1

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

**Part-Time Work in Canada: A
Segmentation Approach**

by

Glenn Wheeler, B.A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

**Master of Arts
Department of Sociology and Anthropology**

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
July 18, 1990**

**©copyright
1990, Glenn Wheeler**

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

ISBN 0-315-60476-X

The undersigned recommend to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

**Part-Time Work in Canada: A
Segmentation Approach**

submitted by Glenn Wheeler, B.A.
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
August 13, 1990

ABSTRACT

The issue of part-time work in Canada is the subject of intense debate. Part-time workers tend to receive lower wages and fewer benefits, and they are subjected to strict managerial control and the threat of job loss. Segmentation theory provides the basis for an understanding of the disadvantaged position of those who work less than full-time. To contribute to the study of this phenomenon an examination of part-time workers is undertaken, using data from the 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project. The findings lend support to the segmentation theory assertion that people with certain characteristics are susceptible to this form of employment and that part-time positions are less advantageous than full-time positions. Part-time workers constitute a disadvantaged segment of the labour force.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	iv
Chapter 1 - Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 - Review of Literature.....	5
Segmentation Perspective.....	5
Flexible Firm Model... ..	12
Capitalist Restructuring.....	15
Part-time Employment Definitions.....	18
The Impact of Unionization.....	19
Labour Legislation.....	25
The Economic Structure.....	29
Reasons for Workers Taking on Part-time Employment.....	31
Women.....	35
Employer Motives.....	37
Chapter 3 - Methodology.....	40
Chapter 4 - From Theory to Hypotheses.....	46
Chapter 5 - Analysis of Data	
Section 1 - Worker Characteristics.....	56
Section 2 - Conditions of Jobs.....	59
Chapter 6 - Discussion and Conclusions.....	68
Tables.....	74
Footnotes.....	103
References.....	105
Appendix A: Relevant Questions from Survey.....	114

List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
1	Part-Time and Full-Time Employment in Canada, 1953-1986	74
2	Benefit Coverage of Part-Time and Full-Time Employees, Canada, 1985	75
3	Labour Force by Sector, Canada, 1951-1987	76
4	Part-Time Workers in the Service Sector, Canada, 1987	76
5	Reasons for Part-Time Employment in Canada, 1975-1986	77
6	Involuntary Part-Time Workers as a Percentage of All Employment, Canada, 1986	77
7	Wright's Twelve-Category Industry Classification Scheme, Canadian Workers, 1983	78
8	Classification of Industries, Periphery and Core, Canada, 1983	79
9	Part-Time and Full-Time Workers by Core and Periphery Segments, Canada, 1983	80
10	Part-Time and Full-Time Workers by Core, Periphery and State Segments, Canada, 1983	81
11	Respondent's Job Status, By Number and Percentage, Canada, 1983	82
12	Job Status by Sex, Part-Time and Full-Time Positions, Canada, 1983	82
13	Job Status by Age and Sex, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	83
14	Job Status by Education and Sex, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers Canada, 1983	84

List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
15	Women's Job Status by Marital Status, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	85
16	Married Women's Job Status by Presence of Children, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	86
17	Job Status by Whether or Not Attending School, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	87
18	Job Status by Ability to Take Time Off Without Penalty, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	88
19	Job Status by Ability to Slow Down Work at Own Discretion, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	89
20	Job Status by Possibility to Design Own Work, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	90
21	Job Status by Decision-Making Procedure, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	91
22	Job Status by Whether Supervisor Decides Daily Tasks, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada 1983	92
23	Job Status by How Closely Instructions Followed, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	93
24	Job Status by Degree to Which Supervisor Influences Pay and Promotion, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	94
25	Job Status by Training Required for Type of Work, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	95
26	Job Status by Usefulness of Job Skills Elsewhere, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	96

List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
27	Job Status by Level of Skill Others Perceive Job Having, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	97
28	Job Status by Amount of Thought and Attention Required of Job, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	98
29	Job Status by Union at Place of Work, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	99
30	Job Status by Ever Unemployed, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	100
31	Job Status by Ever Unemployed and Age, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	101
32	Job Status by Position in the Management Hierarchy, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983	102

Chapter 1

Introduction

The issue of part-time work in Canada has attracted widespread interest among academics, union representatives, government organizations, women's groups, and workers themselves. This attention is due to both the increasing proportion of part-time workers in the labour force and the unique experiences of this group. The growth in part-time employment was strong in the 1960s, moderated in the 1970s, and accelerated again in the early 1980s (Coates, 1988: 6). Part-time employment increased 83.2 percent from 1975 to 1986, while total employment rose by only 25.3 percent. So by 1986, 15.6 percent of employed persons were working part-time (or 1,810,000 people), compared to 10.6 percent (988,000 workers) in 1975 (Levesque, 1987: 88; Coates, 1988: 7) (Table 1). This increase, and the issues associated with it, have certainly focused attention on the situation of part-time workers in Canada.

A number of reasons have been suggested for the expansion of part-time work. They include the following:

- (1) the impact of economic downturns which makes part-time work more attractive to employers (Akyeampong, 1987: 31);

- (2) family members take on part-time employment to help to pay expenses or increase consumer buying power (Fraser, 1986: 37);
- (3) rising numbers of women want to combine family responsibilities with careers (Burke, 1986: 9);
- (4) students rely on part-time employment as a means of paying for their education (Baker, 1988: 3; Ronen, 1984: 17);
- (5) more older people want to continue working, on a part-time basis, to maintain a better income or ease into retirement (Ginzberg, 1982: 81-83; Jackofsky, Salter, and Peters, 1986: 41; Ronen, 1984: 120, 125; Labour Canada, 1983: 109-118);
- (6) the expanding service sector is more conducive to part-time employment (Lindsay, 1989: 23); and,
- (7) some people, such as young married professionals, are questioning the merits of full-time work, a result of the increasing importance attached to leisure time and recreational activities (Pierce, Newstrom, Dunham, and Barber, 1989: 74-75; Weiermair, 1988: 25).

These factors have combined to raise substantially both the demand for part-time positions and the supply of part-time workers.

The situation of these part-time workers, however, is less advantageous than that of the labour force as a whole. This is reflected in part-timers' lower wages, fewer benefits, and less job security. Although there are variations of part-time work, such as flexible working hours, job sharing, and short-time compensation, which allow employees in many instances to maintain a status similar to that of full-time job-holders, most part-time workers have jobs characterized by low pay, little chance of promotion, little job security, a lack of continuity in employment, and few fringe benefits (Baker, 1988: 4-5; Burke, 1986: 9).

Given both the large number of issues that part-time work incorporates and the central importance of work in our society, it is no surprise that sociology has taken a keen interest in this subject.¹ Part-time work touches on such pervasive sociological concerns as inequality, gender relations, power, stratification, and labour relations. As such, a number of theories or perspectives have been developed which may be presented to help explain this phenomenon. Segmentation theory, as well as the flexible firm model and work on capitalist restructuring, prove very useful as aids to understand part-time work, or at least situate it within a manageable framework. The three serve to complement rather than challenge each other.

Segmentation theory points to a labour force divided into at least two general groups. The first segment includes workers in good jobs characterized by promotional opportunities, security, good pay, and superior working conditions. The second segment is made up of those in less desirable jobs characterized by strict managerial control, poor wages, little protection from unemployment, little bargaining power, and inferior working conditions. Part-time jobs are generally seen to be of the latter nature. Proponents of this approach, including Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel (1983), and Doeringer and Piore (1971), point to the disparities between the two segments, and the barriers which serve to perpetuate them. The

flexible firm model sees part-time work as a form of numerical flexibility. Part-time workers are sought as a means of quick response to continuous change in the demand for labour (Pollert, 1985). Capitalist restructuring theorists see part-time labour as one component of an overall restructuring of work, which is connected to attempts by employers to better control workers, increase profits, and facilitate flexibility (Panitch, 1987).

This study will contribute to the sociological understanding of part-time work by investigating how accurately segmentation theory accounts for this issue. This is to be accomplished by analyzing data collected for the 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project (Myles and Clement, 1983). Comparing the characteristics of part-time workers with full-time workers, and comparing part-time positions with full-time positions, facilitates a comprehensive evaluation of the validity of the segmentation perspective.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The investigation of part-time work encompasses several theoretical perspectives and many empirical studies. An analysis of the research done in this area will serve to situate the discussion and suggest hypotheses which merit testing. In this section, the theoretical framework will be introduced. Part-time work may be studied within the labour market segmentation perspective which points to a segmented labour force characterized by primary and secondary jobs. Related theoretical contributions include work on flexible specialization and capitalist restructuring. Subsequently, a number of more empirically oriented contributions will be drawn upon and discussed within the theoretical framework.

Segmentation Perspective

The segmentation perspective was developed in the United States in response to the perceived failure of the supply-side thrust of the war on poverty. This had involved emphasis on training and investment in experience and other human capital. Limited success led sociologists

and economists to look more closely at the institutional context of work, especially the segregation of "good" and "bad" jobs (Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 247). This perspective is, accordingly, critical of both human capital theory and the functional theory of stratification. As Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel (1983: 246) point out, segmentation theory is a middle-range conceptualization in the field of stratification, developed inductively from research findings and criticism of existing social policies. It is also necessary to advocate that labour force segments are best seen as ideal types or "poles" between which industries, firms, jobs, and workers are ranged. Often, various factors interact, meaning that determination of segment location is multi-causal (Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 40, 53). In addition, it is essentially superficial to conceptualize the existence of only a dual labour market (two separate labour markets) when there exists in reality a set of segmented markets (Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 52).

The main argument of the segmentation perspective is that inequalities which profoundly affect life chances are in large measure a function of the way work is organized in our society. Systematic processes are at work which segment the labour market, creating inequalities which interact with and reinforce social divisions among the population. This necessitates a focus on the question of

how working conditions, compensation, training, and promotion opportunities are linked to the distribution of power and the way market activities are structured and institutionalized (Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 40; Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 246). As such, "segmentation theorists emphasize barriers rather than mobility, inequity rather than equalization of return, employer strategy in place of worker sovereignty and institutionalized job structures and market arrangements as well as individual labour market outcomes" (Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 247). This implies an emphasis on a working class divided into those workers in good jobs which have adequate levels of compensation, job security, and training opportunities (primary employment conditions), and those workers filling poor jobs which have undesirable characteristics (secondary employment conditions) (Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 52).

With attention paid to "structure" and "institutionalization", the segmentation perspective has emphasized the interaction of power, technology, and market conditions as basic explanatory factors. More specific concepts utilized include internal labour markets, the structure of managerial control, bargaining power, market control, labour force strategy, tracked mobility, and pre- and in-market mobility. Despite the number of widely varying contributions to segmentation theory, there are common

tenets which provide a degree of theoretical coherence (Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 248). They include the following: inequity, inequality of opportunity, distribution of bargaining power, internal labour markets, stability of work careers, capriciousness of management, and alienation.

The first tenet, inequity, asserts that rewards (such as promotions and security) to workers vary by segment. In other words, there is an intersegment inequality in compensation. It is also suggested that inequity in returns applies mainly to certain types of workers such as women, migrants, and visible minorities, and "that the relationship between compensation and human capital is essentially spurious, reflecting credentialism, pre-market segmentation, and the like" (Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 249). As such, part-time workers are seen to receive lower returns than full-time workers for the most part, due to their location in secondary job ghettos.

Segmentation theorists point to inequality of opportunity, suggesting the existence of barriers, including a scarcity of jobs in the advantaged segments, which limit movement across segments. Thus job sectors are divided into non-competing groups (Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 68). As a result, most job changes are of an intra-segment nature, meaning there is considerable "tracking" and little mobility out of the disadvantaged

segments into the more advantaged segments (Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 249; Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 52). Part-time work serves as a barrier to mobility for reasons including fewer hours worked (resulting in less seniority) and frequent job changes. These barriers are not absolute, but rather they are "like a tangle of thickets which can be traversed only by a combination of perseverance, favourable circumstances, and knowledge of the hidden paths" (Morse, 1969: 67).

The distribution of bargaining power is a central concern. This tenet postulates an explicit link between segment location and social characteristics such as age, sex, and race. What is emphasized is

the marginality of workers in the disadvantaged segment. The major point is that workers with different social characteristics located in different sectors have different bargaining power and capacity to resist exploitation. Processes of exclusion and exposure result in their being especially vulnerable to ... 'the anarchy of the market' (Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 249-250; also Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 41, 59).

Members of the disadvantaged segment fail to have their interests and concerns represented, so these concerns are not well reflected in societal consensus through laws and legislation. Part-time workers in particular have little bargaining power and therefore have limited opportunity to improve their condition.

The segmentation perspective emphasizes the presence of internal labour markets which serve to insulate workers

from wider markets outside the employing organization. The segments differ substantially with respect to meaningful training, internal job ladders, and mobility ladders (and their degree of institutionalization). These differences in organization and structure create different opportunities for advancement. Part-time workers are often excluded from internal labour markets due to their generally weaker link to the work organization (Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 55; Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 250). Doeringer and Piore (1971) emphasize the centrality of internal labour markets for the advantaged segments. They outline three major factors necessary for the generation of internal labour markets:

- (1) skill specificity refers to the notion that specific training has little effect on the productivity of employees that would be useful at other workplaces. Skill specificity increases the training costs for the employer and makes it advantageous to minimize employee turnover (Doeringer and Piore, 1971: 13-14).
- (2) on-the-job training dictates that formal educational requirements are often used mainly as a screening device for selecting people with certain aptitudes or characteristics. On-the-job training functions to provide the skills necessary for job performance (Doeringer and Piore, 1971: 18).
- (3) custom or stability refers to rules that govern the work relationship. Unions serve to facilitate stability because training, promotion, and wage decisions become formal in nature and are subject to the explicit review of unions and management (Doeringer and Piore, 1971: 23-24, 35).

These three factors serve to concretize internal labour

markets. Conversely, in the disadvantaged segments skills are more general and learned relatively quickly.

The fifth tenet, stability of work careers, suggests that segments differ in terms of job stability. Both employers and employees in the disadvantaged segments seem to have little commitment to "a stable workforce". And since these segments are associated with unstable product demand factors, a significant difference between segments in job instability is apparent. It is also postulated that differences in job instability by segment are manifested primarily in "voluntary" job instability, or people quitting (Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 250). By its very nature, part-time work is characterized by instability. Part-timers in the disadvantaged segment in particular do not generally possess scarce skills and are seen by employers as lacking commitment.

The sixth tenet, capriciousness of management, states that relations between management and workers are expected to differ by segment.

Because of labour availability and the low capital/labour ratio of the work organization in the less advantaged segment(s), workforce morale is not an employer priority in these segments. There is also a lower level of unionization. As a consequence of these factors, employer-employee relations are expected to be less institutionalized and more capricious (Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 251).

Therefore, labour-management relations contrast from instrumental/bureaucratic in the advantaged segments to

negative exchange in the disadvantaged segments. Part-time workers in the disadvantaged sectors bear the brunt of management capriciousness.

A final tenet, alienation, suggests that segment location has effects that carry over outside the labour market as well. Being in the disadvantaged segments for a time has a negative effect on work attitudes and behaviour. It is even stated that effects are felt at the societal level (Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 251; Feldberg and Glenn, 1979: 525-526). Some segmentation theorists also emphasize the importance of education, which serves to limit the number of "qualified" people eligible for jobs in the advantaged segments (Hodson and Kaufman, 1982: 731; Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 61).

