

ETLA

ELINKEINOELÄMÄN TUTKIMUSLAITOS

THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF THE FINNISH ECONOMY
Lönnrotinkatu 4 B 00120 Helsinki Finland Tel. 358-9-609 900
Telefax 358-9-601 753 World Wide Web: <http://www.etla.fi/>

Keskusteluaiheita - Discussion papers

No. 602

Jouko Nätti*

ATYPICAL EMPLOYMENT AND GENDER IN FINLAND**

* Dr. Jouko Nätti
University of Jyväskylä
Dept. of Social Sciences and Philosophy
Box 35, FIN-40351 Jyväskylä, Finland
Tel. +358 14 603 118, fax +358 14 603 101
Email: natti@dodo.jyu.fi

** Paper presented at the seminar "Gender and the Labour Market" arranged by ETLA in Helsinki in August, 15-16, 1996.

NÄTTI, Jouko, ATYPICAL EMPLOYMENT AND GENDER IN FINLAND. Helsinki: ETLA, Elinkeinoelämän Tutkimuslaitos, The Research Institute of the Finnish Economy, 1997. 33 p. (Keskusteluaiheita, Discussion Papers, ISSN 0781-6847; No. 602).

ABSTRACT: The study concentrates on part-time and temporary work as the two most frequent forms of atypical work in Finland. The first aim of the study is to analyse the characteristics of atypical workers and their distribution according to industry and employer sector. In Finland, 11% of female wage and salary earners work on a part-time basis and 20% are on temporary contracts. For men, the corresponding figures are 5% in part-time and 14% in temporary work. As a consequence, part-time work is more female-dominated (73%) than temporary work (60%). The second aim is to inquire whether atypical forms of employment appear precarious as compared to standard employment relationships. The investigation concentrate on job characteristics (union density, overlap between temporary and part-time work) and stability of employment (unemployment experiences). In Finland, temporary jobs, especially, tend to be more precarious than permanent full-time jobs. Temporary work, even compared to part-time work, seems to have a closer connection with unemployment. The third aim is to analyse to what extent atypical forms of employment can be considered as either 'bridges' or 'traps' in the labour market. For most part-timers, part-time jobs seem to be bridges rather than traps. Motives in temporary work vary with business cycles. Temporary workers also have a higher risk of unemployment compared to permanent workers. However, shifting from temporary work to permanent work occur widely, especially among men. To some - especially persons completing their studies -temporary work may also be a transitional stage on their way towards more permanent employment.

KEY WORDS: atypical employment, part-time work, temporary work, mobility, motives

NÄTTI, Jouko, ATYPICAL EMPLOYMENT AND GENDER IN FINLAND. Helsinki: ETLA, Elinkeinoelämän Tutkimuslaitos, The Research Institute of the Finnish Economy, 1997. 33 s. (Keskusteluaiheita, Discussion Papers, ISSN 0781-6847; No. 602).

TIIVISTELMÄ: Tutkimuksen kohteena ovat osa-aikatyö ja määräaikainen työllisyys, joita voidaan pitää ei-tyypillisen työllisyyden yleisimpinä muotoina Suomessa. Tutkimuksen ensimmäisenä tavoitteena on analysoida ei-tyypillisen työn yleisyyttä ja ominaispiirteitä. Suomalaisista naispalkansaajista 11% työskentelee osa-aikaisesti ja 20% määräaikaisesti. Miehillä vastaavat osuudet ovat 5% osa-aikatyössä ja 14% määräaikaisissa työsuhteissa. Vastavasti naisten osuus osa-aikatyössä on suurempi (73%) kuin määräaikaisissa työsuhteissa (60%). Toisena tavoitteena on pohtia sitä, missä määrin ei-tyypillinen työllisyys on riskialttiimpaa verrattuna normaalityösuhteisiin. Kohteena ovat työn ominaispiirteet (järjestäytymisaste, osa- ja määräaikaistyön päällekkäisyys) ja työn vakaus (työttömyyskokemukset). Suomessa erityisesti määräaikaiset työsuhteet näyttävät olevan riskialttiimpia verrattuna pysyviin kokoaikaisiin työsuhteisiin. Määräaikainen työ, verrattuna myös osa-aikatyöhön, kytkeytyy läheisesti työttömyyteen. Kolmantena tavoitteena on analysoida sitä, missä määrin ei-tyypilliset työsuhteet ovat siltoja tai ansoja työmarkkinoilla. Osa-aikaiset työsuhteet ovat useimmille pikemmin siltoja kuin umpikujia. Määräaikaistyön motiivit vaihtelevat suhdanteittain. Määräaikaisilla on lisäksi suurempi työttömyysriski. Silti liikkuvuus määräaikaisista pysyviin työsuhteisiin on yleistä, erityisesti miespalkansaajilla. Erityisesti opintojaan päättävälle määräaikainen työ voi olla siirtymävaihe pysyvämpiin työsuhteisiin.

AVAINSANAT: ei-tyypillinen työllisyys, osa-aikatyö, määräaikainen työ, liikkuvuus, motiivit

Contents

1.	DEBATE ON ATYPICAL EMPLOYMENT	1
	1.1. The concept of atypical employment	1
	1.2. Research problems and data	3
2.	PART-TIME WORK	4
	2.1. Definition and extent of part-time work	4
	2.2. Part-time employees and jobs	7
	2.3. Are part-time jobs precarious?	11
	2.4. Are part-time jobs bridges or traps?	12
3.	TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT	18
	3.1. Definition and regulation of temporary employment	18
	3.2. Temporary workers and jobs	21
	3.3. Are temporary jobs precarious?	24
	3.4. Bridges or traps?	25
4.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	28
	References	31

Yhteenveto

Tutkimuksen kohteena ovat osa-aikatyö ja määräaikainen työllisyys, joita voidaan pitää ei-tyypillisen työllisyyden yleisimpinä muotoina Suomessa. Tutkimuksen empiirisinä aineistoina ovat Tilastokeskuksen työvoimatutkimuksen vuosihaastattelut (1986, 1993, 1995) ja vuoden 1994 elinolututkimus. Osa- ja kokoaikatyön liikkuvuutta analysoidaan lisäksi väestölaskennan pitkittäisaineiston (1975-90) avulla.

Tutkimuksen ensimmäisenä tavoitteena oli analysoida ei-tyypillisen työn yleisyyttä ja ominaispiirteitä. Suomalaisista naispalkansaajista 11% työskentelee osa-aikaisesti ja 20% määräaikaisesti. Miehillä vastaavat osuudet ovat 5% osa-aikatyössä ja 14% määräaikaisissa työsuhteissa. Vastaavasti naisten osuus osa-aikatyössä on suurempi (73%) kuin määräaikaisissa työsuhteissa (60%). Suomi poikkeaa muista Pohjoismaista osa-aikatyön yleisyyden suhteen. Muissa Pohjoismaissa noin 40% naisista työskentelee osa-aikaisesti, Suomessa vain joka yhdeksäs. EU-maissa osa-aikaisten osuus on keskimäärin 30% naispalkansaajista. Lisäksi määräaikaiset työsuhteet ovat yleisempiä pohjoismaisilla naisilla verrattuna EU-maiden keskiarvoon. Miesten osalta maiden väliset erot ei-tyypillisen työllisyyden yleisyydessä ovat vähäisiä.

Tutkimuksen toisena tavoitteena oli pohtia sitä, missä määrin ei-tyypillinen työllisyys on riskialttiimpaa verrattuna normaalityösuhteisiin. Kohteena olivat työn ominaispiirteet (järjestäytymisaste, osa- ja määräaikaistyön päällekkäisyys) ja työn vakaus (työttömyyskokemukset). Näiden kriteereiden valossa osa-aikaisten asema on kokoaikaisiin verrattuna riskialttiimpi suomalaisilla työmarkkinoilla. Muissa Pohjoismaissa (Norjassa ja Ruotsissa) osa- ja koko-aikaisten väliset erot (järjestäytymisasteessa ja työn jatkuvuudessa) ovat supistuneet, mikä saattaa ilmentää osa-aikatyön normalisoitumista näissä maissa. Osa-aikatyö ei siten väistämättä johda naisten marginalisoitumiseen työmarkkinoilla. Suomessa erityisesti määräaikaiset työsuhteet näyttävät olevan riskialttiimpia verrattuna pysyviin kokoaikaisiin työsuhteisiin. Määräaikainen työ - verrattuna myös osa-aikatyöhön - kytkeytyy läheisesti työttömyyteen. Epävarmuuden suhteen monet määräaikaiset työsuhteet ovat siten riskialttiimpia, mutta eivät kaikki.

