of occupations "where they form either the major sex or a relatively large proportion of the total number of workers in each of these occupations" is described as "occupational segregation" (Power, 1975, p. 225) or sex segregation (Baxter \textit{et al.} 1990, p. 63). Jenni Neary (1984, p. 47), Director of the Women's Bureau, made the following observation about occupational segregation in Australia at a national women's employment conference "From Margin to Mainstream", in Melbourne in October 1984:

One of the most significant contributing factors to women's comparatively poor position in the labour market is the sexual division of labour within industries and occupations. The sexual division of labour in the Australian labour force is more apparent than in most advanced industrialised countries...

The OECD (1980)\textsuperscript{128} has assessed the Australian labour market to be the most gender segregated by occupation of the twelve industrialised member countries surveyed, and one of the most segregated by industry.

\textsuperscript{127} Of these clerical workers, two thirds worked for an employer and one third worked in family partnerships; one clerical worker was self-employed (see Appendix D, Table 22).

Power et al. (1984) have concluded that "... if anything, occupational segregation has been increasing rather than decreasing since the middle of the 1970s".

Baxter et al. (1990, p. 63) develop this point:

While opinion differs as to whether the sex segregation of the Australian workforce is actually increasing (Mumford, 1989: 19-20) or decreasing marginally (Lewis, 1983), there is general agreement that no significant improvements are expected in the foreseeable future.

Shirley Dex (1987, pp. 9-10), in her analysis of women's occupations from the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain (1980), outlines various methods for measuring occupational segregation, which provide "useful comparisons over time". She also draws attention to Hakim's (1979) distinction between horizontal and vertical occupational segregation:

Horizontal segregation occurs if women and men are working in different types of occupations, whereas vertical segregation exists if men are mostly working in higher grade occupations and women in lower grade ones.

The information regarding "promotion" in the next section of this paper may be of interest to those who are concerned about vertical segregation of occupations and women's equity in the Australian labour market.
In regard to part-time employment and occupational segregation in Australia, Watts and Rich (1991, p. 169) found that

The evidence suggests that in Australia, the level of part-time employment has a disproportionate influence on the degree of overall sex segregation, and that the growth of part-time employment has slowed down the occupational integration as measured by the composition effect.

Dex, however, reported that for the Women and Employment Survey in Great Britain

The extent of occupational segregation appears to increase because of part-time work, although when occupations are controlled for, the increase attributable to part-time work was quite small. The major determinant of the extent of occupational segregation, therefore, is concentration of women in certain occupations rather than in part-time jobs per se. (Dex 1987, p. 11).

To return to the Australian context, Richardson (1984, p. 28) at a Commonwealth Government Conference on Women in the Labour Force in 1982 comments:

Finally, there remains the puzzle of occupational segregation. Why does it persist so stubbornly? Why is it so severe in Australia? Perhaps we do not need fully to understand why in order to make an assault on this rigidity, which surely must reduce the welfare of women and, to a lesser extent, of men. Perhaps the greatest form of job segregation of all is that which makes work in the home (and especially child-care) women’s work. It may not be possible to have equality in the labour force without real progress towards equality within the home.

17. Part-Time Working Women – Employment Benefits, Including Promotion

Employment or work benefits in Australia are available to full-time full year employees under a variety of Federal and State industrial awards. These benefits include paid sick leave, paid annual leave, holiday pay loading, compassionate leave, parental leave, training, promotion and superannuation. "Regular" or "permanent" part-time employees are more likely to

134 Holiday pay is a "loading" (e.g. $\frac{17}{2}$ %) on the period of annual leave (e.g. 1 month).

135 "Superannuation" in Australia may be received upon retirement from paid work as a retirement pension, a lump sum payment, or a combination of both.
receive employment benefits (on a pro-rata\textsuperscript{136} or proportional basis) than "casual" employees. Casual employees more commonly receive a pay "loading" (e.g. 20\%) to compensate them for the lack of non-wage benefits and the lack of ongoing tenure.

In the Waverley Survey, the 73 women who worked part-time for an employer on a regular basis indicated their eligibility for the following work or employment benefits:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Part-time working women: work benefits for regular employees (73 women)}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Work Benefit} & \textbf{Yes} & \textbf{No} & \textbf{Don't Know} & \textbf{Non-Response} \\
\hline
Holiday Pay & 53\% & 43\% & 3\% & 1\% \\
Sick Leave & 43\% & 55\% & 1\% & 1\% \\
Salary Rises & 37\% & 60\% & 1\% & 1\% \\
Long Service Leave & 19\% & 75\% & 4\% & 1\% \\
Promotion & 15\% & 78\% & 6\% & 1\% \\
Superannuation & 4\% & 92\% & 3\% & 1\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

As Table 14 shows, superannuation, promotion and long-service leave were the work benefits least available to regular part-time employees.

In Table 15, when looked at by occupational grouping, the proportion of women eligible for each work benefit decreases as one moves across the occupational scale.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{136} Where pro rata benefits are available, the ACTU recommends that only the pay be proportional – not the time.

\textsuperscript{137} Only in the case of holiday pay (p = 0.05) and sick leave (p = 0.1) were these differences statistically significant.
TABLE 15: PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN - 73 REGULAR EMPLOYEES:
PROPORTION ELIGIBLE FOR WORK BENEFITS ACCORDING
TO OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Benefit</th>
<th>Professional/Managerial</th>
<th>White Collar</th>
<th>Skilled/Semi-Skilled</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Pay</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Rises</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Service Leave</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superannuation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 16, it can be seen that much lower percentages of part-time working employees who worked on an irregular\textsuperscript{138} basis were eligible for work benefits than part-time employees who worked on a regular basis. However, this is not surprising in view of the fact that "casual" employees are normally compensated by a pay loading instead of benefits. The Waverley Survey did not probe as to whether a pay loading was available to irregular part-time employees or not.

TABLE 16: PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN
WORK BENEFITS FOR IRREGULAR EMPLOYEES (22 Women)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK BENEFIT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>NON-RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Pay</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Rises</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Service Leave</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superannuation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The composite picture for all 95 female, part-time working employees – regular and irregular – in the Waverley Survey is shown in Table 17.