In terms of segmentation theory, part-time workers are generally seen to be in the disadvantaged segments. There exist serious barriers to standards which workers in the advantaged segments enjoy. Inequality of opportunity, little bargaining power, strict management control, and few promotional opportunities are all factors which describe the situation of workers in the disadvantaged segments and of part-time workers in general.

Flexible Firm Model

The flexible firm model can also be used as an

explanation for the conditions of part-time work. Flexibility can be seen as the freedom for employers to lay off workers in response to changed economic conditions, the freedom to deploy labour as desired within the firm, and the effort to convert a more traditional and hierarchical corporate structure into a form that can quickly and efficiently respond to changing economic conditions (Piore, 1986: 146; Streeck, 1987: 287-290). These three aspects have played a prominent part in the ongoing debate over labour market flexibility. This model serves to complement segmentation theory because of its emphasis on the precarious and second-class position of part-time workers.

Analysts of the flexible firm model, such as Pollert (1988), Atkinson (1984), and Piore and Sabel (1984), see flexibility in the firm in terms of its adaptability to expansion, contraction, or change in the product market. This, in turn, is dependent on the firm's workers offering two different kinds of flexibility. The first group of workers offer "functional flexibility" in the labour process. This is done by crossing occupational boundaries and multi-skilling, and also flexibility in time, in terms of adjusting more closely to production demands. The second group provides "numerical flexibility". These workers may be insecurely or irregularly employed, enjoy only part-time status, or they may not have a direct relationship with the firm at all (for example,

sub-contractors). For the second group, the precariousness of the employment relationship provides the employer with a numerically variable workforce (Pollert, 1988: 283; Piore, 1986: 152-153, 157, Streeck, 1987: 290).

This model postulates an emerging system which incorporates the two kinds of worker flexibility. The flexible firm may be seen as a micro dual labour market model, with an inner "core" of stable, skilled employees with access to a "primary labour market". The economic and social basis of this more privileged sector is its importance to the organization's key, firm-specific activities (Pollert, 1988: 283 cited from Atkinson, 1984). Therefore, the model rests on the assumption of a direct relationship between primary employment conditions and the business concept of strategic choice of an organization's core activity. The "peripheral" workers,² by contrast, are less central, meaning they are important, but not part of the core business. They are more easily recruitable from the open labour market, and therefore less protected from its competitive pressures. Numerical flexibility is sought so that the number of employees can be quickly and easily increased or decreased in line with changes in the level of demand for labour (Pollert, 1988: 284 cited from Atkinson, 1984). In seeking workers' functional and numerical flexibility, the flexible firm seeks both product market flexibility and financial flexibility.

It is worth noting that the flexible firm is described as "a tool with which to analyse a wide variety of changes in employment practice, rather than as a description of a real firm" (Pollert, 1988: 285). Its value is based on its illustration of part-time work as a peripheral form of labour that is distinct from the primary labour market. As such, this model serves to complement segmentation theory.

Capitalist Restructuring

The debate over capitalist restructuring can also be used to help situate part-time work, although it is somewhat at odds with both the segmentation perspective and the flexible firm model. Panitch (1987: 131) states that

one of the most important developments currently taking place in capitalist societies is a restructuring of work, whereby changing processes of production, changing locations of production, changing job definitions and requirements, and changing relations between workers and managers at the point of production are all issuing a profound challenge to long-established patterns.

The restructuring of the labour market has been seen in terms of a return to cyclical unemployment, structural unemployment, part-time work, and the presence of a reserve of unemployed. This restructuring, characterized by global financial speculation, mergers, and closures, illustrates the limits of each corporation's ability to control its environment and the necessity of finding new ways to compete successfully (Panitch, 1987: 134-135; Kuttner, 1983: 61).

In the face of such strong competition, recent developments initiated by capitalist classes can be seen as a strategic attack on labour. The new stress on individualism and competition in the labour market (the "right to work") as the prime components of freedom are in direct contrast to the gains made for the collective rights and benefits of workers. Actions by capitalists have taken the form of abridging collective rights such as the right to strike or picket (Panitch, 1987: 136). This is coupled with the introduction of new technology, specifically computers, which serves "to raise productivity, lower costs, particularly labour costs, to increase control over the labour process and thus over workers" (Armstrong, 1986: 45). And, as the new technology increases productivity while reducing the number of workers needed, the least protected, such as part-time employees and workers without union protection, are the most likely to be hurt (Armstrong, 1986: 88; Kuttner, 1983: 62).

But the current capitalist offensive is more than this because there are important changes also being introduced at the level of individual firms. The major corporations have responded to economic uncertainty by organizing production so that they can respond flexibly and quickly to changing market situations. As such, the growth in part-time jobs and the employment of casual labour is not simply a matter of workers taking what they can get in the

context of current labour market conditions. It is also a matter of capital's own search for flexibility, and it reflects the way demand for labour is being restructured. Thus, the effort on the part of capital for decentralized collective bargaining is intended to break up the system of centralized, industry-wide bargaining which now gets in the way of the search for flexibility on a firm by firm, plant by plant, office by office basis. "Management's new design involves socializing workers into the ethos of profitability through flexibility, in the hope that they will internalize it, [and] police themselves accordingly" (Panitch, 1987: 137).

The work on restructuring illustrates the role that capital desires part-time work to play in the economy. Part-time labour serves to reduce employee-related costs and increase flexibility. The precarious nature of this type of employment is evident.

The theoretical formulations introduced above suggest that the situation of part-time workers in Canada is characterized by little chance of career advancement, insecurity, and few benefits. This is especially true when part-time workers are compared to full-time workers in general. The increase in, and probable permanence of, part-time employees as a significant proportion of the Canadian labour force makes this situation an important one. An examination of the characteristics of part-time

workers and the conditions of part-time positions may be useful. More specifically, an examination of both employers' and workers' perspectives on part-time work shows that a conflict of interests is apparent. It is necessary to ask who benefits and who does not. Is part-time work a source of greater inequality in the labour market? Who gets stuck in part-time jobs? Why is it on the increase? These issues can be examined by analyzing the following aspects of part-time work: the influence of unionization, the impact of legislation, the role of the changing economic structure, why people accept part-time employment, involuntary part-time workers, women as part-time workers, and employers' reasons for hiring part-time help. These issues will be examined within the general framework of segmentation theory.

Part-time Employment - Definitions

Before the issues introduced above are examined, it is necessary to define part-time employment more carefully and explicitly. There are a range of definitions of part-time work in Canada. The following definition was used by the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council (CEIAC) in its 1981 study of part-time work: "A work schedule other than regular full-time, year-round employment offered by an employer and accepted by an employee" (Baker, 1988: 2). In addition to regular or permanent part-time

employment, part-time work may be on a casual, intermittent, contingent, temporary, seasonal, or contract basis. It may also include arrangements such as job sharing (Burke, 1986: 10). This definition, however, is general and must be made more specific for empirical analysis. The most common and widely acknowledged quantitatively-oriented definition is put forward by Statistics Canada. The Labour Force Survey differentiates between full-time and part-time employment by the number of hours usually worked per week. A person who is employed in the reference week, and who usually works less than thirty hours per week, is considered a part-time worker (Akyeampong, 1986: 146). While a strict definition is not critical during this review of the literature, it will be for the data analysis. The above-mentioned aspects of part-time work will be looked at more closely.

The Impact of Unionization

It is logical to assume that part-time workers can improve their standing by unionizing, but the solution is not as simple as it appears. "Traditionally, unions have placed a low priority on negotiating provisions for part-time employees in collective agreements" (Coates, 1988: 70; also Labour Canada, 1983: 93; Baker and Robeson, 1981: 379). Their objections to this group are based on a number of assumptions. One observation is that the

expansion of part-time jobs is contrary to the interests of people who need full-time income. A second reason is that since a shorter work week and fewer work years, without loss of pay, are important union goals, a focus on part-time work could detract from this. Unions feel that exploitation of part-timers is common and easy for companies, and this erodes labour standards (thus hurting union goals). Another reason is that part-time employment often downgrades occupational status and institutionalizes women in inferior roles (Labour Canada, 1985: 93-94; Ronen, 1984: 153; Canadian Labour Congress, 1982: 6; Benimadhu, 1986: 21-22). Unions have had limited success organizing part-time workers because of high turnover rates, difficulties in arranging meeting times, and part-timers' generally low level of job commitment (Baker, 1988: 6; Baker and Robeson, 1981: 384). While the primary involvements of full-time workers tend to be job-related, the primary involvements of part-time workers are often external, namely family, school, or another job (Jackofsky, Salter, and Peters, 1986: 41). Unions are of the opinion that quite often labour relations legislation or practice excludes part-timers, thus making it harder to fight for this group's rights.

This union opposition has often been put into practice through moves to protect the bargaining strength of full-time workers, including "limits on the ratio of

part-time to full-time employees; restrictions on seniority rights; controls on the number of part-time hours worked, entitlement to overtime payments, and mobility between part-time and full-time positions" (Coates, 1988: 71; also Baker, 1988: 4). Another form of restriction on part-time work is lower wage scales for these employees (Coates, 1988: 74). Nevertheless, these reasons can be seen ultimately as union excuses. Unions have, especially in the past made very little effort to incorporate this group. Part-timers have been intentionally and deliberately excluded from union participation.

More recently, however, there has been a trend towards a more accepting and supportive attitude with respect to these workers. Many unions now seem less opposed to part-time work itself than to employers' use of this type of employment as cheap labour, its expansion at the expense of full-time positions, and to employers' inequitable treatment of part-time workers (Coates, 1988: 70; Labour Canada, 1983: 93). It appears, therefore, that the union attitude towards this work arrangement is in a state of transition. Many unions see the potential offered by part-time workers as new recruits, especially among women and in retail trade and financial sectors where there are many part-time employees (Coates, 1988: 70-71; Clemenson, 1989: 30).

Unions, such as the Canadian Union of Public Employees

(CUPE), the Federation of Social Affairs Inc. (FSA), the Service Employees' International Union (SEIU), and the Ontario Nurses Association (ONA), are now trying to improve the pay, benefits, work schedules, and rules relating to seniority and overtime pay to protect their growing proportions of members who work part-time (Clemenson, 1989: 40; Baker, 1988: 6). It is pointed out that changing economic and social circumstances dictate that unions have to take a more flexible approach in dealing with the issue of part-time work (Little, 1986: 20). With increasing frequency labour negotiations result in union acceptance of part-time workers (Fraser, 1986: 37).

It appears that the more women members within a union, the more progressive its attitude towards part-time workers and the greater its success in obtaining benefits for these people. An example is nurses' unions, whose membership is 98 percent female, and between 40 and 60 percent part-time. They have fought for prorated fringe benefits or pay in lieu of benefits for their part-time members. Teachers and retail clerks (in supermarkets) are two other groups which have negotiated for equality for part-time workers (Labour Canada, 1983: 94-95). However, it should be pointed out that other occupations, such as office and restaurant workers, with a high proportion of both women and part-timers, have low unionization rates³ (Baker and Roeson, 1981: 386).

The fact remains that few part-time workers are unionized or covered by collective agreements. That is, there are significant differences in unionization rates between part-time and full-time employees. As of 1984, only 19 percent of part-time employees, compared to 41 percent of full-time employees, were unionized. Among part-time workers, 21 percent of women and only 14 percent of men were unionized (Coates, 1988: 48-49). It is indeed probable that most of these unionized part-timers are in relatively advantaged positions to start with.

Would increased unionization assist part-time workers? Would unionized part-time workers fare better than those not belonging to unions? The answer to both questions is a qualified "yes". In 1984, the average hourly wage of part-timers was 66 percent of that of their full-time counterparts: part-time workers earned an average of \$6.85 an hour compared to \$10.41 for full-time workers. The gap closes considerably among unionized workers where the average hourly wage rates were \$10.68 for part-time workers and \$12.27 for full-timers. Non-unionized part-time workers averaged only \$5.84 an hour compared to \$9.17 for similar full-time workers (Burke, 1988: 13; also see Simpson, 1986: 806). So while a non-unionized part-time worker made only \$5.84 an hour, a unionized part-timer made \$10.68, a substantial difference. It is necessary to point out, though, that occupational variations, including type

of firm and type of industry, do complicate these statistics.

On the basis of the evidence, it seems that certain conditions are necessary for unionization of part-time workers. First, regular part-time job-holders, meaning those employed part-time on a continuous basis, are more likely to be unionized than casual part-time workers, or those whose part-time employment is seasonal or intermittent. This is because the former are a more stable group (Labour Canada, 1983: 72; Veevers, 1986: 95). Second, unions with substantial numbers of women are more likely to push for the protection of part-timers (Labour Canada, 1983: 94-95). Third, part-time workers who hold professional positions are more likely to bargain collectively. Unfortunately, many part-time workers in Canada lack these conditions.

The evidence cited with respect to unions is in accordance with the theoretical formulations presented earlier. Unions serve to maximize the rewards or compensation for work, and the low percentage of unionized part-timers hinders this maximization. Unions serve to counteract management attempts at control, attempts which are often facilitated by the absence of bargaining power among part-timers. It is harder for these workers to resist exploitation. Low unionization among part-time workers facilitates less institutionalized

management/employee relations, which in turn allows for the capriciousness of management. The evidence also supports the work on restructuring, specifically capital's attack on labour through the limiting of collective bargaining rights.

Labour Legislation

Another crucial area where part-time workers tend to be adversely affected is in labour legislation and standards. The percentage of these people in the labour force is large enough to raise questions about the rights of those who work part-time to some protection (Fraser, 1986: 37; England, 1987: 58). Employment standards legislation establishes minimum standards such as hour of work, minimum wages, overtime pay rates, statutory holidays, vacations, maternity leave, and termination of employment notification. But part-time workers often do not receive equal treatment under employment protection legislation. Some jurisdictions expressly exclude these workers, while others make no specific provisions for them or prevent them from qualifying for some benefits (England, 1987: 3; Coates, 1988: 30; Benimadhu, 1986: 22).

Coates (1988: 44) states that part-time employees "are not specifically excluded from such legally required social security arrangements as unemployment insurance, workers compensation, and the Canada/Quebec Pension Plan. However,

they may fail to meet certain criteria for qualifying for the benefits available under such programs." Many of these workers are affected by the continuity of employment prerequisites for much of the employment standards legislation. In order to be eligible for benefits from such standards as annual vacations, paid holidays, maternity leave, termination of employment provisions, and unemployment insurance eligibility and benefits, workers must be continually employed for a specified minimum time period. But because approximately half of all part-timers are employed for less than a period of one year, this requirement means that full-time and part-time workers are not treated equally. As such, "casual, seasonal and temporary employees are particularly disadvantaged since they, as opposed to permanent, regular part-time employees, are more likely to experience interrupted periods of employment" (Coates, 1988: 31-32).

