

Casualization and Labour Utilization: a Global Perspective

¹Oyadiran Phillip A., ²Daniel Dare, ³Aisha Ahmad Faskari & ⁴Ademeso Tosin Success

^{1&4}*Department of Public Administration,*

²*Department of Business Administration,*

Faculty of Management Science, University of Abuja

³*University of Abuja Teaching Hospital (UATH)*

Abstract

Casualization in the labour market is a subject of great concern and increase casual employees are filling positions that are permanent in nature in both private and public organizations. It is against this background that this study sets out to examine the relationship between casualization and labour utilization within a global perspective. The study explores secondary source data as its methodology and Neo-Liberal theory as theoretical framework. Benchmarking the global world, the study however recommends that Nigerian government should promote effective labour management relationship as against commercial-employment relationship that is becoming the order of the day in many Nigerian organizations. Also, there is need for Nigerian government as obtainable in other climes, to enact new laws and policies that will eschew all forms of employment irregularities and workplace exploitations in the context of labour casualization. This will be a positive response to the plights of casual workers who are being maltreated or exploited day-by-day in the course of work engagement. It will also serve as a way of fostering the horizon of democracy in Nigeria towards a caring employment for all in relation to what happens in other global climes as observed in the study.

Keyword: *Employment, Labour Casualization, Employee Utilization, Organization*

Corresponding Author: Oyadiran Phillip A.

Background to the Study

One outstanding challenge facing trade unionism in developing countries as well as Nigeria is “labour casualization”. Labour casualization depicts the process whereby workers in an organization are casual, temporary, seasonal, contract or part-time employees with little or no legal provisions (Solaja, 2015).

Kalejaiye, (2014) observed that casual work has become a social phenomenon and a cankerworm in labour relations in various industries across developing countries of the world and Nigeria inclusive. This he noted was as a result of the deliberate policy of the multi-nationals in productive and service companies, which created casual workers in place of permanent labour employment. That is, the placement of workers as temporary employees on jobs that is routine, contentious and permanent in nature (Op cit). This non-standard work arrangement is a form of work arrangement occasioned by the effects of globalization and trade liberalization. This development was facilitated by technological improvement in communication and information technology (Okafor, 2010).

Scholars have argued that the shift from permanent work to casual work arrangement is as a result of employers using it to avoid the mandates and costs associated with labour laws which are designed to protect permanent employees in standard employment (Onyeonoru, 2008; Okafor, 2010). Available records have shown that within the shortest of time, employers of labour are increasingly filling positions in their organizations that are supposed to be permanent with casual employees. The reason for this has been largely attributed to the increasing desperation on the side of employers to cut down the organizational cost and also the increase of capital mobility (Kalleberg, 1999; Basso, 2003; Anugwon, 2007; Okafor, 2011; Fapohunda, 2012).

Objectives of the study

- i. To explore the concept and theoretical underpinning of casualization and labour utilization.
- ii. To examines casualization and labour utilization within Global perspective.
- iii. To offer useful recommendations that can assist governments globally on the issue of casualization of labour.

Significance of the Study

This research intends to create awareness in relevant stakeholders such as labour union, the government and the general public. It will be of immense benefits to government in terms of economic development planning and other relevant policies. The research will also serve as a reference material for policy makers in formulating relevant policies and researchers that wish to carry out further research in this area of study. Finally the research would contribute immensely to the growing body of knowledge on casualization and labour utilization within a global perspective.

Research Methodology

The research utilized Secondary data obtained from review of related literatures of opinions of experts in the subject matter. These data were obtained from journal articles, text books and online publications.

Theoretical Framework

Neo-Liberal Theory

Neo-Liberalism is seen as a body of economic theory and as well a policy stance. The liberal school of economics became famous in Europe when Adam Smith, a Scottish economist, published a book in 1776 called THE WEALTH OF NATIONS. He and others advocated the abolition of government intervention in economic matters. No restrictions on manufacturing, no barriers to commerce, no tariffs, he said; free trade was the best way for a nation's economy to develop. Such ideas were "liberal" in the sense of no controls. This application of individualism encouraged "free" enterprise, "free" competition -- which came to mean, free for the capitalists to make huge profits as they wished.