\textsuperscript{138} "Irregular" refers to those who worked on a basis of "casual for a few weeks or months, with periods of no work in between", "on call at short notice", "relief" or "other".
TABLE 17: PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN:
WORK BENEFITS FOR ALL EMPLOYEES
(73 Regular Plus 22 Irregular Employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK BENEFIT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON’T KNOW</th>
<th>NON-RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Pay</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Rises</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Service Leave</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superannuation</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 17, 38% of these part-time working female employees\(^{139}\) were eligible for salary rises and 44% were eligible for holiday pay.\(^{140}\)

Additionally,
- 35% were eligible for sick leave
- 16% were eligible for long service leave
- 3% were eligible for superannuation.

Data on employment benefits for female part-time employees in Australia can be derived from the ABS Survey\(^{141}\) of Employment Benefits that was carried out in August 1994. Of the women surveyed by the ABS (see Table 18),

- 38% received paid holiday leave.

Additionally,\(^{142}\)
- 39% received paid sick leave
- 32% received long service leave
- 73% received a superannuation benefit.

---

139 Women "in scope" in the Waverley Survey were aged 18 years and over, not 15 years and over as in ABS labour force surveys.
140 In the Waverley Survey, holiday pay probably indicates paid annual leave (holiday leave), but one cannot assume the fact.
141 ABS (1995c, p. 7, Table 5).
142 Paid sick leave, long service leave and holiday leave (as opposed to holiday costs) were first documented by the ABS in 1984 (ABS, 1985b).
With regard to superannuation, the ABS\textsuperscript{143} reports that the percentage of female part-time workers\textsuperscript{144} "covered"\textsuperscript{145} by superannuation increased from 19% in November 1988 to 65% in November 1993.\textsuperscript{146} No doubt much of this increase was due to the introduction of the Commonwealth Government’s Superannuation Guarantee Levy in 1992.\textsuperscript{147}

Superannuation lump sum payments and/or pension schemes in Australia are based upon a combination of years of continuous service and "final average salary".\textsuperscript{148} Women are more likely than men to have a discontinuous employment pattern, and lower average wages and salaries\textsuperscript{149} than men. The "coverage" rates reported here therefore mask the disadvantage that women suffer in relation to men in the matter of lower superannuation benefits.\textsuperscript{150}

Table 18 provides ABS data for employment benefits received in Australia by male\textsuperscript{151} and female part-time and full-time employees\textsuperscript{152} in August 1994.
TABLE 18: ABS SURVEY RESULTS:
PERCENTAGES OF EMPLOYEES (Not Attending School)
IN RECEIPT OF EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS
AUSTRALIA, AUGUST 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Benefit</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female(s)</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Service Leave</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superannuation</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Leave</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As shown in Table 18:

- 34% of all part-time employees received paid sick leave, compared with 89% of full-time employees
- 28% of part-time employees received long service leave, compared with 77% of full-time employees
- 67% of part-time employees received a superannuation benefit, compared with 93% of full-time employees
- 34% of part-time employees received paid holiday leave, compared with 90% full-time employees.

These comparisons appear to confirm Lambert and Petridis' (1995, p. 7) assertion that:

Earnings are only part of the employment contract which determine the level of welfare obtained through market work and it is in part-time employment where the other conditions of work such as superannuation, workplace training, sickness, holiday and parental leave and job security are poorest.

Vandenheuvel (1994, p. 1) appears to agree: "The main target of concern among those who condemn part-time employment is the non-proportional level of
monetary and non-monetary benefits received by part-time earners compared with full-time earners”.\textsuperscript{153}

In recent years, however, other commentators such as Weeks (1987) and Lever-Tracy (1988) in Australia have been more selective in their criticisms. They have given approbation to permanent part-time employment if it is accompanied by pro-rata or proportional benefits; if one can revert from full-time employment to part-time and back to full-time again; if the part-time employment is voluntary (i.e. at the discretion of the employee); and if the expansion of part-time employment is not at the expense of full-time jobs.\textsuperscript{154}

Their criticisms, in line with union policies, have been reserved for “casual” part-time employment and the trend has been to “oust” casual work and to transfer casuals to the status of permanent part-time employment.\textsuperscript{155} Hargreaves (1984, p. 172) explains:

- Because of the difficulties in organising casual workers and the irregularity of their employment, they are very vulnerable to exploitation. The most widespread example of this is disregard by employers of casual loadings. Working hours of casual workers are variable and unpredictable, and in some cases penalty rates are not paid. ...Unions have expressed the fear that acceptance of part-time employment on these terms would lead to an erosion of conditions of full-time workers.

Lever-Tracy (1988, p. 231) affirms:

- It is not part-time work as such that should be resisted, but the conditions commonly associated with it – super-exploitation, casualization, ghettoization, and the reduction of job opportunities for those definitely wanting full time work.


\textsuperscript{154} The Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Part-Time Work (1983, p. 25) in Canada reported that unions in Canada were willing to support the concept of part-time work if these conditions could be met. They did not, however, include the reversionary principle in their demands.

\textsuperscript{155} This process is described as “decasualisation”.

She goes on (p. 232) to expand this idea:

A positive approach to regular part-time work could use it as a wedge to displace casual employment. If regular part-time concepts are extended to cover a regular proportion of days in the month or even of weeks in the year, it could be possible to push for decasualization of a substantial amount even of genuinely intermittent or seasonal work.

The alternative\textsuperscript{156} way of combating casual employees' lack of employment benefits – by providing them with benefits – is suggested by the Lavarch Committee in its report, \textit{Half Way to Equal}\textsuperscript{157} (1992, p. xvii). Recommendation No. 2 of this report reads as follows:

The Committee recommends that the Department of Industrial Relations initiate a process which will result in all industrial awards being amended to:

(a) include permanent part-time clauses with associated pro-rata preferences;

(b) ensure that casual employees are entitled to the same non-wage benefits, on a pro-rata basis, afforded to permanent staff.\textsuperscript{158}

In the Waverley Survey, 12\% of all\textsuperscript{159} female part-time employees and 15\% of female part-time employees who worked on a regular basis\textsuperscript{160} were eligible for the work benefit of promotion. As a result of the introduction of anti-discrimination and equal opportunity legislation\textsuperscript{161} at Federal and State Government levels during the late 1970s and 1980s one would expect that the situation in regard to "promotion" in the intervening years would have greatly improved. However, the ABS reports that in South Australia\textsuperscript{162} in 1986, in Victoria\textsuperscript{163} in 1988 and NSW\textsuperscript{164} in 1991, approximately 23\% of part-time

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[156] See Appendix C for further information.
\item[158] The emphasis is the writer's.
\item[159] See Table 17.
\item[160] See Table 14.
\item[162] ABS (1987, p. 15, Table 8).
\item[163] ABS (1989, p. 12).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
workers\textsuperscript{165} had a career structure, including promotion opportunities available to them. Or, as Sloan and Tulsi (1987, p. 205) point out in a review of the South Australian survey, "three quarters of the surveyed part-time workers maintained that there was no career structure in their jobs". A similar percentage (22\%) of female part-time workers in Tasmania\textsuperscript{166} had career opportunities available to them in October 1990.

