

Informal Jobs in Industrialized “North” Countries

**Françoise Carré, Ph.D.
and
Joaquín Herranz, Jr.¹**

May 20, 2002

Background paper for “Women and Men in the Informal Economy: A Statistical Picture,” a volume prepared by M. Chen and J. Vaneck for International Labour Conference, 90th Session, June 2002

Comments welcome. Under revision.

carre@Radcliffe.edu
herranz@Radcliffe.edu

¹ Authors are, respectively, Research Director, Radcliffe Public Policy Center, RIAS/Harvard University; and PhD Candidate, MIT Department of Urban Studies and Planning, and Project Coordinator, Radcliffe Public Policy Center.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Persistence and re-emergence of informal economy in the industrialized “North”

In the industrialized North countries, patterns of employment have emerged—or re-appeared—that compel attention to informalization. In these countries, the informal economy is conceived as encompassing informalization of employment *within* formal enterprises as well as self-employment of a particular kind. This interpretation of the informal economy differs from that used for South countries for several reasons. Formal enterprises comprise the bulk of employers in industrialized economies. That formal enterprises should generate arrangements that entail greater informalization of the employment relationship is a concern.

While informalization is an elusive phenomenon, one difficult to circumscribe precisely, there is a general consensus among researchers that employment arrangements that entail a more tenuous, often less explicit, connection between the worker and the formal enterprise are part of informalization. Similarly, arrangements that weaken worker access to employment-based social protection can be understood to contribute to informalization. “Nonstandard” jobs are part of this informalization. They encompass jobs that entail an employment arrangement that diverges from regular, year round, full time employment with a single employer. Finally, certain patterns of inter-firm contracting may create conditions propitious to the informalization of employment.

This chapter focuses on the best documented and understood aspects of informal employment in industrialized countries. These are nonstandard arrangements and self-employment.

Sources of data and their limitations

Several categories of nonstandard employment can be reliably considered cross nationally. Most of these categories are features of “wage and salary” employment (or “paid” employment), that is employment dependent upon an employer or other corporate entity. In contrast, an additional category of nonstandard work is “self employment” that is, employment that, on the face of it, is independent and therefore not part of the wage and salary work.

First, part-time, that is, regularly scheduled hours that are below a full-time standard has been documented in all countries. Part-time work hours per se do not constitute nonstandard work. However, part-time schedules have been associated with other job characteristics such as limited or no access to benefits, reduced eligibility for employment-based government programs and employer-sponsored training for example.

Second, fixed term employment, that is a job with an explicitly stipulated fixed duration can be compared across European Union countries because it often corresponds to a specific contract of employment.

Third, temporary, short term, employment through an intermediary company—temporary help/staffing employment—is defined in fairly similar ways across countries.

Fourth, independent contracting, or “own account” self employment (see below) is not defined consistently across countries but most countries have a data series permitting an estimation of the phenomenon. This is a sub category of self employment.

Estimates on nonstandard work in the industrialized North

1. Part-time

As part-time is often counted in statistical series that are separate from those on nonstandard arrangements, one cannot add part-time to other nonstandard arrangements to obtain total informal employment due to double counting.

Table L provides the Incidence of part-time across gender groups in OECD countries 1990-99 (OECD 2000). There is noticeable variation in the incidence of part-time (PT) across countries. Historically, Nordic countries on the whole have had higher rates of part-time. For the European Union as a whole in 1998, part-time workers accounted for 16 percent of total employment. Since the beginning of the 1970s, most OECD countries have seen a marked growth in the proportion of part-time working in total employment.

In virtually all OECD countries, the incidence of part-time work is much higher among women than men; in some countries it is twice as high. As a result, women make-up much higher shares of part-time employment than men. For example, in the European Union in 1998, women represented 81.8 percent of all part-time workers. The share of women in part-time employment was 69.5 percent in Canada, 68 percent in the United States, 67.5 percent in Japan, and 54.8 percent in Korea (Table L).

2. Temporary Employment

In this section, we use the word “temporary” to denote all forms of explicitly short term employment arrangements, whether employment through an intermediary, a temporary help/temporary staffing company (Temporary Agency Work, a.k.a. “temp” employment), or fixed-term employment, that is, direct employment of a short term nature (a.k.a. direct hire temporaries). This section relies on regional and national statistics as definitions vary substantially and do not allow for cross national comparisons.

EUROPE: TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT & TEMP AGENCY EMPLOYMENT

A definition of temporary employment (that excludes apprentices, trainees and research assistants) indicates that most EU countries, and the EU as a whole, experienced increasing temporary employment between 1988 and 1988 (Table A1). In all countries for which data are available, temporary employment grew except for Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, and Portugal.

Temporary employment is primarily a female phenomenon, although there is wide variation among EU countries in its incidence. In all countries except Austria, the incidence of temporary employment among female workers is higher than in the total workforce (Table B1).

NORTH AMERICA: TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT & TEMP AGENCY

Temporary employment—both temporary agency work and fixed term hires—grew in Canada during the 1980s and 1990s. In 1989, 8 percent of wage and salary workers identified themselves as temporary workers (in a job with a specified end-date). By 1994, 9 percent of all 15 to 64 year-old employees were in temporary positions. Temporary employment affects younger workers relatively more and seems to affect men and women equally.

In the US, various forms of temporary employment are tracked in disparate ways. Nevertheless, growth has been documented particularly in temp agency employment. Temporary agency employment affects women workers disproportionately. Women are 58.9 percent of temporary agency workers in 2001 (up from 52.8 percent in 1995) as compared to 47.8 percent of workers in regular employment arrangements (Table D). The incidence of temporary agency employment among women grew from 0.8 percent in 1995 to 1.08 percent in 2001.

Direct hire temporaries were estimated to account for 4.1 percent of employment in 1999 (Table C). On-call workers, directly surveyed, represent 1.6 percent of US employment in 2001.

ASIA: TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT & TEMP AGENCIES

In Japan, temporary employment (temporary, day laborers, and some temporary agency workers) increased from 11.6 percent in 1982 to 11.8 percent in 1997 (Table F). In 1997, 66 percent of temporary employees were women. In terms of incidence, 19.6 percent of women were temporary employees compared to 6.7 percent of men.

Temporary agency employment—temporary employment through an intermediary—is a relatively new phenomenon in Japan. It has grown very fast in recent years but from a small base. Its incidence in wage and salary employment grew from 0.2 percent in 1987 to 0.5 percent in 1997. Women account for the bulk of this employment arrangement.

3. Self employment

Self-employment is another form of nonstandard work arrangement that has grown and has particular implications for women.

Within self-employment, own-account work is most directly relevant to dimensions of the informal economy because it is often characterized by weak attachments to formal structures, with weak economic position and therefore with less social protection, lower wages, and poorer working conditions. Also known as independent contracting or free lancing, own-account self-employment refers to individuals generating self-produced employment income for themselves and their families and without paid employees.

Some forms of self-employment are “near employee,” “hidden employee,” or otherwise employee-like. That is, they display few of the traditional characteristics of self-employment and small business ownership. Indeed, this type of self-employment may well be generated by the activities of formal enterprises.

Self-employment, own-account self-employment, and the number and proportion of women in self-employment have all increased in many OECD countries. While the share of self-employment in total non-agricultural employment varies widely, from 5.4 percent in Norway to 27 percent in Greece, in 1997 (Table P), overall, it has increased in most countries.

Additionally, the share of own-account self-employment within total self-employment increased in 6 of 10 OECD countries (where data was available) between 1990 and 1997 (Table R). Own-account jobs accounted for the majority share of self-employment in 7 of 10 OECD countries in 1997. Gender breakdowns for own-account self-employment across countries are not available in published form.

In almost all countries, numbers of women in self-employment have increased considerably. Women comprised one of three self-employed workers for OECD countries overall in 1997 and this proportion is growing. Indeed, the female self-employment growth rate has increased over the past two decades and has outpaced men in the majority of OECD countries.

Implications for access to social protection

Women comprise significant shares of nonstandard work arrangements across countries. They thus experience a disproportionate share of the negative characteristics associated with such arrangements: sometimes precarious employment, poorer working conditions, limited access to health and pension benefits, and lower earnings. However, there is considerable variability across countries and arrangement in terms of the extent that women experience such penalties. Implications for workers of any gender are very much shaped by whether a country relies on employer-sponsored (often tax deductible) social protection benefits that are rarely universal or socially-administered (tax funded) benefits

that have broad bases of eligibility. Additionally, implications are affected by the extent to which a system is predicated on employment being full-time and continuous.

BENEFITS: PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT

Women part-time workers in Europe are more likely to be eligible for benefits than women part-time workers in North America or Japan and Korea. In the European Union, laws proscribe discrimination by employers against part-time workers in pay, certain benefits, and working conditions. In some countries, however, these protections do not apply to part-time workers who work below a certain threshold number of hours. For example, public health, old-age pension, and unemployment benefits in France, Germany, Ireland, Japan and Sweden require minimum hours or earnings for eligibility which part-timers may not meet consistently. Part-time workers outside the European Union are less well protected. For example, in the US, they may receive fewer employer-provided benefits.

BENEFITS: TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT & TEMP AGENCY

As with part-time and in spite of parity mandates in several countries, some European Union workers in temporary employment and in temp agency work may not meet the hours, seniority, and earnings thresholds necessary for eligibility for some social benefits (sick leave or family leave for example.)

In Canada, temporary or contract workers were less likely than full-time or permanent workers to be entitled to company pensions, health plans, dental plans, paid sick leave, and paid vacation leave in 1995 (Table M).

In the US, in 2001, only 10.7 percent of temporary help agency workers and 29.8 percent of on-call workers were eligible for employer sponsored health insurance compared to 58.3 percent of workers in standard arrangements. And 7.6 percent of temporary help agency workers and 31.3 percent of on call workers were eligible for the employer-sponsored pension plan compared to 49.5 percent of workers in standard arrangements (Table EEE, BLS 2001).

BENEFITS: OWN-ACCOUNT & INDEPENDENT CONTRACTING

By definition all those classified as self-employed—whether own account or employer—do not tap into the system of social protection that has been constructed by welfare states for the wage and salary workforce. They are responsible for their own contributions to national retirement plans (in countries with universal systems where they are eligible to enroll), health insurance schemes, and other protection mechanisms. In some countries, enrollment and payment of a premium out of one's resources is mandated by law. For example, most countries have a tax-financed old age pension system with mandatory contributions. Self employed workers are usually ineligible for government-run unemployment insurance, being responsible for generating their own jobs.

INFORMAL JOBS IN INDUSTRIALIZED “NORTH” COUNTRIES

I. Persistence and re-emergence of informal economy in the industrialized “North”

In the industrialized North countries, patterns of employment have emerged—or re-appeared—that compel attention to informalization. In these countries, the informal economy is conceived as encompassing informalization of employment *within* formal enterprises as well as self-employment of a particular kind. This interpretation of the informal economy differs from that used for South countries for several reasons. Formal enterprises comprise the bulk of employers in industrialized economies. That formal enterprises should generate arrangements that entail greater informalization of the employment relationship is a concern.

While informalization is an elusive phenomenon, one difficult to circumscribe precisely, there is a general consensus among researchers that employment arrangements that entail a more tenuous, often less explicit, connection between the worker and the formal enterprise are part of informalization. Similarly, arrangements that weaken worker access to employment-based social protection can be understood to contribute to informalization. Finally, certain patterns of inter-firm contracting may create conditions propitious to the informalization of employment.

We further detail each of these aspects of informalization and their manifestation in recent years.

- First, several forms of non-standard employment arrangements have grown within formal enterprises. Nonstandard jobs encompass jobs that entail an employment arrangement that diverges from regular, year round, full time employment with a single employer.
- Second, the steady decline of self-employment (a.k.a. independent employment), an expected consequence of industrialization and formalization, has come to a halt in many countries, and possibly reversed itself. The form of self-employment that draws particular attention is own-account self employment or free-lancing, usually meaning a self-employed person with no employee and few business customers.
- Third, across countries, inter-firm subcontracting has increased. Particular forms of subcontracting may contribute to informal jobs. They include employment in growing sectors whose main activity is to provide labor-intensive services to other businesses or public institutions (e.g. janitorial services) and to individual households (e.g. home care). These are usually low-skill, low-wage, activities. In these sectors, the workforces are affected by: 1) competition based on costs and, because costs are primarily labor driven, competition based on low compensation (wages and benefits); 2) low barriers to entry that result in employer inability (and lack of incentive for employers) to capture a surplus to re-direct toward workforce development (training, retention, benefits); and 3) by the small size of employers and their difficulty with controlling their market in many, though not all, cases (Carré 1998).

This chapter focuses on the best documented and understood aspects of informal employment in industrialized countries. These are nonstandard arrangements and self-employment. Greater details on the categories are in section III.

II. Informal economy in the industrialized North vs. the developing South countries

It has been standard practice over the years to distinguish informal activities in the North from those in the South because of the different structures of economies. On the whole, the structures of North and South economies remain rather different. Nevertheless, developments of the recent decades, particularly the extension and growth of cross border commodity chains, and cross border investment (North country corporate investment in South countries) have generated informal jobs in conditions that are analogous across seemingly disparate economies.

Starting with the sharpest contrast, informal jobs in South countries continue to be located in informal enterprises (e.g. street vending) to a much greater degree than in North countries. Yet, shared patterns have developed:

- Formal enterprises themselves have increased their reliance on nonstandard employment arrangements. This is the predominant form of informal jobs in the industrialized North. In some South countries, this pattern has also taken hold particularly in production geared to exports and driven by foreign investment. For example, computer software production in Mexico-based US plants employs large numbers of computer programmers in free lance arrangements rather than in regular, wage employment (Piore 2001).
- Subcontracting to dependent contractors –whether self employed or wage workers—exists across countries. Dependent contractors, who produce goods or services as part of subcontracting arrangements exist in North as well as South countries. Home based production for manufacturing, also known as “outwork” (light manufacturing assembly, food processing, garment production) is one aspect of such depending contracting. Dependent contracting as part of cross border commodity chains led by North country corporations is a type of informal employment that is part of a similar phenomenon across North and South countries.

III. Sources of data and their limitations

In industrialized north countries, workforce statistics are well developed for regular employment in formal enterprises. Labor force surveys have been developed to keep track of regular, long term, wage and salary employment. Surveys keep track of new forms of employment inconsistently thus limiting comprehensive cross national comparisons somewhat.

In countries with active government regulation of employment relationships, different employment arrangements correspond to specific employment contracts—fixed term, temporary, part-time— thus facilitating statistical tracking. Thus, European Union

countries tend to have decade long data series on several nonstandard arrangements. In contrast, countries with more limited employment regulation must generate empirically-driven definitions for national surveys to identify non standard arrangements. The most striking example is that of the United States which has ambiguous distinctions between regular and short term employment and no common legal standard across all states for such distinction. For this reason, fixed term employment is derived by US researchers rather than directly surveyed.

In spite of these limitations, several categories of nonstandard employment can be reliably considered cross nationally. Most of these categories are features of “wage and salary” employment (or “paid” employment), that is employment dependent upon an employer or other corporate entity. One category of nonstandard work, is “self employment” that is employment that, on the face of it, is independent (see below) and therefore not part of the wage and salary workforce.

First, part-time, that is, regularly scheduled hours that are below a full-time standard has been documented in all countries. Part-time work hours per se do not constitute nonstandard work. However, part-time schedules have been associated with other job characteristics such as limited or no access to benefits, reduced eligibility for employment-based government programs and employer-sponsored training for example. Additionally, part-time, although not defined consistently across all countries has been tracked for the longest period for any job arrangements. As a result, international organizations have been able to construct comparable cross national longitudinal data series.

Second, fixed term employment, that is a job with an explicitly stipulated fixed duration can be compared across European Union countries because it often corresponds to a specific contract of employment.

Third, temporary, short term, employment through an intermediary company—temporary help/staffing employment—is defined in similar ways across countries due to the fact that the staffing industry is a multinational industry and employment in the industry can be tracked.

Fourth, independent contract, or “own account” self employment (see below) is not defined consistently across countries but most countries have a data series permitting an estimation of the phenomenon. This is a sub category of self employment.

Fifth, contract company employment, that is, employment by a company providing services to another under a contract, is not readily estimated across countries although it is understood as a phenomenon associated with informal jobs. It is available for the United States in recent years as a subcategory of wage and salary employment. It is not discussed in details here but is included in some tables.