Neo-liberalism refers to the desire to intensify and expand the market, by increasing the number, frequency, repeatability, and formalization of transaction. The ultimate goal of neo-liberalism is a universe where every action of every being is a market transaction, conducted in competition with every other being, and influencing every other transaction. Neo-liberalism seeks to transfer part of the control of the economy from the public to the private sector, under the belief that it will produce a more efficient government, and improve the economic indicators of the nation. The neo-liberal theory sees the nation primarily as a business firm. The nation-firm is selling itself as an investment location, rather than simply selling export goods. A neoliberal government pursues policies designed to make the nation more attractive as an investment location. These policies are generally pro business.

The main features of neo-liberalism include: the rule of the market, cutting public expenditure for social services, deregulation, privatization and eliminating the concept of "the public good" or "community".

Neo-liberalism assumes that higher economic freedom has a strong correlation with higher living standards; higher economic freedom leads to increased investment, technology transfer, innovation, and responsiveness to consumer demand (Martinez and Garcia, 2000) cited in (Okafor, 2010). Neo-liberalism believes staunchly on the freedom of contract. Freedom of contract is the right to choose one's contracting parties and to trade or work with them on any terms and conditions one sees fit. Contracts permit individuals to create their own enforceable legal rules, adapted to their unique situations. Parties decide whether contracts are profitable or fair, but once a contract is made, they are obliged to fulfil its terms, even if they are going to sustain losses by doing so. Through making binding promises, people are free to pursue their own interests. For neo-liberalism, it is a moral duty of human beings to arrange their lives to maximize their advantages in the labour market. According to Harvey (2005), corporations operating in a

typical neo-liberal economic environment prefer short-term contract of employment, which in effect, forces workers to apply and re-apply for the same job over and over again. This kind of flexibilization reduces cost of production, boost profit but, at the same time, minimizes or cheapens workers' quality of working lives (Bucher, Haynes and Baxter, 2009) cited in (Okafor,2010).

Conceptual Clarification

Casualization as a form of labour practice is the process whereby employment shifts from a preponderance of full time and permanent positions to higher levels of casual positions, in an irregular or intermittent nature (Luswili, 2009; Fapohunda, 2012).

Traditionally, casual labour is work conducted for defined period and during peak business period. Casual workers will be called to supplement full time workers in times of high business activity (Bodibe, 2006). Sheen (2012) defines a casual job as a job without paid leave entitlements, but the essence of a casual job is that the worker is entirely expendable on an hour-to-hour, week-to-week, year-to-year basis. Day and Buultjens (2007) agree when they opine that casual employment can be defined in terms of its lack of entitlements usually associated with permanent employment. Casualization captures the phenomenal growth on non standard employment globally. Okafor (2012) is also of this thought when he asserts that in recent decades there has been a dramatic increase in nonstandard jobs due to such factors as: massive unemployment, globalization, the shift from the manufacturing sector to the service sector and the spread of information technology. These changes have created a new economy which demands flexibility in the workplace and, as a result, caused the decline of the standard employment relations and a dramatic increase in precarious work. Fourie (2008) sees the current labour market as a market which has many forms of employment relations that differ from full-time employment. These include part-time employees, temporary employees, employees supplied by employment agencies, casual employees, home workers and workers engaged in a range of contracting relationships. They are usually described as non-standard or atypical employees.

In Nigeria, the term is used to describe work arrangements that are characterized by bad work conditions like job insecurity, low wages, and lack of employment benefits that accrue to regular employees as well as the right to organize and collectively bargain (Kalajaiye, 2014). Okafor (2012) points out, that workers in this form of work arrangement can be dismissed at any time without notice and are not entitled to redundancy pay. It is an unprotected form of employment, because it does not enjoy the statutory protection available to permanent employees. Okafor (2012) also argues that in developing societies like Nigeria which is bedeviled by the crisis of development and where labour market is saturated, most employers' intention to keep cost of labour as low as possible has resulted in the proliferation in nonstandard employment relations such as contract work, casual work or part time work even though workers in these categories have prerequisite skills to hold full time jobs with varying implications for decent work deficits.