There are serious problems associated with the lack of explicit legislation to protect this group. Little (1986: 20; also Baker, 1988: 5; Burke, 1986: 14) refers to the phenomenon of people underfunding their future needs due to lack of benefits as a "time bomb". Not only are part-timers discriminated against when they are actually working, but there are repercussions which will be felt later on by these workers. A lack of financial security upon retirement is an obvious example. This may lead to

increased strains on social security and welfare programs. Fraser (1986: 38) stresses that legislated protection must be implemented for those part-time workers who do not benefit from union protection and who are therefore "at the mercy of the labour market". Reasonable minimum standards would accomplish two things. First, these would better protect this group of workers. Second, they would add stability to a segment of the labour force that while increasing is still largely unrepresented in present legislation.

An examination of relevant statistics puts this inequality in more concrete terms. A 1985 Labour Canada study of federally regulated industries provides an illustration. An examination of six major benefits, including short-term disability, long-term disability, life insurance, extended health care, dental plans, and pension schemes, shows that while over 95 percent of all full-time employees were covered by these benefits, coverage of part-time workers was lower and characterized by much variation. Short-term disability was provided for 62 percent of part-time workers, while 40 percent were covered by dental plans, 30 percent by long-term disability and life insurance, and 18 percent by pension schemes. Moreover, permanent part-time workers were covered to a greater extent than seasonal, temporary, and casual workers. In fact, the majority of temporary and casual

workers received no benefits (Coates, 1988: 48). A 1985 study by Hewitt Associates found that the availability of benefits decreased as hours worked declined. For instance, it was found that fully paid supplemental medical benefits were offered to 26 percent of employees who worked between 20 and 29 hours per week, but to only 9 percent of those who worked less than 20 hours per week. The same trend held for fully paid life insurance, with 29 percent working 20 to 29 hours per week eligible, but only 12 percent working less than 20 hours per week eligible for this benefit (Coates, 1988: 45-47). The inequality with respect to benefits which full-timers receive is obvious (Table 2).

These problems point to the necessity of seriously considering the calls for the (legislative) implementation of prorated employee benefits for part-time workers in Canada. The reasoning behind this proposal is that if full-time workers are entitled to full-scale benefits, it is only fair that part-time workers also receive benefits, adjusted for the number of hours worked (Campling, 1987: 55). Campling (1987: 56, 76) points out that costs to individual firms would depend on how many part-timers are employed, how many of these are already receiving benefits, the impact of administrative costs, and the number of hours worked per week by part-time employees. Empirical research leads to the observation that prorating benefits is a feasible solution, although there would be many variations

in implementation (Reid and Swartz, 1982: 1-2). But to date prorating initiatives have been met by determined employer resistance in many instances (Labour Canada, 1983: 163).

At the present time, since part-time workers are rarely adequately covered by union negotiations or employment legislation, some companies and industries are taking advantage of the opportunity to hire cheap labour. Some changes are needed. The social safety net is a necessity for those who only work on a part-time basis (Fraser, 1986: 38). This reinforces the emphasis the segmentation perspective puts on the lack of representation of disadvantaged workers' interests. Their lack of bargaining power does not allow them to force the issues. Management can more easily control part-timers because of this. The evidence also reinforces the contention that capital restructuring involves employers actively lobbying for minimal legislation to protect workers, especially marginal workers.

The Economic Structure

Any examination of the increase in part-time work and its subsequent effects must also take into account the role of the changing employment structure. The postwar economy has been characterized by substantial growth in the share of employment accounted for by service sector workers

(Lindsay, 1989: 20). The service sector,⁴ which includes industries such as trade, transportation, communication, utilities, insurance, real estate, and business and personal services, has grown at a much faster pace than the goods-producing sector (Lindsay and McKie, 1986: 3). For instance, only 47 percent of all labour force participants were involved in service industries in 1951. However, by 1981, 66 percent of those in the labour force were service sector workers (Picot, 1987: 8) and by 1987, 71 percent of all employment was in the service sector (Lindsay, 1989: 20) (Table 3).

In 1987, 89 percent of all part-time workers were in the service sector, or to put it another way, 19 percent of service sector workers were employed part-time compared with just 6 percent of goods-producing workers. But the relative frequency of part-time work even varies widely in service industries. Almost one-quarter of those employed in both community, business and personal services (24 percent), and wholesale and retail trade (23 percent) worked part-time. However, the percentages of part-timers in finance (11 percent), public administration (7 percent), and transportation, communications, and utilities (6 percent) were much lower (Lindsay, 1989: 23) (Table 4).

The trends associated with the changing economic structure are emphasized in the literature on both flexibility and restructuring. The increase in part-time

work in the service sector (for example, personal and retail services) is a reflection of the efforts being made by management to implement numerical flexibility. The low wages and few benefits required for service sector positions, and part-time positions in general, accentuates the importance of the shifting structure of the economy.

Reasons for Workers taking on Part-time Employment

It is necessary to examine, given the circumstances of part-time employment, why people would "want" this type of work. There are a number of reasons. One important explanation is that it allows people, such as married women and mothers, flexibility in combining work with other activities such as family responsibilities, educational objectives, and a desire to pursue leisure activities (Burke, 1986: 9; Ronen, 1984: 15-19). Another influential factor is that many women feel that they can best care for their own children, but financial need causes them to look for jobs which fit around their domestic responsibilities (Baker, 1988: 3; Labour Canada, 1983: 106; Nakamura and Nakamura, 1985: 178). Part-time workers are often the second or third employed person in a family, working to earn money to help out with expenses or increase consumer buying power (Fraser, 1986: 37). According to a Statistics Canada survey,⁵ in 1986 71.6 percent of people were employed voluntarily in such positions. Of all

part-timers, reasons cited included personal or family responsibilities (9.1 percent), going to school (28.6 percent), and simply not wanting full-time work (32.0 percent). Involuntary workers accounted for 28.4 percent of part-timers (Coates, 1988: 8) (Table 5).

But despite the fact that the majority of part-time workers are "voluntary", this does not mean that these people are necessarily content with their situation or unaware of the unequal conditions to which they are subjected. The evidence suggests that these workers are very much aware of their low status (Labour Canada, 1983: 85). Both employers and employees want flexibility but there is a greater cost for employees. No matter whether part-time workers are "voluntary" or "involuntary", conditions exist that facilitate poor working environments. This evidence suggests that workers' part-time status serves as a barrier to career advancement. Market arrangements serve to prevent mobility. The social characteristics of these workers (for example, mothers) serve to place them in the disadvantaged segments. Their marginal status makes them vulnerable to exploitation.

As noted, a central aspect of this form of employment, involuntary part-time work, has gained widespread attention. Involuntary part-time workers can be defined as individuals who usually work "less than thirty hours per

week, because they are unable to find full-time work. All other part-time workers are considered voluntary part-time workers" (Akyeampong, 1987: 26). Involuntary part-time employment has considerable bearing on the conditions of part-time work because it implies an inability to resist by turning to full-time jobs.

Growing numbers of Canadians are bearing involuntarily the costs of part-time work. Between 1975 and 1985 the number of involuntary part-time employees increased at an average annual rate of 16.8 percent. In comparison, the number of voluntary part-time employees rose by 3.5 percent and full-time employment increased by 1.4 percent (Coates, 1988: 6). After increasing every year since 1975, which saw 109,000 involuntary part-timers, the number peaked at 516,000 in 1985 before slipping back to 514,000 in 1986 and 485,000 in 1987. In other words, while only 11 percent of part-time workers would have preferred full-time jobs in 1975, the percentage rose to 30 percent in 1984, before falling to 28 percent in 1986 and 27 percent in 1987 (Baker, 1988: 3; also Akyeampong, 1987: 26; Burke, 1986: 11). These numbers are of concern because "involuntary part-time employment is a form of under-employment or underutilization of labour. It may contribute to deepening inequalities in the distribution of income and wealth" (Akyeampong, 1987: 26; also Akyeampong, 1986: 143).

Many factors have contributed to the growth of involuntary part-time employment. On the supply side, the increasing numbers of women entering the labour force has resulted in a growing pool of available workers and greater competition for jobs. On the demand side, the growing importance of the service sector has contributed to this increase because part-time work is more adaptable to this sector (Akyeampong, 1986: 147-148). Also of importance was the recession of the early 1980s. In this period of economic uncertainty many people could only find part-time work (Akyeampong, 1987: 27).

It is also necessary to look at where these involuntary workers are situated and who they are. In 1986, about 90 percent of involuntary part-timers were in the service sector, and almost 90 percent of the increase in involuntary part-time employment between 1975 and 1986 occurred in this sector (Akyeampong, 1987: 31). So by 1987, 434,000 service sector workers, almost double the number in 1980, worked part-time because of a lack of full-time work (Lindsay, 1989: 23). Equally important, certain people seem more likely to suffer from this phenomenon. As of 1986, women aged 25-54 accounted for 41 percent of involuntary part-timers, compared with 29 percent of all employment. Women aged 15-24 made up 24 percent of all involuntary part-timers, but only 10 percent of total employment. Young men (15-24) comprised 16

percent of involuntary part-time workers but only 11 percent of total employment (Akyeampong, 1987: 27-28) (Table 6). It is also apparent that involuntary part-time workers tend to be less well-educated than the labour force in general (Akyeampong, 1986: 145).

That a large number of involuntary part-timers are women adds another dimension to the debate over the social implications of involuntary part-time work (Akyeampong, 1987: 26). This has led unions and women's groups to demand equalization of pay, benefits, and working conditions of full-time employees and part-time employees. The existence of involuntary part-time workers points to what the segmentation perspective describes as inequality of opportunity, or the lack of availability of jobs in the advantaged segments. Those in involuntary part-time jobs lack the bargaining power to change the situation (reinforcing the link between segment location and social characteristics).

Women

Throughout this discussion of part-time work, the situation of women has been alluded to. In fact, it should be stressed that many of the issues regarding part-time work are closely related to the concerns of working women in general (Coates, 1988: 83; White, 1983: 1). In this light, such employment is seen as "women's work", a

utilization of a reserve supply of cheap female labour, and a form of peripheral or marginal work (Weeks, 1984: 138, 142) although Walby (1989: 127-128) tends to disagree. The increase in part-time positions has coincided with increasing proportions of women, particularly married women, who want to work outside the home, but who still are responsible for childcare. Implicitly and explicitly, women are encouraged to a greater extent than men to take these jobs so as to enable them to maintain their domestic responsibilities (Baker, 1988: 6).

Weeks (1984: 142-143) and White (1983: 3-9) point out that these positions are taken for the most part by women who act as secondary family income earners. This fits conveniently within the traditional sexual division of labour because despite its second-class status, it is a plausible solution for mothers who want to or must work, and lack viable childcare arrangements. It is a compromise in a situation of limited options. These women, although in the labour force, can still fulfill their traditional family roles. The capacity for exploitation is evident. As such, part-time work status "will not lead to equality, but will reinforce traditional sex roles in the family and perpetuate the practice of segregated men's and women's work" (Weeks, 1984: 143). Some critics, such as Armstrong (1984: 134), assert that such work under any circumstances in reality perpetuates segregation, unemployment, widening

income differentials, and a double day for women.

Employer Motives

Lastly, it is necessary to look more closely at employers' motives with respect to part-time work. A key reason why employers desire part-time workers is to increase flexibility (as emphasized so strongly in the theory). Flexibility is useful in many situations, peak periods in demand for workers being the most obvious example. This includes "annual peaks, such as Christmas and summer sales; hotel and resort work and seasonal work such as parks maintenance; weekly peaks such as in food sales, banking and meat packing plants; and daily peaks, such as in transportation" (Weeks, 1984: 140). It serves to satisfy "the need to fill 'peak-time' needs without having to staff to the 'peak' demands" off-season (Little, 1986: 18; also Baker, 1988: 4-5; Burke, 1986: 9; Ronen, 1984: 133). This is especially true in the service industries which tend to have continuous operations (Weeks, 1984: 140; Little, 1986: 20; Coates, 1988: 61).

A secondary reason is due to competition and restructuring. Inflationary pressures are forcing companies to re-examine their labour needs. This is especially true given that in many industries labour is the most expensive part of doing business. Many are replacing under-utilized full-timers with part-time workers and

therefore are paying only for the actual time worked (Weeks, 1984: 139). Maintaining profitability is dependent upon keeping costs down (especially in the face of unrestricted competition), in particular with potential free-trade force which could exert further competitive pressures (Little, 1986: 20; Sabel, 1979: 171-172).

A related factor is employers' efforts to reduce worker benefit costs. Weeks (1984: 139), Ronen (1984: 134), and Little (1986: 18-19) all point out that fringe benefits are very costly to employers and that they are the fastest growing component of labour costs. Fringe benefits such as pensions and insurance coverage (Akyeampong, 1987: 26) and overtime costs (Weeks, 1984: 139) are major expenses saved by employers by hiring part-timers. Savings are substantial because as of 1984, the average cost of benefits was 32.5 percent of gross payroll (Campling, 1987: 12). This is a major explanation for why employers use temporary help agencies (Akyeampong, 1989a:43). Hiring part-time workers can minimize benefit costs significantly.

Other reasons for employers using part-time help include the observation that part-timers are not always included in labour codes and union contracts. This means that these workers are easier to dismiss or fire, do not receive overtime pay for working outside regular hours, and do not always require employer contributions to benefits (Baker, 1988: 6). Another reason is the view that this

portion of the labour force is more productive than full-time workers are (Pierce, Newstrom, Dunham, and Barber, 1989: 79-81; Labour Canada, 1983: 123; Coates, 1988: 61) and that this part of the labour force constitutes a "buyers'" or employers' market (Fraser, 1986: 38). Employers see the part-time labour force as a "reserve supply of cheap labour" (Weeks, 1984: 142).

Indeed, as this literature review has demonstrated, there is considerable evidence to suggest that part-time workers are in positions of limited options, with few benefits and little stability. The literature also points to the observation that certain people or groups of people (women, younger workers, mothers) are more likely to be in such positions than are other groups. This review shows that there is a real need for additional research in this area. Empirical analysis may help to clarify some of the existing confusion over part-time work. An investigation using relevant data could possibly give added credibility to the theoretical framework presented. In the next two chapters, several methodological issues related to the empirical study of part-time work will be discussed. As well, hypotheses developed from this literature will be put forward for testing.

Chapter 3

Methodology

From the literature review it became apparent that although the theoretical framework adequately explains the situation of part-time workers, there exists the necessity to test more specifically its validity for this particular group. In other words, how accurately does segmentation theory account for part-time work in Canada? This section outlines the procedure the research followed in the empirical investigation of the study, as well as the problems and limitations encountered.

After an extensive search for relevant sources, it was decided that the 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project provided the best available data to test segmentation theory (Myles and Clement, 1983). There were several advantages in selecting this particular source. The data were collected in a painstaking manner by competent researchers. There were a great number of variables (799), ranging from information on personal characteristics to measures of attitudes towards work. Many of these variables were related to the issues surrounding part-time work, and their values could be used to compare part-time and full-time workers and jobs. There were also two

principal disadvantages to using this source. First, the data did not deal specifically with part-time workers and were not collected for this purpose. These data were in fact compiled by Myles and Clement (1983) as part of a study of the issue of class in Canada.⁶ Second, a relatively small number of respondents were polled (2577). Despite these disadvantages, the data were still very acceptable for the purposes of the study.