Additionally, a number of emergent forms of nonstandard employment arrangements are not documented consistently across countries. For example, France keeps track of

contracts for intermittent employment. Many European countries keep statistics on workers in internships, apprenticeships, and other short-term employment arrangements that have arisen as means of easing access to the labor market for young labor force entrants in periods of high unemployment. In European Union countries, these arrangements are often counted among “fixed term” job arrangements as many do substitute for regular, longer term, jobs. They are not counted in other regions.

Published statistics do not include “underground” (unreported, illegal) economy jobs. While these jobs also exist in the industrialized economies, they are not considered part of the informal economy per se for this volume.

The statistics to be discussed must be understood against the backdrop of the macro economy and labor market in each country. Over the past 20 years, many countries have experienced low aggregate job growth and high unemployment (long term employment), particularly among youths and women, while others, the US most noticeably, had high job growth and low unemployment on average.

IV. Structure of the data presentation

This chapter presents data on nonstandard arrangements as follows. First, whenever possible, cross national statistics are reported that follow closely-related definitions. Most often, these are for aggregate trends. Second, more detailed information on gender, industry, and occupational patterns are reported by region —European Union, North America, Asia— and for single countries within regions. When this shift occurs in the text, we rely on national definitions and sources that are not strictly comparable cross-nationally.

This chapter will first discuss part-time. It will then turn to “temporary and short term work” and to the issue of self employment. Finally, it addresses the issue of benefit eligibility and coverage.

V. Estimates on nonstandard work in the industrialized North

3. Part-time

As already noted in the introduction, part-time work is not a status of employment per se. Statistically, part-time work is measured based on work schedules. Nevertheless, part-time work hours tend to be associated with an employment status and employment conditions that differ with those associated with full-time work. As government policy and employer based social protection are structured around full-time work experience, with eligibility criteria often pegged to hours threshold, part-time workers often have less access to social protection. Perhaps best known, part-time work in the US, a country with a system of employer-based, tax deductible, health insurance provision, part-timers are much less likely than full-timers to have health insurance through their employer.

Additionally, representation structures for workers have also tended to reflect the dominance of full-time work. Thus part-time workers are often less likely to be represented by a union. For these reasons, broad segments of part-time jobs are included for consideration as part of the informal economy.

A note on part time and other forms of nonstandard arrangements

Part-time hours affect regular employment as well as nonstandard work arrangements. As part-time is often counted in statistical series that are separate from those on nonstandard arrangements, one cannot add part-time to other nonstandard arrangements to obtain total informal employment due to double counting. Some national data series “net out” part-time in nonstandard arrangements from total part-time to obtain “regular part time” (cf. US Current Population Survey supplement.)

PART-TIME ACROSS OECD COUNTRIES

Definitions of part-time vary somewhat across countries partly due to variations in definitions of *full-time* work. Nevertheless, a general comparison of the relative incidence of part-time across countries can be made with the construction of a singled definition which is how the OECD has proceeded. Table L provides the Incidence of part-time across gender groups in OECD countries 1990-99 (OECD 2000). In it, part-time is defined as under 30 weekly hours (actual hours worked) in the main job for all workers (wage, and salary, as well as self employed).

There is noticeable variation in the incidence of part-time (PT) across countries. Historically, Nordic countries on the whole have had higher rates of part-time. By 1998, however, the Netherlands (30 percent of total employment), Switzerland (24.2 percent), and United Kingdom (23 percent) have the highest incidence. Australia (25.9 percent), , and Japan (23.6 percent) also have high incidence. In contrast, the incidence of PT was quite low in Korea (6.8 percent) For the European Union as a whole in 1998, part-time workers accounted for 16 percent of total employment. The incidence for all European OECD member countries was 14.4 percent, and for the OECD as a whole it was 14.3 percent.

Since the beginning of the 1970s, most OECD countries have seen a marked growth in the proportion of part-time working in total employment. A particularly rapid rate of growth has been observed in France over the 1990s. The exceptions include the southern European countries and the Nordic countries. [European Commission (1994); Smith et. Al. (1998)]. Countries with fastest growth from 1990 to 1998 in PT incidence include France (incidence grew from 12.2 percent to 14.8 percent), United Kingdom (20.1 to 23.0 percent), Luxembourg (7.6 to 12.8 percent), and Germany (13.4 to 16.6 percent).

As already noted, the association between part-time and access to social protection has great policy relevance. Section IV below details the relationship between part-time and access to benefits. Countries with high incidence of part-time work vary in the degree to which they extend social protection to PT workers. Therefore, there seems to be no clear

relationship between high incidence of PT and either high or low degrees of social protection for these workers.

Gender Patterns

In virtually all OECD countries, the incidence of part-time work is much higher among women than men; in some countries it is twice as high. This results in the very high representation of women in the part-time workforce relative to their share of the total workforce. For example, in the European Union in 1998, part-time workers comprised almost one-third (28.1 percent) of all employed women. In comparison, male part-time workers were 5.9 percent of male employment. These large gender differences persist across different regions. In Canada (1998) 28.6 percent of employed females were part-time workers versus 10.5 percent of employed males. In the United States (1998), 19.1 percent of employed females were part-time workers versus 8.2 percent of employed males. In Japan (1998) 39 percent of employed females were part-time workers versus 12.9 percent of males and, in Korea, (1998) 9.3 percent of employed females are part-time workers versus 5.2 percent of males (Table L).

As a result, among all OECD countries, women make-up much higher shares of part-time employment than men. For example, in the European Union in 1998, women represented 81.8 percent of all part-time workers. The share of women in part-time employment was 69.5 percent in Canada, 68 percent in the United States, 67.5 percent in Japan, and 54.8 percent in Korea (Table L).

Industry and occupational patterns

Part-time jobs concentrate in *service-producing industries*. Within these industries, it concentrates in clusters of occupations.

In most countries, the wholesale and retail trade sectors employ the largest share of part-timers. Next in concentration is the “real estate, renting, and business activities” sector (OECD 1999, 23). In terms of occupations, part timers concentrate in service and sales, clerical and low-skilled “elementary” occupations” (table 1.A.3, OECD 1999, 38; OECD 1999 p 23) with a distinct gender pattern in this distribution. *Female part-time workers concentrate in service and sales* (33.2 percent of women’s total part-time employment versus 21.3 percent for men) *and clerks* (24.5 percent of women’s total part-time employment versus 11.7 percent for men). Male part-time workers concentrate in “elementary” occupations (e.g. laborers) (25.5 percent of men’s total part-time employment versus 22.8 percent for women) (table 1.A.3, OECD 1999, 38).

Implications for earnings differentials

For most of the countries with available data, the median hourly earnings for part-time workers are lower than those for full-time workers in most sectors. Hourly earnings of part-time workers represent between around 55 and 90 percent of those of full-timers, depending on the country (OECD 1999, 23.) Overall, the relative hourly earnings of part-timers are lowest in “real estate, renting and business activities”, with men earning less than two-thirds and women less than three-quarters of their full-time counterparts. This sector typically employs 15 per cent or more of total part-time employment.

However, in the wholesale and retail trade sector, which in most countries employs the largest share of part-timers, the gap is much smaller. Women tend to earn more than 90 percent of the hourly earnings of their full-time counterparts, while men average just over 80 percent.” (OECD 1999 P 23). Male part-timers show higher earnings gaps with full-timers than females, probably due to the fact that women part-timers AND full-timers concentrate in relatively low paid occupational groups.

PART-TIME IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

EU part-time employment and women:

Part-time is mostly women’s work in the European Union. (The EU uses un-reconciled national definitions for PT).² In 1998, in the EU-15 member countries almost one third of employed women worked part-time, compared to 6 percent of employed men (Fagan and Ward, 2000, p.10 and table 4, p. 54).³ However, there has been increase in PT among men. The absolute increase is small (6 percent in 1998 vs. 4 percent in 1990) but the growth rate is high, and part-time work is dispersing across age groups for men (European Commission 1996 in Fagan and Ward 2000, 11).

For women, rates of part-time work are high for women in prime working years; it is not the case for men. Women’s involvement in part-time employment varies between countries due to differences in availability of public childcare services, the hours involved in holding down a full-time job, the amount and quality of part-time jobs on offer and social norms concerning the appropriate economic role of mothers (O’Reilly and Fagan 1998 in Fagan and Ward 2000, p. 11).

PART-TIME IN NORTH AMERICA:

Canada part-time trend (Table H):

Aggregate trends in part-time mask part of the phenomenon according to some observers. In Canada, for example, the proportion of workers employed part time climbed significantly, from 11 percent in 1976 to 17 percent in 1994 (Canadian Labor Force Survey, PT defined as under 30 weekly hours) and 18.7 percent in 1998 (Table K). However, since many individuals holding several part-time jobs are classified as full-time workers (those working 30 or more hours weekly at all jobs combined), and the number of multiple jobholders has been increasing (Pold 1994), PT is actually underestimated. In the same time period, the number of part-time jobs increased at an average rate of 6.9 percent annually, compared with 1.5 percent for full-time jobs. By 1994, 23 percent of all jobs (rather than people) were part-time, although only 17 percent of all workers were classified as such”⁴ (Krahn 1995, p 35-36.) (GSS data is for all employed workers including agriculture, see methodology p. 35).

² The EU European Labor Force Survey and earlier European Commission publications use no single definition for part-time. Instead, the EU relies on varied national definitions. For example, for Sweden, PT is under 34 weekly hours; for the UK, it is under 30 hours.

³ EU-15 refers to the fifteen countries in the European Union: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.

⁴ See Krahn (1995, p 41, footnote 10): “The 1989 and 1994 General Social Survey estimates of part-time employment among 15 to 64 year-olds in Table H are both 15 percent and so do not reflect the increase seen in Labour Force Survey data. In 1989, only 0.3 percent

Canada part-time trend and gender:

Women in Canada in 1994 were three times as likely as men to be working part-time (Table H). According to OECD statistics, the incidence of PT among women was 26.8 percent in 1990 and 28.6 percent in 1998. For men, it was 9.1 percent in 1990 and 10.5 percent in 1998. Women's share of part-time workers actually declined from 70.1 percent in 1990 to 69.5 percent in 1998 (OECD 1999).

As is true for the OECD as a whole, the incidence of PT is highest in service activities, in 1994, 29.1 percent of workers in lower-tier services (retail trade and other consumer services) were employed PT.

US: Part time trends

The US, a country with relatively high incidence of PT historically, has actually witnessed a modest rise of PT during the 1980s, a slight decline in the mid 1990s (Houseman and Osawa 2001) and a slight upward trend in the late 1990s (Table C). In US national statistics, PT grew from 13 percent of non-agricultural employment in 1958 to 18 percent in 1989 (Tilly 1992, reporting from Employment and Earnings with PT defined as weekly hours less than 35 hours). Data from recent years are not strictly comparable to historical trends due to a survey change in 1994. Regular part-time—which corresponds to part-time jobs net of those with nonstandard arrangements—amounted to 16.8 percent in 2001 (BLS 2001).

US: Part-time and Gender

In the US, in 1998, part-time accounted for 8.3 percent of male as compared to 19.5 percent of female employment (OECD 1999, 39).⁵ During the period 1987-97, total employment grew by 1.42 percent; of this total, part-time employment change was 0.12 percent and full-time growth was 1.3 percent (OECD 1999, p. 36). The fall in the incidence of PT in total employment during the 1990s may be attributed to the decline in PT employment among US women, particularly among married women. US women continued a long term trend of shifting to full time work during the 1990s (Houseman and Osawa 2001, 22).

ASIA: PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT

Japan: Part-time trends and ambiguities in the definition

PT grew dramatically in Japan during the 1980s and 1990s as did other nonstandard arrangements. According to the OECD definition which relies on actual hours worked, the incidence of PT rose from 19.1 percent in 1990 to 23.6 percent in 1998. For women,

of employed 15 to 64 year-old GSS respondents failed to provide information on their full-time/part-time status. By 1994, this figure had risen to 1.8 percent. This difference may partly account for the lower-than-expected 1994 GSS part-time estimate."

⁵ Part-time is measured by the OECD as working hours under 30 hours per week which understates part-time employment in the US when compared to the US definition of part-time employment which is under 35 hours per week. However, while different hours thresholds yield significant differences in PT levels, the relative rankings of countries in terms of part-time incidence vary little with the choice of definition (OECD 1999, 22).

the incidence went from 33.2 percent to 39 percent while, for men, it went from 9.5 to 12.9 percent (Table L).

In some Japanese surveys, workers are classified as part-time if they work fewer hours per day or days per week than regular workers (e.g., the Survey on the Diversification of Employment), in others, they are classified as part-time if they are termed part-time in their place of employment (e.g., the Employment Status Survey and the Survey on the Diversification of Employment). In 1999, about 30 percent of workers classified as part-time by their employers worked the same number of hours per week as full-time workers! Thus, these two definitions produce substantially different estimates of the number of part-time workers. “In cases where Japanese part-time and full-time employees work similar hours, part-time refers to a lower status of employment within the firm” (Houseman and Osawa 2001, 2-3).⁶

Using national statistics, Houseman and Osawa find that PT accounted for 45 percent of the net growth in wage employment from 1982 to 1997, and for 77 percent of the net growth for the more recent period of 1992 to 1997 (2001, 4) (table F).

Japan: Part-time and gender

Even compared to the US which has had high rates of PT historically, the incidence of PT among Japanese women workers is quite high. The incidence of PT is particularly high for women aged 20 to 64 in Japan. For comparison, rates of PT are relatively high for US teenagers, older (age 65 and over) women and men, but they are much lower than in Japan for women.

The recent, rapid, increase in PT in Japan seems to be driven by changes in the pattern of labor demand by firms. This demand has been accommodated partly by women who have sought PT employment in response to the decline in opportunities for self and for family employment (small enterprises). Japanese government policy has also provided substantial incentives for firms to generate PT jobs and for workers to take PT jobs (Houseman and Osawa 2001, 7).

Korea: Part-time trends

The incidence of PT in total employment grew from 4.5 percent in 1990 to 6.8 percent in 1998. It is higher among women (6.5 percent in 1990 and 9.3 percent in 1998) but has grown faster among men (3.1 percent in 1990 and 5.2 percent in 1998). As a result, the share of women in total PT declined from 58.9 percent in 1990 to 54.8 percent in 1998.

Across quite a large number of countries part-time has grown. It continues to be primarily a female phenomenon. However, the 1990s have witnessed the fast growth of PT among male workers.

⁶ See Houseman and Osawa (2001, 3): “Some government surveys recently began distinguishing between part-time and “arubaito” jobs. Part-time and arubaito jobs are similar. Most part-time workers are housewives and most arubaito are students, although in recent years the arubaito category increasingly has included non-regular, non-student employees.” Part-time and arubaito workers are grouped together in Tables F, G.

4. Temporary Employment

In this section, we use the word “temporary” to denote all forms of explicitly short term employment arrangements, whether employment through an intermediary, a temporary help/temporary staffing company, or fixed-term employment, that is, direct employment of a short term nature (a.k.a. direct hire temporaries). This section relies on regional and national statistics as definitions vary substantially and do not allow for cross national comparisons. As will be seen, more details are available for temporary agency employment (TAW, a.k.a. “temp” employment); therefore it is explored in separate subsections.

EUROPE: TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT & TEMP AGENCY EMPLOYMENT

EU temporary employment trends (Tables A1 and B1):

For the European Union as a whole and for a majority of EU nations, the share of workers in “temporary” employment increased from the mid-1980s to the late 1990s. This is true for both a broad and for a narrow definition of temporary employment. Under a broad definition that includes temporary agency workers, workers with fixed-term contracts, seasonal workers, and persons with training contracts, most European Union countries experienced increases in temporary employment between 1985 and 1998 (see Table B1).⁷ The largest increases were in: 1) Spain where these arrangements grew from 16 percent of employees in temporary in 1985 to 32.9 percent in 1998 (after reaching a high of 35 percent in 1995); 2) France, where they grew from 5 percent to 13.9 percent; and Finland where they grew from 5 percent to 17.7 percent. Many countries had slight to moderate increases. Three countries had decreases over the period 1985 to 1998: Greece decreased from 21 percent to 13 percent; Denmark from 12 percent to 10.1 percent and Luxembourg from 5 percent to 2.9 percent.