Tutkimuksen kolmantena tavoitteena oli analysoida sitä, missä määrin ei-tyypilliset työsuhteet ovat siltoja tai ansoja työmarkkinoilla. Osa-aikainen tai määräaikainen työ on tulkittu ansaksi tai loukuksi, mikäli se on vastentahtoista ja mahdollisuudet päästä kokoaikaiseen tai pysyvään työhön ovat olemattomat. Useimmat osa-aikatyöntekijät sanovat valinneensa osa-aikatyön omasta halustaan, vapaaehtoisesti sekä Suomessa että muissa Pohjoismassa. 1980-luvulla osa-aikatyön yleisimpiä syitä olivat Suomessa naisilla lasten ja kodinhoito sekä opiskelu, miehillä puolestaan opiskelu. Tosin 1990-luvulla yleisimmäksi syyksi on noussut kokoaikaisen työn puute. Osa-aikatyöhön liittyy suurempi liikkuvuus kuin kokoaikatyöhön: viisivuotisen seurannan aikana osa-aikaiset poistuivat kokoaikaisia useammin työmarkkinoilta. Työttömyysriskin suhteen ero oli kuitenkin vähäinen. Lisäksi liikkuvuus osa-aikatyöstä kokoaikatyöhön oli yleistä, erityisesti miespalkansaajilla. Siten osa-aikaiset työsuhteet ovat useimmille pikemmin siltoja kuin umpikujia. Määräaikaistyön motiivit vaihtelevat suhdanteittain. Taantuman aikana useimmat määräaikaiset palkansaajat voidaan luokitella vastentahtoiksi: vuonna 1993 määräaikaistyön selvästi yleisin syy oli pysyvän työn puute. Määräaikaisilla oli lisäksi suurempi työttömyysriski. Silti liikkuvuus määräaikaisista pysyviin työsuhteisiin oli yleistä, erityisesti miespalkansaajilla. Erityisesti opintojaan päättävälle määräaikainen työ voi olla siirtymävaihe pysyvämpiin työsuhteisiin.

1. DEBATE ON ATYPICAL EMPLOYMENT

1.1. The concept of atypical employment

The growing interest in atypical employment has arisen from a concern for "marginal" groups in the labour market on the one hand and labour market flexibility on the other (Casey et al. 1989, 459). Atypical forms of work are regarded as "precarious" because they involve special risks in respect of workers' legal protection and social security. Therefore, the growth of atypical employment is often expected to increase labour market segmentation and social inequalities. On the other hand, the promotion of atypical employment is often seen as a way to increase labour market flexibility and/or individual alternatives to standard paid employment.

Several terms have been proposed for these forms of employment: the most widely accepted is that of atypical or nonstandard employment. Atypical employment can be seen as a departure from those employment patterns that have until recently been considered normal or "the standard employment relationship" (SER).

The key elements of the SER can be described as follows (Cordova 1986, 642). First, the SER implies continuity and stability of employment which although not excluding the risk of dismissal, increases with length of service (seniority rights). The SER also means legal protection and rights of participation. Moreover, social security benefits are usually tied to the duration of employment and the level of former earnings, although there are considerable differences between welfare-state regimes in this respect (Esping-Andersen 1990). In particular, "normal" employment usually means full-time employment with only one employer (in a firm and not at home).

In Finland, the formation of the standard employment relationship took place relatively late. The first law providing for employment contracts was not passed until 1922 because of late industrialization. Even, in the 1950s, almost half of the Finnish labour force still worked in rural occupations. The rapid transformation of the Finnish economy from an agrarian to industrial and post-industrial economy began in the 1960s. During this decade, major reforms of employment contract and social security legislation, leading to a comprehensive system of universal pension, sickness and unemployment insurance, took place. In the 1980s, flat-rate

benefits were complemented by unified, earnings-related schemes. In the other Nordic countries, the same processes had started already in the 1960s (Uusitalo 1990, 4).

Atypical forms of employment have been classified in many ways. According to Cordova (1986, 643-645), three major categories comprise most or all atypical forms: self-employment, atypical contracts and clandestine employment.

(1) Many areas of atypical activity are forms of "**new**" (**non-agricultural**) **self-employment**. Many governments in Western Europe have since the 1980s begun to encourage young people to undertake independent activities, or former wage earners to become entrepreneurs and start their own small firms (Loufli 1991). Although formally self-employed, these workers often remain 'controlled' (Felstead 1991) or dependant de facto (e.g. the franchise system in the retail trade).

(2) Atypical **employment contracts** differ from full-time wage employment contracts in many of essential respects. (a) Instead of relationships with a single employer, there now exist employment relationships in which the workers establish occupational connections with multiple employers (e.g. temporary work agencies, subcontracting, intermediary agents, office sharing, labour on call). (b) Even when the employment relationship is limited to a single employer, the worker is not necessarily confined to the employer's premises. One modern variant of home-based work is tele-work. (c) Part-time employment is the more standard and best studied among nonstandard employment practices. It is the most important type, in terms of its share of the labour force. (d) The greatest diversity, however, is to be found in the duration of employment contracts. There are many new kinds of fixed-term contracts (e.g. contracts for a specific job or service, for cyclical or seasonal work, for casual, occasional or intermittent work, for the temporary substitution of other workers).

(3) The third (heterogeneous) category of atypical employment is **clandestine work**, which can be subdivided into four groups: (a) undeclared work, which is carried on beyond the reach of labour, fiscal and administrative law (e.g. moonlighting); (b) family work, which takes advantage of family ties to elude the requirements of social protection; (c) work in micro-enterprises, which seldom complies with industrial regulations; and (d) work performed by foreigners without valid work permits, which is becoming a vast and expanding phenomenon in many countries (Cordova 1986, 645).

Most of these practices have for a long time coexisted with standard wage employment. Some were even dominant in certain industries at earlier stages in the development of capitalism. Though existing for a long time, their specific forms have undergone change and atypical employment has spread to a much wider range of economic activities and to new categories of workers (Marshall 1989, 18). In addition, all these categories tend to overlap to a greater or lesser extent. This study concentrates on part-time and temporary employment as the two most frequent forms of atypical employment in Finland.

1.2. Research problems and data

The study concentrates on part-time and temporary employment as the two most frequent forms of atypical work in Finland. (1) The first aim of the study is to analyse the characteristics of atypical workers and their distribution according to industry and sector. (2) The second aim is to inquire whether, as often assumed, forms of atypical employment appear precarious as compared to standard employment relationships. According to Rodgers (1989, 3), the concept of precariousness involves instability, lack of protection, insecurity and social or economic vulnerability. Thus, it is some combination of these factors that identifies precarious jobs, and the boundaries around the concept are to some extent arbitrary. The extent to which different forms of atypical work are precarious will be analysed in this paper. The investigation concentrates on job characteristics (union density, overlap between temporary and part-time work) and stability of employment (unemployment experiences).

(3) The third aim is to analyse to what extent atypical forms of employment can be considered as 'bridges' or perhaps rather as 'traps' in the labour market (see also Büchtemann and Quack 1989, 110). Atypical workers are not a homogeneous group. An individual may be forced to accept atypical employment if there are no other alternatives. However, some individuals may also prefer atypical employment. In this study, atypical work is classified as a bridge or a trap depending on (i) whether the taking up of part-time or temporary work has been voluntary or involuntary, and (ii) whether part-time or temporary work is associated with frequent job moves. Part-time or temporary work is interpreted as a trap when it is involuntary and when there are few opportunities of getting a full-time or permanent job.

The analyses are based on data from Finnish labour force surveys. Special analyses are made on the basis of Finnish supplementary labour force surveys (LFS 1986, N=8276; LFS 1993, N=5831; LFS 1995, N=18675) and The 1994 Living Conditions Survey (LCS 1994, N=8650). In addition, mobility patterns in part-time work are analysed with the Census panel data (1975-90).

2. PART-TIME WORK

2.1. Definition and extent of part-time work

The definitions of part-time work vary in the Nordic countries, both regarding the underlying concepts and the methods of collecting data. In Finland, part-time employees are persons who (normally) work less than 30 hours a week. In Sweden the criterion is less than 35 hours, in Norway less than 36 hours per week. In Denmark, part-time employees are persons who report that they work part-time (as in the EU labour force survey). Because of this conceptual variation, valid conclusions as to the development of part-time work within the various countries can be drawn from national time series, but international comparisons of the character of part-time work should be made with caution.

Table 1. Part-time employment as a proportion of total employment by gender 1973, 1983 and 1995

Country	All			Women			Men		
	1973	1983	1995	1973	1983	1995	1973	1983	1995
Denmark	17,0	23,8	21,6	40,3	44,7	35,5	1,9	6,6	10,4
Sweden	18,0	24,8	24,3	38,8	45,9	40,3	3,7	6,3	9,4
Norway	23,5	29,0	26,5	47,6	54,4	46,6	8,7	7,7	9,4
Finland	6,1 ^a	8,3	8,4	10,2	12,5	11,3	2,3	4,5	5,7

Source: OECD 1996, 192. ^a Data is for 1977.

During the 1960s and 1970s, the number and proportion of female part-time employees grew in all the Nordic countries. Since the early 1980s, however, the proportion of female part-timers has declined (Table 1). In the EU countries as a whole, the proportion of female part-time employment increased from 27% in 1985 to 31% in 1995 (Employment in Europe 1996, 147). In the Nordic countries, male part-time employment, compared with that of women, has grown steadily. In 1995, the proportion of male part-timers was 5–10%. In the EU countries, the proportion of part-time work out of the total male employment increased from 3% in 1985 to 6% in 1995 (Employment in Europe 1996, 147).