There exists the potential here for discrepancy with respect to the operationalization of the segmentation perspective. Studies of socioeconomic segmentation have used many different units of analysis in their investigations. "At the present time, the segmentation perspective is operationalized variously at the level of industry, firm, establishment, jobs, and workers' characteristics" (Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel, 1983: 256). There are advantages and disadvantages to the implementation of each level of analysis. For example, a part-time clerical position could be classified as disadvantaged in one firm and a virtually identical position could be seen as advantaged in another firm. It is very possible that identical positions in the same firm could be classified differently. Some part-time jobs enjoy a privileged status while others do not. The same observations can be made of full-time jobs (see Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 54). Additionally, there is

no clear agreement as to exactly how many segments there are (see Apostle, Clairmont, and Osberg, 1985: 35-37; Hauser, 1980: 703). Indeed, classifying part-time work can amount to a methodological nightmare. Despite the controversy over the most correct level of analysis, it is apparent that Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel (1983: 258-259) have the best outlook, stating that "the quest for 'the' theoretically appropriate level of operationalization should perhaps not be pushed too strongly....some space for pragmatic decisions should always be allowed, as specific research questions require specific levels of operationalization."

With this in mind, it was decided that it was necessary to consider both structural or demand-type factors (such as unionization) and supply-type factors (such as education) when studying segmentation (Apostle, Clairmont, and Osberg, 1985: 33). Accordingly, three units of analysis were utilized. The first unit was all respondents who were employed. Excluding the unemployed and discouraged workers is biased in a sense. However, only employed workers were asked most of the pertinent work-related questions. The second unit of analysis was characteristics of part-time and full-time workers. The following variables were used as indicators: sex, age, marital status, level of education, presence of children, and student status. The purpose of introducing these variables was to investigate

whether certain "types" of people are more likely to take on part-time work than others. The third unit of analysis was the job itself. The following variables were used as indicators and can be placed into three broad categories:

- (1) degree of managerial control and supervision: includes, sometimes possible to design own work, can take time off without accounting, can slow down pace of work, how decisions regarding work are made, whether supervisor decides on daily tasks or jobs, how closely instructions followed, whether supervisor influences pay and promotion
- (2) measures of skill: includes, training required for type of work, usefulness of job skills elsewhere, level of skill others perceive job having, thought and attention required of job
- (3) others: includes, ever unemployed, union at place of work, position in management hierarchy.

See Appendix A for detailed information on how the values for these variables were elicited.

Analysis involved comparing part-time and full-time workers, and part-time and full-time jobs. This comparison was chosen because part-time and full-time workers and jobs constitute two distinct populations. The findings were presented in the form of tables, with part-time and full-time workers/jobs being compared for each variable introduced. Tables were chosen as the means of analysis because the findings could be clearly presented in this manner. A significance level of 0.05 was used.

As discussed in the literature review, defining part-time work can be a hazardous endeavour. The Canadian Class Structure Project specifically asked workers how many

hours they usually worked a week. Responses ranged from 8 hours to 92 hours. The respondents were sorted into two groups using the Statistics Canada definition of labelling workers employed less than 30 hours per week as part-time workers, and those employed 30 or more hours weekly as full-time workers. There is the common sense observation that there is a difference between a part-time worker who is employed 10 hours per week and another who is employed 29 hours a week on average. While a theoretically relevant point, it was decided not to divide the part-time workers into two groups as the resulting categories would simply contain too few respondents for accurate analysis.

It is also necessary to explain the rationale behind the categorization of other important variables, including age, education, and presence of children. Workers' ages ranged from 18 to 80. It was decided to ignore respondents 65 and over as most people this age are retired and those who are not usually work under exceptional circumstances. Also, the number of workers 65 and over was very small.⁷ Those between 18 and 64 were divided into three categories: ages 18 to 24, ages 25 to 50, and ages 51 to 64. These categories were used because it was felt that they could best highlight differences in job status due to age. Workers' education ranged from no schooling at all to a professional degree. The large number of categories necessitated recoding into three manageable but relevant

groups: those with elementary schooling or less, those with some secondary schooling to community college, and those having some university to a professional degree. Concerning the presence of children, married women with any children 16 or under were put in one category while all other married women were recoded into a second category. Ideally, the first category would have contained only mothers with children less than school age, but the question only asked whether children were younger or older than age 16. It is also necessary to point out that many variables measuring characteristics of jobs were recoded (see Appendix A for details of recoding).

In the following chapter, the issue of how part-time work may be operationally incorporated within segmentation theory will be addressed. Subsequently, this will be empirically investigated. Finally, testable hypotheses will be introduced.

Chapter 4

From Theory to Hypotheses

In this section, a number of issues will be addressed that have a bearing on how notions from the literature review may be empirically tested. First, aspects of segmentation theory that are subject to criticism will be discussed. Second, a means of implementing the concept of "segments" with respect to part-time work will be suggested. Third, a number of testable hypotheses, drawn from the literature, will be put forward.

Although segmentation theory makes a substantial contribution to the understanding of differentiation in the labour market, well-founded criticisms have surfaced. Most importantly, some sociologists, including Hunter (1986: 201) and Hodson and Kaufman (1982: 733-734; 1981: 882), state that operationalizations of segmentation tend to be circular in conception. To cite an often-used example, labour markets are sometimes distinguished from one another partly in terms of workers' incomes, despite the fact that the location of workers in one labour market or another is used to explain the differences among workers in their incomes⁸ (Hunter, 1986: 201). A second criticism is that segmentation theory does not elaborate on a truly

systematic model. This leads to ambiguities in research (Hodson and Kaufman, 1982: 733-734). Related are the persistent problems of unclear and ambiguous definitions of such key concepts as primary jobs and secondary jobs (Hunter, 1986: 201; Hodson and Kaufman, 1982: 732). A third criticism is that segmentation theory tends to be more descriptive than theoretical (Hunter, 1986: 201; Hodson and Kaufman, 1982: 732) and fails to explain the origins of segmentation (Lowe, 1987: 12).

Despite the limitations of segmentation theory, it would be premature to dismiss it as inappropriate for an analysis of part-time work. As illustrated in the literature review, its explanatory powers are considerable. Given the apparent "versatility" of segmentation theory (or to put it another way, its lack of systematic propositions), it is postulated that the validity of this perspective may be tested with respect to part-time work.

In order to use segmentation theory to study part-time work as a disadvantaged form of labour, it is necessary to establish that part-time workers are more likely to be found in the disadvantaged segment. Segmentation theorists, such as Freedman (1976) and Clairmont, Apostle, and Kreckel (1983) emphasize a division of the industrial structure into core and periphery segments. Therefore, it is expedient to categorize workers by industry and then

separate industries into the two sectors. Subsequently, workers will be divided into those employed part-time and full-time within each segment.

To dichotomize workers into the core and periphery segments, they must first be grouped into industrial categories. This is done by placing workers according to O.E. Wright's twelve-category classification scheme (Table 7). The second step is to classify each industrial category as part of either the core or the periphery. Obviously, there are a number of ways to do so. In fact, at least twelve different sector taxonomies have been proposed at various times. Four operational definitions, however, are regarded as superior in the literature (Zucker and Rosenstein, 1981: 870). They include two developed by Beck, Horan, and Tolbert (1978 and 1980), one by Bibb and Form (1977), and one by Hodson (1977). After careful consideration, the classification scheme outlined by Beck, Horan, and Tolbert (1978) seems most appropriate for the purposes of this study, partly because it is explained in the greatest detail.⁹

Beck, Horan, and Tolbert (1978: 706) postulate a core industrial segment dominated by large corporate enterprises with a monopoly-type system of production. Conversely, the periphery segment is characterized by smaller firms in a very competitive environment. These sociologists point to

more detailed definitions of the two segments as put forward by Bluestone, Murphy, and Stevenson (1973: 28-29):

The core economy includes those industries that comprise the muscle of American economic and political power....Entrenched in durable manufacturing, the construction trades and to a lesser extent, the extraction industries, the firms in the core economy are noted for high productivity, high profits, intensive utilization of capital, high incidence of monopoly elements, and a high degree of unionization. What follows normally from such characteristics are high wages....Workers who are able to secure employment in these industries are, in most cases assured of relatively high wages and better than average working conditions and fringe benefits....Beyond the fringes of the core economy lies a set of industries that lack almost all of the advantages normally found in center firms. Concentrated in agriculture, nondurable manufacturing, retail trade, and sub-professional services, the peripheral industries are noted for their small firm size, labour intensity, low profits, low productivity, intensive product market competition, lack of unionization, and low wages. Unlike core sector industries, the periphery lacks the assets, size, and political power to take advantage of economies of scale or to spend large sums on research and development.

Accordingly, Beck, Horan, and Tolbert (1978: 709) categorize agriculture, nondurable manufacturing, retail trade, business services, and personal services as composing the periphery segment. The core segment is made up of mining, construction, durable manufacturing, communications and utilities, wholesale trade, professional services and state services (Table 8). The core/periphery dichotomization is treated as qualitative, meaning there exists the assumption that the two segments are relatively internally homogeneous. While a simplification to be sure,

such an approach at least provides a crude measure of segment differences.

If the data show that there is a tendency for part-time workers to be found in the periphery segment, then there exists the basis for an analysis of part-time work and workers as being in the disadvantaged segment compared to full-time work and workers. The findings illustrate that while part-time workers made up 15.0 percent of the periphery segment, they composed only 10.1 percent of the core segment (Table 9). While there is a tendency for part-time workers to be found in the periphery segment, the correlation is not overwhelming. Concluding that part-time workers are the disadvantaged segment results in a misclassification of 43.1 percent of workers. Therefore, it can only be stated that part-time workers are more likely to be found in the disadvantaged segment than in the advantaged segment. This generalization must be seen predominantly as an analytical tool facilitating the study of part-time work within the segmentation perspective. It is interesting to note that some researchers, including O'Connor (1973) and Hodson (1977), advocate treating state employment as distinct from the core and periphery. If state employees are temporarily put into a third and separate category, the results are even stronger. Part-timers made up 15.0 percent of the periphery segment,

only 5.8 percent of the core segment, and 15.5 percent of the state segment (Table 10).

Given the finding that part-time workers are more likely to be found in the disadvantaged segment than in the advantaged segment, studying part-time workers as a disadvantaged group within segmentation theory is a plausible approach to take. Thus comparing part-time workers with full-time workers may shed some light on the situation of part-timers. A number of specific hypotheses may be introduced from the literature. These hypotheses draw on the established literature in order to provide a sound basis for the empirical investigation of part-time work. This is a limited but feasible application of segmentation theory in that it may be seen as a modest utilization of the conventional theoretical propositions. These hypotheses will now be introduced.

Sex is mentioned throughout the segmentation perspective and supporting literature as a central determinant of segment location. Women in particular are at a disadvantage for a number of reasons, including their having little bargaining power, a more tenuous link to employment in general, and their subjection to pre-market barriers. The more empirically-oriented works by Coates (1988), White (1983), and Weeks (1984) tend to stress the disadvantaged position of women in the labour force. They

emphasize that women who work part-time are especially disadvantaged. Therefore, hypothesis (a) is put forward:

Hypothesis (a): Women are more likely than men to be employed on a part-time basis.

According to segmentation theory, workers' ages should influence job status (full-time versus part-time). Younger workers are one group that tend to have little bargaining power, partly due to their lack of experience. Therefore, younger workers may be steered into part-time jobs. There is agreement in the literature on the precarious position of younger workers in the labour market (Baker, 1988: 3; Ronen, 1984: 17). The following hypothesis may be introduced:

Hypothesis (b): Part-time workers are more likely to be young than old.

Although the influence of education on job status is somewhat ambiguous in segmentation theory, it is generally seen as a barrier to limit the number of "qualified" persons eligible for the better jobs (credentialism). The reasoning here is that higher educational levels lead to greater rewards in bureaucratized primary sector jobs, whereas there are few rewards for education in unbureaucratized secondary sector jobs (Garnsey, Rubery, and Wilkinson, 1985: 61). Therefore, hypothesis (c) is as follows:

Hypothesis (c): Workers with much education are less likely to work part-time than workers with little education.

For women, marriage and the presence of children serve to weaken their link to the labour force (Nakamura and Nakamura, 1985: 178). This allows employers to use pre-market segmentation, allocating wives and mothers to disadvantaged positions. This group's marginal position undermines their bargaining power and ability to resist exploitation. The following pair of hypotheses may be introduced:

Hypothesis (d): Married women are more likely to be employed part-time than are single women.

Hypothesis (e): Mothers with young children are more likely to be employed part-time than women with older children.

Attending school is seen to be a determinant of part-time job status (Baker, 1988:3). This is in accordance with segmentation theory's assertion that outside commitment necessitates a more tenuous link to the labour force. Hypothesis (f) is as follows:

Hypothesis (f): Workers attending school, whether on a part-time or full-time basis, are more likely to be employed part-time than are workers not attending school.

A key component of segmentation theory is that the degree of management control differs by segment. Whereas labour-management relations are instrumental or bureaucratic in the advantaged segments, they are much more direct in the disadvantaged segments. In the latter case, management closely supervises and monitors workers. Researchers, including Weeks (1984) and Fraser (1986),

emphasize this aspect of part-time work. Hypothesis (g) is as follows:

Hypothesis (g): Workers in part-time positions are subject to stricter control and closer supervision than are workers in full-time positions.

Segmentation theory stresses the importance of bargaining power. Whereas workers in the advantaged segments have at least some bargaining power (partly because of their level of skill), those in the disadvantaged segments have little bargaining power as they can be replaced with relative ease. Part-time positions in general involve the utilization of routine skills. Therefore, the following hypothesis can be tested:

Hypothesis (h): Part-time positions require less training than full-time positions.

Proponents of the segmentation approach stress the importance of unions in increasing the bargaining power of workers. In accordance with researchers such as Coates (1988) and Clemenson (1989), hypothesis (i) is introduced:

Hypothesis (i): Part-time positions are less unionized than full-time positions.

Also, as noted previously, workers in the disadvantaged segments have a marginal attachment to the labour force. And since part-time workers may be characterized as a marginal group, the following hypothesis is tested:

Hypothesis (j): Those in part-time positions are more susceptible to unemployment than those in full-time positions.

Segmentation theory describes the existence of barriers which serve to limit, among other things, part-timers' ability to "tap into" internal job markets. This means that part-time workers should tend to occupy only non-management positions. Thus hypothesis (k):

Hypothesis (k): Part-time workers are less likely to occupy managerial or supervisory positions than are full-time workers.

These hypotheses will be tested in order to determine whether part-time workers and jobs constitute a disadvantaged segment, compared to full-time workers and jobs. If the findings indicate that this is in fact occurring, then it will be concluded that segmentation theory provides a valid explanation of part-time work. Chapter 5 is devoted to this task.

Chapter 5

Analysis of Data

Section 1 - Worker Characteristics

In this section, data collected on workers' characteristics will be introduced. The findings will be discussed in the context of hypotheses put forward in Chapter 4. Afterwards, the results will be discussed in more detail.

Before the detailed findings are presented, it is necessary to outline the composition of the sample. In the survey, the responses of 2577 people were recorded. There were actually two separate questionnaires used in this survey. The respondents were screened, and those who were employed were given one questionnaire, while housewives and those unemployed were given another questionnaire. A total of 2127 individuals were employed in paid jobs. Of these workers, 260 (or 12.2 percent) were employed part-time, and 1867 (or 87.8 percent) were employed on a full-time basis (Table 11). A number of specific hypotheses will now be tested.