A narrower definition of temporary employment that excludes apprentices, trainees and research assistants—usually preparatory situations while awaiting regular arrangements—provides a clearer indication of temporary arrangements. By this measure, most EU countries experienced increasing temporary employment between 1988 and 1998 (Table A1). In countries for which temporary employment data are available, temporary employment grew except in Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, and Portugal. From 1988 to 1998, the largest increases were seen in Spain, from 15.3 percent to 24.3 percent; France, from 4.6 percent to 10.3 percent; and the Netherlands, from 7 percent to 11.1 percent. Other EU countries had slight increases while a few had slight decreases in temporary employment. Greece had the largest drop in temporary employment from 8.5 percent to 7 percent. Ireland’s temporary employment decreased

⁷ See Hudson (1999, p. 19). Employees with fixed-term contracts include the following categories in the European Labour Force Survey: 1) Employee hired for a job that ends on a specific date, completion of a task or the return of another employee who has been temporary replaced; 2) Persons engaged by an agency or employment exchange and hired to a third party to perform a specific task. Note that persons with a written work contract of unlimited duration with the agency or employment exchange are not counted as temporary employees; 3) Seasonal employees; and 4) Persons with specific training contracts.

from 5.7 percent to 4.7 percent, even though it had the largest increase in total employment among EU countries during the same period.

EU women and temporary employment (Table B1):

Temporary employment is primarily a female phenomenon, although there is wide variation among EU countries in its incidence. In all countries except Austria, the incidence of temporary employment among female workers is higher for women than in the total workforce (Table B1). *The following percentages use the broader definition of temporary employment noted above because of limited gender data availability for the narrower definition (Table B1).* EU countries with the highest incidence (percentage of women workers in temporary employment) are: Spain (34.4 percent), Finland (21.9 percent), Portugal (18.5 percent), Netherlands (16.1 percent), Sweden (15.2 percent), France (15 percent), and Greece (14.7 percent). EU countries with the lowest incidence for women include Luxembourg (3.7 percent), Austria (7.7 percent), United Kingdom (8.3 percent), Ireland (9.8 percent), and Italy (10.2 percent). As a result, women constitute the bulk of temporary workers. In nine of the fifteen EU countries, women account for about half or more of temporary employment. In six of the fifteen EU countries, women comprised a majority of temporary employment: Sweden (58.6 percent), Ireland (57.5 percent), Belgium (56.5 percent), United Kingdom (55.3 percent), Netherlands (54 percent), and Denmark (51.8 percent). The EU countries with the lowest women's share of temporary employment are: Spain (38.4 percent), Austria (43.3 percent), Greece (43.5 percent), and Germany (45 percent).

EU temporary employment and industry:

Overall for the EU-15, temporary employment is more heavily concentrated in service producing activities than standard employment is; the high representation of women workers in these sectors correlates with their high representation in temporary employment. Compared to regular (open-ended) and full-time contracts, temporary employment concentrated in "other services" (see table note for definition), and to a lesser extent in hotels and restaurants (Fagan and Ward 2000, p. 22 and table 11 p. 61).

EU temporary agency work:

We provide information on temporary agency employment for cross-national comparisons because less data is available for direct-hire temporaries. However, direct-hire temporary employment may account for a larger employment share than temporary agency employment in some countries. For example, according to 1999 national statistics in France, short-term direct hire employment accounted for 6.1 percent of private wage and salary employment as compared to 3 percent for temporary agency employment (Carré 2001). Temporary agency work increase in almost all European countries though the 1990s. Definitions vary but the trend is unequivocal (Table N).⁸ Temporary agency

⁸ See Michon (1999). Cross national comparisons of statistics on temporary agency employment (a.k.a. Temporary Agency Work/TAW) are affected by varied legal regimes that include: 1) General lack of clear specific definition and regulation of TAW work as a separate type of employment relationship - as in Denmark, Finland, Ireland and the UK; 2) Specific legal definition and regulation of TAW, focusing primarily on the relationship between the agency, the user company and the worker - as in Austria, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Sweden; and 3) specific legal definition and regulation of TAW, covering the relationship between the agency, the user company and the worker, but also defining a specific status for temporary agency

work has grown rapidly in some countries, particularly in the 1990s. In most countries, its incidence does not exceed 2 percent of total employment though its impact on employment flows is greater. For example, in Spain it accounted for 12.5 percent of new hires in 1997 (Michon 1999).

Europe: the shifting gender composition of temporary agency employment

The gender composition of employment mirrors that of the sectors in which temporary agency assignments take place. Thus women account for the majority of agency temps in countries where such employment concentrates in “tertiary” sectors (Table N). For example, women are more than two-thirds of temporary agency workers in Sweden (80 percent), Finland (75 percent), and Denmark (70 percent) where temporary agency employment is mainly seen in tertiary sectors. In contrast, women represent less than 4 out of 10 temporary agency workers in countries where temporary agency employment is mainly in industrial sectors. For example, women represent relatively low percentages of temporary agency workers in Austria (16 percent), Germany (22 percent), France (27 percent), and Belgium (41 percent).

NORTH AMERICA: TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT & TEMP AGENCY

Canada: temporary employment:

Temporary employment—both temporary agency work and fixed term hires—grew in Canada during the 1980s and 1990s. In 1989, 8 percent of wage and salary workers identified themselves as temporary workers (in a job with a specified end-date). By 1994, almost one million or 9 percent of all 15 to 64 year-old employees were in temporary positions.⁹ (Krahn 1995, 38).

Temporary employment affects younger workers relatively more and seems to affect men and women equally. In 1994, roughly one in six employees aged 15 to 24 (17 percent of women and 16 percent of men) were in temporary jobs. In contrast, only 5 percent to 7 percent of both women and men aged 35 or older held temporary positions. (Krahn 1995, p 39). Social services and public administration account for 38 percent of all temporary workers (but only 30 percent of all wage employment) (Krahn 1995, 39) (Table H).

United States: varied forms of temporary employment

In the US, national establishment statistics (Current Employment Statistics) for the temporary agency industry indicate rapid growth during the 1980s and early 1990s. Since 1995, a national household survey keeps track of temporary agency, and on-call workers. Direct hire temporaries, a key type of temporary employment, is estimated rather than obtained directly from surveys. For this reason, we provide more detail on the temporary agency industry than on other forms of temporary work.

workers - as in Belgium, France, Italy and Portugal. TAW exists in Greece, but - unusually - remains practically unregulated. Agencies exist and operate without a license, but are not prohibited by law.

⁹ See Krahn (1995, footnote 13 p. 41). Canada uses the terms temporary, fixed term, and contract work to denote temporary work. “The 1991 Survey of Work Arrangements (SWA) estimated that 5 percent of employees aged 15 to 64 were in temporary jobs. The difference may be due to the SWA’s six-month cut-off, compared with the GSS, which counted any job with a specific end-date as a temporary job.”

US: temporary agency employment trend

From 1973 to 1999, the number of workers employed in the personnel services industries, the bulk of which consists of temporary help agencies, grew much faster than total US employment. In 1999, 2.6 percent of all workers were employed in the personnel services industry, a large increase from the 0.3 percent employed in the industry in 1973 (Mishel, et. al. 2001, p. 252; table CC). During the 1990s, the share of workers in the personnel services industry more than doubled. Employment in temporary help agencies doubled between 1982 and 1989 and again between 1989 and 1997 (Mishel, et. al. 2001, p. 252; Table CCC). The industry accounting for about 10 percent of net employment growth in the 1990s (Houseman and Osawa 2001, 5).

In surveys, user employers report the need to respond to fluctuations in workload, the difficulty in finding qualified workers on their own, and the desire to screen workers before hiring permanently as reasons for their increased use of temporary agency workers.

The household survey, Current Population Survey, keeps track of people rather than jobs. From 1995 to 1999, it report that temporary agency workers account for about 1 percent of employment (Table C).¹⁰ (The number of jobs is higher than the number of people.) While temp workers are overwhelmingly white, the incident of temp employment is twice as high among Black workers (2 percent) and slightly higher for Hispanics (1.4 percent) (Houseman 1999, Hudson 1999).

US: Women are over represented in temporary agency employment

In the US, temporary agency employment affects women workers disproportionately. Women are 58.9 percent of temporary agency workers in 2001 (up from 52.8 percent in 1995) as compared to 47.8 percent of workers in regular employment arrangements (Table D). The incidence of temporary agency employment among women grew from 0.8 percent in 1995 to 1.08 percent in 2001.

US: Two poles of activity for temporary agency employment

US temp workers cluster in services, trade and manufacturing. However, manufacturing assignments have been fast growing in recent years. In the U.S., temporary agency workers cluster in administrative support, on one end, and operators (fabricators, laborers) occupations, on the other end. Female temps cluster in secretarial, nursing, data entry, and office clerks occupations while male temps cluster among assemblers and laborers outside of construction. Occupational characteristics vary across racial/ethnic groups. For example, the most common occupation for Black women in temp work is secretary and for Hispanic women is it nursing aide (Hudson 1999).¹¹ Since the mid 1980s, the composition of temp assignments has shifted away from clerical and service occupations (female dominated) and towards blue collar occupations (male dominated).

¹⁰ Incidence was 1 percent in 1995; 0.9 percent in 1999; and 0.9 percent in 2001.

¹¹ For Black male temporary workers, the most common occupation is assembler, and for Hispanic males it is truck driver.

Therefore, while women continue to predominate, their share of temporary agency employment has actually declined since the 1980s.

US direct-hire temporaries and on-call employment:

The other arrangements that comprise “temporary” employment include direct-hire temporaries and on-call employment. Direct hire temporaries were estimated in Houseman and Osawa (2001) to account for 4.1 percent of employment in 1999 (Table C).¹² This was an increase from previous estimates of direct-hire temporaries ranging from 2.1 to 2.7 percent of employment in the 1995 CPS (Houseman and Polivka 1999) and 2.6 percent in the 1997 CPS (Houseman 1999).¹³ On-call workers, directly surveyed, represent 1.6 percent of US employment in 2001.

US on-call and direct hire temporaries— occupation and gender:

U.S. female on-call workers cluster in elementary and secondary schools, hospitals, and eating and drinking places while male on-call workers cluster in construction (Hudson 2000). Women are over-represented among on-call workers relative to their share of the workforce (Table D). They are also over-represented among direct hire temporaries (Houseman 1999).

ASIA: TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT & TEMP AGENCIES

JAPAN definition of temporary employment

Temporary workers in Japan are those hired on a contract for a limited duration (fixed term). Often a distinction between temporary workers and day laborers is made; the first have a contract of one month or longer, while the second have a contract for under one month” (Houseman and Osawa 2001, 3). Further, temporary agency workers may have a temporary employment contract too, thus comparison with other countries is limited. (Part-time also can be in temporary contracts.)¹⁴ In Japan, temporary employment (temporary, day laborers, and some temporary agency workers) increased from 11.6 percent in 1982 to 11.8 percent in 1997 (Table F).

JAPAN temporary employment and gender:

In 1997, 66 percent of temporary employees were women. In terms of incidence, 19.6 percent of women were temporary employees compared to 6.7 percent of men. This a higher gender differential than in the US for example. The incidence of temporary employment is higher among Japanese women than US women across all age brackets (Table 3 in Houseman and Osawa 2001, 35).

¹² Direct-hire temporaries is estimate derived from 1999 supplement to Current Population Survey (CPS) by Houseman and Osawa (2001).

¹³ Based on an employer survey, Houseman (1997) reports an estimate of 3.4 percent for direct hires.

¹⁴ According to the Ministry of Labor, the fraction of part-time workers reporting that they were on a temporary contract grew from 30.4 percent in 1990 to 40.6 percent in 1996 (Houseman and Osawa 2001, 5).

JAPAN temporary agency employment

As already noted, temporary agency workers can be counted among the temporary workers because a number among them hold a temporary contract. (However, half or more of temporary agency workers do not report having a temporary contract).¹⁵

Temporary agency employment—temporary employment through an intermediary—is a relatively new phenomenon in Japan. It has grown very fast in recent years but from a small base. The incidence of agency temporary work in wage and salary employment grew from 0.2 percent in 1987 to 0.5 percent in 1997 (of these 0.2 percent have a temporary contract and 0.3 percent have a nontemporary contract) (Table F presents slightly overlapping categories of employment for Japan in 1997 and US in 1999) Further growth is expected because regulations of the industry were relaxed in 1999 (Houseman and Osawa 2001, p. 5).¹⁶

Temporary agency employment and gender

In Japan in 1997, 1 percent of women were agency temporary workers compared to 0.2 percent of men. Women account for the bulk, 79.4 percent, of temporary agency employment.

3. Self employment

Self-employment is another form of nonstandard work arrangement that has grown and that has particular implications for women. Self-employment jobs, according to the OECD and international traditional definitions, are ones where remuneration is directly dependent upon profits, and incumbents make operational decisions or are responsible for their own welfare and/or that of the enterprise. National labor force surveys provide most self-employment data by asking respondents to classify themselves as employees or self-employed according to their status in their main job.¹⁷ Statistics on self-employment distinguish three main sub-categories: self-employed without employees, or “own-account workers”; self-employed with employees, or “employers”; and unpaid family workers. Many analyses (such as the OECD findings reported in this paper) exclude unpaid family workers because they are considered entrepreneurial assistants and not entrepreneurs according to international guidelines. Because this understates the real level of women’s entrepreneurship, some women classified as unpaid family workers in national statistics are likely better considered as partners with the self-employed person (OECD 2000, 156).

¹⁵ Houseman and Osawa, 2001.

¹⁶ According to Houseman and Osawa (2001, 25) “Prior to 1986, temporary staffing agencies were prohibited by the Employment Security Act of 1947, with an exception for those run by trade unions. Union-run agencies were not allowed to charge for their services. In 1986, the government passed legislation to permit temporary staffing agencies to supply workers to perform 11 specified tasks. In 1995 this law was amended to cover 26 job categories. The Labor Dispatching Law of 1999 greatly expanded the jobs in which temporary agency workers are permitted, but rather provides a short list of occupations in which they are prohibited. Temporary agency employment is expected to grow rapidly in the coming years as a result of this deregulation.”

¹⁷ While this method provides generally consistent results, there are important exceptions, particularly owner-managers of incorporated businesses, who represent a large proportion of self-employment in some countries--- 31.4 percent in the United States in 1998, for example. These are people who own their own business and are responsible for it, but who are legally employees of the business. Because their legal status is of employee of the company they may identify themselves as employees when they are best classified as self-employed for labor force analysis (OECD 2000 p. 156).

Within self-employment, own-account work is most directly relevant to dimensions of the informal economy because it is often characterized by weak attachments to formal structures, with weak economic position and therefore often associated with less social protection, lower wages, and poorer working conditions. Also known as independent contracting or free lancing, own-account self-employment refers to individuals generating self-produced employment income for themselves and their families and without paid employees. Although own-account workers are categorically distinct from “employer” self-employed workers who hire one or more people, not all countries distinguish employers from own-account workers in self-employment data.

Another complication with measuring own-account self-employment is that some forms of self-employment are “near employee,” “hidden employee,” or otherwise employee-like. That is, while the own-account self-employed do not employ other workers as wage workers, they also display few of the traditional characteristics of self-employment and small business ownership. Indeed, this type of self-employment may be generated by the activities of formal enterprises. For example, such workers may perform on the site of their customer business and under supervision of staff from their business customer. One aspect of changing labor market structures is that the line between wage and self-employment has become harder to draw and criteria of dependency and (lack of) supervision may be increasingly difficult to verify. Moreover, a number of governments have been concerned about the rise of “false” self-employment where work situations are reclassified as self-employment in order to reduce tax liabilities (OECD 2000 p 177). The OECD (2000) has recognized that some of the recent growth of self-employment is likely to be composed of “hidden employee” workers who in previous times would have been counted among the wage and salary workforce.

In order to address the data limitations involved in providing cross-national comparisons of own-account self-employment, we first provide analysis of self-employment data for the OECD in context. Furthermore, for international comparisons of own-account work in this section, we use own-account self-employment as the best proxy for independent contracting and free lancing.¹⁸

OECD SELF-EMPLOYMENT

Self-employment, own-account self-employment, and the number and proportion of women in self-employment have all increased in many OECD countries. While the share of self-employment in total non-agricultural employment varies widely among OECD countries, from 5.4 percent in Norway to 27 percent in Greece, in 1997 (Table P), overall, self-employment has increased among most OECD countries. Indeed, during the past 25 years, non-agricultural self-employment has grown at a faster rate than total

¹⁸ The US Current Population Survey does provide a category of “independent contractors” but its definition is ambiguous enough that some independent contractors self classify as wage workers thus displaying confusion about the definition.

nonagricultural employment in many OECD countries.¹⁹ From 1990 to 1998, non-agricultural self-employment grew faster than total non-agricultural employment in 14 of 24 countries where data was available (Table Q). Countries with particularly high growth rates, relative to total employment growth, were Germany (5.6 percent growth rate) and the Netherlands (5 percent growth rate).