Lever-Tracy (1988, p. 223) also reports:

In a small survey of 36 firms in Brisbane and Adelaide, we found 15 that employed more than 50 part-time workers each. Only four of these employed any supervisory staff on a part-time basis and one of these, a large supermarket chain with over 1200 part-time employees, had a single part-time supervisor.

The Lavarch Committee's Report \textit{Half Way to Equal} (1992, pp. 33-34) states "Lack of career structure\textsuperscript{167} for part-timers was noted on many submissions ... for many people part-time work is very static. While there may be room to move sideways, there is great difficulty in moving upwards as a permanent part-time worker."\textsuperscript{168}

This is despite the fact that the ACTU (1990, p. 12) has suggested the following wording for negotiation in the industrial arena:

Part-time employees shall be entitled to equal access to all training and promotional opportunities.

The same pattern of fewer "other conditions of work" that concern Lambert and Petridis for women part-time employees compared with full-time employees showed up in the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain in 1980. Martin and Roberts (1984, pp. 46-49) report that 77\%\textsuperscript{169} of part-time employees, 164\textsuperscript{ABS (1992c, p. 1).} 165\textsuperscript{A breakdown by sex is not available in these published figures.} 166\textsuperscript{ABS (1991b, p. 4, Table 4).} 167\textsuperscript{Romeyn (1992, pp. 72-73) identifies factors that act as barriers to the development of career paths, training and promotional opportunities for permanent part-time workers, and gives practical suggestions for removing these barriers, together with a rationale for doing so.} 168\textsuperscript{For the Committee's comment about promotion for full and part-time female employees in the private and public sectors of Australia, see Appendix F.} 169\textsuperscript{The comparable figure for those working less than 16 hours per week was 62\%.}
compared with 96% of female full-time employees, had some paid holiday leave, and part-time employees had proportionally shorter paid holidays than full-time employees. Also, part-time workers were less likely to receive sick pay from their employer and only 9% of part-time employees belonged to an employer's pension scheme compared with 53% of full timers.

The disadvantages that part-time workers experience compared with full-time workers were also a matter of concern in Canada. One of the two main reasons\textsuperscript{170} for the appointment of the Canadian Commission of Inquiry into Part-Time Work\textsuperscript{171} in 1982 was:

the mounting pressure on Labour Canada to do something about what many perceive to be unfair treatment of part-time workers – their low pay, lack of fringe benefits and pensions, and the fact that most are working in job ghettos with little chance of training or promotion (p. 18).

The Commission's Report \textit{Part-Time Work in Canada} (1983, p. 87) states that the five problem areas\textsuperscript{172} associated with part-time work were:

- lack of pensions and fringe benefits
- wages, benefits and working conditions are not as good as those of full-time workers
- lack of seniority and job security, and union discrimination
- the pressures of family responsibilities
- inadequate career, promotion and upgrading opportunities.

In summary, in Australia, ABS figures indicate that about one third of female part-time employees in 1994 received sick leave, long service leave and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{170} The other main reason was the "rapid growth in the number of part-time workers" ... since 1953, "when Statistics Canada first began to collect data on part-time workers". The growth in part-time work was "a steady one, with no direct relation to the level of unemployment or to the state of the economy". Commission of Inquiry into Part-Time Work (1983, p. 17).
\item \textsuperscript{171} Copies of this Canadian Report may be obtained from:
  
  \begin{center}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
  \textbf{Publications Distribution Centre} \\
  \textbf{Labour Canada} \\
  \textbf{Ottawa, Ontario} \\
  \textbf{KIA OJ2} \\
  (819) 994-0543
  \end{tabular}
  \end{center}
  
  Quote the number L24-0978/83E when ordering.
\item \textsuperscript{172} These problem areas were identified in a survey undertaken by John Kervin. For methodology of this survey see Commission of Inquiry into Part-time Work (1983, pp. 79-80).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
holiday leave. The Superannuation Guarantee Levy boosted "coverage" rates for female part-time employees in 1994 to 73%, but barely one quarter of part-time workers in South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania had promotion opportunities available to them.

These data highlight the fact that part-time workers do not, compared with full-time workers, have equitable access to employment benefits, including opportunities of promotion; nor do organisations capitalise fully upon the diverse talents of all employees.

18. Part-Time Working Women – Trade Union Membership

In the Waverley Survey, 22% of all female part-time employees were members of a trade union. In the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain (1980), 28% of female part-time employees belonged to a union – and this percentage dropped to 17% for women who worked less than 16 hours a week (Martin and Roberts (1984, p. 54). Figures for union membership for female part-time employees throughout Australia were first published by the ABS in 1982. In that year, 32% of female part-time employees were members of a union. The percentage declined to 24% in 1995 (ABS, 1996b, p. 32).

In the Waverley Survey, 95 women were currently working part-time and working for an employer. They were asked: "Are you a financial member of a trade union?"

- 22% belonged to a trade union (21 women)
- 78% did not belong to a union (74 women).

The 74 women who did not belong to a union were asked why they were not members. They could be divided into two categories:

---

173 These female employees were aged 15 years and over.
174 ABS (1983b, p. 12, Table 11). Earlier publications, such as ABS (1977a) did not provide a breakdown of membership by part-time members or by sex.
175 Sundström (1991, p. 175) reports that in Sweden in 1978, 69% of women employed part-time were members of a union.
176 This percentage was the same (24%) for female employees aged 15 years and over, and those aged 20 years and over.
177 For data on occupation, by union membership and reason for non-membership for these 95 women, please see Appendix G.
• those who were possible union recruits
• those who disapproved of trade unions.

In the first category 37 women gave replies such as: "I didn't think of it", "There is no need", "No union available" or "Employer disapproves". A further 19 women did not indicate why they were not union members.

The reason why three quarters of these part-time working women were not members therefore appears to be more for the reason that they "had not thought of it" rather than the fact that they disapproved of trade unions. Romeyn (1992, p. 83) indicates that little may have changed in subsequent years, when she writes:

... significant improvements for these workers are unlikely to be forthcoming unless unions update their policies178 and are more active in recruiting and representing both part-time and casual employees. If they do not respond to this challenge, and part-time and casual employment continue to increase, unions will find their already declining membership base further weakened.