Hypothesis (a) suggests that women are more likely than men to work on a part-time basis. The statistics support the hypothesis, showing that while only 4.0 percent of men were employed part-time, 21.2 percent of women were. Women

made up 82.7 percent of the part-time labour force, but only 47.6 percent of the total number of workers. There was a strong relationship between sex and working part-time (Table 12).

It is hypothesized that young workers are more likely to be employed part-time than are older workers (hypothesis (b)). The data show that while 15.8 percent of workers aged 18 to 24 worked part-time, only 12.1 percent of workers between the ages of 25 and 50 did so. And only 9.8 percent of those 51 to 64 worked part-time. When sex is introduced as a control variable, it was found that for men, age had an impact on job status. Of men aged 18 to 24, 11.4 percent were employed part-time. This dropped to only 2.0 percent for men aged 25 to 50, but increased slightly to 4.8 percent for men 51 to 64. The results for women were not statistically significant (Table 13).

A third worker characteristic is education. Hypothesis (c) states that workers with high levels of education are less likely to work part-time than workers with little education. No conclusions can be reached as there were high significance levels for both men and women (Table 14).

The variable marital status (living with spouse/partner) should exert some type of influence on the probability of working part-time. From Hypothesis (d), married women are more likely to be employed part-time than are single women. It is shown that for women, living

arrangements influenced job status. While only 15.1 percent of single women worked part-time, 24.0 percent of attached women did so (Table 15).

Another worker characteristic is the presence of children. Therefore, it is necessary to look at women with children and how children influence job status. Only women living with a spouse/partner will be looked at because single parents can be considered exceptional cases. And only women are looked at because it is felt that their job status will be much more likely to be influenced by children than will men's job status. Hypothesis (e) states that mothers with children 16 or under are more likely to be employed part-time than women with older children. The findings are not statistically significant so no conclusion may be reached (Table 16).

Finally, it is hypothesized that being a student influences the probability of working part-time (hypothesis (f)). Specifically, workers who also attend school are more likely to work only on a part-time basis than are workers not attending school. The data show that while 18.8 percent of workers attending school worked part-time, only 11.5 percent of workers not attending school worked less than full-time. Hypothesis (f) is substantiated (Table 17).

To summarize, analysis of workers' personal characteristics yields some important findings. Age influences job status: younger workers are more likely to

work part-time than older workers. For men alone, age also influences job status in a curvilinear manner: young men (18 to 24) are found to be more susceptible to part-time employment than middle-aged men (25 to 50). Older men (51 to 64 years of age) show a slight increase in the probability of working part-time, compared to middle-aged men. Sex is also seen to be a key variable: women are found to be employed to a greater extent than men on a part-time basis. Marital status influences job status for women: women living with a spouse/partner are more likely to work part-time than single women. Attending school influences job status: workers also attending school are more likely to work part-time than workers not attending school. Statistically significant relationships were not found when looking at the influence of women's ages, educational levels, and the presence of children on the probability of working part-time.

These findings illustrate that workers' characteristics influence the likelihood of their taking on part-time employment. Now it is necessary to look at the jobs themselves in order to determine if part-time positions are less advantageous than full-time positions. Section 2 is devoted to this task.

Section 2 - Conditions of Jobs

It is necessary to point out that the job itself

(full-time versus part-time positions) exerts an effect on working conditions. It is felt that part-time positions are less advantageous than are full-time positions along a number of measures. In this section, the influence the job itself has on a number of conditions is examined.

Hypothesis (g) states that workers in part-time positions are subject to stricter control and closer supervision than are workers in full-time positions. A total of seven variables are introduced to determine the validity of this hypothesis. They include: the ability to take a day off without losing pay, whether workers can slow down the pace of their work at their own discretion, the possibility for workers to put their own ideas into practice, the manner in which decisions are made at work, the detail the supervisor uses in outlining daily tasks, how closely instructions are followed, and the influence the supervisor has over pay increases and promotional opportunities.

The first variable to be looked at is the ability for workers to take a day off work without losing pay, having to claim vacation time, take sick leave, or make up the lost time later. The statistics show that while only 16.7 percent of those in part-time positions could take time off without being penalized, 28.0 percent of those in full-time positions could do so. The self-employed were not asked this question (Table 18).

Another variable that can be examined to determine if there is a difference in the degree of control is whether workers can slow down the pace of their work at their own discretion. Again, the data show that workers in full-time positions were more able to do so than were those in only part-time positions. The self-employed were not asked this question (Table 19).

A third variable is the possibility for workers to put their own ideas into practice on the job, or to plan or design some aspects of the job. The findings show that full-time workers were more likely to be able to do so than were part-time workers. While only 52.4 percent of part-timers agreed it was possible for them to implement their own ideas, 64.0 percent of full-time workers replied positively. As with the previous two variables, the self-employed were not polled for this question (Table 20).

The manner in which decisions are made at work signals much about management control. In some instances management makes decisions without consulting employees, whereas in other instances employees are actively consulted and encouraged to have input. The data show that while 48.7 percent of those in part-time positions had management alone make decisions, 39.9 percent of those in full-time positions had the same experience. And while only 7.3 percent of people in part-time positions were given a joint say in decision-making, 11.3 percent of those in full-time

positions were. Only respondents who were self-employed without paid employees were not asked this question (Table 21).

The fifth variable chosen to measure the degree of managerial control is the degree of detail the supervisor uses to outline the daily tasks of the worker. The findings illustrate that supervisors were more likely to specifically set out work to be done for part-timers than they were for those in full-time positions. This question was not applicable to the self-employed and those without supervisors (Table 22).

Quite closely related to the previous variable is how closely instructions given by supervisors are actually followed. The data show that 63.2 percent of those in part-time positions very closely followed instructions, compared to a lower percentage, 52.4, among those in full-time positions. As with the last variable, the self-employed and those without supervisors were not asked this question (Table 23).

The last variable is the degree of influence the supervisor has over the worker's pay changes and promotional opportunities. The data show that supervisors of those in part-time and full-time positions had very similar percentages with respect to influencing pay and promotion to a substantial degree, a somewhat surprising finding given the results of the previous six variables.

The self-employed and those without supervisors were excluded (Table 24).

The above variables all measure aspects of managerial control and worker freedom. Taken together, they substantiate the hypothesis that workers in part-time positions are subject to stricter control and closer supervision than workers in full-time positions. Indeed, there is a difference between part-time and full-time positions.

Hypothesis (h) states that part-time positions require less training than full-time positions. A total of four variables are introduced to investigate this hypothesis: training required for type of work, usefulness of job skills elsewhere, level of skill others perceive job having, and amount of thought and attention required for the job.

The first variable is training required for type of work. The data show that while 59.9 percent of part-time positions required little training (up to 30 days), only 37.8 percent of full-time positions did. And 41.5 percent of full time positions required much training (more than six months), compared to only 21.6 percent of part-time jobs. The self-employed were excluded from this measure (Table 25).

A related variable is usefulness of job skills elsewhere. While only 44.8 percent of part-time jobs

involved skills useful elsewhere, 53.4 percent of full-time jobs involved skills which could also be used in different lines of work. The self-employed were not asked this question (Table 26).

A third skill-related variable is how individuals think other people perceive their job (the respondent's job). It can be seen that while a higher percentage of people in part-time positions than in full-time positions felt that others perceived their jobs to be unskilled, the percentages were similar for those who felt that others saw their jobs as highly skilled. The self-employed were not asked this question (Table 27).

A fourth skill-related variable is the degree of thought and attention required on the job. The data show that while 63.6 percent of part-time positions required only little thought and attention, 57.0 percent of full-time positions did so. Again, the self-employed were excluded (Table 28).

Taken together, these four variable substantiate hypothesis (h). It is concluded that part-time positions require less training than full-time positions.

Hypothesis (i) states that part-time positions are less unionized than full-time positions. The best available variable to test this hypothesis is whether there is a union at the respondent's place of work. The data show that there is a greater tendency for part-time positions to

be at sites with no union presence. While only 30.8 percent of part-time workers reported a union presence at their place of work, 45.0 percent of full-time workers did so (Table 29).

Hypothesis (j) states that those in part-time positions are more susceptible to unemployment than those in full-time positions. The variable used to test this hypothesis is whether respondents had ever been unemployed. The findings illustrate that those in part-time positions tended to be less vulnerable to unemployment, a somewhat strange finding (Table 30). It was felt that this result was a function of when workers entered the labour force. The logic here was that younger workers employed part-time had not been in the labour force long enough to be unemployed, whereas older workers presently employed full-time had in all likelihood been unemployed at some point in their lives. Controlling for when workers entered the labour force, however roughly, did not yield statistically significant results (Table 31). However, close examination of Table 30 showed that jobs of a seasonal nature were not included in the total. And since 21.2 percent of part-time jobs were periodic, this may account for the unexpected finding.

Hypothesis (k) states that part-time workers are less likely to attain managerial or supervisory status than are full-time workers. The statistics show that only 15.1

percent of part-time positions were managerial or supervisory, compared to 29.8 percent of full-time positions. Hypothesis (k) is substantiated (Table 32).

To summarize, examination of job positions in this section yields some important information. Those in part-time positions are subjected to closer supervision and stricter control. A total of seven variables were introduced to determine if there was a difference by position. Although none of the variables yielded bold differences, their accumulated results do lend support to the hypothesis that part-timers are subjected to stricter controls. A total of four variables were used to test for differences between part-time and full-time positions in skill. All four measures indicated a difference: part-time positions are found to generally require less skill and training. Part-time positions are less likely to have unions at their place of work and are less likely to be managerial than are full-time positions. The only finding going against what was hypothesized was that those in full-time positions are more likely to have been unemployed in the past than those in part-time positions (and this may simply be a function of who was asked this question).

It is necessary to consider the possibility that job status (part-time versus full-time) may be acting as an intervening variable between segment location and job characteristics. This would run contrary to the

theoretical assertion that it is the general segment location which exerts a predominant influence on job characteristics (while bearing in mind that part-time jobs are theoretically considered to be a disadvantaged segment, compared to full-time jobs which are considered an advantaged segment). This was investigated by running crosstabulations of segment location by job characteristics, while controlling for job status. The findings showed that without exception the relationships found previously remained (although a number of tables were not utilized as they were not statistically significant). These results lend support to the theory that segment location exerts substantial influence on job characteristics. In other words, not only is it important that certain workers are part-time workers, but also of importance is where (segment location) these people work.

The findings from both sections of this chapter merit further discussion. In the concluding chapter, these results will be looked at with respect to segmentation theory. Also, other issues raised in this chapter will be addressed.

Chapter 6

Discussion and Conclusion

At this point it is advisable to look more closely at the findings. In this chapter, the results will be examined in light of segmentation theory and a number of generalizations will be made. Second, several issues raised during the course of this study will be addressed. Third, the merits of studying part-time work within the segmentation perspective will be elaborated on. Finally, some suggestions for further research will be put forward.

The data analysis illustrates that people with certain personal characteristics are more likely than others to work on a part-time basis. For example, women are more susceptible to part-time employment than are men. In general, younger people work less than full-time to a greater extent than do older people. Among men at least, there is a curvilinear relationship between age and working part-time. Younger men are more likely to work part-time than are middle-aged men. And while they do not work part-time to the same extent as young men, older men exhibit an increased tendency to work less than full-time. For women, marital status influences job status. That is, women living with a spouse or partner are more likely to

work only on a part-time basis than are single women. Although it is often suggested that the presence of children inhibits full-time work, no such relationship is apparent in this analysis. Perhaps this is because of the fact that it was not possible to compare women having children less than school age with mothers having older children. Or maybe children are not an obstacle to full-time employment among women after all.

The findings give added credibility to segmentation theory. The relationship between personal characteristics and working part-time is in accordance with assertions made in the theory. For instance, that people with certain characteristics exhibit a preponderance for this type of work reflects the segmentation view that systematic processes are at work which serve to reinforce social divisions among the population. Characteristics such as age, sex, and marital status serve as barriers, either explicitly or implicitly, to full-time employment. These characteristics serve to exclude these people from internal labour markets so that the labour force is essentially segmented into non-competing groups. Because of their age, sex, or marital status, these workers have a weaker link to work organizations and a resulting lack of stability in their work careers.

The data analysis also shows that part-time jobs are different than full-time jobs. Those in part-time jobs are

subject to closer management supervision and less individual freedom than workers in full-time positions. Those in part-time positions have jobs requiring little training and little concentration, compared to workers with full-time jobs. Also, workers in part-time positions are exposed to union influence to a lesser extent than workers in full-time positions. Part-time positions are much less likely to involve management or supervision than are full-time positions. Paradoxically, workers in part-time jobs are less likely to have been unemployed in the past than workers with full-time jobs (although, as has been discussed, other factors appear to be at work here).

These findings also support segmentation theory contentions. It is apparent that there is a definite employer strategy at work. Part-time workers are subjected to strict managerial control. The capriciousness of management is reflected in labour-management relations, which are characterized by negative exchange. Part-time workers' low levels of skill leads to relatively easy replacement. Part-time jobs tend to be nonmanagement in nature, thus inhibiting stability in work relationships.

Several questions were raised in this study that merit discussion. First, the extent to which part-time work serves as a source of greater inequality must be addressed. The evidence accumulated suggests that at the very least, part-time work perpetuates inequality. Workers

in such positions cannot "compete" with full-time workers in terms of income, prestige, and career advancement. And since those who work less than full-time tend not to benefit from union presence and have only limited protection in the form of legislation, often their concerns are not effectively voiced. Second, the question arises as to the permanence of this type of employment. This study supports the conclusion that part-time work is not about to fade away. In the face of slow economic growth, employers are of the opinion that part-time work is a feasible option. In addition, the continued shift in the Canadian economy towards service-oriented industries creates part-time positions. And substantial numbers of workers themselves opt for this variation of employment. Third, the findings point to the question of why part-time workers do not more actively fight to improve their situation. The evidence suggests that for many of these people, work is not their primary involvement, for whatever the reasons (family responsibilities, educational goals, leisure interests). Thus, for many of these workers, it often simply does not appear to be worthwhile to push for change. Fourth, the question then becomes who is to encourage changes. Since neither the workers themselves, nor employers, nor unions seem to be taking definite steps towards improving the situation of part-time work, it would seem logical to point to government as the most probable option for improving conditions.

This study has placed part-time work within the framework of segmentation theory. Analyzing this phenomenon in terms of the segmentation perspective has been advantageous for a number of reasons. It has facilitated the analysis of both the institutional context of part-time work and the dynamics associated with it. The theory has induced the investigation of a number of issues related to part-time work, ranging from the impact of personal characteristics of workers to methods of managerial control. The testable hypotheses were drawn from a well-established literature on segmentation. The elasticity of segmentation theory allowed for a specific application of the perspective to this one particular aspect of work. In addition, it also allowed part-time and full-time workers and jobs to be meaningfully compared. Indeed, segmentation theory facilitates the study of part-time work within both a manageable and meaningful framework.

However, it must be asked how accurately segmentation theory accounts for part-time work in Canada. Segmentation theory does adequately explain part-time work. Part-time workers tend to be found in the disadvantaged segments, workers with certain characteristics are more likely to work part-time than others, and part-time jobs exhibit peripheral or marginal characteristics. Nevertheless, as important as these findings are, it is necessary to state

that the link between part-time work and segment location is not overwhelming. In fact, this study shows that part-time work is not solely confined to the peripheral segment. Part-time work is a phenomenon visible throughout the economy.