It is evident that own-account self-employment has increased. Even as self-employment has been growing, so has the share of own-account self-employment within total self-employment. The proportion of own-account self-employment within total self-employment increased in 6 of 10 OECD countries (where data was available) between 1990 and 1997 (Table R).²⁰ For example, the share of own-account self-employment within total self-employment increased in the United Kingdom (68.9 percent to 74.2 percent) and Germany (40.2 percent to 47 percent). Not only has the share of own-account self-employment within total self-employment been growing, but in many instances it is the main type of self-employment. That is, in most OECD countries, more self-employed workers are own-account than they are employers. Own-account jobs accounted for the majority share of self-employment in 7 of 10 OECD countries in 1997. For example, in Belgium 9 of 10 (89.7 percent) self-employed jobs were own-account, and in the United Kingdom (74.2 percent) and Greece (71.2 percent) about 7 of 10 self-employed jobs were own-account in 1997 (Table R).

Unfortunately, gender data for own-account self-employment across OECD countries are not available in published form. However, understanding that own-account self-employment is the dominant form of self-employment in most OECD countries, we look at gender data for total self-employment to consider implications for female own-account self-employment. National labor statistics show that, in some cases, higher proportions of women than work in own-account self-employment. For example, in Canada in 1994, the proportion of own-account workers among middle-aged (45 to 54 year-old) workers was higher for women (13 percent) than for men (9 percent) (Krahn 1995). Women, in some cases, are thus more likely to experience this less desirable form of self-employment.

Compared to both employer self-employed workers and regular employees, own-account workers tend to report poorer working conditions (less likely to wear protective equipment), longer and irregular working hours, less access to training, less autonomy, and more job insecurity (OECD 2000, p 170). However, “women own-account workers reported working longer hours than women employees, but considerably shorter hours than male own-account workers (male and female own-account workers were found to

¹⁹ Over the 1990s, the industry sectors which contributed the most to the growth in self-employment were financial intermediation, real estate, renting and business (FIRE); followed by community, social and personal services. The occupation groups that contributed most strongly to the growth in self-employment over the 1990s were professionals, and technicians and associated professionals (OECD 2000 pp 160-161).

²⁰ Among European Union countries, own-account non-agricultural self-employment increased between 1988 and 1998 in 8 of the 12 countries where data is available. However, for the EU as a whole, own-account non-agricultural self-employment countries has not grown, the rate actually decreased from 8.6 percent in 1988 to 7.1 percent in 1998. One reason for this overall decline is the large decrease in Italy, which fell from 18.9 percent in 1988 to 10.2 percent in 1998. Another reason is because it has increased in countries where it was comparatively lower in 1988 (e.g., Germany, Denmark) and declined where it was comparatively higher (e.g., Italy, Spain). For the majority of EU countries where data is available, the increases were slight. The highest increases were in Portugal 1.4 percent and Germany 1.2 percent.

work, on average, 46 and 40 hours, as opposed to 41 and 33 hours for employees” (OECD 2000,169-170).²¹

In almost all countries, numbers of women in self-employment have increased considerably. Women comprised one of three self-employed workers for OECD countries overall in 1997 and this proportion is growing. Indeed, the female self-employment growth rate has increased over the past two decades and has outpaced men in the majority of OECD countries. From 1990 to 1997, annual average growth rates of female self-employment surpassed those of men in 10 of 18 countries where data was available (Table J). Female self-employment growth rates were especially high, relative to male self-employment rates, in Ireland (5.7 percent compared to 2.4 percent) and Greece (3.2 percent compared to 1.1 percent). While to some extent these trends mirror the increase in the proportion of women in total employment as a whole, the growth rate of women self-employment outpaced that of women in total employment in the 1980s, then stabilized in the 1990s (OECD 2000, p 159).

The distribution of industries among OECD self-employed (both own-account and employers) workers significantly differs from that of civilian employment as a whole. For example, self-employed people are less likely to work in electricity, gas and water supply, and mining and quarrying than civilian employed people. Rather, non-agricultural self-employed people in OECD countries are concentrated in wholesale and retail trade and repairs, and hotels and restaurants. However, these patterns vary country to country. Overall for OECD countries in the 1990s, the industry sectors that contributed the most to self-employment growth were financial intermediation, real estate, renting and business (FIRE), followed by community, social and personal services (Services). These industries grew faster for the self-employed than for the employed as a whole. Some OECD countries with the fastest self-employment growth in the 1990s experienced distinct patterns. For example, Canadian own-account self-employment grew in all sectors, including agriculture. In France, self-employment decreased in most sectors, but increased in FIRE and Services (OECD 2000, p. 160).

The distribution of occupational groups among self-employed people in OECD countries slightly differs from the occupational distribution among civilian employment. Compared to civilian employment as a whole, self-employed workers included larger shares of legislators, senior officials and managers, and smaller shares of clerks and low-skill “elementary” occupations. Overall for OECD countries in the 1990s, the industry sectors that contributed the most to self-employment growth were professionals, and technicians and associated professionals (OECD 2000, p. 162).

²¹ Actual data from Second European Survey on Working Conditions.

NORTH AMERICA: SELF-EMPLOYMENT

Focusing on North America, Canada has a higher percentage of self-employed workers than the United States, even when definitional differences are taken into account.²² In Canada the share of self-employment in total non-agricultural employment was 16 percent compared to 7.2 percent for the United States in 1997 (Table P). Between 1990 and 1998, Canada's annual average growth rate for self-employment was higher than the rate for total employment (4.7 percent compared to .9 percent), whereas the U.S.'s self-employment growth rate was lower than total employment (0.4 percent compared to 1.3 percent) (Table Q).²³

Own-account self-employment has increased over time in Canada. In 1989, in national statistics, own-account and "employer" self-employment each accounted for 7 percent of all workers. By 1994, own-account self-employment increased to 9 percent of total employment and employer self-employment decreased to 6 percent (Table H). Similarly, the share of own-account self-employment within total self-employment increased between 1990 and 1997 from 51.6 percent to 62.3 percent (Table R).

There is no identical own-account self-employment data for the United States because of changes in national labor statistics definitions. However, the United States collects data about "independent contracting" that provides information for comparative purposes.²⁴ These national statistics make a distinction between independent contractors who report they are wage and salary employees and those who report they are self-employed. The majority of independent contractors are self-employed. For example, in 1995, of the 6.7 percent of workers that were independent contractors, 5.6 percent were self-employed (see Hudson 1999, 3). Though the statistics do not provide long-term trends, they do indicate that the share of all employed persons who are independent contractors was 6.7 percent in 1995 and 6.4 percent in 2001 (Table C).²⁵ More noteworthy is that though women were underrepresented (35.5 percent female compared to 64.5 percent male) among independent contractors in 2001, women's share among independent contractors has been increasing (Table D); that is, the proportion of independent contractor who are female increased from 32.7 percent in 1995 to 35.5 percent in 2001, while the male share of independent contractors decreased from 67.3 percent in 1995 to 64.5 percent in 2001.

²² Definitions of own-account self-employment differ between the two countries. In Canada, it includes both incorporated and unincorporated self-employed workers, whereas in the United States, it includes only unincorporated self-employed workers—that is, those who have not set up their business as a legal corporation.

²³ Over the 1984-1995 period, the share of employees in total Canadian employment declined, while the share of self-employment increased. (NAALC 1997, North American Labor Markets).

²⁴ Biennially since 1995, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics has conducted Contingent Work Supplements as part of the Current Population Survey.

²⁵ Wage and salary and self-employed independent contractors often differ on the basis of their occupational characteristics as well as the quality of the jobs and the personal characteristics of those who fill them. The most frequently occurring occupations of wage and salary and self-employed independent contractors are listed respectively in Tables S20 and S21 in the online Data Supplement (www.epinet.org). Two distinctions are readily apparent. First, many wage and salary independent contractors are employed in occupations where workers are paid a base salary in addition to some type of commission or additional pay for each product sold or customer served. Second, self-employed independent contractors are more likely to work in higher status and "professional" occupations than their wage and salary counterparts.

Moreover, incident of independent contracting among women remained stable between 1995 (4.8 percent) and 2001 (4.8 percent) while the share of men that are independent contractors has decreased between 1995 (8.4 percent) and 2001 (7.7 percent) (Table E).

Like most OECD countries, in both Canada and the U.S. more self-employed workers are own-account than they are employer self-employed workers. In Canada, 6 of 10 (62.3 percent) self-employed jobs were own-account, and in the United States about 8 of 10 (78.9 percent) self-employed jobs were own-account in 1997 (make table 5.4 OECD 2000 p 162).

The numbers of women in self-employment have increased in both Canada and the U.S. as they did in almost all OECD countries. Among OECD countries in 1997, one of three self-employed workers was female. A similar rate was seen in Canada (32.7 percent) and a slightly higher rate was seen in the United States (37 percent).

Following similar trends among other OECD countries, the annual average growth rates of female self-employment surpassed those of men in both Canada and the United States between 1990 and 1997 (see Table J). The female self-employment growth rate was especially high, relative to male self-employment rates, in Canada (6.5 percent compared to 3.8 percent) than in the United States where the male self-employment rate actually declined (1.9 percent compared to -0.2 percent).

Canadian women were only slightly less likely than men to work as own-account self-employees. In 1994, the share of women workers (all ages) that were own-account workers was 8 percent compared to 9 percent of all male workers that were own-account (see Table H). However, the proportion of women own-account workers among 45 to 54 year-old women workers was much higher for women (13 percent) than for men own-account workers in the same age range for male workers (9 percent). Moreover, the share of own-account workers among all female workers is growing faster than the share of own-account workers among all male workers. For example the share of own-account workers among all women workers increased from 6 percent in 1989 to 8 percent in 1994, while the share of own-account workers among all male workers increased from 8 percent to 9 percent. (Krahn 1995 p 37)

In terms of their distribution across industries, own-account workers concentrated in agriculture (51 percent), construction (23 percent) and business services (15 percent) in 1994. Another 14 percent of own-account workers were in low-skilled consumer services (Table H). (Krahn 1995 p 38)

ASIA: SELF-EMPLOYMENT

In Korea the share of self-employment in total non-agricultural employment was 24.4 percent compared to 9.7 percent for Japan in 1997 (Table P). Between 1990 and 1998, Korea's annual average growth rate for self-employment was higher than the rate for total employment (3.8 percent compared to 2.1 percent), whereas the Japan's self-employment

growth rate actually decreased as total employment slightly increased (-1.4 percent compared to 0.7 percent) (Table Q).²⁶

In Japan, the share of own-account self-employment within total self-employment decreased between 1990 and 1997 from 78 percent to 74.7 percent) (Table R). No comparable own-account trend data for Korea.

Like most OECD countries, more of Japan's self-employed workers are own-account than they are employer self-employed workers. In Japan, 7 of 10 (74.7 percent) self-employed jobs were own-account (Table R).

Similar to many OECD countries in 1997, in Japan one of three (33.9 percent) self-employed workers was female. Korea had a slightly lower rate of 30.3 percent. However, in contrast to almost all OECD countries (including Korea) where the numbers of women in self-employment have increased, in Japan they decreased. And while both female and male self-employment decreased in Japan between 1990 and 1997, the annual average growth rate of female self-employment was much lower than the growth rate of male self-employment in Japan (-2.8 percent female growth rate compared to -0.8 percent male growth rate). Between 1990 and 1997 in Korea, the female self-employment growth rate was only slightly higher than that of men (5.2 percent compared to 5 percent).

VI. The Implications for access to social protection

Women comprise significant shares of nonstandard work arrangements across industrialized North countries. As a result, they experience a disproportionate share of the negative characteristics associated with such arrangements. These include lower earnings, sometimes precarious employment, poorer working conditions, limited access to health and pension benefits, and unreported or quasi-legal work. However, there is considerable variability by country and by type of arrangement in terms of the extent that women may receive less social protection. Implications for workers of any gender are very much shaped by whether a country relies on employer-sponsored (often tax deductible) social protection benefits that are rarely universal or socially-administered (tax funded) benefits that have broad bases of eligibility. Additionally, implications are affected by the extent to which a system is predicated on employment being full-time and continuous.

²⁶ Over the 1984-1995 period, the share of employees in total Canadian employment declined, while the share of self-employment increased. (NAALC 1997, North American Labor Markets).

BENEFITS: PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT

Women comprise the majority of part-time workers in Europe, North American, and industrialized Asia. Since the total number of part-time workers is growing, increasingly more women and their families are less likely to have access to social protection. However, women part-time workers in Europe are more likely to be eligible for benefits than women part-time workers in North America or Japan and Korea.

In the European Union, laws proscribe discrimination by employers against part-time workers in pay, certain benefits, and working conditions.²⁷ In addition, many European countries have collective agreements supporting the principle that part-time workers are entitled to the same rights and benefits as full-time workers (Cranfield 1997 in OECD 1999). In some countries, however, these protections do not apply to part-time workers who work below a certain threshold number of hours. For example, public health, old-age pension, and unemployment benefits in France, Germany, Ireland, Japan and Sweden require minimum hours or earnings for eligibility which part-timers may not meet consistently [Doudeijns (1998); OECD (1998)]. While part-time workers within the European Union may have limited protections, those outside it are less well protected. For example, in the US, they may receive fewer employer-provided benefits (e.g., paid holidays), although this differential is limited in some cases by law or collective bargaining agreements (Houseman 1997; OECD 1999).

In Canada, part-timers were less likely than full-timers to be entitled to company pensions, health plans, dental plans, paid sick leave, and paid vacation leave. Drawing on the 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements, Lipsett and Reesor (1997) present data showing that part-timer entitlement rates for each of these benefits were less than two-fifths of those for full-timers. For example, 58 percent of full-time workers are entitled to an employer sponsored pension plan (other than the Canada/Quebec Pension Plan) while only 19 percent of part-time workers are entitled. Similarly low benefit entitlement rates among part-time workers as compared to full-time workers are found for supplementary health and dental plans and paid sick leave (See Table M).

In the United States, where part-time work is less common than in the average OECD country, part-timers appear to be offered very few benefits. In the United States, 18 percent of workers in regular part-time jobs have employer-sponsored health insurance as compared to 87 percent of regular full-time workers. Part-time workers receive fewer other benefits than full-time workers. For example, 19 percent of regular part-time workers have employer-provided pensions as compared to 60 percent of regular full-time workers (Hudson 1999). More over, Ferber and Waldfogel (2000) find that past experience in part-time employment reduces the probability of a worker having health insurance and pension coverage in the United States.

²⁷ Some of these protections are evidenced in the European Council Directive EU91712175N (Council of Ministers 1997) as described in F. Michon, 1999.. In addition, part-time workers may be covered by specific protections in national law. For example, the Netherlands requires equal treatment in terms of hourly earnings and social protection for part-time and full-time workers fulfilling equal functions based on the 1996 Law on Equal Treatment of Part-Time and Full-Time Employment (OCED 1999 p 25, footnote 10).

In Japan, part-time work is more likely to be associated with low wages, few benefits, and little job security than regular full-time arrangements (Houseman and Osawa 2001, 7). Japanese employers are not obligated to pay social security, disability, and unemployment insurance taxes for many part-time and temporary workers²⁸ (Houseman and Osawa 2001, p. 9). The situation is mitigated with regards to health insurance. Since 1961, Japan has a universal program in which everyone has been enrolled in some form of health insurance. Moreover, wage and salary workers generally are enrolled in company-provided health insurance plans in which the premium is financed through a payroll tax jointly paid by the employer and the worker. Nevertheless, employers are not required to provide health insurance to those working fewer than three-fourths the hours of regular workers (Houseman and Osawa 2001, 10).

BENEFITS: TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT & TEMP AGENCY

Several European Union countries mandate parity in wages and benefits for workers in most forms of temporary employment, whether direct-hire temporaries or through a temporary agency. As a result, on the face of it, such workers remain eligible for all socially administered employment-based benefits in countries with parity legislation. Nevertheless, as these workers may experience employment instability, they may not meet some of the hours, seniority, and earnings thresholds necessary for eligibility for some social benefits (sick leave or family leave for example.) For fixed-term contracts, the European Union issued a directive covering “nondiscrimination” principles and parity in 1999 (EU31990L0070). A proposed directive on temporary agency work is still under debate as of spring 2002.