The International Labour Organization (ILO) (2007) defines casuals as workers who have an explicit or implicit contract of employment which is not expected to continue for more than a short period, whose duration is to be determined by national circumstances. This ambiguous definition has led to varying definitions of casual and contract workers and their rights in different jurisdictions.

Casualization is referred to in Europe and the United States as Non Standard Work Arrangements (NSWAs). Casualization involves a process whereby more and more of the workforce are employed in “casual” jobs. It is the corporate trend of hiring and keeping workers on temporary employment rather than permanent employment, even for years, as a cost reduction measure.

It is an unprotected form of employment because it does not enjoy the statutory protection available to permanent employees. Basso (2003) observes that casualization may be linked to under-employment and has two main meanings.

It is often used loosely in international literature to refer to the spread of bad conditions of work such as employment insecurity, irregular work hours, intermittent employment, low wages and absence of standard employment benefits. The term casual is however, becoming a more usual and constant language in employment relations. The meanings may vary, but there exist a common overlap in the meanings as may be used in different occasions. Bodibe (2006) affirms that traditionally, casual labour referred to work conducted for defined periods and during peak business periods when individuals are called to supplement full time workers in times of high business activity, particularly in retail, but the situation is different now. O'Donnell (2004) emphasizes that legally, a casual employee is seen as a worker engaged for a period of less than six months and who is paid at the end of each day. The expectation is that this category of worker includes those engaged, for example, in piece work, short- term construction work, etc. This however, is not really the practice, casual jobs today are commonly understood as jobs that attract an hourly rate pay but very few of the other rights and benefits, such as the right to notice, the right to severance pay and most forms of paid leave (annual leave, public holidays, sick leave, etc.).

Similarly, Okafor (2012) notes that losses suffered by casual employees include: abysmal low wages, absence of medical care allowances, no job security or promotion at work, no gratuity and other severance benefits, no leave or leave allowance, freedom of association which is often jeopardized, no death benefits or accident insurance at work, no negotiation or collective bargaining agreement.

This treatment extends to job allowances, canteen services, pension plans, health and life insurance schemes, transportation and leave entitlements etc. Sadly, the trend now is that casual workers work for many years without promotion and necessary entitlements, and sometimes they do what normal employees should do, but are not compensated for such. The emerging pattern of employment in Nigeria indicates that casualization is fast

becoming the dominant form of flexible work arrangement particularly in the banking, telecommunications, as well as the oil and gas industries. There are two forms of employment under casualization in Nigeria namely casual and contract labour. The terms and conditions of employment of this category of workers are not regulated by the Nigerian Labour Laws in the sense that their status is not defined and no provisions are made for the regulation of the terms and conditions of their employment, hence the mass exploitation of these workers by employers. Employers use casualization of the labour force as an effective means of reducing cost, maximizing profit and de-unionizing the work force. Fajana (2005) notes that it is difficult to give accurate statistics about the number of casual and contract workers in Nigeria because there are no official statistics showing the extent and trends of casualization. Animashaun (2007) asserts that some organizations have been reported to have up to 60- 90 percent of their workers as casual/contract employees. The Nigerian Labour Act does not define casualization and does not provide a legal framework for the regulation of the terms and conditions of this work arrangement.

However, Section 7(1) of the Act provides that a worker should not be employed for more than three months without the regularization of such employment. After three months every worker including the casual or contract worker's employment must be regularized by the employer by being giving a written statement indicating the terms and conditions of employment including "the nature of the employment" as well as "if the contract is for a fixed term and the date when the contract expires".