While this study addresses important issues related to part-time work, further research could aid in an even better understanding of this form of employment. Aspects of part-time work which deserve further investigation include part-time work as a women's issue, part-time work from the employer's viewpoint, economic implications of this type of labour, the role unions can and should play, government responsibilities towards these workers, and how the transformation to a service-oriented economy is influencing the evolution of part-time work. Given both the permanent place this form of employment has gained in the Canadian labour market and the substantial numbers of people working on less than a full-time basis, future research is essential for a more complete understanding of its causes, nature, and consequences.

Table 1
Part-time and Full-time Employment
in Canada, 1953-1986

Year	Part-Time Employment			Full-Time Employment		
	As a % of Average Annual Number ('000)	Total Employment	% Change	As a % of Average Annual Number ('000)	Total Employment	% Change
1953	197	3.8		5,039	96.2	
1954	208	4.0	5.6	5,035	96.0	-0.1
1955	230	4.3	10.6	5,136	95.7	2.0
1956	243	4.4	5.7	5,342	95.6	4.0
1957	288	5.0	18.5	5,441	95.0	1.9
1958	349	6.1	21.2	5,356	93.9	-1.6
1959	367	6.3	5.2	5,502	93.7	2.7
1960	366	6.2	-0.3	5,565	93.8	1.1
1961	441	7.3	20.5	5,578	92.7	0.2
1962	497	8.0	12.7	5,728	92.0	2.7
1963	532	8.3	7.0	5,843	91.7	2.0
1964	597	9.0	12.2	6,013	91.0	2.9
1965	657	9.6	10.0	6,205	90.4	3.2
1966	647	9.1	-1.5	6,474	90.9	4.3
1967	706	9.6	9.1	6,518	90.4	2.2
1968	785	10.5	11.2	6,675	89.5	0.9
1969	854	11.1	8.8	6,839	88.9	2.5
1970	922	11.9	8.0	6,856	88.1	0.2
1971	960	12.1	4.1	6,996	87.9	2.0
1972	988	12.1	2.9	7,204	87.9	3.0
1973	1,031	12.0	4.4	7,567	88.0	5.0
1974	1,106	12.4	7.3	7,845	87.6	3.7
1975 (a)	1,175	12.9	6.2	7,919	87.1	0.9
1975	988	10.6		8,296	89.4	
1976	1,047	11.0	6.0	8,431	89.0	1.6
1977	1,128	11.7	7.7	8,524	88.3	1.1
1978	1,206	12.1	6.9	8,780	87.9	3.0
1979	1,301	12.5	7.9	9,094	87.5	3.6
1980	1,392	13.0	7.0	9,316	87.0	2.4
1981	1,487	13.5	6.8	9,519	86.5	2.2
1982	1,534	14.4	3.2	9,110	85.6	-4.3
1983	1,651	15.4	7.6	9,083	84.6	-0.3
1984	1,689	15.4	2.3	9,311	84.6	2.5
1985	1,757	15.5	4.0	9,555	84.5	2.6
1986	1,810	15.6	3.0	9,824	84.4	2.8

(a) Between 1953 and 1975, the Labour Force Survey considered those who usually worked 35 hours or less per week as part-time workers. The revised Labour Force Survey, in effect since 1975, considers persons who usually work less than 30 hours per week as employed on a part-time basis.

Source: Statistics Canada, Historical Labour Force Statistics, for 1953-1965 and 1976-1986 data, and Statistics Canada, Household Surveys Division, for 1966-1975 data.

Table 2

**Benefit Coverage of Part-Time and
Full-Time Employees,
Canada, 1985**

Percentage of Companies Providing Benefit

<u>Benefit</u>	<u>Full-Time</u> <u>Non-Union Employees</u>	<u>Part-Time</u> <u>Non-Union Employees</u>	
	<u>30 or more</u> <u>hours/week</u>	<u>20-24</u> <u>hours/week</u>	<u>less than 20</u> <u>hours/week</u>
1) Supplemental Medical Benefits - fully paid	69	26	9
2) Life Insurance - fully paid	59	29	12
3) Paid Sick Leave - available	72	35	22
4) Short-term Disability Benefits - fully paid	78	35	16
5) Long-term Disability Benefits - fully paid	47	17	6
6) Pension Plans - fully paid	39	16	6
7) Paid Vacation - available	99	77	64

Source: Hewitt Associates, Benefits for Canadian Part-Time Employees (Toronto, 1985). Cited in Mary Lou Coates, Part-Time Employment: Labour Market Flexibility and Equity Issues (1988: 45-47)

Table 3
Labour Force By Sector,
Canada, 1951-1987

<u>Year</u>	<u>% of Labour Force in Service Sector</u>	<u>% of Labour Force in goods-producing sector</u>	<u>Total %</u>
1951	47	53	100
1961	56	44	100
1971	62	38	100
1981	66	34	100
1987	71	29	100

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada. Cited in W. Garnett Picot, The Changing Industrial Mix of Employment, 1951-1985 (1987: 11) and Colin Lindsay. The Service Sector in the 1980s (1989: 20).

Table 4
Part-Time Workers in the Service
Sector, Canada 1987

<u>Service Industry</u>	<u>% in Industry Employed Part-Time</u>
Community, Business, and personal Services	24
Wholesale and Retail Trade	23
Finance	11
Public Administration	7
Utilities	6

Source: Colin Lindsay, The Service Sector in the 1980s (1989: 23).

Table 5
Reasons for Part-Time Employment
in Canada, 1975-1986

Percent of Total Part-Time Employment

<u>Year</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
Voluntary Part-Time	89.0	82.0	71.5	70.6	71.6
Personal or Family Responsibilities	12.1	12.3	9.2	9.2	9.1
Going to School	34.8	29.9	25.6	27.3	28.6
Did Not Want Full-Time Work	36.8	35.6	32.3	32.2	32.0
Other	5.3	4.2	4.4	1.8	1.9
Involuntary Part-Time Work	11.0	18.0	28.5	29.4	28.4

Source: Statistics Canada, The Labour Force, for 1985 and 1986 data, and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Annual Averages, 1975-1983. Cited in Mary Lou Coates, Part-Time Employment: Labour Market Flexibility and Equity Issues (1988:8).

Table 6
Involuntary Part-Time Workers
as a Percentage of All Employment
Canada 1986

<u>Group</u>	<u>% of all</u> <u>Involuntary PT Work</u>	<u>% of all</u> <u>Employment</u>
Men 15-24	16	11
Women 15-24	24	10
Men 25-54	13	39
Women 25-54	41	29
Men & Women 55+	7	11

Source: Ernest B. Akyeampong, Involuntary Part-Time Employment in Canada, 1975-1986 (1987: 27-28).

Table 7

**Wright's Twelve-Category Industry
Classification Scheme,
Canadian Workers, 1983**

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number of Workers</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Valid Percentage</u>
Agriculture	133	6.3	6.3
Mining	37	1.7	1.7
Construction	141	6.6	6.6
Durable Manufacturing	203	9.5	9.6
Nondurable Manufacturing	213	10.0	10.0
Communication and Utilities	147	6.9	6.9
Wholesale Trade	84	3.9	4.0
Retail Trade	222	10.4	10.5
Business Services	178	8.4	8.4
Personal Services	190	8.9	8.9
Professional Services	47	2.2	2.2
State Services	528	24.8	24.9
Missing	4	0.2	
Total	2127	100.0	100.0

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project.

Table 8

**Classification of Industries,
Periphery and Core,
Canada, 1983**

<u>Segment</u>	<u>Number of Workers</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Periphery		
Agriculture	133	6.3
Nondurable Manufacturing	213	10.0
Retail Trade	222	10.5
Business Services	178	8.4
Personal Services	190	8.9
Total	936	44.1
Core		
Mining	37	1.7
Construction	141	6.6
Durable Manufacturing	203	9.6
Communications and Utilities	147	6.9
Wholesale Trade	84	4.0
Professional Services	47	2.2
State Services	528	24.9
Total	1187	55.9
Total	2123	100.0

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project.

Table 9

**Part-Time and Full-Time Workers,
by Core and Periphery Segments,
Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Segment</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Periphery</u>		<u>Core</u>		<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>		
Part-Time	140	15.0	120	10.1	260	12.2
Full-Time	796	85.0	1067	89.9	1863	87.8
Column Total	936	44.1	1187	55.1	2123 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 10.99

Significance = 0.0009

Minimum Expected Frequency = 114.63

(a) There were 4 missing cases

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 10

**Part-Time and Full-Time Workers,
by Core, Periphery and State
Segments, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Segment</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Periphery</u>		<u>Core</u>		<u>State</u>		<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	140	15.0	38	5.8	82	15.5	260	12.2
Full-Time	796	85.0	621	94.2	446	84.5	1863	87.8
Column Total	936	44.1	659	31.0	528	24.9	2123 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 37.44

Significance = 0.0000

Minimum Expected Frequency = 64.66

(a) There were 4 missing cases

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 11

**Respondent's Job Status,
By Number and Percentage,
Canada, 1983**

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number of Workers</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Valid Percentage</u>
Part-Time Workers	260	10.1	12.2
Full-Time Workers	1,867	72.4	87.8
Housewives and Unemployed	370	14.4	
Others	80	3.1	
Total	2,577	100.0	100.0

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 12

**Job Status by Sex, Part-Time and
Full-Time Positions,
Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Men</u>		<u>Women</u>		<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	45	4.0	215	21.2	260	12.2
Full-Time	1069	96.0	798	78.8	1867	87.8
Column Total	1114	52.4	1013	47.6	2127	100.0

Chi-Square = 144.42

Significance = 0.0000

Minimum Expected Frequency = 123.82

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 13

**Job Status by Age and Sex, Part-Time
and Full-Time Workers,
Canada, 1983**

Total

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Age</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>18-24</u>		<u>25-50</u>		<u>51-64</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	52	15.8	169	12.1	39	9.8	260	12.2
Full-Time	278	84.2	1228	87.9	361	90.3	1867	87.8
Column Total	330	15.5	1397	65.9	400	18.8	2127	100.0

Chi-Square = 6.14 Significance = 0.0464 Minimum Expected Frequency = 40.33

Men

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Age</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>18-24</u>		<u>25-50</u>		<u>51-64</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	19	11.4	14	2.0	12	4.8	45	4.0
Full-Time	147	88.6	683	98.0	239	95.2	1069	96.0
Column Total	166	14.9	697	62.6	251	22.5	1114	100.0

Chi-Square = 31.26 Significance = 0.0000 Minimum Expected Frequency = 6.70

Women

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Age</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>18-24</u>		<u>25-50</u>		<u>51-64</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	33	20.1	155	22.1	27	18.1	215	21.2
Full-Time	131	79.9	545	77.9	122	81.9	798	78.8
Column Total	164	16.2	700	69.1	149	14.7	1013	100.0

Chi-Square = 1.33 Significance = 0.5141 Minimum Expected Frequency = 31.62

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 14

**Job Status by Education and Sex,
Part-Time and Full-Time Workers,
Canada, 1983**

Total

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Education</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Elementary School or Less</u>		<u>Some Secondary Schooling to Community College</u>		<u>Some University to a Professional Degree</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	25	10.5	183	12.4	52	12.8	260	12.2
Full-Time	214	89.5	1298	87.6	355	87.2	1867	87.8
Column Total	239	11.2	1481	69.6	407	19.1	2127	100.0

Chi-Square = 0.83 Significance = 0.6594 Minimum Expected Frequency = 29.21

Men

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Education</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Elementary School or Less</u>		<u>Some Secondary Schooling to Community College</u>		<u>Some University to a Professional Degree</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	3	1.9	34	4.7	8	3.5	45	4.0
Full-Time	153	98.1	697	95.3	219	96.5	1069	96.0
Column Total	156	14.1	731	65.6	227	20.4	1114	100.0

Chi-Square = 2.66 Significance = 0.2640 Minimum Expected Frequency = 6.30

Women

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Education</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Elementary School or Less</u>		<u>Some Secondary Schooling to Community College</u>		<u>Some University to a Professional Degree</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	22	26.5	149	19.9	44	24.4	215	21.2
Full-Time	61	73.5	601	80.1	136	75.6	798	78.8
Column Total	83	8.2	750	74.0	180	17.8	1013	100.0

Chi-Square = 3.32 Significance = 0.1894 Minimum Expected Frequency = 17.61

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 15

**Women's Job Status by Marital Status,
Part-Time and Full-Time Workers,
Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Marital Status</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Married</u>		<u>Single</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	167	24.0	48	15.1	215	21.2
Full-time	528	76.0	270	84.9	798	78.8
Column Total	695	68.8	318	31.4	1013	100.0

Chi-Square = 9.88

Significance = 0.0017

Minimum Expected Frequency = 67.49

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 16

**Women's Job Status by Presence of
Children, Part-Time and Full-Time
Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Presence of Children</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Any Children 16 or Younger</u>		<u>Only Children Over 16 or No Children</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	116	26.0	51	20.6	167	24.0
Full-time	331	74.0	197	79.4	528	76.0
Column Total	447	64.3	248	35.4	695 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 2.53

Significance = 0.1114

Minimum Expected Frequency = 59.59

(a) There were 318 respondents not included in this table.
All of these were single women.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 17

**Job Status by Whether or Not
Attending School, Part-Time and
Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Student</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Column %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	40	18.8	220	11.5	260	12.2
Full-time	173	81.2	1694	88.5	1867	87.8
Column Total	213	10.0	1914	90.0	2127	100.0

Chi-Square = 8.81

Significance = 0.0030

Minimum Expected Frequency = 26.03

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 18

**Job Status by Ability to Take Time
Off Without Penalty, Part-Time and
Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Can Take Time Off Without Penalty</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	39	16.7	194	83.3	233	12.5
Full-time	458	28.0	1180	72.0	1638	87.5
Column Total	497	26.6	1374	73.4	1871 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 12.60

Significance = 0.0004

Minimum Expected Frequency = 61.89

- (a) There were 256 missing cases. Self-employed businesspeople (149), self-employed professionals (19), and self-employed farmers (82) were not asked this question as it was not applicable to their situations. A total of 6 people did not know the answer or refused to respond.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

2

of/de

2

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

Table 19

**Job Status by Ability to Slow Down
Work at Own Discretion, Part-Time and
Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Can Slow Down Pace of Work</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Yes</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	82	35.2	151	64.8	233	12.4
Full-time	696	42.5	943	57.5	1639	87.6
Column Total	778	41.6	1094	58.4	1872 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 4.14

Significance = 0.0417

Minimum Expected Frequency = 96.83

(a) There were 255 missing cases. Self-employed businesspeople (149), self-employed professionals (19), and self-employed farmers (82) were not asked this question as it was not applicable to their situations. A total of 5 people did not know the answer or refused to respond.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 20

**Job Status by Possibility to
Design Own Work, Part-Time and
Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Possible to Design Own Work</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	122	52.4	111	47.6	233	12.4
Full-time	1051	64.0	590	36.0	1641	87.6
Column Total	1173	62.6	701	37.4	1874 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 11.40

Significance = 0.0007

Minimum Expected Frequency = 87.15

(a)