In Canada, like part-time workers, temporary or contract workers were less likely than full-time or permanent workers to be entitled to company pensions, health plans, dental plans, paid sick leave, and paid vacation leave in 1995 (Table M). According to the 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements, only 19.9 percent of non-permanent workers (which includes temporary or contract workers) were entitled to an employer sponsored pension plan other than the Canada/Quebec Pension Plan while 58.4 percent of full-time workers were entitled (Lipsett and Reesor 1997).²⁹

Like other nonstandard workers in the United States, agency temporaries, on-call workers, direct-hire temporaries (and regular part-time workers) are still much less likely than regular full-time workers to have health insurance and private pension plans. For example, in 2001, 10.7 percent of temporary help agency workers and 29.8 percent of on-call workers were eligible for employer sponsored health insurance compared to 58.3

²⁸ “Specifically, employers are not required to pay social security taxes on the wages of workers who work less than three-fourths of regular workers’ hours and disability and unemployment insurance taxes on workers who work less than 20 hours per week or who have less than a one-year contract or are expected to work less than one year. (footnote 13 in Houseman and Osawa 2001, p. 9).

²⁹ Calculations by Human Resources Development Canada based on the 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements, Statistics Canada provide figures for non-permanent employment that includes on-call or casual jobs, temporary or non-seasonal contract jobs, seasonal jobs, and temporary help agency jobs.

percent of workers in standard arrangements. And 7.6 percent of temporary help agency workers and 31.3 percent of on call workers were eligible for the employer-sponsored pension plan compared to 49.5 percent of workers in standard arrangements (Table EEE, BLS 2001)³⁰.

Eligibility for universal programs such as unemployment insurance is difficult to ascertain in the US case. For example, Mehta and Theodore (2001) argue that the corporate practice of outsourcing high-turnover positions to the temporary staffing industry challenges the effectiveness of the current unemployment insurance which is designed to discourage chronic, temporary layoffs (experience based system). Staffing agencies have few opportunities to recover increased unemployment insurance taxes³¹ through increased billing rates to employer clients because of severe competition. Their cost recovery strategies therefore rely on containing administrative costs, holding down wages paid to temporary workers, and limiting future unemployment insurance claims in order to maintain control over their UI tax rates. One consequence is that the temporary staffing industry has advocated sometimes successfully for rule changes and regulations at the state level to make it more difficult for temporary-agency workers to collect UI-benefits. (Mehta and Theodore 2001, 23).

In Japan, employers are not obligated to pay social security, disability, and unemployment insurance taxes for many part-time and temporary workers³² (Houseman and Osawa 2001, 9). This is particularly true for those with short hours.

BENEFITS: OWN-ACCOUNT & INDEPENDENT CONTRACTING

Own account self employment and access to social protection

By definition all those classified as self-employed—whether own account or employer—do not tap into the system of social protection that has been constructed by welfare states for the wage and salary workforce. They are responsible for their own contributions to national retirement plans (in countries with universal systems where they are eligible to enroll), health insurance schemes, and other protection mechanisms. In some countries, enrollment and payment of a premium out of one's resources is mandated by law. For example, most countries have a tax-financed old age pension system with mandatory contributions. Self employed workers are usually ineligible for government-run unemployment insurance, being responsible for generating their own jobs.

³⁰ Excludes incorporated and unincorporated self-employed and independent contractors.

³¹ In April 2001 alone, job losses in the temporary employment sector accounted for nearly half of all job losses nationwide, (Mehta and Theodore 2001, 2).

³² See Houseman and Osawa (2001, p. 9): "Specifically, employers are not required to pay social security taxes on the wages of workers who work less than three-fourths of regular workers' hours and disability and unemployment insurance taxes on workers who work less than 20 hours per week or who have less than a one-year contract or are expected to work less than one year.

Women are more likely to be in own account self employment in many OECD countries, and therefore are exposed to these risks of self employment while benefiting from few of the benefits of autonomous self employment.

US independent contracting

As noted earlier, US independent contractors are, for the most part, self employed workers with only one client at a time. Among all US nonstandard workers independent contractors earn relatively higher wages than their regular full-time counterparts when controlling for personal and job characteristics (Table EE and State of Working America p, 237). This is likely due to the client employers having to pay higher cash wage to compensate for lack of health or pension benefits (Mishel, et. al. 2001). Table EEE shows the percentage of workers, by work arrangement, with health and pension coverage through their employer in 2001 and reveals that 73.3 percent of independent contractors have health insurance from all sources as compared to 82.8 percent for those in standard arrangements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anker, Richard. 1998. *Gender and Jobs: Sex Segregation of Occupations in the World*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organization.
- Carré, Françoise with the assistance of Pamela Joshi. 1998. "Temporary and Contracted Work: Policy Issues and Innovative Responses." MIT Task Force on Reconstructing America's Labor Market Institutions. Working Paper No.2.
- Carré, Françoise. 2001. "Nonstandard Work Arrangements in France and the United States: Institutional Contexts, Labor Market Conditions, and Patterns of Use." Conference paper for Nonstandard Work Arrangements in Japan, Europe, and the United States, August 2000, Michigan.
- Carré, Françoise and Marianne A. Ferber, Lonnie Golden, and Stephen A. Herzenberg, editors. 2000. *Nonstandard Work: The Nature and Challenges of Changing Employment Arrangements*. Champaign, ILL: Industrial Relations Research Association.
- Commission for Labor Cooperation (North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation). 1997. *North American Labor Markets: A Comparative Profile*. Dallas: Texas: Commission for Labor Cooperation.
- Cranfield. 1997. *Working Time and Contract Flexibility in the EU: Main Report*, Cranfield University School of Management, Bedford, England. Cited in OECD 1999.
- Doudeijns, M. 1998. "Are Benefits a Disincentive to Work Part-Time?", in O'Reilly, J. and Fagan, C. (eds.), *Part-Time Prospect*. Routledge, London and New York, pp. 116-136. Cited in OECD 1999.
- European Commission. 1996. *Employment in Europe*. Official Publications of the European Communities: Luxembourg. Cited in Fagan, Colette, and Kevin Ward. 2000. "Regulatory Convergence? Nonstandard Work in the UK and the Netherlands." Conference paper for Nonstandard Work Arrangements in Japan, Europe, and the United States, August 2000, Michigan.
- Fagan, Colette, and Kevin Ward. 2000. "Regulatory Convergence? Nonstandard Work in the UK and the Netherlands." Conference paper for Nonstandard Work Arrangements in Japan, Europe, and the United States, August 2000, Michigan.
- Ferber, Marianne and Waldfogel, Jane (2000). "The Effects of Part-Time and Self-Employment on Wages and Benefits: Differences by Race/Ethnicity and Gender". In Françoise Carre, Marianne Ferber, Lonnie Golden, and Steve Herzenberg (eds.). *The Rise of Nonstandard Work Arrangements: Dimensions, Causes, Consequences, and Institutional Responses*. Ithaca: Industrial Relations Research Association and Cornell University Press.
- Hoffman, Edeltraud, and Ulrich Walwei. 2000. "The Change in Work Arrangement in Denmark and Germany: Erosion or Renaissance of Standards?" Conference paper for Nonstandard Work Arrangements in Japan, Europe, and the United States, August 2000, Michigan.
- Houseman, Susan N. 1997. *Temporary, Part-Time, and Contract Employment in the United States: A Report on the WE Upjohn Institute's Employer Survey on Flexible Staffing Policies*. W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan..

- Houseman, Susan N. 1999. "Why Employers Use Flexible Staffing Arrangements: Evidence from an Establishment Survey." Working Paper, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan..
- Houseman, Susan, and Machiko Osawa. 2000. "The Growth of Nonstandard Employment in Japan and the United States: A Comparison of Causes and Consequences." Conference paper for Nonstandard Work Arrangements in Japan, Europe, and the United States, August 2000, Michigan.
- Houseman, Susan N. and Anne E. Polivka. 1999. "The Implications of Flexible Staffing Arrangements for Job Stability." Working Paper, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan..
- Hudson, Ken. 1999. "No Shortage of 'Nonstandard' Jobs: Nearly 30% of workers employed in part-time, temping, and other alternative arrangements." Economic Policy Institute Briefing Paper. Washington, D.C: Economic Policy Institute.
- International Labour Organization. 2000. *World Labour Report 2000: Income Security and Social Protection in a Changing World*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organization.
- Krahn, Harvey. 1995. "Nonstandard work on the rise." Perspectives on Labour and Income (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 75-001E) Winter 1995: 35-42.
- Lipsett, Brenda and Mark Reesor. 1997. "Flexible Work Arrangements: Evidence from the 1991 and 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements," Research Paper R-97-10E. Quebec, Canada: Human Resources Development Canada.
- Mehta, Chirag and Nik Theodore. 2001. "The Temporary Staffing Industry and U.S. Labor Markets: Implications for the Unemployment Insurance System", paper prepared for America's Workforce Network Research Conference, June 25-26, 2001, Washington, D.C.
- Michon, Francois. 1999. "Temporary Agency Work in Europe." European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Accessed online Dec 13, 2001: <http://217.141.24.196/1999/01/Study/TN9901201S.html>.
- Mishel, Lawrence, Jared Bernstein, and John Schmitt. 2001. *The State of Working America 2000/2001*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2000. *OECD Employment Outlook*. Paris: OECD.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 1999. *OECD Employment Outlook*. Paris: OECD.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 1998. *OECD Employment Outlook*. Paris: OECD.
- Piore, Michael J. 2001. "Rethinking International Labor Standards" paper presented at MIT IWER Seminar and "under revision".
- Pold, H. "Jobs! Jobs! Jobs!" Perspectives on Labour and Income (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 75-001-XPEZ) 6, no.3 (Autumn 1994): 14-17. Cited in Krahn, 1995.
- Smith, M., Fagan, C., and Rubery, J. 1998. "Where and why is part-time work growing in Europe?" in Jacqueline O'Reilly, and Colette Fagan, eds. *Part-Time Prospects: An International Comparison of Part-Time Work in Europe, North America and the Pacific Rim*. London: Routledge.
- Standing, Guy. 1999. *Global Labour Flexibility*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Tilly, Chris. 1992. "Short hours, short shrifts: the causes and consequences of part-time employment", in duRivage, Virginia L. (ed.): *New policies for the part-time and contingent workforce*. Washington, DC, Economic Policy Institute, pp. 15-43.
- United Nations. 2000. *The World's Women 2000: Trends and Statistics*. New York: United Nations.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2001. *Contingent and Alternative Arrangements*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Vosko, Leah F. 2000. *Temporary Work: The Gendered Rise of a Precarious Employment Relationship*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

TABLE A: Selected Work & nonstandard work arrangements in E.U. Europe, 1988 and 1998 (% total employment)

| | Total employment (in thousands) | | Self-employment (including family workers) | | Self-employment without employees (own account) Non- agriculture | | | | Part-time employment | | Temporary Employment ¹ | | Temporary Employment ² | | Non-standard work arrangements ³ | |
|----------------|------------------------------------|--------|--|------|--|------|------|------|-------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|------|---|------|
| | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 |
| Germany 4 | 26999 | 35537 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 3.1 | 4.3 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 13.2 | 18.3 | 10.1 | 10.9 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 19.7 | 26.0 |
| Denmark | 2683 | 2679 | 11.0 | 9.7 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 23.7 | 22.3 | 10.2 | 9.1 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 29.1 | 28.3 |
| Austria | | 3626 | | 13.8 | | 2.1 | | 3.8 | | 15.8 | | 6.8 | | 3.1 | | 19.8 |
| Belgium | 3483 | 3857 | 18.0 | 17.4 | 11.7 | 12.3 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 9.8 | 15.7 | 4.5 | 6.4 | 3.4 | 5.5 | 23.3 | 31.0 |
| Spain | 11709 | 13161 | 29.1 | 23.0 | 12.6 | 11.3 | 6.5 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 8.1 | 15.8 | 25.3 | 15.3 | 24.3 | 31.1 | 39.6 |
| Finland | | 2179 | | 14.6 | | 5.6 | | 4.6 | | 11.7 | | 15.1 | | 13.8 | | 26.9 |
| France | 21503 | 22469 | 16.2 | 12.5 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 12.0 | 17.3 | 6.6 | 12.2 | 4.6 | 10.3 | 19.8 | 27.7 |
| Greece | 3651 | 3967 | 49.5 | 43.4 | 15.4 | 15.5 | 14.2 | 9.7 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 8.8 | 7.4 | 8.5 | 7.0 | 27.7 | 26.4 |
| Ireland | 1090 | 1496 | 25.3 | 20.2 | 6.7 | 6.9 | 10.6 | 5.8 | 8.0 | 16.7 | 6.8 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 4.7 | 17.2 | 24.5 |
| Italy | 21085 | 20357 | 29.5 | 28.7 | 18.9 | 10.2 | 4.7 | 1.8 | 5.6 | 7.4 | 4.1 | 6.1 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 25.2 | 19.5 |
| Luxembourg | 152 | 171 | 11.2 | 9.4 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 6.6 | 9.4 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 11.8 | 12.3 |
| Netherlands | 5903 | 7402 | 12.1 | 11.6 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 30.2 | 38.7 | 7.7 | 11.2 | 7.0 | 11.1 | 35.9 | 44.6 |
| Portugal | 4427 | 4764 | 30.9 | 28.2 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 14.4 | 9.4 | 6.5 | 11.1 | 12.6 | 12.4 | 12.5 | 12.0 | 25.8 | 30.1 |
| Sweden | | 3946 | | 11.4 | | 5.4 | | 1.5 | | 23.2 | | 11.4 | | 11.3 | | 32.7 |
| United Kingdom | 25660 | 26883 | 12.7 | 12.5 | 7.8 | 8.4 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 21.9 | 24.9 | 5.2 | 6.1 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 29.9 | 34.0 |
| European Union | 128345 | 152494 | 19.1 | 16.6 | 8.6 | 7.1 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 13.2 | 17.4 | 7.8 | 10.6 | 6.0 | 8.5 | 25.1 | 29.2 |

¹Dependent employees inc. apprentices, trainees, research assistants, etc. Note: temporary employment includes both agency temporary em

²Dependent employees excl. apprentices, trainees, research assistants, etc. Note: temporary employment includes both agency temporary er

³Sum of self-employment in non-agricultural industries, part-time and temporary employment; corrected for double counting.

⁴ 1988 excl./1998 inc. the new German Lander

Source: Eurostat, Labour Force Survey as reported in Hoffman and Walwei 2000

TABLE A1: Selected work & non-standard work arrangements in E.U. Europe, 1988 and 1998 (% total employment)

| | Total Employment (in thousands) | | | Self-employment without employees (own account) | | | | Part-time employment | | Temporary Employment ¹ | | Non-standard work arrangements ² | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|--------|--------------------|--|------|------|------|-------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|------|---|------|
| | 1988 | 1998 | '88-'89 pct chg | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 | 1988 | 1998 |
| Germany ³ | 26999 | 35537 | 31.62% | 3.1 | 4.3 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 13.2 | 18.3 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 19.7 | 26.0 |
| Denmark | 2683 | 2679 | -0.15% | 2.5 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 23.7 | 22.3 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 29.1 | 28.3 |
| Austria | | 3626 | | | 2.1 | | 3.8 | | 15.8 | | 3.1 | | 19.8 |
| Belgium | 3483 | 3857 | 10.74% | 11.7 | 12.3 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 9.8 | 15.7 | 3.4 | 5.5 | 23.3 | 31.0 |
| Spain | 11709 | 13161 | 12.40% | 12.6 | 11.3 | 6.5 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 8.1 | 15.3 | 24.3 | 31.1 | 39.6 |
| Finland | | 2179 | | | 5.6 | | 4.6 | | 11.7 | | 13.8 | | 26.9 |
| France | 21503 | 22469 | 4.49% | 4.6 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 12.0 | 17.3 | 4.6 | 10.3 | 19.8 | 27.7 |
| Greece | 3651 | 3967 | 8.66% | 15.4 | 15.5 | 14.2 | 9.7 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 8.5 | 7.0 | 27.7 | 26.4 |
| Ireland | 1090 | 1496 | 37.25% | 6.7 | 6.9 | 10.6 | 5.8 | 8.0 | 16.7 | 5.7 | 4.7 | 17.2 | 24.5 |
| Italy | 21085 | 20357 | -3.45% | 18.9 | 10.2 | 4.7 | 1.8 | 5.6 | 7.4 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 25.2 | 19.5 |
| Luxembourg | 152 | 171 | 12.50% | 3.9 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 6.6 | 9.4 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 11.8 | 12.3 |
| Netherlands | 5903 | 7402 | 25.39% | 4.9 | 5.5 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 30.2 | 38.7 | 7.0 | 11.1 | 35.9 | 44.6 |
| Portugal | 4427 | 4764 | 7.61% | 8.7 | 10.1 | 14.4 | 9.4 | 6.5 | 11.1 | 12.5 | 12.0 | 25.8 | 30.1 |
| Sweden | | 3946 | | | 5.4 | | 1.5 | | 23.2 | | 11.3 | | 32.7 |
| United Kingdom | 25660 | 26883 | 4.77% | 7.8 | 8.4 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 21.9 | 24.9 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 29.9 | 34.0 |
| European Union | 128345 | 152494 | 18.82% | 8.6 | 7.1 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 13.2 | 17.4 | 6.0 | 8.5 | 25.1 | 29.2 |

¹ Dependent employees excl. apprentices, trainees, research assistants, etc. Note: temporary employment includes both agency temporary employment (through an intermediary) and fixed-term (direct hire) employment.