Causes of Casualization

Increase in capital mobility and the deregulation of the labour market are some of the major causes of casualization. Trade liberalization made way for competing imports into the economy; this consequently resulted to lots of instability in the product market. In response to this challenge, employers became tempted to adopt cost-cutting measures, including downsizing, cutting back on employment and use of permanent employees; the offshoot being the current predominance of casual workers. Okafor (2007) argues that continuous trade and capital liberalization led to the growth of the informal sector, which engages workers under unfair labour practices like casual/contract employment and deplorable working conditions and environment. Okafor adds that the inability of labour to flow or migrate to other work organisations or parts of the world for improved standards of living as part of globalization worsened the labour situation. Added to this is the increasing absence of substantial infrastructure and enabling environment for businesses to successfully operate as organisations are forced to fend for such needed infrastructures as power and litany of others.

All these factors have an overbearing effect on the overhead costs of organisations thus leading to harsh cost reduction approaches in which the welfare status of the workforce unfortunately becomes a prey. Other causes of casualization include globalization, technological changes and abundance of labour supply. Globalization came with the deregulation of both the product markets and the labour market and promoted

outsourcing, which today is highlighted as one of the major causes of casualization. Arising from globalization, outsourcing provided an easier way to cut costs and run off competition. Where an employer outsources labour or production components, less numbers of permanent employees are needed. The popular practice is to cut the number of permanent employees and replace them with casuals. The high level of unemployment and abundance or excess supply of labour also plays a major role in fuelling casualization.

This situation results partly in the treatment meted on employees, as employers believe that they will always have people willing to work for them irrespective of the conditions. Again there is the desperate attitude of potential or existing employees in getting or retaining jobs at any condition or cost. As noted earlier, Nonstandard Work (NSW) arrangements is a global issue. Kalleberg (1999) observes that in advanced economies due to globalization and trade liberalization, many enterprises have resorted to the engagement of contract labour, part-time work, temporary work etc. in order to cut cost and remain competitive in the global market. In addition, employers argue that this growth is influenced by demographic changes in the composition of the labour force. Many women want to work part-time in order to combine family care and work; this is the flexibility that NSW gives them.

Therefore, the changing economic conditions such as greater instability and uncertainty necessitated the use of nonstandard workers as a response to the market by entrepreneurs. The difference between Nigeria and the advanced economies is that an increasing number of workers have found themselves outside the standard purview of collective relations. Whereas in advanced jurisdictions, the situation has necessitated a readjustment of collective labour relations rules and practices so that the workers concerned can enjoy the fundamental collective labour relations rights of collective bargaining and union representation, as well as protection against exploitation.

Also motivating casualization is the lack of clarity in government's labour laws concerning legal employee categories. There is only one category of worker defined in the Labour Act and that is a "worker".

The Act defines a worker to mean: "Any person who has entered into or works under a contract with an employer, whether the contract is for manual labour or clerical work or is expressed or implied or oral or written, and whether it is a contract of service or a contract personally to execute any work or labour." The definition does not recognize workers in nonstandard work arrangements. This can be adduced to the fact that the current labour Act was enacted in 1971 when nonstandard work arrangements was alien to our industrial relations environment.

Uvieghara (2001) argues that the definition is narrow because it is apparent that it is not every employee at common law that is a worker under the Act. Thus for Part 1 of the Act to apply to an employee under the common law he or she has to fall within the definition of the term worker. The term „employee“ is not defined by the Labour Act, therefore we rely

on the common law definition which states that an employee is a worker who has a contract of service. This is distinguishable from an independent contractor or a self-employed person who are said to have a contract of service.

This distinction is arrived at through the various test used under the common law such as control, mutuality of obligation, integration and multiple test. The consequences of this however, is that the casual worker does not fall within the purview of the protection and rights available to permanent employees covered by the Labour Act. This form of work arrangement is therefore characterized by instability, lack of benefits and lack of right to organize and collective bargaining. In advanced jurisdictions, current trends have necessitated a readjustment of collective labour relations rules and practices so that the workers concerned can enjoy the fundamental collective labour relations rights of collective bargaining and union representation, as well as protection against exploitation.