Lewis (1990, p. 79) suggests that flexible scheduling of union meetings and sliding scale union dues may be methods by which part-time workers could be encouraged to join their union.

Unions have traditionally made wages a priority in their industrial negotiations. However Martin and Roberts (1984, p. 78) note in their report on the Women and Employment Survey of Great Britain that:

Even women working part-time for "essentials" rated "convenient hours" more important than "a good rate of pay".

Hewitt (1993, p. 172), also writing from Britain, suggests that

178 The Evatt Foundation (1995, p. 233) appears to concur:

The Australian union movement has been slow in recognising the revolution in the workplace occurring through the participation of part-time workers with family responsibilities. In the early 1980s, unions discouraged or opposed part-time work; but this encouraged the growth of casual positions. This position eventually changed, in 1989-90, with the new ACTU policy favouring full pro-rata pay and benefits, "decasualisation" in favour of permanent part-time work (PPTW), integration of part-time and full-time work, and worker-initiated rather than management-initiated part-time jobs. Much more work remains to be done by the union movement in this area.
For unions ... recruiting and representing an increasingly disparate workforce will depend upon their ability to use collective organisation to achieve more – rather than less – individualisation of working conditions.

In Australia, Campbell (1995, p. 24) concludes that "trade union policy appears to have slid away from its traditional orientation, based on an extension of standardisation and a progressive reduction in the levels of agreed standard working-time, but it has failed to replace this with a new working-time policy".

Further research is needed to probe the reasons why female part-time employees are not members of a union and to what extent the observations which have been made in Britain have relevance for the Australian industrial scene.

19. **Work Preferences**

Of all women in the Waverley Survey, 28% were currently working part-time, but 46% preferred to be employed part-time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Work Pattern</th>
<th>Preferred Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time Paid Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Paid Work</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Paid Work</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Paid Work</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to women who were currently working part-time, 80% preferred to continue in part-time employment, rather than work full-time or "stop paid employment (including self-employment) altogether". A similar finding was reported for women aged 27-43 years, from the Australian Family Formation Project (AFFP) of 1991 by Wolcott and Glezer (1995, p. 85). In ABS nation-wide surveys of married women who worked part-time, in 1979\(^{180}\) and 1996\(^{181}\) 93% and 86% respectively "preferred not to work more hours".

\(^{179}\) For methods of categorising data, please see Appendix H.
\(^{180}\) ABS (1979, p. 19, Table 12).
\(^{181}\) ABS (1996c, p. 24, Table 20).
In this paper, 35% of women in the Waverley Survey who had "no paid work" but wanted "to work part-time now" have been described as "unemployed". However, most of these women had not actively looked for work in the four weeks prior to the survey, and the ABS would therefore categorise them as "marginally attached to the labour force". Although not officially described as "unemployed" by the ABS, these women nonetheless represent an "under-utilisation" of the labour market.

It would be reasonable to assume that in the past 20 years the excess supply of labour suggested by this finding of the Waverley Survey has been absorbed by the increased participation of women in the labour force and the associated increase in part-time employment. However, this is not the case. In September 1996, according to the ABS, 65% of women aged 20 years and over who were marginally attached to the labour force throughout Australia, preferred to be employed part-time, rather than full time. Additionally, in September 1996, the ABS reported that 39% of unemployed married females aged 20 years and over were actively looking for part-time rather than full-time employment. Published data on work preferences for full-time working women are not available from the ABS for this period of time.

The percentages of women that preferred part-time employment as indicated in the Waverley Survey, AFFP and ABS surveys, challenge the relevance of low levels of quotas for part-time employment which in the past have been stipulated in some industrial awards.

It has also been suggested that the demand for part-time employment may vary at different stages of life. An acknowledgement of this concept

---

182 See ABS (1984, pp. 17-24) and Norris and Wooden (1996, p. 9) for information about this term.
184 Of these women, 64.9% preferred part-time work, 16.9% preferred full-time work, and 18.2% had no preference.
185 ABS (1996c, p. 26, Table 24).
186 Quotas were usually below 10%.
187 The purpose of these quotas has been to protect the jobs of full-time employees.
189 These stages may include study, injury/ill health, retirement, childbirth, child-rearing, and caring for elderly parents or other members of one's family or household.
raises the need for the development of employment policies that allow for the integration of part-time employment with full-time employment\textsuperscript{190} and the operation of a "reversionary principle"\textsuperscript{191} in industrial awards and enterprise agreements. Lever-Tracy (1988, p. 232) explains that this principle involves

continuity and free movement between them and the access to part-time work throughout and at all levels of the occupational structure. Conversion should be possible without loss of position or of accrued entitlements. Choice of conversion from full-time to part-time and back could be seen as a workers right.

The ACTU (1990, p. 12) recommends

A full-time employee should be able to convert to part-time work if he/she wishes, and the employer agrees, however no existing employee should be transferred to part-time employment without his/her agreement. A full-time employee who converts to part-time employment should be able to revert back to full-time employment at a future date, by agreement, if he/she so desires, or be allowed to apply for full-time vacancies when they occur.

Baxter et al. (1992, p. 101), however, remind us that the reversionary principle will benefit only the employed – not those who are unemployed or marginally attached to the labour force – and that, similarly, the impost of quotas may be to the disadvantage of new entrants to the labour market, when those entrants prefer to be employed part-time.

\textsuperscript{190} The introduction of the federal policy of Parental Leave which resulted in "12 months unpaid leave for fathers or mothers, and optional part-time work up to a child’s second birthday" (Mathews, 1992, Attachment I) demonstrates one specific example of the integration of full-time and part-time employment.

\textsuperscript{191} [Hunt and Romeyn] (1993, pp. 17-18, 21-23) provide practical advice on how this principle may be implemented at the enterprise level.
CONCLUSION

In the Waverley Survey "part-time employment" represented a great variety of patterns of days and hours of employment for the women in the survey. In 1993, the ABS documented a similar diversity in regard to days for all part-time employees (male and female) aged fifteen years and over throughout Australia.

Part-time working women were employed for virtually the whole range of part-time work hours – from two to thirty-three hours a week. Twenty-eight percent of part-time working women were employed for less than 10 hours a week, 44% for 15 hours or less a week, 67% for 20 hours or less a week, and 29% for 21-34 hours a week. Similar patterns in regard to the range of hours and number of hours were recorded by the ABS for married females who were employed part-time in 1977, 1983, 1984, and 1995.