² Sum of self-employment in non-agricultural industries, part-time and temporary employment; corrected for double counting.

³ 1988 excl./1998 inc. the new German Lander

Source: Eurostat, Labour Force Survey as reported in Hoffman and Walwei 2000

TABLE B: Trends in fixed-term contracts

| | % of employees with fixed-term contracts ¹ | | | | % concentration of EU-15 fixed-term contracts 1998 | % of fixed-term contract employees who are women 1998 ³ | % female employees with fixed-term contracts ⁴ |
|-----------------------|---|------|------|------|--|--|---|
| European Union | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 | 1998 | 1998 | 1998 | 1998 |
| Austria | na | na | 6 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 43.3 | 7.7 |
| Belgium | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 56.5 | 10.4 |
| Denmark | 12 | 11 | 12 | 10.1 | 1.5 | 51.8 | 11 |
| Finland | 11 | 12 | 17 | 17.7 | 2.1 | 49.9 | 21.9 |
| France | 5 | 11 | 12 | 13.9 | 16.9 | 49.9 | 15 |
| Germany ² | 10 | 11 | 10 | 12.3 | 23.9 | 45 | 12.5 |
| Greece | 21 | 17 | 10 | 13 | 1.8 | 43.5 | 14.7 |
| Ireland | 7 | 9 | 10 | 7.7 | 0.5 | 57.5 | 9.8 |
| Italy | 5 | 5 | 7 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 46.8 | 10.2 |
| Luxembourg | 5 | 3 | na | 2.9 | <0.5 | 50 | 3.7 |
| Netherlands | 8 | 8 | 11 | 12.7 | 5.2 | 54 | 16.1 |
| Portugal | 14 | 18 | 10 | 17.4 | 3.7 | 48.2 | 18.5 |
| Spain | 16 | 30 | 35 | 32.9 | 20.6 | 38.4 | 34.4 |
| Sweden | 12 | 10 | 13 | 12.1 | 2.8 | 58.6 | 15.2 |
| United Kingdom | 7 | 5 | 7 | 7.1 | 10.2 | 55.3 | 8.3 |

Fixed-term contract refers to delimited contract on which an employee is either directly employed or employed through a temporary work agency. Employees with fixed-term contracts include the following categories in the European Labour Force Survey:

* Employee hired for a job that ends on a specific date, completion of a task or the return of another employee who has been temporary replaced;

* Persons engaged by an agency or employment exchange and hired to a third party to perform a specific task. Note that persons with a written work contract of unlimited duration with the agency or employment exchange are not counted as temporary employees;

* Seasonal employees;

* Persons with specific training contracts.

¹ Source: European Labour Force Survey. Data for 1985-96 extracted from European Commission Employment in Europe, 1996 and 1997 editions. 1998 data is calculated from tables 28 and 31 of the European Labour Force Survey published results, as reported in Fagan and Ward 2000.

² Note: German data from 1991 refers to unified Germany; as reported in Fagan and Ward 2000.

³ Source: European Labour Force Survey 1998: tables 30 and 36; as reported in Fagan and Ward 2000.

⁴ Source: European Labour Force Survey 1998: table 28; as reported in Fagan and Ward 2000.

TABLE B1: Trends in temporary employment/fixed-term contracts
(note these numbers are more inclusive & larger than Temp Emp 1 and Temp 2 from Table A1)

| | % of employees with fixed-term contracts ¹ | | | | | | | % concentration of EU-15 fixed-term contracts 1998 | % of fixed-term contract employees who are women 1998 ³ | % female employees with fixed-term contracts ⁴ |
|-----------------------|---|------|------|------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|---|
| European Union | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 | 1998 | 85-98chg | 90-98chg | 95-98chg | 1998 | 1998 | 1998 |
| Austria | na | na | 6 | 7.8 | | | 1.8 | 1.5 | 43.3 | 7.7 |
| Belgium | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7.8 | 0.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 56.5 | 10.4 |
| Denmark | 12 | 11 | 12 | 10.1 | -1.9 | -0.9 | -1.9 | 1.5 | 51.8 | 11 |
| Finland | 11 | 12 | 17 | 17.7 | 6.7 | 5.7 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 49.9 | 21.9 |
| France | 5 | 11 | 12 | 13.9 | 8.9 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 16.9 | 49.9 | 15 |
| Germany ² | 10 | 11 | 10 | 12.3 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 23.9 | 45 | 12.5 |
| Greece | 21 | 17 | 10 | 13 | -8 | -4 | 3 | 1.8 | 43.5 | 14.7 |
| Ireland | 7 | 9 | 10 | 7.7 | 0.7 | -1.3 | -2.3 | 0.5 | 57.5 | 9.8 |
| Italy | 5 | 5 | 7 | 8.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 7.7 | 46.8 | 10.2 |
| Luxembourg | 5 | 3 | na | 2.9 | -2.1 | -0.1 | | <0.5 | 50 | 3.7 |
| Netherlands | 8 | 8 | 11 | 12.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 54 | 16.1 |
| Portugal | 14 | 18 | 10 | 17.4 | 3.4 | -0.6 | 7.4 | 3.7 | 48.2 | 18.5 |
| Spain | 16 | 30 | 35 | 32.9 | 16.9 | 2.9 | -2.1 | 20.6 | 38.4 | 34.4 |
| Sweden | 12 | 10 | 13 | 12.1 | 0.1 | 2.1 | -0.9 | 2.8 | 58.6 | 15.2 |
| United Kingdom | 7 | 5 | 7 | 7.1 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 10.2 | 55.3 | 8.3 |

Fixed-term contract refers to delimited contract on which an employee is either directly employed or employed through a temporary work agency.

Employees with fixed-term contracts include the following categories in the European Labour Force Survey:

* Employee hired for a job that ends on a specific date, completion of a task or the return of another employee who has been temporary replaced;

* Persons engaged by an agency or employment exchange and hired to a third party to perform a specific task. Note that persons with a written work contract of unlimited duration with the agency or employment exchange are not counted as temporary employees;

* Seasonal employees;

* Persons with specific training contracts.

¹ Source: European Labour Force Survey. Data for 1985-96 extracted from European Commission Employment in Europe, 1996 and 1997 editions. 1998 data is calculated from tables 28 and 31 of the European Labour Force Survey published results; as reported in Fagan and Ward 2000.

² Note: German data from 1991 refers to unified Germany; as reported in Fagan and Ward 2000.

³ Source: European Labour Force Survey 1998: tables 30 and 36; as reported in Fagan and Ward 2000.

⁴ Source: European Labour Force Survey 1998: table 28; as reported in Fagan and Ward 2000.

TABLE CC: US Employment in personnel services industry 1973 to 1999

| Year | Number (thousands) | | | As percentage of total employment | | |
|------|--------------------|------|-------|-----------------------------------|------|-------|
| | All | Men | Women | All | Men | Women |
| 1973 | 247 | 118 | 128 | 0.3% | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| 1979 | 508 | 210 | 298 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| 1989 | 1455 | 581 | 874 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.8 |
| 1992 | 1629 | 676 | 954 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| 1999 | 3405 | 1584 | 1821 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 1.5 |

Source: BLS data analyzed by Mishel et. al. 2001.

TABLE CCC: US Employment in temporary help industry 1982 to 1999

| Year | Number (thousands) | | | As percentage of total employment | | |
|------|--------------------|------|-------|-----------------------------------|------|-------|
| | All | Men | Women | All | Men | Women |
| 1982 | 417 | 158 | 259 | 0.5% | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| 1989 | 1216 | 494 | 722 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| 1992 | 1411 | 594 | 817 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.8 |
| 1999 | 3017 | 1437 | 1580 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 1.2 |

Source: BLS data analyzed by Mishel et. al. 2001.

TABLE C: Percentage of Workers with Alternative Employment Arrangements ⁵

| Work Arrangement | Percent of all employed | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | 1995 | 1999 | 2001 ¹ |
| Regular part-time | 16.5 | 15.5 | 17.85 |
| Temporary help agency | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.86 |
| Direct-hire temporaries | na | 4.1 ⁴ | na |
| On call | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.55 |
| Independent contractors | 6.7 | 6.3 | 6.37 |
| Contract firms | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.47 |
| Total nonstandard | 9.9 | 9.3 | 9.26 |
| All nonstandard | 26.4 | 24.8 | 24.52 |
| Regular full-time | 73.6 | 75.1 | 75.32 |

TABLE D: Distribution of Workers with Alternative Arrangements by Gender

| % of Independent Contractors who are: | 1995 | 1999 | 2001 ² |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|-------------------|
| Men | 67.3 | 66.2 | 64.5 |
| Women | 32.7 | 33.8 | 35.5 |
| On-call Workers | | | |
| Men | 48.4 | 48.8 | 53.1 |
| Women | 51.6 | 51.2 | 46.9 |
| Temporary Help Agency Workers | | | |
| Men | 47.2 | 42.2 | 41.1 |
| Women | 52.8 | 57.8 | 58.9 |
| Workers provided by contract firms | | | |
| Men | 71.5 | 70.5 | 70.6 |
| Women | 28.5 | 29.5 | 29.4 |
| Workers with traditional arrangements | | | |
| Men | 52.8 | 52.4 | 52.2 |
| Women | 47.2 | 47.6 | 47.8 |

TABLE E: Percentage of Male and Female Workers with Alternative Arrangements

| | 1995 | | 1999 | | 2001 ³ | |
|---------------------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Independent Contractors | 8.4 | 4.8 | 7.8 | 4.5 | 7.75 | 4.82 |
| On-call workers | 1.4 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.55 | 1.55 |
| Temporary Help Agency Workers | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.67 | 1.08 |
| Workers provided by contract firms | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.62 | 0.29 |
| Workers with traditional arrangements | 88.5 | 92 | 89.2 | 92.2 | 89.18 | 92.14 |

Source (Tables C, D, & E): Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1995, 1999, 2001.

¹ BLS 2001 table 5.

² BLS 2001 table 6.

³ BLS 2001 table 5.

⁴ Direct-hire temporaries is estimate derived from 1999 supplement to CPS by Houseman and Osawa (rev 2001, p. 33)

⁵ Percentage of all employed persons, except unpaid family workers, were included in the CPS February supplements conducted in 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001. For persons holding more than one job, the questions referred to the characteristics of their main job--the job in which they worked the most hours. (From BLS 2001 Technical Note)

TABLE EE: USA Wages of nonstandard workers compared to regular full-time workers, by gender and work arrangement 1997

| <u>Work Arrangement</u> | <u>Women</u> | <u>Men</u> |
|---|--------------|------------|
| Controlling for personal characteristics | | |
| Regular part time | -20% | -27% |
| Temporary help agency | -18% | -15% |
| On call | -20% | -10% |
| Self-employed | -26% | -11% |
| Independent contracting | -7% | --- |
| Contract company | --- | 8% |
| Controlling for personal and job characteristics | | |
| Regular part time | -6% | -8% |
| Temporary help agency | --- | --- |
| On call | -6% | --- |
| Self-employed | -7% | 19% |
| Independent contracting | 13% | 20% |
| Contract company | --- | 7% |

Note: The dependent variable is log (wage). The model of personal characteristics controls for four race/ethnicity categories, six education levels, four Census regions, three urbanicity categories, age and age squared, two marital status categories, being a leased worker, and whether born in the U.S. The model, which includes job characteristics, also has controls for 14 industries, 12 occupations, receipt of either employer-sponsored health insurance or a pension, and union membership or coverage by a union contract.

--- indicates that the difference is not statistically significant. All other differences are statistically significant.

Source: Hudson 1999 analysis of February 1997 Supplement to the Current Population Survey.

TABLE EEE: USA Health and Pension coverage by nonstandard work arrangement 2001

| | Percent with health insurance | | Percent eligible for pension ² | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---|-------------|
| | Employer-provided ¹ | All sources | Included in pension plan | All sources |
| Temporary help agency | 10.7 | 48.1 | 7.6 | 13.3 |
| On call | 29.8 | 70.0 | 31.3 | 36.9 |
| Independent contracting | n.a. | 72.5 | 2.3 | 3.5 |
| Contract company | 52.1 | 80.1 | 47.7 | 55.7 |
| Standard arrangements | 58.3 | 83.1 | 49.5 | 54.5 |

¹ Excludes incorporated and unincorporated self-employed and independent contractors.

² Excludes incorporated and unincorporated self-employed; includes self-employed independent contractors.

Source: BLS, Contingent and Alternative Employment Arrangements, February 2001.

TABLE F: Japan: Trends in nonstandard employment

| | part-time | temporary | day laborers | agency temporary | |
|---------|-----------|-----------|--------------|------------------|--|
| 1982 | 11.0 | 7.9 | 3.7 | na | |
| 1987 | 14.2 | 8.9 | 3.1 | 0.2 | |
| 1992 | 16.1 | 8.4 | 2.8 | 0.3 | |
| 1997 | 18.8 | 9.2 | 2.6 | 0.5 | |
| 1982-97 | 7.8 | 1.3 | -1.1 | 0.3 ¹ | |

Source: Bureau of Statistics Management Coordination Agency, Employment Status Survey

¹ Change from 1987-97

TABLE G: Distribution of 1997 Employment by Employment Arrangement and Temporary Status, Japan, in percent ¹

| | (1) Not Temporary | (2) Temp/Day Laborer | Sum 1 + 2 |
|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| Full-time | 76.5 | 0.6 | 77.1 |
| Part-time | 9.6 | 9.2 | 18.8 |
| Shukko ² | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.8 |
| Temp agency | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Other | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.9 |
| Total | 88.2 | 11.8 | 100 |

¹ Figures are percent of paid employment. Numbers in parentheses are the percent within each employment arrangement that is temporary. Japan data from special tabulations of the Bureau of Statistics Employment Status Survey.

² Workers transferred by their parent company to a subsidiary company.

Source: 1997 Employment Status Survey (note: categories are defined to be mutually exclusive; special tabulations by Hoffman and Walwei separate out temp/day laborers).

TABLE GG

Distribution and Incidence of nonstandard employment by gender and age in Japan 1997 and the United States 1999¹ (in percent)

| | Part-time | | Temporary | | Agency Temporary | |
|--------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| | U.S. | Japan | U.S. | Japan | U.S. | Japan |
| Male | 31.1 (10.5) | 20.2 (6.3) | 48.6 (3.8) | 34.1 (6.7) | 42.2 (0.8) | 20.6 (0.2) |
| Female | 68.9 (25.3) | 79.8 (37.8) | 51.4 (4.3) | 66 (19.6) | 57.8 (1.2) | 79.4 (1.0) |

¹ Figures for Japan come from the 1997 Employment Status Survey, Bureau of Statistics. Figures for part-time employment in the United States are tabulations by Houseman and Osawa (2001) from the out-going rotation groups of the 1999 Current Population Survey. Figures for temporary and agency temporary employment in the United States come from the tabulation of Houseman and Osawa (2001) of the February 1999 Supplement to the CPS. Figures in parentheses are the percent within the group that are part-time, temporary, or agency temporary.