There were 253 missing cases. Self-employed businesspeople (149), self-employed professionals (19), and self-employed farmers (82) were not asked this question as it was not applicable to their situations. A total of 3 people did not know the answer or refused to respond.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 21

**Job Status by Decision-Making
Procedure, Part-Time and
Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Decision-Making Procedure</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Management Alone</u>		<u>Management Consults</u>		<u>Joint Agreement</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	114	48.7	103	44.0	17	7.3	234	12.1
Full-Time	680	39.9	830	48.7	193	11.3	1703	87.9
Column Total	794	41.0	933	48.2	210	10.8	1937 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 7.96

Significance = 0.0186

Minimum Expected Frequency = 25.36

- (a) There were 190 missing cases. Of these, 167 were self-employed respondents without paid employees, and 23 people either did not know or refused to answer.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 22

**Job Status by Whether Supervisor
Decides Daily Tasks, Part-Time and
Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Supervisor Decides Daily Tasks</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>No</u>		<u>General</u>		<u>Specific</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	65	36.3	40	22.3	74	41.3	179	12.2
Full-Time	596	46.5	272	21.2	415	32.3	1283	87.8
Column Total	661	45.2	312	21.3	489	33.4	1462 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 7.46

Significance = 0.0239

Minimum Expected Frequency = 38.20

(a)

There were 665 missing cases. Self-employed businesspeople (149), self-employed professionals (19), and self-employed farmers (82) were not asked this question. A total of 346 respondents had no supervisor, and 69 did not know or refused to answer.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 23

**Job Status by How Closely
Instructions Followed, Part-Time and
Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>How Closely Instructions Followed</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Very Closely</u>		<u>Somewhat Closely</u>		<u>Not Closely</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	110	63.2	58	33.3	6	3.4	174	12.2
Full-Time	656	53.4	514	41.1	81	6.5	1251	87.8
Column Total	766	53.8	572	40.1	87	6.1	1425 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 7.88

Significance = 0.0194

Minimum Expected Frequency = 10.62

(a) There were 702 missing cases. Self-employed businesspeople (149), self-employed professionals (19), and self-employed farmers (82) were not asked this question. A total of 346 respondents had no supervisor, and 106 did not know or refused to answer.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 24

**Job Status by Degree to Which
Supervisor Influences Pay and
Promotion, Part-Time and
Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Amount of Influence</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>None</u>		<u>A Little</u>		<u>Much</u>		<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	92	52.6	27	15.4	56	32.0	175	12.1
Full-Time	591	46.4	310	24.4	372	29.2	1273	87.9
Column Total	683	47.2	337	23.3	428	29.6	1448 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 6.89

Significance = 0.0318

Minimum Expected Frequency = 40.72

- (a) There were 679 missing cases. Self-employed businesspeople (149), self-employed professionals (19), and self-employed farmers (82) were not asked this question. A total of 346 workers had no supervisor, and 83 did not know or refused to answer.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 25

**Job Status by Training Required
for Type of Work, Part-Time and
Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Training Required</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Little</u>		<u>Some</u>		<u>Much</u>		<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	136	59.9	42	18.5	49	21.6	227	12.2
Full-Time	619	37.8	339	20.7	681	41.5	1639	87.8
Column Total	755	40.5	381	20.4	730	39.1	1866 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 44.94

Significance = 0.0000

Minimum Expected Frequency = 46.34

(a) There were 261 missing cases. Of these, 250 were self-employed and 11 did not know or refused to answer.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 26

Job Status by Usefulness of Job Skills Elsewhere, Part-Time and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Usefulness of Skills Elsewhere Only in Present Job</u>		<u>Also in Different Lines of Work</u>		<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	127	55.2	103	44.8	230	12.2
Full-time	785	47.6	863	52.4	1648	87.8
Column Total	912	48.6	966	51.4	1878 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 4.34

Significance = 0.0370

Minimum Expected Frequency = 111.69

(a) There were 249 missing cases, those self-employed.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 27

**Job Status by Level of Skill
Others Perceive Job Having, Part-Time
and Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Level of Skill Others Perceive</u>						<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Unskilled</u>		<u>Semiskilled</u>		<u>Highly Skilled</u>		<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-Time	51	22.4	108	47.4	69	30.3	228	12.2
Full-Time	245	14.9	861	52.2	542	32.9	1648	87.8
Column Total	296	15.8	969	51.7	611	32.6	1876 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 8.49

Significance = 0.0143

Minimum Expected Frequency = 35.97

(a) There were 251 missing cases, all but 1 being self-employed.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 28

**Job Status by Amount of Thought
and Attention Required of Job,
Part-Time and Full-Time Workers,
Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Amount of Thought and Attention Required</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Little</u>		<u>Much</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	147	63.6	84	36.4	231	12.3
Full-time	939	57.0	709	43.0	1648	87.7
Column Total	1086	57.8	793	42.2	1879 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 3.68

Significance = 0.0550

Minimum Expected Frequency = 97.49

(a) There were 248 missing cases, those self-employed.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 29

**Job Status by Union at Place of Work,
Part-Time and Full-Time Workers,
Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Union</u>		<u>No Union</u>		<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Union at Work</u>					
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	80	30.8	180	69.2	260	12.2
Full-time	840	45.0	1027	55.0	1867	87.7
Column Total	920	43.3	1207	56.7	2127	100.0

Chi-Square = 18.23

Significance = 0.0000

Minimum Expected Frequency = 112.45

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 30

**Job Status by Ever Unemployed,
Part-Time and Full-Time Workers,
Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Ever Unemployed</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	71	35.0	132	65.0	203	13.0
Full-time	572	42.0	790	58.0	1362	87.0
Column Total	643	41.1	922	58.9	1565 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 3.59

Significance = 0.0578

Minimum Expected Frequency = 83.40

(a) There were 562 missing cases. They included 299 workers employed only periodically, 250 self-employed respondents, and 13 people who did not know or refused to answer.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 31

**Job Status by Ever Unemployed,
and Age, Part-Time and Full-Time
Workers, Canada, 1983**

Ages 18-30

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Ever Unemployed</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	27	40.9	39	59.1	66	13.4
Full-time	207	48.5	220	51.5	427	86.6
Column Total	234	47.5	259	52.5	493 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 1.02

Significance = 0.3108

Minimum Expected Frequency = 31.32

Ages 31-64

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Ever Unemployed</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	44	32.1	93	67.9	137	12.8
Full-time	365	39.0	570	61.0	935	87.2
Column Total	409	38.2	663	61.8	1072 ^(b)	100.0

Chi-Square = 2.14

Significance = 0.1434

Minimum Expected Frequency = 52.27

(a)(b) There were 562 missing cases. They included 299 employed only periodically, 250 self-employed, and 13 who did not know or refused to answer.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Table 32

**Job Status by Position in the
Management Hierarchy, Part-Time and
Full-Time Workers, Canada, 1983**

<u>Job Status</u>	<u>Position in Hierarchy</u>				<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Management/Supervisor</u>		<u>Nonmanagement</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Row %</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Part-time	36	15.1	203	84.9	239	12.1
Full-time	514	29.8	1209	70.2	1723	87.8
Column Total	550	28.0	1412	72.0	1962 ^(a)	100.0

Chi-Square = 21.96

Significance = 0.0000

Minimum Expected Frequency = 66.99

(a) There were 165 missing cases, made up of those who did not know the answer, refused to reply, or felt the question was not applicable to their situation.

Source: 1983 Canadian Class Structure Project

Footnotes

- 1 The seminal sociological study of part-time work is the 1969 book by Dean Morse, The Peripheral Worker, with the emphasis on "peripheral" or "marginal" workers as worthy subjects of serious study.

- 2 Walby (1989: 129) raises the question as to whether flexibility is gendered. She finds the evidence ambiguous. Jenson (1989: 141) also investigates the gender-blind nature of much work done on flexible specialization and asks if men and women really do benefit similarly.

- 3 Part-time jobs tend to be located in relatively small and widely dispersed establishments, such as restaurants and store chains, in which unions find it harder to establish control. Ownership can take advantage of this "job fragmentation" to actively discourage union activity (Clemenson, 1989: 33, 34; White, 1980: 44-47).

- 4 Lindsay (1989: 21) defines the service sector as including "distributive services such as transportation and storage, communications, utilities, and wholesale and retail trade; consumer services such as accommodation and food services, personal services, and amusement and recreational services; producer services such as services to business management, and finance, insurance and real estate; and non-commercial services such as education, health and welfare services, religious organizations, and public administration. The goods-producing sector include agriculture, manufacturing, construction, mining, forestry, and fishing."

- 5 Source: Statistics Canada, The Labour Force, (Catalogue Number 71-001), December 1986

- 6 The Canadian data were obtained through a multi-stage probability sample in 1982-1983, stratified by region and community size. Completed interviews were obtained in 76 percent of total households (Black and Myles, 1986: 161).

- 7 Concerning those 65 years of age and over, a total of 56 were employed in paid jobs. A total of 12 individuals (21.4 percent) were working on a part-time basis, compared to 44 (78.6 percent) working full-time. Of the 56 workers, 21 (37.5 percent) were self-employed.

- 8 Hunter (1986: 201) cites a more detailed example. Given that engineers make more money than labourers partly because engineers are employed in primary jobs while labourers are working in secondary jobs is to make a circular argument, if primary jobs are defined as more financially lucrative than secondary jobs. Hodson and Kaufman (1982: 733-734) state that, as an example, it is not valid to use income levels, and degree of job stability as both dependent variables and indicators of the major independent variable.
- 9 All four classifications were tested using the data, and they all yielded similar results.

References

- Akyeampong, Ernest B.
 1986 "'Involuntary' Part-Time Employment in Canada, 1975-1985." The Labour Force (December 1986): 144-170
- 1987 "Involuntary Part-Time Employment in Canada, 1975-86." Canadian Social Trends (Autumn 1987): 28-31
- 1989a "The Changing Face of Temporary Help." Perspectives (Summer 1989): 43-49
- 1989b "The Labour Market: Mid-year Report." Perspectives (Autumn 1989): 19-29
- Apostle, Richard, Don Clairmont and Lars Osberg
 1985 "Segmentation and wage determination." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 22(1): 30-56
- 1986 "Economic Segmentation and Politics." American Journal of Sociology 91(4): 905-931
- Armstrong, Pat
 1984 Labour Pains: Women's Work in Crisis. Toronto: Women's Educational Press
- 1986 "Women, Technology and the Economic Crisis." Pp. 43-95 in John F. Peters (ed.), Work in Canada. Waterloo: Interdisciplinary Research Committee, Wilfred Laurier University
- Atkinson, J.
 1984 "Manpower strategies for flexible organisations." Personnel Management. August
- Baker, Maureen and Mary-Anne Robeson
 1981 "Trade Union Reactions to Women Workers and Their Concerns." Pp. 379-392 in Katherine Lundy and Barbara Warne (eds.), Work in the Canadian Context: Continuity Despite Change. Toronto: Butterworths
- Baker, Maureen
 1988 Part-Time Work. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada
- Beck, E.M., Patrick M. Horan and Charles M. Tolbert
 1978 "Stratification in a dual economy: a sectoral model of earnings determination." American Sociological Review 43: 704-720
- 1980 "Industrial segmentation and labour market discrimination." Social Problems 28: 113-130

- Benimadhu, Prem
1986 "Labour Resists Tide Toward Part-Time Work."
Canadian Business Review 13: 21-23
- Bibb, Robert and Hilliam H. Form
1977 "The effects of industrial, occupational, and sex
stratification on wages in blue-collar markets."
Social Forces 55: 974-976
- Black, Don and John Myles
1986 "Dependent industrialization and the Canadian
class structure: a comparative analysis of Canada,
the United States, and Sweden." Canadian Review
of Sociology and Anthropology 23(2): 157-181
- Bluestone, Barry, William Murphy and Mary Stevenson
1973 Low Wages and the Working Poor. Ann Arbor:
Institute of Labour and Industrial Relations,
University of Michigan
- Buckley, Joanne
1987 Fit to Print: The Canadian Student's Guide to
Essay Writing. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich
- Burke, Mary Anne
1986 "The Growth of Part-Time Work." Canadian Social
Trends (Autumn 1986): 9-14
- Campling, Robert F.
1987 Employee Benefits and the Part-Time Worker: Legal
and Economic Issues. Kingston: Industrial
Relations Centre, Queen's University
- Canadian Labour Congress
1982 "CLC Brief on Part-Time Jobs." Canadian Labour
27(8): 6
- Canadian Mental Health Association
1984 Work and Well-Being: The Changing Realities of
Employment. Toronto: Health and Welfare Canada
- Chekki, Dan and John R. Hofley
1980 "Women and Inequality." Pp. 378-400 in John Harp
and John R. Hofley (eds.), Structured Inequality
in Canada. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada,
Ltd.
- Clairmont, Donald H. and Martha Macdonald and Fred C. Wien
1980 "A Segmentation Approach to Poverty and Low-Wage
Work in the Maritimes." Pp. 285-315 in John Harp
and John R. Hofley (eds.), Structural Inequality
in Canada. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada
Ltd.