In the Waverley Survey, 6% of "unemployed" women were prepared to work less than 10 hours a week, 26% less than 15 hours a week, and 56% less than 20 hours a week. These findings have implications for industrial awards, where often a minimum of 15 or 16 hours per week is stipulated for part-time employment. They also have relevance for guidelines relating to entry to government labour market programs. In 1994-95, Commonwealth Government Job Compact programs, with a budgeted outlay of $528 million, stipulated that "some jobs will be part-time... provided they offer at least 20 hours work per week".

In the Waverley Survey, one quarter of part-time working women worked on an "irregular" basis. One half of the unemployed women preferred to work on an irregular basis. Of the unemployed women, 39% preferred to work a pattern that was "casual for a few weeks or months, with periods of no work in between". The question arises as to whether a demand for an intermittent or discontinuous pattern of paid work still exists. If "yes", it has implications not only for policies

---

192 ABS (1994k, p.4).
193 ABS (1978, p. 11, Table 8).
194 ABS (1984, p. 16, Table 2.5).
195 ABS (1995d, p. 28, Table 21).
196 "Irregular" included "casual for a few weeks or months", "relief", "on call at short notice" and "varied".
of decasualisation\textsuperscript{197} but also for government labour market programs. In 1994-95, a guideline for the Commonwealth Government Job Compact program was that "Temporary casual positions\textsuperscript{198} will not be considered". If the demand for an intermittent pattern of part-time employment persists, it would also be helpful to probe the reasons why – whether it be on account of pay loadings or some other factor.

This paper draws attention to the difficulty mentioned by other writers (Lewis [1990, p. 3], Dawkins and Norris [1990, pp.156-7]) in regard to the definition and interpretation of the word "casual". This definitional problem needs to be solved before coherent policies concerning "casual" work, as a subset of part-time employment, can be developed.

The following findings may provide a useful data base for policy makers who are interested in the issue of workers and family responsibilities and/or a "managing diversity" approach to implementing merit and equity in employment.

(a) \textit{Part-time employment 9 am – 3.30 pm and school level of youngest child} \\
Relatively more part-time working women with a youngest child at primary school worked between 9 am and 3.30 pm compared with other part-time working women who did not fall into this category.

Unemployed women with a youngest child at primary school had the strongest preference for part-time employment between 9 am and 3.30 pm: those with no dependent child had the weakest preference for this pattern of hours.

(b) \textit{Part-time employment for 20 hours or more a week, and school level of youngest child} \\
Relatively fewer part-time working women with a youngest child "not yet at school" worked 20 hours or more a week, compared with other part-time working women.

Relatively fewer unemployed women with a youngest child at primary school were prepared to work 20 hours or more a week compared with unemployed women who did not have a child in this category.

\textsuperscript{197} A policy by which casual employees are transferred to "permanent" or regular part-time status.

(c) Part-time employment, school holidays, and school level of youngest child

Relatively fewer unemployed women with a youngest child at primary school were prepared to work school holidays, compared with unemployed women who did not have a child in this category.

(d) Part-time employment at home, and school level of youngest child

One quarter of part-time working women were employed partly or wholly at home. Relatively more part-time working women with a youngest child "not yet at school" worked partly or wholly at home, compared with those who did not have a child in this category.

One third of unemployed women who wanted to work part-time preferred to work partly or wholly at home. This preference was strongest for women with a child "not yet at school".

(e) Childcare for a child "not yet at school"

Whilst a woman worked part-time, most care arrangements for a child "not yet at school" were made with relatives, friends or neighbours rather than a creche, care centre or kindergarten. A similar finding was revealed by an ABS survey of childcare throughout Australia in 1993.

(f) Employers attitude to time off work for sick child

Where a part-time working woman needed to take time off work in order to provide constant care for a sick child, in almost all cases her employer was completely or fairly co-operative about the matter.

Further research is required to confirm whether these relationships concerning workers and family responsibilities have changed over time. Walpole, in an introduction to Charlesworth (1996), reminds us that "the federal Industrial Relations Act, 1988 ... states specifically that the interests of women, including part-time and casual workers ... must be taken into account" in the enterprise bargaining process in the industrial arena. This continues to be the case under the Workplace Relations Act (1996).

The Waverley Survey drew attention to the fact that, in 1977, superannuation (3%), long service leave (16%) and promotion (12%) were the "work" or employment benefits least available to female part-time employees. In
regard to superannuation, the ABS reports\textsuperscript{199} that from 1988 to 1993 "coverage" rates improved\textsuperscript{200} for female part-time employees from 19\% to 65\%. This coverage rate, however, masks the disadvantage that female part-time employees may still experience in superannuation\textsuperscript{201} pensions and/or lump sum payouts, due to a life and career pattern which may include periods of unpaid work as well as paid work and lower "final average salaries" than those received by males.

In 1994, the ABS\textsuperscript{202} documented the percentages of female part-time employees who received the employment benefits of long service leave (32\%), holiday leave (38\%), and sick leave (39\%). The lowest percentage, at 32\%, was recorded for long service leave. In ABS surveys carried out in South Australia\textsuperscript{203} in 1986, Victoria\textsuperscript{204} in 1988 and NSW\textsuperscript{205} in 1991, approximately 23\% of part-time workers had a career structure, including promotion opportunities, available to them. In Tasmania\textsuperscript{206} in 1990, 22\% of female part-time workers had career opportunities available to them. Thus long service leave and particularly promotion still appear to be the employment benefits in which female employees are most disadvantaged when they are employed part-time.

In the Waverley Survey, 22\% of female part-time employees aged eighteen years and over were members of a trade union. In 1982, the ABS\textsuperscript{207} recorded a 32\% trade union membership rate for female part-time employees aged fifteen years and over throughout Australia. This membership rate\textsuperscript{208} declined to 24\% in 1995.\textsuperscript{209} In the Waverley Survey, the reason most women gave for non-membership was that "they had not thought of it" rather than the fact that they disapproved of trade unions. This may provide a starting point for research and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{199} ABS (1994j, p.2).
\item \textsuperscript{200} This improvement was probably due to the introduction of the Superannuation Guarantee levy in 1992.
\item \textsuperscript{201} Superannuation calculations are based on a formula of number of years of paid work, multiplied by a "final average salary" (e.g., an average of "superable" salary over the past two years).
\item \textsuperscript{202} ABS (1995c, p.7, Table 5).
\item \textsuperscript{203} ABS (1987, p.15, Table 8).
\item \textsuperscript{204} ABS (1989, p.12).
\item \textsuperscript{205} ABS (1992c, p. 1).
\item \textsuperscript{206} ABS (1991b, p. 4, Table 4).
\item \textsuperscript{207} ABS (1983b, p. 12, Table 11).
\item \textsuperscript{208} ABS (1996b, p. 32).
\item \textsuperscript{209} This membership rate (24\%) is the same for female part-time employees aged 15 years and over, and those aged 20 years and over.
\end{itemize}
analysis into the reasons for low levels of union membership amongst female part-time employees.