Unfortunately, in Nigeria the legislation has since not been reviewed to address the current realities on ground. Also there is the feeling that labour laws make excessive demands to pay terminal benefits to employees. Many employers thus decide that they simply cannot afford to hire workers on permanent bases because they will have to pay huge pension benefits. Casualization is also encouraged by the numerous loopholes that exist in labour laws, allowing employers to hire casual employees continuously to fill permanent positions. For instance, while labour laws may cover almost all workers, there are serious challenges of enforcement. Occasionally, government lacks the resources and in some cases the will to enforce labour laws to ensure that workers enjoy the protection granted in law and labour laws often conflict with government's investment promotion activities. In addition, the growth in casualization of employment is influenced by demographic changes in the composition of the labour force. Many women want to work part-time in order to combine family care and work; this is the flexibility that casual work can give them. Therefore, the changing economic conditions such as greater instability and uncertainty necessitated the use of casual workers as a response to the market by entrepreneurs.

Flexible Work Arrangement and its Implications

Grimshaw, et al. (2008) observes that recent changes to organizational context associated with economic restructuring have resulted in a dismantling of the traditional labour market as organizations 'delay' and 'downsize', resulting in a dislocation of workers from traditional career paths and limited access to training and development. The effects of these changes are unthinkable in the sense that according to Nicholls (2006), the changes resulted in the wholesale loss of the tradition of permanent positions, with production staff increasingly working on short-term contracts from weeks to months in duration, always mindful of how to obtain the next package of work. Okafor (2007) also reveals that some work organizations resorted to unethical business practices like casualization of workers thereby hurting workers interest and violating some fundamental labour laws. As a driving force to casualization, neoliberalism tends to deregulates markets including the labour market to increase labour flexibility. It is widely

acknowledged that labour market flexibility is a subject of great controversy. Flexible work arrangements have different connotations that reflect the same concept. According to Campbell (2004), their definitions are often a source of confusion and controversy because it is marked by tension between vernacular, regulatory and contractual meanings. Available literatures have preferred using different terms for this same concept, (e.g. contract, contingent, casual, irregular, non-standard, atypical, non-core, temporary, part-time, flexible, hire labour, subcontracting, fixed term, short term, etc) (Wooden & Hawke, 1998; Quinlan, 2003; Australian Industry Group (AIG), 2005; Hamilton, 2006). Cheadle (2006) identifies and categorizes three kinds of flexibility:

- i. Employment flexibility (the freedom to determine employment levels quickly and cheaply),
- ii. Wage flexibility (the freedom to alter wage level without restraint),
- iii. Functional flexibility (the freedom to alter work processes, terms and conditions of employment, etc and cheaply) upon which increase in adoption of casual employment is based.

Based on this, Reilly (1998) avers that flexibility of labour is reflected in an employer's ability to: recruit or dispose of labour as required; alter labour costs in line with market needs; allocate labour efficiently within the firm; and fix working hours to suit business requirements.

Fleetwood (2007) argues that in the context of the employment relationship flexibility is for the employer and of the employee, and subsequently, whilst there are undeniable benefits for labour from certain forms of flexibility – where there are mutual gains to be had from both parties – flexibility cannot be seen as unequivocally good from an employee perspective.

Increasingly, casual employees are filling positions that are permanent in nature and behind employee vulnerability; the high levels of unemployment and accompanying poverty are the most driving force in Africa (Bodibe, 2006; Anugwon, 2007; Okafor, 2012). Wandera (2011) posits that the three main reasons for employers to use short term workers are flexibility of staff, reduction of cost and ease of dismissal. On his part, Jauch (2010) notes that global experiences have shown that employers use labour hire workers for a variety of reasons, which include coping with peaks in demand, reducing costs, avoiding industry al relations problems, greater flexibility, as well as avoiding retrenchment procedures and trade unions.