In most of the four Nordic countries studied, the proportion of part-time work of all female employment is still considerable (36–47%), except in Finland (11%). Among the EU countries, only Britain (44%) and the Netherlands (67%) have a high level of part-time employment (OECD 1996, 192).

Another important difference between Finland and the other Nordic countries is the number of hours actually worked per week in part-time work. The number of part-timers' weekly hours was smallest in Finland (18) and largest in Sweden (25) (OECD 1990, 26–27). The number of working hours is important in many ways. A small number of hours usually means low income and dependence on additional allowances or on a main earner in the household. In addition, access to social benefits and the social security system is generally best for part-timers working more than 20 hours a week and worst for those working less than 16 hours (ILO 1989; Delsen 1995, 33–34). Exclusion from protection by labour law is another major factor explaining the increase in precarious, i.e. marginal jobs.

Thus, in the Nordic context Finland seems to be an exception: the comparative proportion of female part-time work is distinctly smaller, and the characteristics of Finnish part-time work are also different.

The different path of development in Finland — compared with the other Nordic countries — may, at least partly, be attributed to earlier developments in female employment. The female labour force participation rate in Finland was formerly much higher than in either the other Nordic or western European countries: in 1950, it was 60% in Finland, 50% in Denmark, 37% in Norway and 35% in Sweden. In 1995, the female participation rate was at almost the same high level in all the Nordic countries (from 70% in Finland to 75% in Sweden). In the other

Nordic countries, the considerable increase in female economic activity was the result of increased part-time work, but in Finland a tradition of full-time work has dominated the female labour market (Pfau-Effinger 1993). In the other Nordic countries, an additional source of part-time work was the fact that many women working previously full time reduced the number of their working hours. In Sweden, especially, a rise in marginal tax rates, the introduction of a partial pension, and increased opportunities for parents with preschool children to work fewer hours may have been factors inducing women to reduce their number of working hours (Sundström 1987, 111).

The willingness to work on a part-time basis also depends on economic circumstances. In Finland, wage levels and the standard of living were formerly lower than in the other Nordic countries. There are also important differences in housing policy: the proportion of rented accommodation is significantly lower in Finland than in the other Nordic countries. Accordingly, the high cost of acquiring an owner-occupied dwelling usually implies a full-time job. All these factors have hindered employees from choosing part-time work in Finland. In addition, the concentration of part-time jobs in only a few occupations has restricted the implementation of full-timers' willingness to work shorter weeks.

The decrease in female part-time work in the Nordic countries since 1982 may imply that change is taking place in dynamics of part-time work in these countries. The positive effects of increased female employment are probably outweighed by the negative effects of the decreasing proportion of part-time work. Sundström (1987) argues that the main reason for the decline in part-time work in Sweden has been the tax reforms since 1983, whereby marginal tax rates for full-time workers were reduced stepwise, while those of the part-time workers were raised. In the Danish debate, increased restrictions in unemployment benefits for part-timers played their part. In addition to these changes, there may be other factors. One explanation in the decrease of part-time work in middle-aged groups may be the rising educational level, which implies willingness to work full-time (see also Blank 1989, 299). On the demand side, an important change has been the break of the expansion of the public sector. From the 1960s to the early 1980s, employment grew much faster in the public than in the private sector (OECD 1989, 167). In the late 1980s, the share of the public sector of total employment declined in Sweden, was stable in Denmark, and grew slower than earlier in Norway and Fin-

land. In the Nordic countries (except in Finland) the public sector (health and social services, education) has employed more than half of all female part-timers.

2.2. Part-time employees and jobs

Part-time work is heavily gendered, which indicates its connections with the wider gender differences in family, labour market and society (Beechey and Perkins 1987). The vast majority of part-time employees are women (e.g. 81% in Norway in 1995). In Finland, however, women account for 73% of total part-time employment (Table 2). Furthermore, of all part-time employees, the proportion of women has declined during the past decade. The trend has been the same in the other EU countries (see OECD 1996, 192).

In most EU and Nordic countries, part-time work is usually more common among married than among unmarried/single women, but again Finland is an exception. However, among 30-39-year-old Finnish women, part-time work is usually more common among married than among unmarried/single women. In addition, most female part-timers live in households where there is another (usually full-time) earner. Among men, part-time work is more common among unmarried compared to married men. If all female part-time employment in the EU countries is taken into account, the comparative proportion of married women has declined, from 82% in 1983 to 78% in 1991 (Eurostat 1993). This may indicate that the link between family status (marriage) and part-time work is loosening.

Besides gender, part-time work also varies according to age. The proportion of part-timers is largest among employees less than 25 years or more than 55 years old age. The differences between the various age-groups appear more conspicuous among men than among women. For women, but not for men, part-time work is also usual in the middle age-groups.

Part-time work has expanded, especially in the youngest age-groups, and to a lesser extent among older workers - both women and men. However, most female part-time employees are middle-aged, although the proportion of younger part-timers (15-24 years) is also considerable.

Table 2. Size and composition of part-time employment in Finland 1986 and 1995 by gender (wage and salary earners)

	Proportion				Distribution			
	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	1986	1995	1986	1995	1986	1995	1986	1995
Total	10,3	10,8	4,4	4,8	100	100	100	100
Age								
- 15-24	21,0	30,5	16,6	21,6	30,4	24,1	56,1	40,4
- 25-34	6,9	9,8	3,9	4,3	19,1	22,7	26,8	27,5
- 35-44	8,4	9,2	1,2	2,1	23,4	25,9	8,2	13,1
- 45-54	9,7	8,0	1,1	2,0	18,8	20,6	4,3	10,3
- 55-64	10,9	9,0	2,9	6,5	8,2	6,7	4,6	8,7
Marital status								
- Unmarried	12,3	13,0	10,8	7,7	35,0	34,4	69,9	49,4
- married ¹	9,5	9,8	1,9	3,2	65,0	65,6	30,1	50,6
Children								
- none	11,2	10,2	4,8	5,5	57,2	52,3	27,6	64,6
- one or more	9,3	11,6	4,3	3,8	42,8	47,7	72,4	35,4
Level of education								
- basic	12,8	12,8	6,4	5,8	48,2	30,6	55,6	28,8
- middle	9,1	10,4	3,2	4,6	42,4	49,0	34,6	53,6
- higher	7,5	9,6	3,1	4,0	9,4	20,4	9,7	17,5
Socioeconomic status								
- blue-collar	14,2	13,8	3,9	4,5	43,8	30,4	51,5	48,6
- lower white-collar	8,4	9,5	5,8	4,5	43,7	49,5	27,4	20,8
- upper white-collar	8,7	11,2	4,5	5,5	12,4	20,1	21,1	30,6
Thousands	111	88	23	33	111	88	23	33

Source: LFS 1986, 1995

¹ Married or cohabited

The age distribution of male part-timers is quite different: almost half of all male part-timers are 15-24 years-old. By contrast, the number of older part-timers (over 55 years) is small (9%). The share of older part-timers is much larger in Norway and Sweden, which is mainly due to the extensive part-time retirement schemes in these countries. In addition, working very few hours is more common for male than for female part-timers. Thus for men part-time work is a temporary way of entering and leaving the labour market. For women, part-time employment is a more stable way of remaining in the labour market. In other words, women and men work on a part-time basis at different phases of the life-cycle.

Table 3. Proportion and distribution of part-time employment by industry, employer sector and gender in Finland 1986 and 1995

	Proportion				Distribution			
	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	1986	1995	1986	1995	1986	1995	1986	1995
Industry								
- agriculture	10,8	3,5	6,0	3,2	1,2	0,3	6,4	1,4
- manufacture	4,9	3,0	1,9	1,2	9,2	4,1	14,5	8,8
- construction	7,9	5,3	1,7	1,5	1,2	0,5	5,0	3,0
- retail trade	11,1	13,4	8,4	6,1	19,3	18,7	23,3	15,2
- transport	10,0	13,3	3,4	3,8	4,5	4,6	9,1	7,3
- financing	12,9	15,4	5,3	10,4	11,7	16,4	7,1	21,2
- services	11,7	11,3	8,0	9,3	52,8	55,5	34,5	43,0
Total (%)	10,3	10,8	4,4	4,8	100	100	100	100
Employer sector								
- state	8,9	7,8	4,4	4,0	9,0	5,2	13,7	9,3
- municipal	9,6	10,7	5,3	10,0	30,2	39,5	13,7	31,5
- private	10,9	11,3	4,3	3,8	60,8	55,3	72,6	59,2
Thousands	111	88	23	33	111	88	23	33

Sources: LFS 1986, 1995

Female and male part-timers also differ according to their socioeconomic status. Most female part-timers are white-collar workers, especially lower level white-collar workers (50% in 1995). Most male part-timers, by contrast, are blue-collar workers (49%).

Female and male part-timers are mainly found in the same industries (Table 3). Most female and male part-timers work in services, the retail trade, and financing. For male part-timers, manufacturing industry is also an important employer. In most EU countries, too, part-time work is concentrated in services and trade, while, in less industrialized countries, it is more common in agriculture (Delsen 1995, 25). The proportion of part-time work is smallest in (male-dominated) manufacturing and construction.