TABLE H: Canada: Non-standard Employment among 16-64 year-olds by gender and industry

| | Total Employment | | Part-time | | Temporary ¹ | | Multiple Jobholders | | Own Account ² | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-------|-----------|------|------------------------|------|---------------------|------|--------------------------|------|
| | 1989 | 1994 | 1989 | 1994 | 1989 | 1994 | 1989 | 1994 | 1989 | 1994 |
| | ,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Both Sexes | 12468 | 12799 | 1905 | 1972 | 799 | 970 | 635 | 944 | 858 | 1147 |
| Women | 5535 | 5764 | 1400 | 1379 | 408 | 433 | 302 | 486 | 327 | 486 |
| Men | 6933 | 7035 | 505 | 593 | 391 | 537 | 333 | 458 | 531 | 661 |
| | % of total employment ³ | | | | | | | | | |
| Both Sexes | 100 | 100 | 15 | 15 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 9 |
| Women | 100 | 100 | 25 | 24 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 8 |
| Men | 100 | 100 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Industry | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 278 | 369 | -- | 50 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 124 | 190 |
| Natural resource-based | 818 | 759 | -- | -- | 28 | 58 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Manufacturing | 1779 | 1560 | 71 | 62 | 73 | 90 | 88 | 75 | 39 | 32 |
| Construction | 626 | 671 | 35 | 52 | 69 | 95 | -- | 58 | 81 | 151 |
| Distributive Services | 1326 | 1366 | 89 | 105 | 50 | 72 | 54 | 75 | 86 | 120 |
| Business Services | 1337 | 1556 | 135 | 179 | 52 | 78 | 78 | 107 | 123 | 229 |
| Social Services | 2050 | 2317 | 484 | 521 | 184 | 273 | 143 | 225 | 77 | 86 |
| Public Administration | 1124 | 908 | 74 | 47 | 90 | 99 | 41 | 54 | -- | -- |
| Retail Trade | 1628 | 1613 | 515 | 472 | 88 | 52 | 59 | 160 | 117 | 91 |
| Other consumer services | 1337 | 1584 | 424 | 456 | 136 | 128 | 130 | 124 | 152 | 219 |
| | % of total employment ⁴ | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total Employment | | Part-time | | Temporary ¹ | | Multiple Jobholders | | Own Account | |
| | 1989 | 1994 | 1989 | 1994 | 1989 | 1989 | 1989 | 1994 | 1989 | 1994 |
| ALL INDUSTRIES ⁵ | 100 | 100 | 15 | 15 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 9 |
| Agriculture | 100 | 100 | -- | 14 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 45 | 51 |
| Natural resource-based | 100 | 100 | -- | -- | 4 | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Manufacturing | 100 | 100 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Construction | 100 | 100 | 6 | 8 | 17 | 22 | -- | 9 | 13 | 23 |
| Distributive Services | 100 | 100 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 9 |
| Business Services | 100 | 100 | 10 | 12 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 15 |
| Social Services | 100 | 100 | 24 | 22 | 10 | 13 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 4 |
| Public Administration | 100 | 100 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 4 | 6 | -- | -- |
| Retail Trade | 100 | 100 | 32 | 29 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 6 |
| Other consumer services | 100 | 100 | 32 | 29 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 14 |

Source: General Social Survey (Cycles 4 and 9) as reported in Krahn 1995

¹ Excludes the self-employed

² Self-employed workers without paid employees

³ For temporary workers, this calculation excludes the self-employed

⁴ For temporary workers, this calculation excludes the self-employed

⁵ Includes workers who did not state their industry of employment

Table I: Percentage of Women Employed in Personnel Suppliers and Employment Agencies (SIC 771) in Canada vs. Personnel Suppliers (SIC 7363) in U.S., 1985-1995

| | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Canada | 72.7 | 76.2 | 73.6 | 73.4 | 70.4 | 79.6 | 77.7 | 67.9 | 60.9 | 64.2 | 61.5 |
| USA | 60.8 | 60.8 | 59.5 | 59.6 | 59.4 | 59.1 | 57.5 | 57.9 | 57.1 | 55.5 | 54.2 |

Source: United States Department of Labor (1996). LABSTAT Series Report, Series EEU80736302; Labour Force Survey, 1996; as reported in Vosko 2000.

TABLE J: OECD Self-Employment ¹ by gender: growth rate and share of self-employment (percentages)

| | Annual average growth rates of self-employment | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|------------------------|------------|------------|------------------------|
| | Women | | | Men | | |
| | 1973-1979 | 1979-1990 | 1990-1997 ² | 1973-1979 | 1979-1990 | 1990-1997 ² |
| Australia | 8.5 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 2.4 | -0.2 |
| Belgium | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Canada | .. | 5.3 | 6.5 | .. | 3.6 | 3.8 |
| Denmark | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | -0.7 |
| Finland | -2.4 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 5.1 | 0.1 |
| France | .. | .. | 0.6 | .. | .. | -0.9 |
| Germany | -3.2 | -1.2 | 6.4 | -1.1 | 1.0 | 5.0 |
| Greece | .. | -0.1 | 3.2 | .. | 0.7 | 1.1 |
| Ireland | .. | .. | 5.7 | .. | .. | 2.4 |
| Italy | -6.0 | 3.7 | 0.1 | -0.3 | 2.3 | -0.2 |
| Japan | 0.4 | 0.0 | -2.8 | 1.3 | -0.3 | -0.8 |
| Korea | .. | .. | 5.2 | .. | .. | 5.0 |
| Netherlands | .. | .. | -0.2 | .. | .. | 3.6 |
| Norway | 1.5 | 2.6 | 0.4 | -0.7 | -0.5 | -1.1 |
| Spain | -2.3 | 2.9 | 2.6 | -0.5 | 1.9 | 1.2 |
| Sweden | 7.0 | 5.7 | 1.0 | -1.2 | 5.2 | 1.5 |
| Turkey | .. | .. | 1.3 | .. | .. | 2.1 |
| United Kingdom | -1.9 | 8.9 | -1.0 | -1.1 | 5.9 | -1.5 |
| United States | 5.7 | 4.2 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 1.4 | -0.2 |
| unweighted average ³ | 0.7 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 0.5 |

TABLE J: continued

| | Share of total self-employment | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| | Women | | | Men | | |
| | 1973-1979 | 1979-1990 | 1990-1997 ² | 1973-1979 | 1979-1990 | 1990-1997 ² |
| Australia | 27.5 | 30.5 | 32.9 | 72.5 | 69.5 | 67.1 |
| Belgium | 28.1 | 28.3 | 28.9 | 71.9 | 71.7 | 71.1 |
| Canada | .. | 29.8 | 32.7 | .. | 70.2 | 67.3 |
| Finland | .. | 34.1 | 31.1 | .. | 65.9 | 68.9 |
| France | .. | .. | 26.0 | .. | .. | 74.0 |
| Germany | 34.2 | 26.4 | 28.3 | 65.8 | 73.6 | 71.7 |
| Greece | .. | 16.6 | 19.4 | .. | 83.4 | 80.6 |
| Ireland | .. | .. | 20.1 | .. | .. | 79.9 |
| Italy | 24.5 | 21.9 | 23.4 | 75.5 | 78.1 | 76.6 |
| Japan | 33.6 | 35.5 | 33.9 | 66.4 | 64.5 | 66.1 |
| Korea | .. | .. | 30.3 | .. | .. | 69.7 |
| Netherlands | .. | .. | 32.8 | .. | .. | 67.2 |
| Norway | 21.3 | 23.5 | 28.3 | 78.7 | 76.5 | 71.7 |
| Spain | 25.2 | 24.7 | 26.8 | 74.8 | 75.3 | 73.2 |
| Sweden | 22.3 | 27.3 | 25.7 | 77.7 | 72.7 | 74.3 |
| Turkey | .. | .. | 6.8 | .. | .. | 93.2 |
| United Kingdom | 20.4 | 23.9 | 24.8 | 79.6 | 76.1 | 75.2 |
| United States | 27.2 | 32.9 | 37.0 | 72.8 | 67.1 | 63.0 |
| unweighted average ³ | 26.4 | 28.1 | 29.2 | 73.6 | 71.9 | 70.8 |

.. Data not available

¹ Excluding the agricultural sector and unpaid family workers. For some countries, all or part of owner-managers of incorporated businesses are excluded from self-employment. See notes to Table J.1.

² 1996 for Belgium, Greece, and the United Kingdom.

³ Excluding Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Korea, Mexico, Netherlands and Turkey.
Sources: OECD 2000; OECD database on annual labour force statistics; Canada national submission; Denmark, France, Ireland, and Netherlands: EUROSTAT; European Labour Force Survey.

TABLE J.1: OECD Classification of owner-managers of incorporated business (OMIBs) in labour force surveys

| | Classification of OMIBs in Table J |
|----------------|------------------------------------|
| Australia | Employees |
| Austria | Unclear |
| Belgium | Self-employed |
| Canada | Self-employed |
| Czech Republic | Unclear |
| Denmark | Mainly self-employed |
| Finland | Mainly self-employed |
| France | Mainly self-employed |
| Germany | Mainly self-employed |
| Greece | Mainly self-employed |
| Hungary | Self-employed |
| Iceland | Unclear |
| Ireland | Mainly self-employed |
| Italy | Unclear |
| Japan | Employees |
| Korea | Mainly self-employed |
| Luxembourg | Unclear |
| Mexico | Mainly self-employed |
| Netherlands | Mainly self-employed |
| New Zealand | Unclear |
| Norway | Mainly self-employed |
| Poland | Mainly self-employed |
| Portugal | Unclear |
| Spain | Self-employed |
| Sweden | Mainly self-employed |
| Switzerland | Self-employed |
| Turkey | Mainly self-employed |
| United Kingdom | Mainly self-employed |
| United States | Employees |

Sources: OECD 2000; information submitted to EUROSTAT and OECD by national authorities.

TABLE K: Proportionally fewer women are own-account workers

| | Percentage in female labour force, 1990/1997 | | Percentage in male labour force, 1990/1997 | |
|-----------------------|---|------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | Employers | Own-account workers | Employers | Own-account workers |
| <u>Western Europe</u> | 3 | 10 | 8 | 16 |
| Austria | 3 | 5 | 7 | 5 |
| Germany | 4 | 3 | 6 | 7 |
| Greece | 3 | 16 | 10 | 32 |
| Iceland | 3 | 7 | 9 | 14 |
| Ireland | 3 | 5 | 7 | 20 |
| Portugal | 4 | 22 | 8 | 20 |
| Spain | 3 | 12 | 7 | 16 |
| Australia | 3 | 8 | 6 | 12 |
| Japan | 1 | 7 | 4 | 10 |
| New Zealand | 4 | 8 | 10 | 15 |

Source: ILO, Key Indicators of the Labour Market; as reported in United Nations (2000)

TABLE L: OECD Part-time Employment¹ 1990-1998 (Incidence and composition percentages)

| | Part-time employment as a proportion of employment | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|
| | Men | | | | | Women | | | | |
| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
| Australia ^{2,3} | 11.3 | 13.5 | 14.0 | 14.6 | 14.4 | 38.5 | 40.2 | 40.0 | 41.0 | 40.7 |
| Austria | .. | 3.1 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.7 | .. | 21.6 | 21.7 | 21.3 | 22.8 |
| Belgium | 4.6 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 29.8 | 31.5 | 32.1 | 32.3 | 32.2 |
| Canada | 9.1 | 10.6 | 10.7~ | 10.5 | 10.5 | 26.8 | 28.2 | 28.9~ | 29.4 | 28.6 |
| Czech Republic | .. | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.7 | .. | 5.7 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 5.4 |
| Denmark | 10.2 | 9.7 | 10.2 | 11.1 | 9.9 | 29.6 | 25.6 | 24.2 | 24.2 | 25.4 |
| Finland | 4.8 | 6.0 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 10.6 | 11.7 | 11.3 | 12.4 | 13.0 |
| France | 4.4 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 21.7 | 24.3 | 24.1 | 25.2 | 25.0 |
| Germany | 2.3 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 29.8 | 29.1 | 29.9 | 31.4 | 32.4 |
| Greece | 4.0 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 11.5 | 13.2 | 13.8 | 14.1 | 15.9 |
| Hungary | .. | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.9 | .. | 4.6 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Iceland ⁴ | 7.5 | 9.1 | 8.4 | 10.1 | 9.8 | 39.7 | 37.8 | 35.3 | 36.8 | 38.6 |
| Ireland | 4.2 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.0 | .. | 20.5 | 26.6 | 26.4 | 27.2 | .. |
| Italy | 3.9 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.5 | 18.2 | 21.1 | 20.9 | 22.2 | 22.7 |
| Japan ^{2,6} | 9.5 | 10.0 | 11.6 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 33.2 | 34.7 | 36.6 | 38.3 | 39.0 |
| Korea ² | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 5.2 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 9.3 |
| Luxembourg | 1.6 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 19.1 | 28.4 | 24.7 | 26.2 | 29.6 |
| Netherlands | 13.4 | 11.4 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 12.4 | 52.5 | 54.7 | 55.5 | 54.8 | 54.8 |
| New Zealand | 7.9 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 10.5 | 10.6 | 34.6 | 35.5 | 36.8 | 37.0 | 37.6 |
| Norway | 6.7 | 7.5~ | 8.0 | 7.9 | 8.1 | 39.1 | 37.4~ | 37.3 | 36.9 | 35.9 |
| Poland ² | .. | .. | .. | 8.2 | 8.0 | .. | .. | .. | 16.6 | 16.6 |
| Portugal | 3.1 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 11.8 | 14.5 | 15.1 | 16.5 | 15.8 |
| Spain | 1.4 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 11.5 | 15.9 | 16.2 | 16.8 | 16.6 |
| Sweden | 5.3 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 5.6 | 24.5 | 24.1 | 23.5 | 22.6 | 22.0 |
| Switzerland ⁴ | 6.8 | 6.5 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 42.6 | 44.9 | 44.9 | 45.7 | 45.8 |
| Turkey | 4.9 | 3.9 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 18.8 | 13.2 | 12.0 | 13.5 | 13.3 |
| United Kingdom | 5.3 | 7.3 | 7.7 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 39.5 | 40.7 | 41.4 | 40.9 | 41.2 |
| United States ⁵ | 8.3~ | 8.4 | 8.4~ | 8.3 | 8.2 | 20.0~ | 20.3 | 20.2~ | 19.5 | 19.1 |
| European Union ⁷ | 4.2 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 27.0 | 28.4 | 28.7 | 29.4 | 28.1 |
| OECD Europe ⁷ | 4.4 | 4.9~ | 4.9 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 26.8 | 26.5~ | 26.6 | 26.6 | 26.1 |
| Total OECD ⁷ | 6.0~ | 6.7~ | 6.6~ | 6.9 | 7.0 | 23.6~ | 24.2~ | 24.1~ | 24.2 | 24.0 |