Globalization, technological change and abundance of labour supply are also mentioned as reasons for casualization (Fapohunda, 2012). In addition, Brennan, et al. (2003) cited in Laplagne, et al. 2005) contends that the firms' main reasons for using labour hire include among others:

- i. Source additional staff;
- ii. Replace temporarily absent employees;
- iii. Outsource the administrative burden of employment;
- iv. Achieve thorough recruitment; and
- v. Overcome skill shortages.

Contending, this form of employment is characterized by job insecurity, low wages and substandard working conditions, limited training and skills development and low levels of unionization, job dissatisfaction, low level of sense of belonging, unscheduled turnover, low morale, low level of productivity, dehumanization of work and workers, lack of employment benefits that accrue to regular employee, promotion as well as right to organize and collective bargaining (Wooden & Hawke, 1998; Pocock, Buchanan & Campbell, 2004; Jauch, 2010; Wandera, 2011). In the same vein, Laplagne, et al. (2005) argues that the labour hire work arrangement may be deficient in terms of:

- i. Training, promotion, human capital investment, and career prospects;
- ii. Occupational health and safety and workers' compensation and rehabilitation; and
- iii. Job security and workers' remuneration and entitlements.

While Majid (2012) submits that the work of non-regularly employed workers is characterized not only by low income (as we have seen earlier) but by variability in the intensity as well as timing of labour use over the production cycle by individual workers in this category, Hall (2002), argues that the key challenge in casual employment is not simply to rectify problem experienced by individual casual worker, rather the problem is the processes of casualization itself. He then maintains that the significance of casualization is that it is integral to labour management strategies that achieve better deployment, and not development of labour.

The Effects of Casualization

The ills of casualization can be viewed from a tripartite perspective namely effects on the employee, on the employer and on the economy. The employees' are the direct victims of casualization but beyond that, the effects they suffer transcends through a flow-on process to the other actors. For the employees, casualization exerts downward pressure on the wages and working conditions of those employees who are viewed as permanent workers. This is partly because pay systems and employment conditions are always operated in a process that engenders comparison among the entire workforce. Again, casualization threatens the direct or indirect replacement of permanent workers by casual workers. In both cases, the negative consequences for individual employees readily extend out to negative effects on families and the society. Again, since casual workers do not get benefits, employers do not contribute to their pension and gratuity funds. Hence in the event of an accident or death, workers and their dependants are left destitute because they cannot claim for injury on duty or work place acquired diseases. This is compounded by the fact that such workers cannot afford private insurance due to the low wages. Casualization has increased the ratio of unpaid to paid labour and the intensity of work. It

has increased the number of unprotected workers; most of the workers who are casually employed can no longer be part or members of unions.

This has reduced job security, forced workers to negotiate their positions on their own and made them vulnerable to exploitation. In addition precariousness leads to economic insecurity for the workers and their families. Hence, in the event that a worker is a breadwinner and earns below the poverty line, and if there is no other person working or receiving some income to augment what comes in, then the entire family is placed at risk. Such precariousness affects a worker's experience at work, how he/she makes decisions about work and political issues and how such individual relates to the broader labour market. Many employers especially within the private and public companies champion the continuous use of casual workers, thus introducing lots of casual workers in their workplaces, sometimes structuring almost the entire workforce to be casual workers believing that casualization has numerous benefits such as increased flexibility and lower overhead costs. Employers want the freedom to pay low wages; change the numbers of workers and how and when work is conducted. Casualization however brings in its wake numerous consequences on the employer.

One is job dissatisfaction which Udeozor (2007) identifies as the bane of poor employee commitment and lower productivity. It could also lead to increased level of indiscipline on the side of the employees. The rise in fraud perpetrated in banks in the country could be connected to the rampant cases of casualization of staff by the financial institutions. Again, casualization could also lead to employee turnovers. The effects of casualization to an employer will also include; high cost of recruitment, interviewing and hiring. Shelley (2008) estimates that it costs about 33 per cent of any new employees' salary to replace a worker who left.