One reason often given for part-time work is that it enables employers to achieve numerical flexibility (see Atkinson 1987; cf. Pollert 1988). Numerical flexibility means the ability of enterprises to adjust the number of workers or working hours to changes in the level of demand for them. Indeed, part-time work is usual in industries where the demand for products and services typically varies in the short term (e.g. the retail trade). In most of the Nordic countries, however, part-time work is typical in the public sector as well (health and social services, education, although here the classification of part-time workers as a numerically flexible workforce is more problematic). Thus, part-time work is common in both skilled and less skilled occupations. In Finland, however, part-time work (especially among men) has been concentrated in the private sector and less skilled occupations. This factor has implications for the nature of part-time jobs, as will be seen later.

In the EU countries, too, part-time work has expanded most rapidly among the youngest employees, although the vast majority of female part-timers are middle-aged. The rapid growth of young people working on a part-time basis is usually explained by the fact that most of them are combining studies and work because of the inadequate financial assistance. However, a growing number of studies also indicate higher aspirations respecting consumer culture among the youngest age groups.

2.3. Are part-time jobs precarious?

In the debate on atypical employment it is often assumed that these forms of employment are more precarious than standard employment relationships. In this study, part-time jobs are classified as precarious if they are characterized by low union density (which is usually associated with the control over work and protection), discontinuity, and instability.

Part-time workers are members of trade unions more rarely than full-timers (Table 4). Male part-timers, in particular, are rarely members of trade unions (49%). Among Finnish women, the gap between part-time and full-time workers has narrowed. The pattern has been similar in Sweden and Norway (Ellingsaeter 1989, 79-71). In a Nordic comparison, the difference in unionization between female part-time and full-time workers was smallest in Sweden (80% vs. 86%) and largest in Finland (see Nätti 1995). Compared to most EU countries, however, union density among part-timers is high in the Nordic countries.

Table 4. Unionization rate, proportion of temporary jobs and unemployment experiences in part-time and full-time work 1986 and 1995 in Finland by gender (wage and salary earners, percentages)

Gender/year	A unionization rate		The proportion of temporary jobs		Has been unemployed during the last 12 months	
	part-time	full-time	part-time	full-time	part-time	full-time
Women						
- 1986	37	78	24	12	19	8
- 1995	70	87	40	16	33	10
Men						
- 1986	29	71	39	9	19	10
- 1995	49	83	44	11	25	13
All						
- 1986	35	74	28	11	19	9
- 1995	64	85	41	14	31	12

Sources: LFS 1986, 1995

Another indicator of the integration of the part-time workers into the labour market is job continuity, which is here defined (in a narrow sense) as the overlap between part-time and temporary work (Table 4). In 1995, 41% of part-timers had temporary jobs compared to 14% of full-timers. Especially among female part-timers, the overlap between part-time and temporary work has increased since the 1980s. This may indicate a casualisation of female part-time work. The same phenomenon was evident earlier in Norway, too; but during the 1980s, the gap between female part-timers and full-timers narrowed (in contrast to Finland), which may reflect a normalization of part-time work (Ellingsaeter 1989, 71). A narrow gap between part-timers and full-timers is also found in Sweden (Deltidsarbete 1988, 18).

Differences between Finland and the other Nordic countries are also obvious in the work history of part-timers. Nordic female part-timers are usually older than full-timers, but not in Finland (34 years vs. 40 years). Moreover, in Finland job tenure is clearly shorter in female part-time work than in full-time work (5.2 years vs. 9.9 years; LFS 1995), and the gap remains even when age is controlled for. This may reveal the more temporary character of female part-time work in Finland as compared with the other Nordic countries. In addition, Finnish female part-timers had more often been unemployed (31% vs. 12%) than full-timers during the previous year (LFS 1995).

2.4. Are part-time jobs bridges or traps?

Part-time employment seems to be a heterogeneous phenomenon (Tilly 1992). We can assume that some individuals may be forced to accept part-time work if there are no alternatives (involuntary part-time work), while some individuals may actually prefer part-time work (voluntary part-time work). In this study part-time work is classified as a bridge or a trap depending on (i) whether the taking up of part-time work has been voluntary or involuntary, and (ii) whether part-time work is associated with frequent changes of job. Part-time work is interpreted as a trap when it is involuntary and when there are few opportunities of getting a full-time job.

Motives in taking part-time work

In most of the Nordic countries over the last three decades, part-time work has been an important alternative to full-time work for women (with the exception of Finland). For men, part-time work has tended to be a short-time way of entering or leaving the labour market. At the individual level, a crucial criterion is the motivation to take part-time work. In the Nordic countries, most part-timers work voluntarily on a part-time basis, preferring this form of employment. In the mid-1980s, child or home care was the most common reason among Swedish women (29%) for taking up part-time work (Deltidsarbete 1988), while among women in Finland, in addition to child care (26%), studying (23%) and lack of alternative work (21%) were also reported (LFS 1986; Table 5). In Sweden the most common reason among men was health or age (29%), whereas studying (55%) was the prime reason reported in Finland.

In the 1990s, however, the most common reason for part-time work is lack of alternative work (43% of female and 42% of male part-timers) (LFS 1993). In 1995, the result was similar, despite differences in the classification used.

Table 5. Reasons for part-time work in Finland 1986, 1993 and 1995 by gender (wage and salary earners)

Reasons for part-time work	Women			Men		
	1986	1993	1995	1986	1993	1995
Lack of work	21	43	48	18	42	34
Taking care of children or home	26	14	-	0	0	-
Health, age	6	5	7	4	9	3
Studying	23	24	21	55	33	53
Nature of work	-	8	-	-	10	-
Part-time retirement	-	-	3	-	-	8
Does not want full-time work	-	-	21	-	-	2
Other	24	6	0	23	6	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	260	153	283	115	74	101
Thousands	103	88	77	45	44	26

Source: LFS 1986, 1993, 1995

Involuntary part-time work usually refers to part-time work for labour market reasons. The dominant reason for involuntary part-time work relates to the inability to find a full-time job, while in a minority of cases it is imposed for economic reasons. This would explain why involuntary part-time employment is closely linked to the business cycle (OECD 1993, 14). In Finland, too, involuntary part-time work, defined as part-time work for labour market reasons, varies with unemployment.

The connection between involuntary part-time work and unemployment can also be examined at regional and individual levels. Involuntary part-time work varies with the regional unemployment rate. Correspondingly, involuntary part-timers had been unemployed more often than other part-timers during the preceding 12 months (63% vs. 11%; LFS 1995).

Another means of estimating the proportion of involuntary part-time work is to find out what kind of working hours part-timers prefer. In 1986, the proportion of those part-timers who would willingly transfer to full-time work was 28% of female and 30% of male part-timers. In 1995, in connection with a higher unemployment rate, this figure was also higher (52% of female and 42% of male part-timers).

Mobility patterns in part-time work

To what extent part-time work can be regarded as a trap or a bridge depends also on the possibility of mobility between part-time and full-time work. In this study, mobility between part-time and full-time work was studied with two sets of data. First, *mobility from 1975 to 1990* was studied with Census panel data. The data includes information on working time for the years 1975, 1980 and 1985. People were asked how many months they had been employed part-time and full-time during those years. In this study, we followed up what happened to those wage and salary earners who worked on a part-time/full-time basis in 1975. In the sample, we had 708 part-timers and 16.260 full-timers. First, we looked at their main activity in 1980, 1985 and 1990. People were asked what did they do during a reference week (26.10.-1.11.1980; 11.11.-17.11.1985; 25.12.-31.12.1990). The main results are reported in Table 6.

Five years later (1980), 76% of part-timers and 85% of full-timers were (still or again) employed. A larger share of part-timers had thus left the labour market (20% vs. 14%) to retire, study or take care of children and the home. In terms of the experience of unemployment, the difference between part-timers and full-timers was minor (4% vs. 2%). However, among men, compared to women, the differences between part-time and full-time workers were greater concerning employment, unemployment and exit from the labour market. The main results were similar both for the ten-year period 1975-85 and the 15-year period 1975-90.

Table 6. Main activity of part-time and full-time workers 1975-90 by gender

	Working time 1975					
	Women		Men		Both	
	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time
N (1975)	596	7281	112	8979	708	16260
Main activity 1980						
Employed	77	83	67	86	76	85
Unemployed	3	12	9	2	4	2
Not in the labour force	20	15	24	12	20	13
N (1980)	587	7139	104	8669	691	15808
Main activity 1985						
Employed	70	75	63	77	69	76
Unemployed	2	3	10	4	3	3
Not in the labour force	28	22	27	19	28	21
N (1985)	579	7062	98	8441	677	15503
Main activity 1990						
Employed	59	66	59	68	59	67
Unemployed	3	2	13	5	5	4
Not in the labour force	38	32	28	27	36	29
N (1990)	562	6908	92	8079	654	14987

Source: Finnish census panel data 1975-90.