- Clairmont, Donald H., Richard Apostle and Reinhard Kreckel
 1983 "The segmentation perspective as a middle-range conceptualization in sociology." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 8(3): 245-271
- Clairmont, Donald H. and Richard Apostle
 1986 "Work: A Segmentation Perspective." Pp. 64-81 in Katherina L.P. Lundy and Barbara Warne (eds.), *Work in the Canadian Context: Continuity Despite Change*. Toronto: Butterworths
- Clemenson, Heather A.
 1987 "Unemployment Rates for the Full-time and Part-time labour forces." *Canadian Social Trends* (Autumn 1987): 30-33
- 1989 "Unionization and Women in the Service Sector." *Perspectives* (Autumn 1989): 30-44
- Clutterbuck, David (editor)
 1985 *New Patterns of Work*. Aldershot: Gower Publishing Company Limited
- Coates, Mary Lou
 1988 *Part-Time Employment: Labour Market Flexibility and Equity Issues*. Kingston: Industrial Relations Centre, Queen's University
- Connelly, Patricia
 1978 *Last Hired, First Fired: Women and the Canadian Work Force*. Toronto: The Women's Press
- de Neubourg, Chris
 1985 "Part-Time Work: An International Quantitative Comparison." *International Labour Review* 124(5): 559-576
- Duchesne, Doreen
 1987 "Annual Review of Labour Force Trends." *Canadian Social Trends* (Summer 1987): 25-31
- Eberhardt, Bruce J. and Abraham B. Shani
 1984 "The Effects of Full-Time Versus Part-Time Employment Status on Attitudes Toward Specific Organizational Characteristics and Overall Job Satisfaction." *Academy of Management Journal* 27(4): 893-900
- England, Geoffrey
 1987 *Part-time, Casual and Other Atypical Workers: A Legal View*. Kingston: Industrial Relations Centre, Queen's University

- Feldberg, Roslyn L. and Evelyn Nakano Glenn
 1979 "Male and Female: Job versus Gender Models in the Sociology of Work." *Social Problems* 26(5): 524-538
- Ferber, Marianne A.
 1987 *Women and Work, Paid and Unpaid: A Selected, Annotated Bibliography.* New York: Garland Publishing
- Folkard, Simon and Timothy Monk (editors)
 1985 *Hours of Work: Temporal Factors in Work-Scheduling.* New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Fraser, Doug
 1986 "Protecting Part-timers." *Policy Options* (June 1986):37-38
- Freedman, Marcia
 1976 *Labor Markets: Segments and Shelters.* New York: Allanheld, Osmun and Co. Publishers, Inc.
- Garnsey, Elizabeth and Jill Rubery and Frank Wilkinson
 1985 "Labour market structure and work-force divisions." Pp. 40-76 in R. Deem and G. Salaman (eds.), *Work, Culture, and Society.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- Ginzberg, Eli
 1982 "Early Retirement: Boon or Bane?" Pp. 77-91 in E. Ginzberg, D. Mills, J. Owen, H. Sheppard, and M. Wachter (eds.), *Work Decisions in the 1980s.* Boston: Auburn House Publishing Company
- Goldenberg, Sheldon
 1987 *Thinking Sociologically.* Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company
- Gower, David
 1988a "Annual Update on Labour Force Trends." *Canadian Social Trends* (Summer 1988): 17-20
- 1988b "Labour Force Trends: Canada and the United States." *Canadian Social Trends* (Autumn 1988): 14-19
- Hauser, Robert
 1980 "On 'Stratification in a Dual Economy': *American Sociological Review* 45: 702-712
- Hodson, Randy and Robert Kaufman
 1981 "Circularity in the Dual Economy: A Comment on Tolbert, Horan, and Beck 1980." *American Journal of Sociology* 86: 881-887
- 1982 "Economic Dualism: A Critical Review." *American Sociological Review* 47: 727-739

- Horan, Patrick M., Charles M. Tolbert and E.M. Beck
 1981 "The Circle Has No Close." American Journal of Sociology 86: 887-894
- Hunter, Alfred A.
 1986 Class Tells: On Social Inequality in Canada. Toronto: Butterworths
- Jackofsky, E.F., J. Salter and L.H. Peters
 1986 "Reducing Turnover Among Part-Time Employees." Personnel 63: 41-43
- Jenson, Jane
 1989 "The talents of women, the skills of men: flexible specialization and women." Pp. 141-155 in Stephen Wood (ed.), The Transformation of Work? London: Unwin Hyman
- Kaliski, Stephen F.
 1986 "Trends, Changes, and Imbalances: A Survey of the Canadian Labour Force." Pp. 77-140 in W. Craig Riddell (ed.), Work and Pay: The Canadian Labour Market. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Kumar, Pradeep, Mary Lou Coates, and David Arrowsmith
 1987 The Current Industrial Relations Scene in Canada 1987. Kingston: Industrial Relations Centre, Queen's University
- Kuttner, Bob
 1983 "The Declining Middle." The Atlantic Monthly July: 60-72
- Labour Canada
 1983 Part-time Work in Canada: Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Part-time Work (Joan Wallace - Commissioner). Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada
- Levesque, J.
 1987 "The Growth of Part-time Work in a Changing Industrial Environment." The Labour Force (May 1987): 87-107
- Levitan, S.A. and R.S. Belous
 1977 Shorter Hours, Shorter Weeks: Spreading the Work to Reduce Unemployment. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press
- Lindsay, Colin and Craig McKie
 1986 "Annual Review of Labour Force Trends." Canadian Social Trends (Autumn 1986): 2-7

- Lindsay, Colin
1989 "The Service Sector in the 1980s." Canadian Social Trends (Spring 1989): 20-23
- Little, T.D.
1986 "Part-Time Work: Crisis or Opportunity." Canadian Business Review (Spring 1986) 13: 18-20
- Logan, Nancy, Charles A. O'Reilly and Karlene H. Roberts
1973 "Job Satisfaction Among Part-Time and Full-Time Employees." Journal of Vocational Behavior 3: 33-41
- Low, Graham S.
1987 Women in the Administrative Revolution. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Maklan, David M.
1977 The Four-Day Workweek: Blue Collar Adjustment to a Nonconventional Arrangement of Work and Leisure Time. New York: Praeger Publishers
- McGaughey, William
1981 A Shorter Workweek in the 1980s. White Bear Lake: Thistlerose Publications
- Meier, Gretl S.
1978 Job Sharing: A New Pattern for Quality of Work and Life. Kalamazoo: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
- Meltz, Noah M., Frank Reid and Gerald S. Swartz
1981 Sharing the Work: An Analysis of the Issues in Worksharing and Jobsharing. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Montgomery, Mark
1988 "Hours of Part-Time and Full-Time Workers at the Same Firm." Industrial Relations 27(3): 394-406
- Morse, Dean
1969 The Peripheral Worker. New York: Columbia University Press
- Myles, John and Wallace Clement
1983 Comparative Project on Class Structure and Class Consciousness: Canadian Survey (data provided by Social Science Data Archives)
- Myles, John
1988 "The expanding middle: some Canadian evidence on the deskilling debate." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 25(3): 335-363

- Nakamura, Alice and Masao Nakamura
 1985 "A Survey of Research on the Work Behaviour of Canadian Women." Pp. 171-218 in W. Craig Riddell (ed.), Work and Pay: The Canadian Labour Market. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Nollen, S.D. and B.B. Eddy and V.H. Martin
 1978 Permanent Part-time Employment: The Manager's Perspective. New York: Praeger Publishers
- O'Connor, James
 1973 The Fiscal Crisis of the State. New York: St. Martin's Press
- Panitch, Leo
 1987 "Capitalist Restructuring and Labour Strategies." Studies in Political Economy 24: 131-149
- Picot, W. Garnett
 1987 "The Changing Industrial Mix of Employment, 1951-1985." Canadian Social Trends (Summer 1987): 8-11
- Pierce, J., J. Newstrom, R. Dunham, and A. Barber
 1989 Alternative Work Schedules. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Piore, Michael J. and Charles F. Sabel
 1984 The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity. New York: Basic Books
- Piore, Michael J.
 1986 "Perspectives on Labor Market Flexibility." Industrial Relations 25(2): 146-166
- Pollert, Anna
 1988 "The 'Flexible Firm': Fixation or Fact." Work, Employment and Society 2(3): 281-316
- Reid, Frank and Gerald S. Swartz
 1982 Prorating Fringe Benefits for Part-time Employees in Canada. Toronto: Centre for Industrial Relations
- Reid, Frank
 1986 "Short-Time Compensation: A Strategy to Avoid Layoffs by Sharing Work." Pp. 97-106 in John F. Peters (ed.), Work in Canada. Waterloo: Interdisciplinary Research Committee, Wilfrid Laurier University
- Richlin-Klonsky, Judith and Ellen Strenski
 1986 A Guide to Writing Sociology Papers. New York: St. Martin's Press

- Ronen, Simcha
 1981 Flexible Working Hours: An Innovation in the Quality of Work Life. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- 1984 Alternative Work Schedules: Selecting, Implementing and Evaluating. Homewood: Dow Jones-Irwin
- Rosenberg, Morris
 1968 The Logic of Survey Analysis. New York: Basic Books
- Sabel, Charles F.
 1979 "Marginal Workers in Industrial Society." Pp. 170-185 in Michael J. Piore (ed.), Unemployment and Inflation: Institutional and Structuralist Views. White Plains: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Simpson, Wayne
 1986 "Analysis of part-time pay in Canada." Canadian Journal of Economics 19: 798-807
- Statistics Canada
 1989 Understanding Labour Market Data: A Guide to Choosing the Best Data Source for Your Needs. Ottawa: Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division
- Storey, John
 1985 "The Means of Management Control." Sociology 19(2): 193-211
- Streeck, Wolfgang
 1987 "The Uncertainties of Management in the Management of Uncertainty: Employers, Labour Relations and Industrial Adjustment in the 1980s." Work, Employment and Society 1(3): 281-308
- Thompson, Paul
 1989 The Nature of Work: Introduction to Debates on the Labour Process. London: Macmillan
- Tolbert, Charles M., Patrick M. Horan and E.M. Beck
 1980 "The Structure of Economic Segmentation: A Dual Economy Approach." American Journal of Sociology 85:1095-1116
- Vevers, Richard
 1986 "Results from the Annual Work Patterns Survey: 1984 and 1985." The Labour Force (March 1986): 85-112

Walby, Sylvia

- 1989 "Flexibility and the changing sexual division of labour." Pp. 127-140 in Stephen Wood (ed.), *The Transformation of Work?* London: Unwin Hyman

Weeks, Wendy

- 1984 "Part-Time Work: The Business View on Second-Class Jobs for Housewives and Mothers." Pp. 137-146 in Graham S. Lowe and Harvey J. Krahn (eds.), *Working Canadians*. Toronto: Methuen Publications

Weiermair, Klaus

- 1988 *The Labour Market and the Service Sector*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute

White, Julie

- 1980 *Women and Unions*. The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada
- 1983 *Women and Part-Time Work*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada

Zucker, Lynn and Carolyn Rosenstein

- 1981 "Taxonomies of Institutional Structure: Dual Economy Reconsidered." *American Sociological Review* 46: 869-884

Appendix A

The data used in this study were obtained by eliciting responses to the following questions. Some of the variables were recoded in order to make the tables manageable or to ensure statistically significant findings.

Workers' Characteristics

Variable RESPAGE - worker's age

In what year were you born?

Variable RESPSEX - worker's sex

Obtained from cover sheet on each questionnaire.

Variable Q44 - hours worked weekly

About how many hours do you usually work a week, including paid and unpaid overtime?

— hours per week

(Responses to this question were recoded as follows: those working less than 30 hours per week were designated part-time workers, and those working 30 or more hours weekly were designated full-time workers.)

Variable Q119A - living with spouse-partner

Are you currently living with a husband, wife or partner?

— Yes

— No

Variable INTCHCK1 - children in household

Do you have

— any children age 16 or under in household?

— only children over age 16 in household?

— all others

(Responses to this question were recoded into two groups as follows: the first group consisted of only attached women with any children age 16 or under in the household. The second group was made up of attached women with only children over age 16 in the household and attached women with no children in the household)

Variable Q100A - highest level of education completed

What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

- ☐ no formal schooling
- ☐ elementary school
 - ☐ some
 - ☐ completed
- ☐ secondary/high school
 - ☐ academics
 - ☐ some
 - ☐ completed
 - ☐ vocational or technical
 - ☐ some
 - ☐ completed
- ☐ after secondary/high school but not university
 - ☐ business or trades training
 - ☐ some
 - ☐ completed
- ☐ nursing school or teacher's college
 - ☐ some
 - ☐ completed
- ☐ community college, CEGEP, technical institute
 - ☐ some
 - ☐ completed
- ☐ university
 - ☐ some
 - ☐ completed
 - ☐ certificate or diploma
 - ☐ bachelor's degree
 - ☐ master's degree
 - ☐ doctorate
 - ☐ professional degree

(Responses to this question were recoded into three more manageable groups. The first group consisted of workers who had elementary schooling or less. The second group was made up of workers with educational levels ranging from some high school to a college diploma. Those who had attended university for any length of time made up the third group)

Variable Q100E - currently a student

Are you currently enrolled in an educational program as a

- ☐ full-time student?
- ☐ part-time student?
- ☐ not enrolled

(Those attending school, regardless of whether on a part-time or full-time basis, were grouped together. Those not attending school made up the other category)

Job Characteristics

Variable Q46A - sometimes possible to design own work

Is it sometimes possible for you to put some of your own ideas into practice, that is, to plan or design some aspects of your own or other people's work?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

Variable Q47B - can take time off without accounting

Can you do this on your job, either officially or unofficially...take a day off from work without losing pay or having to claim vacation time, sick leave or put in compensatory time?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Variable A47C - can slow down pace of work

Can you do this on your job, either officially or unofficially...considerably slow down your pace of work for a day when you want to

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Variable Q50A - supervisor decides daily tasks or jobs

Does your supervisor or the person to whom you report decide the specific tasks or jobs you will carry out during the day?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes...would you say his/her instructions are usually
 - ☐ very general
 - ☐ somewhat specific
 - ☐ very specific

(These four categories were recoded into three. Those who answered "somewhat specific" or "very specific" were grouped together)

Variable Q50D - how closely instructions followed

How closely do you usually follow the instructions given you by your supervisor?

- ☐ very closely
- ☐ somewhat closely
- ☐ not very closely
- ☐ not at all closely

(These four categories were recoded into three, with those answering "not very closely" or "not at all closely" being grouped into the third category)

Variable Q52A - supervisor influences pay and promotion

Now we would like to know how much influence your supervisor has over some important aspects of your work. What about decisions concerning your pay raises and promotions? Can your supervisor influence this?

___ No

___ Yes...how much influence would you say he/she has over this?

___ a little

___ some

___ a great deal

(Those who answered "a little" or "some" were grouped together)

Variable Q66 - training required for type of work

Beyond formal schooling, how much on-the-job training, apprenticeship training or job experience is now normally required for people who do your type of work?

___ short demonstration only

___ up to 30 days

___ one to three months

___ more than 3 months up to 6 months

___ more than 6 months up to 1 year

___ more than one year

(Those replying to the first two options were grouped together. Workers replying to options three or four were recoded into a second category. Finally, those will the last two answers made up a third category)

Variable Q67 - usefulness of job skills elsewhere

Thinking about the skills which you use in the job you have now, would you say that you can use these skills

___ only in your present job?

___ only with employers in the same line of work?

___ in jobs with employers in quite different lines of work?

(This variable was recoded by putting answers to the first two options into one category)

Variable Q69 - level of skill others perceive job having

Do you think that most other people would consider your job

___ unskilled?

___ semi-skilled?

___ highly skilled?

Variable Q70 - thought and attention required of job

We would like to know about the kinds of problems which normally arise in your job, and the amount of thought and attention you need to deal with them. I am going to show you some statements and ask you to pick the one which best describes the thought and attention your job normally demands of you. My job requires:

- ☐ little thought and attention (my work is usually routine, and problems seldom arise)
- ☐ some thought and attention (problems which arise normally require straightforward solutions)
- ☐ simple problem solving (unforeseen problems arise which require some practical experience)
- ☐ difficult problem solving (difficult problems arise which require considerable experience and careful analysis to solve)
- ☐ complex problem solving (highly complex problems arise which require a high level of abstract knowledge and theory to solve)

(Answers one, two, and three were grouped together to make up one category. Answers four and five together made up a second category)

Variable Q83A - position in management hierarchy

Which of the following best describes the position which you hold within your business or organization? Would it be a

- ☐ managerial position?
- ☐ supervisory position?
- ☐ non-management position?

(Those in managerial or supervisory positions were grouped together into one category)

Variable Q84A - how decisions regarding work are made

First, I would like you to think about decisions concerning the working conditions of the employees and the way work is done. Could you tell me which of the following statements best describes the way these decisions are made?

- ☐ usually management makes these decisions on its own
- ☐ management acts on its own but usually asks the opinions of the employees or their representatives
- ☐ management first has to get the agreement of the employees or their representatives

Variable Q86A - union at place of work

Is there a union at the place where you work?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Variable Q96 - ever unemployed

Aside from regular, seasonal unemployment, have you ever been unemployed for a week or longer, that is, out of work but wanting to find work?

— Yes

— No

Variable IND1 - Wright's Twelve-Category Industrial classification

END

1 2 0 4 9 1

FIN