| Table L: cont. | Part-time employment as a proportion of total employment | | | | | Women's share in part-time employment | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-------|-------|------|------|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|
| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
| Australia ^{2,3} | 22.6 | 25.0 | 25.2 | 26.0 | 25.9 | 70.8 | 69.2 | 68.5 | 68.0 | 68.6 |
| Austria | .. | 11.1 | 10.9 | 10.8 | 11.5 | .. | 84.2 | 86.4 | 86.3 | 86.9 |
| Belgium | 14.2 | 15.6 | 16.1 | 16.2 | 16.3 | 79.9 | 82.3 | 82.4 | 82.6 | 82.4 |
| Canada | 17.0 | 18.6 | 18.9~ | 19.0 | 18.7 | 70.1 | 68.8 | 69.1~ | 69.7 | 69.5 |
| Czech Republic | .. | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.3 | .. | 70.5 | 67.3 | 69.1 | 70.0 |
| Denmark | 19.2 | 16.8 | 16.5 | 17.1 | 17.0 | 71.5 | 68.1 | 66.0 | 64.3 | 68.5 |
| Finland | 7.6 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 66.8 | 64.2 | 64.0 | 63.2 | 63.1 |
| France | 12.2 | 14.2 | 14.3 | 14.9 | 14.8 | 79.8 | 79.1 | 78.7 | 78.8 | 79.3 |
| Germany | 13.4 | 14.2 | 14.9 | 15.8 | 16.6 | 89.7 | 86.3 | 85.8 | 85.1 | 84.1 |
| Greece | 6.7 | 7.7 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 9.2 | 61.1 | 61.4 | 62.5 | 63.0 | 63.6 |
| Hungary | .. | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.4 | .. | 67.7 | 69.4 | 71.3 | 69.2 |
| Iceland ⁴ | .. | 22.5 | 20.9 | 22.4 | 23.2 | 81.6 | 78.5 | 78.3 | 75.8 | 77.4 |
| Ireland | 9.8 | 14.4 | 14.1 | 15.2 | .. | 71.8 | 72.4 | 73.2 | 72.7 | .. |
| Italy | 8.8 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 11.3 | 11.8 | 70.8 | 70.8 | 71.5 | 71.0 | 70.4 |
| Japan ^{2,6} | 19.1 | 20.1 | 21.8 | 23.2 | 23.6 | 70.5 | 70.2 | 68.2 | 67.0 | 67.5 |
| Korea ² | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 58.7 | 61.2 | 63.5 | 62.4 | 54.8 |
| Luxembourg | 7.6 | 11.4 | 10.4 | 11.1 | 12.8 | 86.5 | 89.2 | 87.3 | 89.0 | 87.3 |
| Netherlands | 28.2 | 29.0 | 29.3 | 29.1 | 30.0 | 70.4 | 76.5 | 77.2 | 77.6 | 75.8 |
| New Zealand | 19.6 | 21.0 | 22.0 | 22.4 | 22.8 | 77.1 | 74.6 | 75.0 | 74.1 | 74.3 |
| Norway | 21.3 | 21.2~ | 21.4 | 21.2 | 21.0 | 82.7 | 80.7~ | 79.7 | 80.0 | 79.1 |
| Poland ² | .. | .. | .. | 11.9 | 11.8 | .. | .. | .. | 61.1 | 62.2 |
| Portugal | 6.8 | 8.6 | 9.2 | 10.2 | 9.9 | 74.0 | 75.3 | 72.9 | 72.6 | 70.9 |
| Spain | 4.6 | 7.1 | 7.5 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 79.5 | 77.1 | 75.1 | 74.8 | 75.9 |
| Sweden | 14.5 | 15.1 | 14.8 | 14.2 | 13.5 | 81.1 | 76.8 | 76.5 | 76.3 | 97.3 |
| Switzerland ⁴ | 22.1 | 22.9 | 23.7 | 24.0 | 24.2 | 82.4 | 83.8 | 82.4 | 83.4 | 83.4 |
| Turkey | 9.2 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 62.5 | 59.2 | 63.7 | 58.6 | 60.3 |
| United Kingdom | 20.1 | 22.3 | 22.9 | 22.9 | 23.0 | 85.1 | 81.8 | 81.4 | 80.4 | 80.4 |
| United States ⁵ | 13.8~ | 14.1 | 14~ | 13.6 | 13.4 | 68.2~ | 68.7 | 68.8~ | 68.4 | 68.0 |
| European Union ⁷ | 13.3 | 14.9 | 15.2 | 15.7 | 16.0 | 80.9 | 79.8 | 79.6 | 79.1 | 81.8 |
| OECD Europe ⁷ | 13.2~ | 13.7~ | 13.8 | 14.1 | 14.4 | 79.6 | 78.7~ | 78.8 | 77.1 | 79.8 |
| Total OECD ⁷ | 13.4~ | 14.1~ | 14.0~ | 14.3 | 14.3 | 74.1~ | 72.6~ | 72.9~ | 72.1 | 73.6 |

~ Indicates break in series

¹ Part-time employment refers to persons who usually work less than 30 hours per week in their main job.

Data include only persons declaring usual hours.

² Data are based on actual hours worked.

³ Part-time employment based on hours worked at all jobs.

⁴ 1990 refers to 1991

⁵ Estimates are for wage and salary workers only.

⁶ Less than 35 hours per week.

⁷ For above countries only.

Notes, Sources and Definitions: OECD 1999; For Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom, data are from the European Labour Force Survey. For other countries data are from National Labour Force Surveys.

TABLE M: Canada Job-Related Employee Benefits by Work Arrangement

| | Percentage of Employees Entitled to Benefit | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | Pension Plan other than CPP/QPP ¹ | Health Plan other than Province Health Care | Dental Plan | Paid Sick Leave | Paid Vacation Leave |
| Full-time | 58.4 | 68.1 | 63.4 | 65.7 | 81.9 |
| Part-time | 18.7 | 17.8 | 15.9 | 17.8 | 29.9 |
| Permanent | 55.5 | 64.4 | 60 | 62.2 | 78.5 |
| Non-Permanent ² | 19.9 | 19.3 | 16.5 | 19.3 | 28.4 |

¹ Canada Pension Plan/Quebec Pension Plan

² Non-Permanent includes on-call or casual jobs, temporary or non-seasonal contract jobs, seasonal jobs, and temporary help agency jobs.

Source: Calculations by Human Resources Development Canada based on the 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements, Statistics Canada; as reported in Lipsett and Reesor (1997).

Table N: Agency Temporary Employment in Europe 1997

| | Agency temporary employment as percentage of total employment | Growth | Main sectors of agency temporary employment | Females as percentage of agency temporary employment ¹ |
|-------------|---|--|---|---|
| Austria | 1 | ++ (since 1993) | Industrial | 16 ² |
| Belgium | 1.4 | ++ | Industrial | 41 ² |
| Denmark | 0.2 | + | Tertiary | 70 ² |
| Finland | 0.4 | ++ (15 % pa) | Tertiary | 75 ³ |
| France | 1.9 (full-time equivalent) | ++ (35.7 %) | Industrial | 27 ³ |
| Germany | 0.6 | + | Industrial | 22 ² |
| Greece | nd | nd | nd | 77 ³ |
| Ireland | nd | nd | nd | nd |
| Italy | nd | ++ (since 1998) | Industrial and tertiary | 38 ³ |
| Luxembourg | 3 | nd | nd | 25 ² |
| Netherlands | 2.5 | ++ (20% pa 1993-7) | Tertiary | 49 ³ |
| Norway | 0.5 | + | Industrial and tertiary | 60 ³ |
| Portugal | 0.5 | + | Industrial and tertiary | 50 ² |
| Spain | 0.56 | ++ (1994-July 1999, nd since new law came into force in August 1999) | Industrial | 41 ² |
| Sweden | 0.44 | ++ (50% pa) | Tertiary | 80 ² |
| UK | 1 | ++ | Tertiary | 55 ² |

nd - no data; pa - per annum growth rate

¹ As reported by International Confederation of Private Employment Agencies (CIETT) using data from CIETT Survey 2000, OECD, EUROSTAT, various articles and reports.

² 1998

³ 1999

Source: European Industrial Relations Observatory (EIRO); as reported in Michon 1999.

TABLE O: Europe share of involuntary part time employment¹ in total part time employment² by gender 1997

| | Percentages | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|
| | All | Men | Women |
| Australia | 11.2 | 17.0 | 8.5 |
| Canada | 31.3 | 34.9 | 29.8 |
| Czech Republic | 3.1 | 1.8 | 3.7 |
| Denmark | 13.6 | 13.1 | 13.9 |
| Finland | 37.6 | 32.8 | 40.2 |
| France | 41.3 | 52.9 | 38.8 |
| Germany | 13.3 | 17.8 | 12.6 |
| Greece | 41.0 | 50.2 | 36.0 |
| Japan | 15.8 | 18.9 | 4.0 |
| Netherlands | 5.5 | 8.2 | 4.6 |
| Norway | 15.7 | 17.2 | 15.2 |
| Portugal | 21.6 | 16.1 | 24.1 |
| Sweden | 32.0 | 34.7 | 31.3 |
| Switzerland | 6.3 | 8.4 | 5.8 |
| United Kingdom | 12.2 | 23.8 | 9.5 |
| United States | 7.8 | 7.4 | 8.0 |
| Unweighted average | 19.3 | 22.2 | 17.9 |

¹ Defined as part-time workers who say they are working part-time because they could not find full-time work.

² For European countries, excludes self-employed and family workers.

³ 1996

Sources: OECD 1999; OECD database on full-time/part-time employment; OECD database on involuntary part-time employment; United States: OECD Secretariat calculations using the March 1997 US Bureau of Labor Statistics Current Population Survey CD-ROM; EUROSTAT (1998).

TABLE P: Europe self employment as share of nonagricultural employment ¹ 1973-1998

| | Percentages | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|
| | 1973 | 1979 | 1983 | 1989 | 1990 | 1994 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
| Australia ² | 9.5 | 12.4 | 12.1 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.5 | 11.8 | 12.9 | 11.8 |
| Austria ³ | 11.7 | 8.9 | 8.1 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.4 |
| Belgium ⁴ | 11.2 | 11.2 | 12.3 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 13.9 |
| Canada ⁴ | .. | 9.9 | 11.4 | 11.8 | 12.3 | 14.0 | 14.7 | 16.0 | .. |
| Czech Republic ³ | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 9.9 | 11.7 | 11.9 | 13.2 |
| Denmark ⁵ | 9.3 | 9.2 | 8.5 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 7.1 | 6.7 | 6.9 |
| Finland ⁵ | 6.4 | 6.1 | 7.0 | 8.7 | 8.8 | 9.9 | 10.3 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| France ⁵ | 11.4 | 10.6 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 8.2 |
| Germany ⁵ | 9.1 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 9.4 |
| Greece ⁵ | .. | 32.0 | 27.9 | 27.2 | 27.4 | 28.0 | 27.5 | 27.0 | .. |
| Hungary ⁴ | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 8.1 | 14.0 | 13.4 | 13.1 |
| Iceland ³ | 8.3 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 11.2 | 11.3 | 14.5 | 15.0 | 14.2 | 14.8 |
| Ireland ⁵ | 10.1 | 10.4 | 10.7 | 12.9 | 13.4 | 13.6 | 12.8 | 12.9 | 1304.0 |
| Italy ³ | 23.1 | 18.9 | 20.7 | 22.4 | 22.2 | 22.3 | 23.0 | 22.7 | 22.7 |
| Japan ² | 14.0 | 14.0 | 13.3 | 12.0 | 11.5 | 10.1 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.7 |
| Korea ⁵ | .. | .. | .. | .. | 21.8 | 23.0 | 23.8 | 24.4 | 24.9 |
| Luxembourg ³ | 11.1 | 9.4 | 8.8 | 7.4 | 7.1 | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Netherlands ⁵ | .. | 8.8 | 8.6 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 9.4 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 9.7 |
| New Zealand ³ | .. | 9.4 | .. | 14.7 | 14.6 | 15.8 | 15.7 | 15.7 | 16.9 |
| Norway ⁶ | 7.8 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.4 |
| Poland ⁵ | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 11.7 | 11.4 | 11.6 | 16.0 |
| Portugal ³ | 12.7 | 12.1 | 17.0 | 16.4 | 16.7 | 19.2 | 19.8 | 19.1 | .. |
| Spain ⁴ | 16.3 | 15.7 | 17.0 | 17.6 | 17.1 | 18.7 | 18.5 | 18.1 | 17.6 |
| Sweden ⁵ | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Turkey ⁵ | .. | .. | .. | 26.3 | 26.6 | 26.4 | 25.4 | 25.3 | 25.1 |
| United Kingdom ⁵ | 7.3 | 6.6 | 8.6 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 12.0 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 11.4 |
| United States ² | 6.7 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.0 |
| Unweighted average | | 9.8 | 9.9 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 11.9 | |

.. Data not available.

¹ Excluding unpaid family workers.

² Excluding owner-managers of incorporated businesses.

³ Classification of owner-managers of incorporated businesses is unclear.

⁴ Including owner-managers of incorporated businesses.

⁵ Including most owner-managers of incorporated businesses.

⁶ Excluding most owner-managers of incorporated businesses.

⁷ Excluding Belgium, the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Poland and Turkey.

Sources: OECD 2000; OECD database on annual labour force statistics; except Canada, national submission.

TABLE Q: Annual Average Growth Rates of OECD Self Employment¹ and Total Civilian Employment Percentages

| | 1973-1979 | | 1979-1990 | | 1990-1998 | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| | Self-employment | Civilian employment | Self-employment | Civilian employment | Self-employment | Civilian employment |
| Australia | 5.6 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Austria | -3.2 | 1.3 | -1.4 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 1.2 |
| Belgium | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.3 |
| Canada ² | .. | .. | 4.1 | 2.0 | 4.7 | 0.9 |
| Denmark | 0.6 | 0.9 | -1.4 | 1.0 | -0.1 | 0.4 |
| Finland | 0.4 | 1.2 | 4.8 | 1.5 | 0.6 | -1.0 |
| France | -0.5 | 0.8 | -0.5 | 0.6 | -1.2 | 0.4 |
| Germany | -1.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 5.6 | 3.2 |
| Greece ² | .. | .. | 0.5 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Iceland | -0.3 | 2.7 | 6.3 | 2.2 | 5.7 | 2.3 |
| Ireland | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 0.4 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Italy | -1.7 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | -0.3 |
| Japan | 1.0 | 1.2 | -0.2 | 1.8 | -1.4 | 0.7 |
| Korea | .. | .. | .. | .. | .3.8 | 2.1 |
| Luxembourg | -1.7 | 1.0 | -0.6 | 2.0 | .. | .. |
| Netherlands | -0.2 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 5.0 | 2.3 |
| New Zealand | .. | .. | 5.5 | 1.4 | 4.1 | 2.2 |
| Norway | -0.3 | 2.7 | 0.2 | 0.8 | -0.1 | 1.6 |
| Portugal ² | 0.9 | 1.1 | 6.4 | 3.5 | 2.4 | 0.5 |
| Spain | -0.9 | -0.3 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.1 |
| Sweden | 0.5 | 1.5 | 5.3 | 0.8 | 1.4 | -1.3 |
| Turkey | .. | .. | .. | .. | 2.0 | 2.7 |
| United Kingdom | -1.3 | 0.3 | 6.6 | 0.5 | -0.9 | 0.1 |
| United States | 3.6 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 1.3 |
| Unweighted average³ | 0.2 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 1.4 | | |
| Unweighted average⁴ | | | 2.3 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.0 |

.. Data not available.

¹ Excluding the agricultural sector and unpaid family workers. For some countries, all or part of owner-managers of incorporated businesses are excluded from self-employment.

² 1990-1997 instead of 1990-1998.

³ Excluding Canada, Greece, Korea, Luxembourg, New Zealand and Turkey.

⁴ Excluding Greece, Korea, Luxembourg, New Zealand and Turkey.

Sources: OECD 2000; OECD database on annual labour force statistics; except Canada, national submission.

TABLE R: Proportion of employers in self employment OECD 1983, 1990 1997¹

| | Percentages | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 1983 | | 1990 | | 1997 | |
| | Employer | Own-account | Employer | Own-account | Employer | Own-account |
| Australia ² | 37.9 | 62.1 | 36.2 | 63.8 | 31.1 | 68.9 |
| Austria | .. | .. | .. | .. | 68.8 | 31.2 |
| Belgium | 13.9 | 86.1 | 11.7 | 88.3 | 10.3 | 89.7 |
| Canada | 51.5 | 48.5 | 48.4 | 51.6 | 37.7 | 62.3 |
| Denmark ³ | 52.6 | 47.4 | 53.8 | 46.2 | 50.1 | 49.9 |
| Finland | .. | .. | .. | .. | 42.3 | 57.7 |
| France | 45.2 | 54.8 | 48.3 | 51.7 | 49.7 | 50.3 |
| Germany | 61.4 | 38.6 | 59.8 | 40.2 | 53.0 | 47.0 |
| Greece | 24.1 | 75.9 | 24.5 | 75.5 | 28.8 | 71.2 |
| Ireland | 38.7 | 61.3 | 37.8 | 62.2 | 39.9 | 60.1 |
| Japan | 20.5 | 79.5 | 22.0 | 78.0 | 25.3 | 74.7 |
| Netherlands | .. | .. | 35.5 | 64.5 | 37.4 | 62.6 |
| Portugal ⁴ | .. | .. | 31.8 | 68.2 | 35.6 | 64.4 |
| Spain ⁴ | .. | .. | 23.5 | 76.5 | 29.6 | 70.4 |
| Sweden | .. | .. | .. | .. | 41.0 | 59.0 |
| United Kingdom | 38.2 | 61.8 | 31.1 | 68.9 | 25.8 | 74.2 |
| United States | .. | .. | .. | .. | 21.1 | 78.9 |
| Unweighted average⁵ | 38.4 | 61.6 | 37.4 | 62.6 | | |
| Unweighted average⁶ | | | 34.5 | 65.5 | 33.8 | 66.2 |

.. Data not available.

¹ Excluding agricultural sector and unpaid family workers. For some countries, all or part of owner-managers of incorporated businesses are excluded from self-employment.

² 1985 instead of 1983.

³ 1984 instead of 1983.

⁴ 1986 instead of 1983.

⁵ Excluding Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the United States.

⁶ Excluding Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Sweden and the United States.

Sources: OECD 2000; EU countries: EUROSTAT, European Labour Force Survey; other countries: national data.