Another interesting question is mobility from part-time to full-time jobs. The results (Table 7), suggest that there is considerable mobility in this direction. Almost half (47%) of all part-time workers (in 1975) were in a full-time job five years later, whereas one third (32%) had stayed in a part-time job. By 1985 (ten years later) only every fifth part-time worker had stayed in a part-time job, while 48% had shifted to a full-time job.

Among men, mobility from part-time to full-time work is extremely common. At the end of the five-year period (1975-80), only 5% of part-time workers had stayed in a part-time job while 70% had shifted to a full-time job.

Table 7. Months of part-time and full-time work 1975-85 by gender (a 10-year panel) (%)

	Working time 1975					
	Women		Men		Both	
	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time
N (1975)	596	7281	112	8979	708	16260
Months of work in 1980						
- none	18	13	20	11	18	12
- part-time	36	4	5	1	31	2
- full-time	43	82	70	88	47	85
- both	3	1	5	1	4	1
N (1980)	587	7139	104	8669	691	15808
Months of work in 1985						
- none	29	25	37	24	30	25
-part-time	23	4	3	1	20	2
- full-time	46	69	56	74	48	72
- both	2	2	4	0	2	1
N (1985)	579	7062	98	8441	677	15503

Source: Finnish census panel data 1975-85.

Mobility from 1989 to 1994 was studied using a retrospective question from the Living Conditions Survey. The interview-based data was collected in Spring 1994 by Statistics Finland.

The data is based on a representative sample of a Finnish population aged 15+ (n=11843; response rate 73%, N=8650). The persons interviewed were asked what they had been doing five years earlier (1989). Half of all respondents had been wage and salary earners (4348 persons). Of these, 280 persons (6.4%) had worked on a part-time basis. Table 8 compares the mobility patterns of part-time and full-time workers between 1989 and 1994.

First, a smaller proportion of part-timers were employed after the five-year period compared to full-timers (62% vs. 72%). The difference was greater among men than women. Secondly, a larger proportion of part-timers had left the labour market (for study, retirement or other reasons) (21% vs. 15%). Again, the difference was larger among men compared to women. Thirdly, differences in becoming unemployed were small: 16% of part-timers were unemployed compared to 14% of full-timers. However, the picture changes when looking at all unemployment experience during the five-year period: 44% of part-timers had been unemployed compared to 37% of full-timers.

Table 8. Mobility of part-time and full-time workers 1989-94 by gender

Main activity in 1994	Working time 1989					
	Women		Men		Both	
	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time
Employed	65	72	55	71	62	72
- part-time	29	4	8	2	23	3
- full-time	36	68	47	69	39	69
Unemployed	15	12	20	16	17	14
Not in the labour force	20	16	25	13	21	14
- studying	5	3	5	2	5	2
- retired, on a pension	10	8	17	11	12	10
- other	5	5	3	0	4	2
Has been unemployed 1989-94	42	34	52	40	44	37
N	205	1988	75	2080	280	4068

Source: Survey on Living Conditions 1994

A critical issue is change over time in part-time jobs: are those in part-time jobs likely to remain in that state or do a significant proportion find full-time employment? According to the results in Table 8, 23% of part-timers had stayed in part-time employment and 39% had shifted to full-time work. Among part-time male workers in particular the mobility to full-time work was considerable: 47% of them had shifted to full-time work and only 8% remained in part-time work.

Thus, most female part-timers have preferred part-time work, and the proportion of involuntary part-time work has been quite small - until the 1990s. Furthermore, mobility between part-time and full-time work in Finland is considerable, especially among part-timers, and correspondingly the opportunities for changing working hours are not so limited. Therefore, for most part-time workers, part-time jobs seem to be bridges rather than traps.

3. TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT

3.1. Definition and regulation of temporary employment

Reasons for offering temporary employment include: the provision of short-term cover (usually to replace absent personnel), adjustments of manning levels to meet (seasonal) demand peaks, and the acquisition of specialist skills (McGregor and Sproull 1991, 27). These reasons continue to be the most important factors determining the use of temporary labour, but employers occasionally also mention new ones. However these new reasons, such as using temporary employees to reduce wage and non-wage costs or to avoid involvement with trade unions, are not thought to be common (*ibid.* 27). In addition, temporary contracts are sometimes used as a means of screening workers before making a final commitment and so provide a 'bridge' into permanent employment. This has especially been the case in Germany (Büchtemann and Quack 1989, 137; Casey et al. 1989, 461).

Temporary employment includes both direct fixed-term contracts and temporary employment through specialized agencies (agency labour) (see Marshall 1989, 30). In the case of a fixed-term contract, the period of the contract is defined by certain objective conditions (e.g. expiry date, the completion of a particular task). The worker involved is recruited directly by the em-

ployer on a temporary basis, which distinguishes this form of employment from agency labour where a third party is involved. Agency labour is based on a contract whereby an agency recruits employees and then places them at the disposal of a user company for the purpose of performing a task (Bronstein 1991, 292–293). In practice, the proportion of agency labour of total employment remains small in most Nordic and EU countries (ranging from 0.3% in West Germany to 1.7% in the Netherlands; OECD 1991, 48), although there was a rapid growth in the 1980s (Bronstein 1991, 295). Therefore, this study focuses on fixed-term contracts.

In most Nordic countries, employment on an open-ended contract is established as the normal form of employment, and fixed-term contracts are restricted to particular situations. By contrast, in many EU countries (Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, UK), fixed-term contracts require no particular justification. In the 1980s, several countries opened up additional opportunities for fixed-term contracts (Emerson 1988, 797), but the impact of deregulation seems to be minor, at least in Germany (Casey et al. 1989, 464; Kuhl 1990, 243; Lane 1989, 598). Thus, temporary work is more regulated in the Nordic countries than in most EU countries — as are other forms of atypical employment (e.g. part-time work; Sundström 1991). Correspondingly, the degree of differentiation between temporary and permanent workers also varies between the Nordic and EU countries. In principle, if one can easily dismiss permanent workers, there is little reason to create a class of temporary workers (on the British case, see Rodgers 1989, 4). In practice, however, the situation is more complicated.

There are also some differences between the Nordic countries in how fixed-term contracts are regulated. According to the Finnish Employment Contracts Act, an employment contract may be concluded for a fixed period only if the nature of the task, the need to replace absent personnel, apprenticeship or a comparable factor requires this (Bruun 1985, 70). In Swedish law there are similar restrictions on fixed-term contracts (see Numhauser-Henning 1988). In the Norwegian Work Environment Act, fixed-term contracts (in the private sector and municipalities) are permitted only where this is required by the particular nature of the work. There are, however, no detailed regulations concerning the terms or duration of such contracts. Civil service law, which covers the state sector, appears to be more flexible (Torp and Pettersen 1989, 136). In Denmark, in contrast to the rest of the Nordic countries, there are no restrictions on the use of fixed-term contracts (*ibid.*, 58–59).

There are differences between the Nordic countries in the definition of temporary employment (Nätti 1993). In Finnish and Swedish labour force surveys, the definition of temporary employment excludes the self-employed (cf. the United Kingdom, Dale and Bamford 1988, 194; Casey et al. 1989, 452-453). In Finland, the term 'temporary worker' refers to wage and salary earners who do not have a permanent (open-ended) contract, including participants in special employment programmes. The attribution of temporary status in the surveys depends upon an individual's own perception of his or her employment position (see also Dale and Bamford 1988, 194). In Swedish labour force surveys the concept of temporary workers (on fixed-term contracts) is more detailed: it includes wage and salary earners who are substitutes (replacing an absent worker), on trial, on 'stand by' or in seasonal work, in special youth programmes (ungdomsplats), in apprenticeship schemes, in project work or in other kinds of casual work. Unfortunately, Norwegian labour force surveys provide no information on temporary employment.

In the Nordic countries, the proportion of temporary workers was about 12 to 14% of all wage and salary earners in the early 1990s; compared with the majority of EU countries, this proportion is quite high (Table 9). Of course, definitions vary, and even the conceptual basis of the statistics is not uniform (OECD 1996, 6). However, most Nordic and EU countries display a rising trend, although the growth has been uneven. In 1995, the proportion of temporary employees in the EU countries varied between 3 and 34% (the average was 11.5%). The largest proportion has tended to be in southern European countries (Spain, Portugal, Greece), where agriculture and tourism are important.

Table 9. Proportion of temporary employment in relation to all salaried employees in the Nordic countries (percentages)

Country	Both		Men		Women	
	1983	1994	1983	1994	1983	1994
Denmark	12,5	12,0	12,2	11,1	12,7	12,9
Sweden	12,0	13,5	9,7	12,3	13,9	14,6
Finland ¹	11,3	13,5	9,3	12,3	13,3	14,7

Source: OECD 1996,8

¹ Finland 1982 and 1993

3.2. Temporary workers and jobs

In Finland, the proportion of temporary employment increased from 13.5% in 1993 to 16.8% in 1995. The increase was larger among women compared to men. Temporary work is also more usual among Finnish female (20%) than male (14%) wage and salary earners, although the difference between the genders is not so overwhelming as in part-time work (Table 10). This is mainly because temporary work is also quite common in male-dominated industries (agriculture and forestry, construction, some manufacturing industries). However, most temporary workers are women (60% in 1995). The same applies to most EU countries (OECD 1996, 8).