Findings for the whole survey population indicate not only a preference for part-time employment, but a mismatch between hours worked and the hours of employment preferred. Of the women who currently worked part-time, 80% preferred to continue in part-time employment; 35% of women with no paid work and 28% of full-time working women preferred to be employed part-time.

Most of the 35% of women with "no paid work" who wanted "to work part-time now" had not actively looked for employment in the four weeks prior to the survey week, and would be categorised as "marginally attached to the labour force" by the ABS. One could argue that in the past 20 years the increase in women’s participation in the labour market and the associated increase in part-time employment would have absorbed this excess supply of labour. However, ABS data\(^{210}\) for September 1996 indicate that 65% of females aged 20 years and over, who were marginally attached to the labour force, preferred to be employed part-time rather than full-time. Additionally, in September 1996, 39% of unemployed married females aged 20 years and over were actively looking for part-time employment rather than full-time employment.\(^{211}\) These data are consistent with the fact that the participation of women in the Australian labour market and the level of part-time employment are both predicted\(^{212}\) to rise – at least up to the year 2005.

However, the concept of part-time employment within a policy framework is a complex one. For women, it is often bound up with unpaid work of the household\(^{213}\) and/or childcare. Unionists are justifiably concerned that part-time employment does not provide a "living wage".\(^{214}\) Others draw attention to the view that "a widening distribution of paid work is associated with the widening distribution of private income"\(^{215}\) – and the growth of part-time employment as well as unemployment must play a part in that.

\(^{210}\) ABS (1997a, unpublished data).
\(^{211}\) ABS (1996c, p. 26, Table 24).
\(^{212}\) DEET (1995, p.29).
\(^{213}\) Bittman (1992, pp.31-32); (1995, p. 9).
\(^{214}\) See Beechey and Perkins (1987, pp.125, 127) for a reference to Braverman’s use of this phrase.
There have been suggestions for several years for the need to change the nexus between income and paid employment.\textsuperscript{216} The predictions of a continued growth in part-time employment and in the participation of women in the labour market may force us to examine these issues more closely.

Blandy (1992, p. 8) maintains that "women... will play an important leadership role in the emerging post-industrial order". Perhaps "women's issues" of the eighties and nineties will become – or need to become – "people's issues" of the new century.

\footnote{216 See Benn (1978, p. 64), Giles (1978, p. 293), Brotherhood of St Laurence (1993, p.1) and Watts (1997, pp. 161-173).}
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APPENDIX B

WORKING NATION – SUMMARY OF MEASURES TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

TABLE 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>$m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment and training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Compact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>538.1</td>
<td>911.4</td>
<td>1030.5</td>
<td>960.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level training</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>134.5</td>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>179.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures for women</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures for Aboriginal &amp; Torres Strait Islander people</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures for people with a disability</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved delivery of labour market assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>149.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other related measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total employment and training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>871.7</td>
<td>1245.7</td>
<td>1368.4</td>
<td>1344.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income support</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>278.5</td>
<td>270.1</td>
<td>293.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>113.4</td>
<td>106.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional development</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total outlays</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1066.5</td>
<td>1733.8</td>
<td>1906.3</td>
<td>1887.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>-18.2</td>
<td>-17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1058.7</td>
<td>1725.7</td>
<td>1888.1</td>
<td>1869.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C

CASUAL WORK: DEFINITIONAL PROBLEMS AND ASPECTS

There is much confusion regarding the definition of the term "casual". Lewis (1990, p. 3) explains:

In reality the terms [of permanent part-time work and casual employment] are used widely without commonly recognised definitions, and within industrial awards, official statistics and other literature are used in different ways to mean different things.

Dawkins and Norris (1990, pp. 156-7) suggest three different interpretations of the term "casual":

- as defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics
- as used in labour economics literature
- in common law interpretation. 217

Their explanation is as follows:

Casual employees are defined [by Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS)] as those "who were not entitled to either annual leave or sick leave in their main job" (ABS 1989a, p. 27)

This is quite different from the traditional meaning of the term in the labour economics literature. Here casual employment has been seen as employment which is devoid of any expectation of a continuing relation between worker and employer. Hicks (1932, p. 63), for example, divided the...

...repeated contracts of a continuous labour market ... into two classes: (1) those in which a labourer normally expects to be re-engaged by the same employer when his first contract has expired; (2) those in which he does not. The second class is evidently that of casual labour in the widest sense.

217 [Hunt and Romeyn] (1993, p. 4) give a similar explanation of the common law interpretation of the word "casual":

The real distinction, at common law, between a permanent and a casual employee is that a permanent employee has an ongoing contract of employment of unspecified duration, whilst casuals do not.
Casual workers are employees on the temporary staff who are employed as and when required.
A casual worker may be employed with the same employer over a long period; however, the law assumes that each engagement of a casual constitutes a separate contract of employment.
There is also the common law interpretation of casual employment which has been summarised by Brooks (1985). Under common law the casual employee is distinguished from the permanent by the period of notice that is required, on either side, to terminate the employment contract. "Each engagement of a casual worker", argues Brooks, "constitutes a separate contract of employment" (Brooks 1985, p. 166). On this basis it can be seen that the common law interpretation is very close to that described above as the traditional economic interpretation of casual employment.

These definitions are complicated further by the fact that, as Dawkins and Norris (p. 157) explain, "casual" employment is defined in different ways both between and within industries, as far as industrial awards are concerned.

Perhaps to overcome this problem, the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU; 1990, p. 15) defines "casual" as follows:

A casual employee is an employee engaged either full-time or less than 38 hours per week, for a period of no longer than 76 hours in total in any 3 month period, to meet exceptional work demands.

Carter (1990, pp. 11, 13) and Romeyn (1992, p. 4) both point out that, despite the definitional problems, one factor common to all casual employment is the pay "loading". This is a percentage increase\(^{218}\) on normal wages, and Romeyn (p. 5) states:

The casual loading varies between awards from 10 to 50% on top of the rate for ordinary day workers, but for the bulk of awards it was 20% in 1986.

