CLMI 4 : INDICATORS BY STATE

Official unemployment

Australia’s official unemployment rate is now 5.2 %, one of the lowest official rates since 1980. This official person-based measure of unemployment fails, however, to capture the splintering of full-time, permanent jobs into part-time and casual positions that has occurred since then. Jobs involving one hour of paid work per week are counted in the official measure as a job, and anyone so employed is counted as employed. However, many people working in these fragments of jobs want more hours of employment, and for many the need is desperate. In fact such a person is partly employed (the hours they work) and partly unemployed (the hours they want to work).

The CLMI developed by CofFEE are designed to incorporate these important realities and to provide broader measures of labour underutilisation. These more fully represent the degree to which willing labour resources are being wasted. A description of all the concepts used in the CLMI appears at the end of this note.

Underutilisation by State

At February 2006, the official State unemployment rates (U3) varied from 4.20 % in Western Australia to 6.42 % in Tasmania. Although this spread of unemployment rates across States has diminished since February 1980, certain States have tended to maintain their position relative to other States over time. Since 1980, for example, Tasmania has almost always had unemployment rates above the national average. This has also been the case for South Australia, although in May 2005 the unemployment rate fell to slightly below the national average. By way of contrast, over the entire period Western Australia has consistently had unemployment rates below the national average.

Table 1 Underutilisation measures by State (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUS</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>TAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1980</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2006</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1980</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2006</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1980</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2006</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU7a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2006</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU8a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2006</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following graphs compare underutilisation across States since February 1978. For consistency, a standard left hand scale has been used on each set of graphs.
It can be seen that all States were adversely affected by the 1991 recession with huge increases in all measures of underutilisation. The recovery from this appears to have been most marked in Queensland and WA where levels of underutilisation have returned to early 1980 levels, with the CU7 and CU8 indicators lower in 2005 than in 1980 (see also Table 1). Although South Australia is comparatively not a strong performer relative to the national average on most indicators, it now also has considerably lower levels of hours based underutilisation CU7 and CU8 in 2005 than in 1980.

Notwithstanding these improvements, the data indicate that there is still a large amount of underutilisation in the economy. The output losses that arise as a result of having around 10 percent of willing labour resources underutilised are enormous. The economic gains from fully employing the labour resources currently wasted in Australia far outweigh any potential efficiency gains from further labour market deregulation and microeconomic reform. CoFFEE’s indicators show the need for a new approach to employment policy.

Figure 1 Official unemployment (U3) by State (%)

Source: ABS Labour Force data.
Figure 2 CofFEE indicator CU4 by State (%)

Source: ABS Labour Force data and CofFEE estimates
Figure 3 CofFEE indicator UE by State (%)

Source: ABS Labour Force data and CofFEE estimates
Figure 4 CofFEE indicator CU7 by State (%)

Source: ABS Labour Force data and CofFEE estimates
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Figure 5 CofFEE indicator CU8 by State (%)
Background - labour underutilisation concepts

Official measures: The labour force is the most commonly used measure of available labour resources in the economy. It counts all those over 15 who are either employed or unemployed. A person is defined as employed if they have at least one hours work per week. A person is defined as unemployed if they do not have work, but they are available for work and they are actively seeking work. The unemployment rate measures the number of persons unemployed as a percentage of the economically active population (the civilian labour force). The inference from the measure is that the economy is wasting resources and sacrificing income by not providing enough opportunities for work and underutilising labour.

Underutilisation refers to all persons who are currently not working but who are willing and able to undertake work. Some of them may be classified as ‘in the labour force’, like the unemployed. Others may not be ‘in the labour force’ but nevertheless have an attachment to it. These persons are referred to as marginally attached workers of which the hidden unemployment is a subset.

The hidden unemployed or discouraged workers want to work and are available to start work in the reference week but are not actively looking for work. A major reason for their lack of search activity is that they believe that search is futile given the poor state of the labour market. They are discouraged from actively looking for work, and thus participating in the labour force, because of labour-market related constraints. The discouraged worker is thus more like the unemployed (in the labour force) worker than they are, for example, like a retired person or a child in full-time education, who are clearly not in the labour force. It is therefore appropriate to take into account their labour market attachment by including them in measures of underutilised labour.

Underemployment refers to employed workers who are constrained by the demand side of the labour market to work fewer hours than they desire. It can also reflect underutilisation of skills due to lack of opportunities. In terms of time-related underemployment, a part of an underemployed worker is employed and a part is unemployed, even though they are wholly classified among the employed. Given this, it is appropriate to also include this unsatisfied willingness-to-work in measures of unused labour resources.

Typically, if these groups are taken into account, it is based on the numbers of persons involved. A truer measure of underutilisation is gained by taking into account how many hours each of the unemployed and marginally attached workers would like to work. Similarly, underemployment can be measured by considering how many more hours each of the currently underemployed would like to work. CoFEE has developed hours-based indicators which address these issues.

CoFEE’s hours-based indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U3</td>
<td>Total unemployed, as a percent of the civilian labour force (official unemployment rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU4</td>
<td>Total unemployed, plus discouraged workers, as a percent of the civilian labour force plus discouraged workers. CU4 adds to U3 an estimate of working hours lost due to hidden unemployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU7</td>
<td>Hours-adjusted unemployment rate which includes the unemployed based on the number of hours they wish to work as well as an estimate of the impact of underemployment of part-time workers, who want to work more hours than they are currently working. CU7 is U3 unemployment measured in hours plus an estimate of working hours lost due to underemployment of those working. It is the ratio of unutilised hours of work available to the total available (fully-utilised) labour force in hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE</td>
<td>A derivative measure of underemployment derived from the components of CU7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU8</td>
<td>Hours-adjusted unemployment rate with hidden unemployment (discouraged workers), which is equal to CU7 plus an estimate, in hours, of the unused resources currently not counted in the labour force but still willing to work – the so-called hidden unemployed. These discouraged worker estimates are explained in Mitchell (2001). CU8 extends CU7 by including the hours-aspirations of the hidden unemployed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CU7 and CU8 distinguish between full-time and part-time employment, and take into account the fact that a substantial number of part-time workers (and in CU8 the hidden unemployed) are frustrated by their failure to gain full-time work or more part-time hours. CU8, the hours-based measure augmented by estimates of hidden unemployment is the most comprehensive measure of underutilisation and underemployment.

All series are seasonally adjusted.

The labels used here reflect the fact that CoFEE computes a range of indicators; for consistency, we retain them here. For example, CoFEE has also computed measures CU7A and CU8A. These latter measures deviate from CU7 and CU8 from April 2001 because they exclude all part-time workers who preferred more hours of work but did not actively search for it or were unavailable. This is consistent with changes in data presentation by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. For the purposes of this report ONLY, the measures CU7A and CU8A as defined above are designated as CU7 and CU8. For the full range of indicators, see http://e1.newcastle.edu.au/coffee/indicators/indicators.cfm
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