It is, however, age rather than sex that typifies workers with temporary contracts: about half of all 15-24-year-old workers in Finland have temporary contracts (57% of female, 42% of male workers in 1995). Thus, young workers are over-represented in temporary jobs. The situation is similar in the other EU countries. This is partly due to the fact that many young temporary workers combine studying and work. Others may consider their current job to be temporary in that they are job-shopping before settling into a more permanent situation. Furthermore, the creation or expansion of government programmes to help young unemployed people is also a factor accounting for the over-representation of young people (Delsen 1995, 50).

Another interesting feature is, that temporary employment is much more common among 25-34-year-old women than men in Finland. Differences between the sexes are less relevant in the older age-groups. Thus, young women often appear to come to the labour market via temporary jobs, which - at least partly - is due to the fact that female temporary workers more often than men are concentrated in the public sector.

As at least a partial result of their younger age, temporary work is more common among unmarried compared to married workers.

Temporary work is frequent both in skilled and usually female occupations (e.g. teaching, health care and social work) and less-skilled occupations (e.g. agriculture and forestry, house-keeping and cleaning) in Finland. A similar heterogeneity applies to education. On the average, female temporary workers (but not men) seem to have a higher education than permanent workers (see also Casey 1987, 65; Dale and Bamford 1988, 197), which is, at least partly, due

to younger age of temporary workers: in Finland vocational training is much more common among younger than older workers. Consequently temporary work is most common among women in upper-level white collar jobs and among men in blue-collar jobs.

Table 10. Size and composition of temporary employment in Finland 1986 and 1995 by gender (wage and salary earners)

	Proportion				Distribution			
	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	1986	1995	1986	1995	1986	1995	1986	1995
Total	13,6	19,7	10,2	13,7	100	100	100	100
Age								
- 15-24	38,0	57,1	25,7	41,6	41,8	26,2	37,4	28,1
- 25-34	15,3	30,3	12,5	16,7	32,3	38,1	36,7	35,6
- 35-44	7,2	14,7	5,3	9,7	15,4	22,5	15,7	21,3
- 45-54	5,2	8,0	3,7	7,3	7,7	11,3	6,4	13,1
- 55-64	5,1	4,6	5,5	4,0	2,9	1,9	3,9	1,9
Marital status								
- Unmarried	20,2	28,7	18,4	22,3	43,6	40,4	51,6	44,2
- married ¹	10,8	16,3	6,9	10,4	56,4	59,6	48,4	55,8
Children								
- none	16,7	19,7	12,8	15,8	65,1	55,0	68,3	62,0
- one or more	10,0	19,7	7,2	11,3	34,9	45,0	31,7	38,0
Level of education								
- basic	10,9	13,4	9,5	13,5	31,3	17,9	35,5	24,4
- middle	15,3	20,3	11,7	14,6	54,4	52,4	54,4	58,0
- higher	15,0	25,5	7,5	11,8	14,3	29,7	10,1	17,6
Socioeconomic status								
- blue-collar	10,4	17,6	10,6	15,1	24,3	21,7	60,3	57,5
- lower white-collar	14,6	18,7	9,3	12,4	57,7	53,3	18,8	19,5
- upper white-collar	16,6	25,2	10,4	12,1	18,0	25,0	20,9	23,1

Source: LFS 1986, 1995

¹ Married or cohabited

In the industrial sector temporary jobs in Finland are most frequently found in (female-dominated) services and the retail trade, and (male-dominated) agriculture and construction - and less common in manufacturing (Table 11). The situation is rather similar in Sweden and Denmark (Torp and Pettersen 1989, 121) and in most EU countries (excluding public services) (OECD 1987, 35-36).

Table 11. Proportion and distribution of temporary employment by industry, employer sector and gender in Finland 1986 and 1995

	Proportion				Distribution			
	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	1986	1995	1986	1995	1986	1995	1986	1995
Industry								
- agriculture	24,1	18,2	20,7	24,5	2,3	1,0	9,6	4,1
- manufacture	5,4	7,7	4,1	9,1	7,8	5,7	13,4	22,8
- construction	13,1	5,7	19,2	17,5	1,5	0,3	24,2	12,2
- retail trade	5,5	15,9	6,2	12,1	7,2	12,4	7,4	10,6
- transport	9,0	7,2	3,7	9,8	3,1	1,5	4,3	7,3
- financing	11,1	15,2	6,6	12,3	7,7	8,7	3,8	8,9
- services	20,8	26,4	20,6	21,9	70,4	70,6	37,3	34,1
Total	13,6	19,7	10,2	13,8	100	100	100	100
Employer sector								
- state	19,9	26,8	12,8	19,3	15,2	10,1	17,2	15,0
- municipal	20,8	26,6	23,2	20,3	49,9	53,1	26,0	21,6
- private	8,2	13,6	7,8	11,7	34,9	36,8	56,8	63,4
Thousands	137	172	106	115	137	172	106	115

Sources: LFS 1986, 1995

The proportion of temporary employment is larger in the public sector (state and municipalities) than in the private sector. Female temporary workers in particular are concentrated in the public sector. Male temporary work is - on the contrary - concentrated in the private sector. In most EU countries, the share of temporary employment has generally been lower in the public

than in the private sector. The only exceptions (1985) were Belgium and Denmark (Torp and Pettersen 1989, 121).

Temporary jobs, as part-time jobs, are concentrated in small establishments. In Finland (1995), almost half of all temporary workers (43%) were in establishments with less than 20 workers (36% of permanent workers). A similar difference was found in all industries. In the EU countries, too, temporary (and part-time) work appears to be particularly important to small and medium-sized businesses, notably those in the service sector such as retailing and tourism (COM(90) 228, 9; Dale and Bamford 1988, 196).

3.3. Are temporary jobs precarious?

In this study, temporary jobs are classified as precarious if they are characterized by low union density, overlap with part-time work and unstable work history. Temporary workers, as part-

Table 12. Unionization rate, proportion of temporary jobs and unemployment experiences among part-time and full-time workers 1986 and 1995 in Finland by gender (wage and salary earners, percentages)

Gender/year	Unionization rate		Proportion of part-time jobs		Has been unemployed during the last 12 months	
	Temporary	Permanent	Temporary	Permanent	Temporary	Permanent
Women						
- 1986	54	78	18	8	32	6
- 1995	77	86	21	8	46	5
Men						
- 1986	50	72	17	2	41	6
- 1995	67	82	13	3	52	8
All						
- 1986	52	75	17	5	36	6
- 1995	73	84	17	5	48	6

Source: LFS 1986, 1995

timers, are more rarely members of trade unions than permanent workers: 73% of Finnish temporary workers are unionized compared to 84% of permanent workers (Table 12). However, especially among women, the difference narrowed between 1986 and 1995. Moreover, Finnish women are more frequently unionized than men, despite continuity of work.

Another indicator of the precarious nature of temporary work is its overlap with part-time work. As was seen earlier, more than every third (41%) Finnish part-time worker has a temporary job. Moreover, 17% of temporary workers as against 5% of permanent workers have part-time jobs. Thus, in Finland, part-time work quite often has a temporary character; most temporary workers, however, are in full-time jobs.

In the current debate it is often assumed that temporary work means less stability of employment than permanent work. With respect to job tenure the differences are obvious: the average job tenure in temporary work was 1.5 years compared to 11.6 years in permanent work (LFS 1995). Correspondingly, temporary work is characterized by above-average mobility in the external labour markets. Temporary workers have - despite their shorter work experience - changed their occupations and employers more often than permanent workers during their working history. In addition, temporary workers had more often been unemployed (48% vs. 6%) than permanent workers during the previous year (LFS 1995).

Thus, in Finland many temporary jobs seem precarious, but not all. A considerable proportion of temporary workers are in more attractive and skilled jobs, especially in the public sector.

3.4. Bridges or traps?

Temporary employment - as part-time employment - seems to be a heterogeneous phenomenon. We can assume that some individuals may be forced to accept temporary work if there are no alternatives (involuntary temporary work), while some individuals may in fact prefer temporary work (voluntary temporary work). In this study temporary work has been classified as a bridge or a trap depending on (i) whether the taking up of temporary work has been voluntary or involuntary, and (ii) whether temporary work is associated with frequent changes of job. Temporary work is interpreted as a trap when it is involuntary and when there are few opportunities of getting a permanent job.

Motives for temporary work

Reasons for taking up temporary work have radically changed in the 1990s. In 1990, before the recession, one out of three temporary workers stated that he or she had been unable to find a permanent job, but as many stated that he or she did not want a permanent job (Table 13). In 1993, 77% of female and male temporary workers said that they had not found a permanent job. Only 5% stated their unwillingness to take a permanent job. There were only minor differences between women and men. Thus, most temporary workers can be classified as involuntary temporary workers.