... The casual loading effectively provides for the "cashing out" of award benefits (primarily annual and sick leave) given that the nature of employment precludes effective access to these conditions.

The "loading", as promoted by trade unions, is seen to have three purposes:

1. To discourage employers from hiring casual employees and so protect the jobs of full-time workers\(^{219}\)

---

\(^{218}\) Carter (1990, p. 13) explains that the casual "loading" is different from a "penalty rate" which "part-timers and others may receive ... for out of ordinary hours work".

\(^{219}\) Quotas for part-time positions have also previously been used to protect the jobs of full-time workers (see Romeyn, 1992, p. 53).
(2) To compensate "casual" employees for their lack of tenure

(3) To compensate casual employees for the lack of employment benefits such as paid annual leave, paid sick leave, and (prior to 1992), superannuation.

There appear to have been two approaches to combat the last problem (the lack of employment benefits). One approach has been to provide casual employees with the pro-rata benefits normally enjoyed by "permanent" part-time workers; the other has been to "decasualise" employees and transfer them from casual to "permanent" part-time status.

As examples of the first policy, the ACTU (1990, p.16) reports that:

Some unions have been able to negotiate award benefits for casuals such as paid annual leave, sick leave, long service leave, overtime payments etc in addition to the casual loading, (e.g. FMWU, FLAIEU, SDA).

It has also been possible in some instances for casual workers to be provided with employment benefits that are calculated on an industry basis. Romeyn (1992, p. 81) cites the case of the building industry Long Service Leave Scheme where reward is on the basis of continuous service with an industry rather than an individual employer. This trend was also reinforced by the introduction of the Superannuation Guarantee Levy in 1992, whereby all casual employees who are over 18 years of age and under 65 years, and earn more than $450 in a calendar month, must be provided with employer contributed superannuation.

---

220 The unions concern about lack of permanency is very understandable. However, one could argue that, especially in recessionary times, very few employees (whether full-time or part-time, private or government sector) have "permanent" tenure.

221 • **FMWU** – The Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union of Australia. This is now the “Miscellaneous” division of the A.L.H.M.U.

• **FLAIEU** – The Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union. This is now the Australian Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union (A.L.H.M.U.)

SDA – Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees’ Association.


223 See **Australian Taxation Office** (1992, p. 7).
The alternative approach by trade unions has been to "decasualise" casual employees and transfer them to the "permanent" status of regular part-time work, with its associated pro-rata or proportional employment (work) benefits. In its Guidelines and Negotiating Exhibit on Part-Time, Casual Work and Job Sharing, the ACTU (1990, p. 15) explains:

Campaigns for "decasualisation" have been run by some unions successfully already, e.g. the SDA\textsuperscript{224} in 1984 in NSW ... and in 1986 in SA the Nurses Federation ran a campaign which dramatically reduced the employment of nurses on a casual basis in private hospitals. The campaign involved an award variation to restrict casuals to people working less than 15 hours per week or less than one month, and to move casuals working more than 15 hours per week into part-time employment.

The aim of this policy has been to provide, for part-time workers, a more secure form of labour contract, a predictable pattern of paid work and pro rata or proportional employment benefits. This has been in exchange for the "casual" contract of pay loadings, the possibility of an irregular pattern of employment, more autonomy in regard to hours and/or periods of employment and less security in regard to tenure of employment. However, the "trade-off" may not always be in the interests of the employee. Charlesworth (1996, p. 11) points out that the conversion of casual work to permanent part-time work, combined with requirements for more flexible rostering arrangements and decreased minimum part-time hours, can ensure a casual-type flexibility paid at ordinary time.

At the time of writing, the Workplace Relations and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 1996 is before the Federal Parliament. This bill, when enacted, may have profound effects upon the "permanent part-time" and "casual" labour forces of Australia.\textsuperscript{225}

\textsuperscript{224} The National Board of Employment, Education and Training (1992, p. 20) reports however, that in regard to this SDA campaign: "The victory was .... short-lived. An appeal by employers against the award incorporating the agreement was granted by Justice Macken".

\textsuperscript{225} It has been suggested that "it is not clear now ... whether casual workers will be entitled to the same conditions as other workers. If they are, this would appear to defeat the purpose of casual employment". McPhee (ed.) (1997, p. 217).
APPENDIX D

PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN – DATA IF WORK FOR EMPLOYER, SELF OR FAMILY PARTNERSHIP

The difference between "n" (the number of the sub-population) and the grand total in each table is due to a non-response in either or both questions.

TABLE 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woman’s Occupation (n = 142)</th>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Professional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Workers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Assistants</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woman’s Occupation if She Works Partly or Wholly at Home (n = 36)</th>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typist/Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical (Private Business)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier or Bookkeeper</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Representative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Assistant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Plan Hostess</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmaker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cake Decorator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb of Work (n = 142)</th>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Waverley</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjoining Suburb</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Suburb</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business District</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Varies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travelling Time, One Way to Work (n = 142)</th>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (Work at home)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $\frac{1}{2}$ hour</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$ hour to 1 hour</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1 hour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It varies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work at Home (n = 142)</th>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All home based</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than half</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About half</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than half</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None home based</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 26

Pattern of Work (n = 142)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief on call</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It varies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 27

Work During School Holidays (n = 142)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 28

Total Number of Hours Worked, if Worked Last Week (n = 110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 29

**Monday to Friday: Number of Days Worked Last Week (n = 90)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 30

**Monday to Friday: Pattern of Hours if Worked Last Week (n = 90)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 am – 3.30 pm</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hour working day</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early evening shift</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late evening shift</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish by 3.30 pm</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 hour working day</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular pattern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School hours + early evening shift</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 31

**Weekend Pattern of Work, if Worked Last Week (n = 25)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work for Employer</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
<th>Family Partnership</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday morning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday day shift</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday early evening</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday late night</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday day shift</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday early evening</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. + Sun. day shift</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. + Sun. early evening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN: OCCUPATIONS

The 142 part-time working women in the Waverley Survey were employed in the following occupations:

Upper Professional: Nil

Graziers: Nil.

Lower Professional: Nurse (11 women), Physiotherapist (1), Radiographer (1), Primary Teacher (4), Secondary Teacher (5), Ballet Teacher (1), Music Teacher (2), Kindergarten Teacher (1), Librarian (1), Laboratory Assistant (1), Fashion Designer (1), Artist (1).