Table 13. Motives for taking temporary work 1990-1993 by gender (%)

	Unable to find a permanent job	Didn't want a permanent job	Work is combined with studying	Other reasons	Total	N
Women						
- 1990	32	32	--	36	100	315
- 1991	65	17	8	10	100	377
- 1993	77	5	4	14	100	214
Men						
- 1990	30	28	--	42	100	236
- 1991	62	14	5	19	100	241
- 1993	76	5	5	14	100	167
All						
- 1990	31	30	--	39	100	551
- 1991	64	15	7	14	100	618
- 1993	77	5	5	13	100	381

Sources: 1990 Quality of working life survey; 1991 LFS; 1993 LFS.

Mobility patterns in temporary work

To what extent temporary work can be regarded as a trap or a bridge also depends on mobility patterns. In this study, mobility from 1989 to 1994 was studied with a retrospective question from Living Conditions Survey. The interview-based data was collected in Spring 1994 by

Statistics Finland (the data was described earlier). The persons interviewed (N=8650) were asked what they had been doing five years earlier (1989). Half of all the respondents had been wage and salary earners (4348 persons). Of these, 13.6% had been working on a temporary basis (591 persons). Table 14 compares the mobility patterns of temporary and permanent workers between 1989 and 1994.

Table 14. Mobility of temporary and permanent workers 1989-94 by gender

Main activity in 1994	Job contract 1989					
	Women		Men		Both genders	
	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.
Employed	54	75	48	74	51	74
- permanent	27	68	21	65	24	66
- temporary	25	4	21	4	23	4
- unknown	2	3	6	5	4	4
Unemployed	21	10	35	13	27	12
Not in the labour force	25	15	17	13	22	14
- studying	10	2	5	1	8	2
- retired, pensions	7	9	11	11	8	10
- other	8	4	1	1	5	2
Has been unemployed 1989-94	54	31	63	37	58	34
N	334	1859	257	1898	591	3757

Source: Living Conditions Survey 1994

Temporary workers have higher mobility than permanent workers. First, a smaller proportion of temporary workers remained employed after the five-year period compared to permanent workers (51% vs. 74%). Secondly, a larger proportion of temporary workers had left the labour market (for purpose of studying, retirement or for other reasons) (22% vs. 14%). Thirdly, there are clear differences in unemployment: 27% of temporary workers were unemployed compared to 14% of permanent workers. Correspondingly, temporary workers (58%) had

more often been unemployed during the five-year period compared to permanent workers (34%). Furthermore, the mobility patterns of male and female temporary workers differ: male temporary workers have a higher risk of unemployment.

A critical issue is change over time in temporary jobs: are those in temporary jobs likely to remain in that state or will a significant proportion find permanent employment? According to the results 23% of temporary workers had remained in temporary employment and 39% had shifted to permanent work (Table 14). Among temporary male workers in particular, the shift to permanent work is considerable: 47% of them had shifted to permanent work and only 8% had stayed in temporary work.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has concentrated on part-time and temporary work as the two most frequent forms of atypical work in Finland. The first aim of the study was to analyse the characteristics of atypical workers and their distribution according to industry and employer sector.

In Finland, 11% of female wage and salary earners work on a part-time basis and 20% are on temporary contracts. For men, the corresponding figures are 5% in part-time and 14% in temporary work. As a consequence, part-time work is more female-dominated (73%) than temporary work (60%).

Finland seems to be a deviant case in the Nordic context, especially as regards female part-time employment. In the other Nordic countries, part-time work accounts for more than 40% of all employed women, but in Finland only one in nine. In the EU countries the average share is about 30%. Moreover, the share of temporary work in female employment is somewhat larger in the Nordic than in the EU countries. As regards men, the extent of atypical employment and the differences between the various countries are smaller.

In Finland and the other Nordic countries studied, the number of part-time employees grew up to the early 1980s. During the late 1980s, however, the number of female part-time employees declined both in Finland and the other Nordic countries. Part-time working declined in the middle-aged groups, which - at least partially - may be a result of women's better education.

At the same time, part-time working has increased in the youngest age-groups, who often combine studying and work. In most EU countries, female part-time employment, by contrast, has grown steadily.

Part-time and temporary work can be seen as strategies used by employers to achieve numerical flexibility. Part-time work is usual in industries where the demand for products and services typically varies in the short term (e.g. daily or weekly as in the retail trade or cleaning). Temporary work is common in those industries where demand varies over a longer term (e.g. seasonally as in agriculture, construction, tourism and education). Neither form of atypical employment is common in the male-dominated manufacturing industries. In Finland, temporary work is also typically found in the public sector (health and social services, education). Thus, part-time and temporary work is frequent in both skilled and less-skilled occupations. A similar heterogeneity applies to education.

As seen from the supply side of the labour market, part-time and temporary work may for some people constitute alternative forms of employment. For Nordic women, part-time work is typical among mothers of small children (except in Finland). For men, part-time and temporary work are often ways of entering or leaving the labour market. However, a significant proportion of atypical employment is involuntary because of lacking full-time, permanent jobs.

The second aim was to inquire whether atypical forms of employment appear precarious as compared to standard employment relationships. The investigation concentrated on job characteristics (union density, overlap between temporary and part-time work) and stability of employment (unemployment experiences). On the basis of these criteria, the situation of part-timers in the Finnish labour market seems still to be more precarious than that of permanent workers. In the other Nordic countries (Norway and Sweden) the gaps between part-time and full-time work (unionization rate, continuity of jobs) have narrowed, which may reflect a normalization of part-time work in these countries. Therefore, part-time work does not lead inevitably to the marginalization of women in the labour market.

Thus, Finland seems to be an exception as regards part-time work. The share of female part-time workers is clearly lower than in the other Nordic countries, which is - partially at least - a result of earlier developments in female employment activity. Further, the social characteristics of female part-timeworkers also differ: in Finland they are usually younger and many are

still studying. Therefore, the role of part-time work has tended to be quite marginal in the Finnish labour markets and, it can be assumed that trade unions have not been as interested in part-time work as in the other Nordic countries.

In Finland, temporary jobs, especially, tend to be more precarious than permanent full-time jobs. Temporary work, even compared to part-time work, seems to have a closer connection with unemployment. Thus, in the sense of uncertainty, many temporary jobs seem precarious, but not all.

The third aim was to analyse to what extent atypical forms of employment can be considered as either 'bridges' or 'traps' in the labour market. Part-time or temporary work is interpreted as a trap when it is involuntary and when there are few opportunities of getting a full-time or permanent job.

In Finland - as in the other Nordic countries - most part-timers work voluntarily on a part-time basis, preferring this form of employment. The most common reasons among women were earlier child care and studying and among men, studying. In the 1990s, however, lack of full-time work has become the most common reason for part-time work.

Part-time workers have higher mobility compared to full-time workers: during the five-year period studied part-timers left the labour market more often than full-timers. With regard to unemployment risk, however, the difference was minor. Furthermore, shifting from part-time to full-time work was common, especially among male part-timers. Therefore, for most part-timers, part-time jobs seemed to be bridges rather than traps.

Motives in temporary work vary with business cycles. During a recession, most temporary workers could be classified as involuntary temporary workers: in 1993, the most common reason for temporary work was lack of permanent jobs. Temporary workers also had a higher risk of unemployment compared to permanent workers. However, shifting from temporary work to permanent work occurred widely, especially among men. To some - especially persons completing their studies - temporary work may also be a transitional stage on their way towards more permanent employment. Further analysis is needed to examine more closely the connections between these motives and the characteristics of temporary workers and jobs. The most difficult situation is probably for those temporary workers who only have a choice between atypical work and unemployment.

References

- Atkinson, J. 1987. Flexibility or fragmentation. *Labour and Society* 12 (1), 87-105.
- Beechey, V. & Perkins, T. 1987. *A Matter of Hours. Women, Part-time Work and the Labour Market*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Blank R. (1989) The role of part-time work in women's labour market choices over time. *American Economic Review* 79, 295-299.
- Bronstein, A.S. 1991. Temporary work in Western Europe: Threat or complement to permanent employment? *International Labour Review* 130, 291-310.
- Bruun, N. 1985. New forms and aspects of atypical employment relationships in Finland. In Tiitinen, K. (ed.) *Työoikeudellisen yhdistyksen vuosikirja 1985*, 63-75.
- Büchtemann, C. & Quack, S. 1989. 'Bridges' or 'traps'? Non-standard employment in the Federal Republic of Germany. In G. & J. Rodgers (ed.) *Precarious jobs in labour market regulation*. Geneva: ILO, 109-148.
- Casey, B. 1987. The extent and nature of temporary employment in Great Britain. *Policy Studies* 8(1), 64-75.
- Casey, B., Dragendorf, R., Heering, W. & John, G. 1989. Temporary employment in Great Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany. *International Labour Review* 128(4), 449-466.
- COM(90), 228. Commission of the European Communities. Proposal for council directives on certain employment relationship with regard to working conditions and to distortion of competition. Brussels, 13 August 1990.
- Cordova, E. 1986. From full-time wage employment to atypical employment: A major shift in the evolution of labour relations? *International Labour Review* 125 (6), 641-657.
- Dale, A. & Bamford, C. 1988. Temporary workers: Cause for concern or complacency. *Work, Employment & Society* 2(2), 191-209.

Delsen, L. 1995. Atypical employment: an international perspective. Wolters-Noordhoff: Groningen.

Deltidsarbeite, 1988. Statistiska Centralbyrån, IAM 1988:2. Stockholm.

Ellingsaeter, A.L. 1989. Normalisering av deltidsarbeidet. Statistisk sentralbyrå, Sociale og økonomiske studier 71. Oslo.

Emerson, M. 1988. Regulation or deregulation of the labour market. *European Economic Review* 32, 775-817.

Employment in Europe 1995. Luxembourg: Commission of the European Union.

Esping-Andersen, G. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Eurostat 1993. Employment and unemployment (Eurostat 3C).

Felstead, A. 1991. The social organization of the franchise: A case of 'controlled self-employment'. *Work, Employment & Society* 5(1), 37-57.

ILO, 1989. Conditions of work digest, Vol. 8(1): Part-time work.

Kühl, J. 1990. New deal and new forms of employment. *Labour and Society* 15(2), 237-255.

Lane, C. 1989. From 'welfare capitalism' to 'market capitalism': A comparative review of trends towards employment flexibility in the labour markets of three major European societies, *Sociology*, 23, 583-610.

Loufli, M. 1991. Self-employment patterns and policy issues in Europe. *International Labour Review* 130(1), 1-19.

Marshall, A. 1989. The sequel of unemployment: The changing role of part-time and temporary work in Western Europe. In G. & J. Rodgers (ed.) *Precarious jobs in labour market regulation*. Geneva: ILO, 17-48.

- McGregor, A. and Sproull, A. (1991) Employer labour use strategies: Analysis of a national survey. London: Department of Employment, Research paper no. 83.
- Numhauser-Henning, A. (1988) Temporary employment: A critical study of the Swedish regulations covering categories of employment and their functions, *Comparative Labor Law Journal*, 10, 36-64.
- Nätti, J. 1993. Temporary employment in the Nordic Countries: A 'Trap' or a 'bridge'? *Work, Employment & Society* 7(3), 451-464.
- Nätti, J. 1995. Part-Time Work in the Nordic Countries: A Trap for Women? *LABOUR. Review of labour economics and industrial relations*, Vol 2(2), 343-357.
- OECD. *Employment Outlook*. Paris (1983-1996).
- Pfau-Effinger B. 1993. Modernisation, culture and part-time employment: The example of Finland and West Germany, *Work, Employment & Society* 7, 451-464.
- Pollert, A. 1988. The 'flexible firm': Fixation or fact? *Work, Employment & Society* 2 (3), 281-316.
- Rodgers, G. 1989. Precarious work in Western Europe: The state of debate. In G. & J. Rodgers (ed.) *Precarious jobs in labour market regulation*. Geneva: ILO, 1-16.
- Sundström, M. 1987. *A Study in the Growth of Part-time Work in Sweden*. Stockholm: Arbetslivscentrum.
- Tilly, C. 1992. Dualism in part-time employment. *Industrial Relations* 31, 330-347.
- Torp, H. & Pettersen, S. 1989. *Markedet for korttidsarbeid*. Institutt for samfunnsforskning, Rapport 89:6. Oslo.
- Uusitalo, H. 1990. *The Scandinavian model of social policy*. Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration, Dept. of Law and Social Sciences, Working Papers F250.

ELINKEINOELÄMÄN TUTKIMUSLAITOS (ETLA)
THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF THE FINNISH ECONOMY
LÖNNROTINKATU 4 B, FIN-00120 HELSINKI

Puh./Tel. (09) 609 900

Telefax (09) 601753

Int. 358-9-609 900

Int. 358-9-601 753

<http://www.etla.fi>

KESKUSTELUAIHEITA - DISCUSSION PAPERS ISSN 0781-6847

- No 575 ERKKI KOSKELA - MARKKU OLLIKAINEN, Optimal Design of Forest Taxation with Multiple-use Characteristics of Forest Stands. 11.12.1996. 31 p.
- No 576 MIKA PAJARINEN, On Possibilities to Construct a Model for Trade Flows and Factors of Production Movements between the EU and Eastern Europe. 30.12.1996. 25 p.
- No 577 ERKKI KOSKELA - MARKKU OLLIKAINEN, Tax Incidence and Optimal Forest Taxation under Stochastic Demand. 07.01.1997. 29 p.
- No 578 JUSSI RAUMOLIN, Trends in Logistics in Europe. 07.01.1997. 31 p.
- No 579 JYRKI ALI-YRKKÖ - SARI SIRVIÖ - PEKKA YLÄ-ANTTILA, Ulkomaiset yritykset Suomessa - onnistuneita yritysostoja vai tehokkaampaa toimintaa? 13.01.1997. 23 s.
- No 580 JULIANNA BORSOS-TORSTILA, Foreign Direct Investment and Technology Transfer. Results of a survey in selected branches in Estonia. 27.01.1997. 27 p.
- No 581 PASI KUOPPAMÄKI, Joint Implementation and Climate Change: Rationality of joint implementation when energy markets are not well-functioning. 28.01.1997. 43 p.
- No 582 THOMAS RIMMLER, Potentiaalisen tuotannon kehitys Suomen kansantaloudessa 1975-1998. 29.01.1997. 61 s.
- No 583 KARI ALHO, The Effect of a Devaluation on Output Revisited. 30.01.1997. 15 p.
- No 584 ANNICK LARUELLE - MIKA WIDGRÉN, The Development of the Division of Power between EU Commission, EU Council and European Parliament. 03.02.1997. 25 p.
- No 585 TIMO KUOSMANEN, Productive Efficiency in the Forest Industry: An International Industry-level Study. 12.02.1997. 89 p.
- No 586 REIJO MANKINEN, Hotelli- ja ravintola-alan kehitysnäkymät vuosina 1997-2000. 12.02.1997. 56 s.
- No 587 MIKA ERKKILÄ, European Integration and Foreign Direct Investment: Finnish Foreign Direct Investment Flows in 1975-1994 with Emphasis on the Host Implications for EMU Membership. 26.02.1997. 27 p.

- No 588 OLLI-PEKKA RUUSKANEN, Menetetyn ajan arvon huomioivat nettokorvausasteet ja kynnyspalkat. 03.03.1997. 24 s.
- No 589 SYNNÖVE VUORI, Technology Spillovers and Their Effects - A Review. 03.03.1997. 26 p.
- No 590 PEKKA LEHTONEN, Osaamispohjaisen yrityksen menestystie: Analyysi seitsemän suomalaisen yrityksen kehittymisestä oman alansa parhaimmistoon. 14.03.1997. 48 s.
- No 591 KAI HUSSO, Investigating the Relationship between R&D and Productivity at the Firm-Level: Case Study of Finnish Manufacturing Industry. 25.03.1997. 48 p.
- No 592 MIKA PAJARINEN, Immateriaaliset oikeudet ja niistä saatavan taloudellisen hyödyn jakaminen. 04.04.1997. 42 s.
- No 593 PEKKA VISURI, Baltian maiden turvallisuuspoliittinen asema. 11.04.1997. 42 s.
- No 594 TARMO VALKONEN, Corporate Taxation and Investment Finance in Finland: A General Equilibrium View. 23.04.1997. 32 p.
- No 595 VESA KANNIAINEN, Empire Building by Corporate Managers: Corporation as a Savings Instrument. 30.04.1997. 24 p.
- No 596 SYNNÖVE VUORI, Alternative Ways of Measuring Technology Spillovers - Results with Finnish Data. 30.04.1997. 25 p.
- No 597 ERKKI KOSKELA - MARKKU OLLIKAINEN, Optimal Design of Forest and Capital Income Taxation in an Economy with an Austrian Sector. 13.05.1997. 26 p.
- No 598 KNUT A. MAGNUSSEN - METTE ROLLAND, The European Economy. Medium-term perspectives. 20.05.1997. 22 p.
- No 599 RIIKKA KIVIMÄKI, Family Life and Working Life Colouring and Structuring Each Other. Case Examples. 21.05.1997. 15 p.
- No 600 HEATHER JOSHI - PIERELLA PACI, Wage Differentials between Men and Women: Evidence from British Birth Cohort Studies. 21.05.1997. 13 p.
- No 601 JUKKA LASSILA - HEIKKI PALM - TARMO VALKONEN, FOG: Suomen kansantalouden limittäisten sukupolvien malli. 21.05.1997. 83 s.
- No 602 JOUKO NÄTTI, A Typical Employment and Gender in Finland. 02.06.1997. 33 p.

Elinkeinoelämän Tutkimuslaitoksen julkaisemat "Keskusteluaiheet" ovat raportteja alustavista tutkimustuloksista ja väliraportteja tekeillä olevista tutkimuksista. Tässä sarjassa julkaistuja monisteita on mahdollista ostaa Taloustieto Oy:stä kopiointi- ja toimituskuluja vastaavaan hintaan.

Papers in this series are reports on preliminary research results and on studies in progress. They are sold by Taloustieto Oy for a nominal fee covering copying and postage costs.

d:\ratapalo\DP-julk.sam\02.06.1997