Managerial: Manager – private sector (5).

Shop Proprietors: Nil.

Farmers: Nil.

Clerical Workers: Combined Clerk/Receptionist/Telephonist (2), Stenographer with Certificate (11), Stenographer without Certificate (3), Clerk in the private sector (12), Telephonist (1), Receptionist (2), Office Machine Operator (2), Cashier (1), Bookkeeper (7), Sales Representative/Promotion Hostess (6).

Armed Service, Police: Nil.

Craftsmen: Dressmaker (3), Printer (1), Cake Decorator (1).

Shop Assistants: Shop Assistant (14), Florist (1).

Operatives: Textile Machinist (1), Process Worker (3), Potter (1), Card Selector (1).

Drivers: Chauffeur (1).

Service Workers: Party Plan Sales Assistant (1), Swimming Instructor (1), School Crossing Supervision (1), 'Home Help' Worker (3), Waiter (3), Caterer (7), Hairdresser (1), Nurse's Aide (1), Commercial Cleaner (4), Ironer (2).

Miners: Nil.

Farm Workers: Nil.

Labourers: Night Filler in Supermarket (1), Storewoman (1).

Non-Response: 10 women did not indicate their current occupation.
APPENDIX F

PROMOTION: WOMEN IN THE PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS

The Lavarch Committee\(^\text{226}\) made the following comment about promotion and women in the private and public sectors of Australia:

Despite the fact that women comprise 42% of the paid workforce, they remain poorly represented in upper management positions in both the public and private sectors. This is the case in skilled and unskilled occupations and even in professions such as education where women comprise a majority of the workforce. (Para. 16)

While cases of overt discrimination continue, the evidence suggests that it is indirect discrimination\(^\text{227}\) which contributes more significantly to the existence of the so-called glass ceiling. (Para. 17)

The Committee was particularly concerned regarding the inequities in promotion prospects for women in professions in the private sector. There is a clear need for public attention to be drawn to the systemic discrimination which is impacting on women in the professions. (Para. 21)

A survey\(^\text{228}\) carried out by the Commission of the European Communities (1984, p. 99) *European Women in Paid Employment*, also refers to all female employees and not specifically to part-time employees in the private and public sectors in this extract from one of its five conclusions:

... when they compare their situation with that of their male colleagues – if they have any, which is only the case of two thirds – many of them (57%) feel at a disadvantage, in some areas at least. The most sensitive issues are, firstly, the chance of promotion, secondly, salary and, lastly – and to a lesser extent – access to additional vocational training and non-salary material perquisites such as bonuses and benefits.

Women working in the public administration feel less discrimination on all these points than women working in firms in the private sector.


\(^{227}\) For an Australian report on indirect discrimination, see Bellamy and Ramsey (1994).

\(^{228}\) In the survey, 5447 women in paid employment, between the ages of 15 and 65, were selected for interview in 10 European countries (Great Britain, The Netherlands, Denmark, Belgium, West Germany, Ireland, France, Greece, Italy and Luxembourg). The aim was to document women’s perception of discrimination in regard to paid employment – including vulnerability to unemployment.
### TABLE 32: PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN WHO WORK FOR AN EMPLOYER: OCCUPATION ACCORDING TO UNION MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Union Member</th>
<th>Non Union Member</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possible Recruit</td>
<td>Anti-Union</td>
<td>Non-Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian (no Certificate)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager (Private Firm)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk, Reception/Telephone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (with Certificate)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical (Private Firm)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (no Certificate)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Machine Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier/Bookkeeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Rep/Hostess</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Assistant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Assistant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Instructor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephonist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Machinist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Filler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Crossing Supervisor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Worker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Aide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Cleaner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 33: METHODS OF CATEGORISING DATA:
ALL WOMEN IN THE Waverley Survey
Current and Preferred Patterns of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Work Pattern</th>
<th>Preferred Work</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time Paid Work</td>
<td>Part-Time Paid Work</td>
<td>No Paid Work</td>
<td>Non-Response</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Paid Work</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Paid Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Paid Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) PART-TIME WORKING WOMEN

The 142 women who currently worked for pay part-time were specifically asked in Q.54 whether they preferred to continue in full-time paid work, part-time paid work or no paid work. Their work preferences were categorised accordingly. Eighty per cent of women who were currently employed part-time preferred to continue in part-time employment, rather than stop paid employment or be employed full-time.

(2) "UNEMPLOYED" WOMEN WITH NO PAID WORK

The 249 women who currently had no paid work were asked (Q.17):

"Would you like to work part-time now?"

One hundred and fifty answered "No". These women were then asked why they were not interested in part-time work. In the "open-ended" Q.18, none volunteered the information that she would have preferred full-time work.

Of the 249 women who had no paid work, 99 ticked "Yes" to Q.17. These 99 women were not specifically asked their work preference, but a check for bias towards part-time work was made in Q.81 when they were asked to indicate their main reason for preferring part-time work to full-time. Amongst the reasons listed was "full-time work is not available". One woman ticked that answer and she was classified with a preference for full-time work. Ten did not give a "Main answer" and were classified as a "non-response". The remaining 88 women who failed to tick "full-time work is not available" as a main reason and additionally gave much detailed data concerning their desired patterns of part-
time work were imputed to have a preference for part-time work. This meant that 35% of women with no paid work preferred to be employed part-time, rather than continue with no paid work or be employed full-time.

(3) FULL-TIME WORKING WOMEN

The 119 women who currently worked full-time were also asked in Q.17:

"Would you like to work part-time now?"

Eighty-two women answered "No". These women were then asked in Q.18 why they were not interested in part-time work. None volunteered the information that she would really have preferred to stop paid work, and these 82 were therefore classified as having a preference for remaining in full-time work.

Thirty-seven women who worked full-time answered "Yes" to Q.17. One of the 37 wanted part-time work in addition to her full-time job, and she was categorised as having a preference for full-time work.

Three other women who ticked "Yes" to Q.17 did not fill in the pink back-up form concerning aspects of part-time work, and in view of this lack of information they were classified in "preferred work patterns" as a "non-response".

The remaining 33 women who ticked "Yes" to Q.17 were not specifically asked their work preference. They did, however, give much detailed data concerning their desired patterns of part-time work and in the light of this information they were imputed to have a preference for part-time work. As a result, 28% of women who were employed full-time in the Waverley Survey preferred to be employed part-time. These women seemed to prefer "a little less than" the standard full-time working pattern of 5 days a week, 8 hours a day.
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