This implies that employers will spend huge sums from time to time as turnover costs. Also high turnover can create a lack of staff to complete essential daily functions of an organization resulting in overworked, frustrated employees and dissatisfied customers. It also creates the challenges of continuity and process inconsistency as turnovers will mean constant distortion of organizational activities, socialization of new employees and their training as well. These processes as short as their duration may seem will create gaps in the organization's activities with its attendant cost. As far as the national economy is concerned, the modern slavery called casualization can destroy an economy gradually. Its long and predominant usage produces individuals who have over-worked themselves with little earnings and consequently little or no savings for retirement, resulting in the emergence of an over-worked population who still depend on the government for survival, thus overbearing the government welfare strength and living at the mercy of the society. Hall (2000) also submits that casualization may have negative effects on important aspects of national economic performance such as skill formation and development.

Within such framework, the labour force of the nation will continue to suffer and be greatly affected. Anti-labour practices such as casualization can derail advancements in

economic progress because there would always be agitations, industrial actions and breakdown in production and services. Casualization may also increase the rate of brain drain and capital flight in the country, since the nation's labour force will begin to run to other countries with perceived better employment conditions and working environment as has been witnessed in Nigeria. More so, it renders the citizens who are supposed to be the major beneficiaries of economic investments impoverished and completely hopeless. Again, it leads to disparity among households over time.

Casual employees also described as non-standard or atypical employees' are particularly vulnerable to exploitation because they are unskilled or work in sectors with little or no trade union organization or little or no coverage by collective bargaining. They frequently have less favorable terms of employment than other employees performing the same work, as well as less security of employment and they often do not receive "social wage" benefits such as medical aid, pension or provident funds. These employees therefore depend upon statutory employment standards for basic working conditions (Fourie, 2008).

In Nigeria, the trend of casualization of labour is increasing at an alarming rate in all as evidence shows that most organisations are downsizing, and restructuring, a process that has created feelings of insecurity among workers and fuelled by the government's uncertain economic and political reforms.

Day and Buultjens (2007), Bodibe (2006) and Kalejaiye (2014) succinctly highlighted the effects of casualization of labour to include:

1. Insecurity of employment. Employment of casual workers can be terminated at any time without notice.
2. Lower average earnings than equivalent permanent workers. This may occur whether or not the casual workers have the same level of skill or qualification with the regular worker.
3. Unpredictability of income. Hours of work may be varied at the discretion of the employer which affects the income of the workers.
4. Reduced access to adequate training and career advancement opportunities. To cut organizational cost, organizations that deploy casual labour do not invest in their training and development.
5. Low organizational commitment. As a result of poor treatment by organisations, casual workers do not employ maximum commitment to their work.
6. Lack of social benefits. Casual are not entitled to vacation. When they do take vacation, it is at their cost.
7. Poor working conditions.
8. There are disparities in the conditions of permanent, casual and subcontracted worker thereby causing divisions and poor work relationships.
9. Detachment from their jobs.
10. Lack of social protection, like the pension scheme.

11. Lack of rights and minimal legal status of casual work. This threatens access to resources and entitlements, and threatens self-respect that equal rights supports.
12. Casual workers lack access to career paths, because much casual work lacks possibilities for career progression comparable to standard employment.

A Global Analysis of Casualization and Labour Utilization

Trends of Casualization in Nigeria

The exact origin of casualization of employment in Nigeria is not clear-cut. However, it can be traced to the introduction of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in 1986, as well as the IMF and World Bank loans and their conditions. The combination of these factors led to a slump in the economy. Many factories shut down, some operating below minimum capacity and many organizations found it difficult to compete in the globalized economy which is tilted more in favour of the developed economies.

Globalization and trade liberalization added to competition from imported goods, have forced enterprises in Nigeria to reduce their staff strength and replace them with contract and casual workers in order to cut costs of production and remain competitive. The Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) was geared toward less government involvement in the economy and more private sector participation. The revitalization of the private sector was aimed at attracting the much needed Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) into the country. While it attracted some FDI especially in the oil and gas industry it has led to the lowering of labour standards at the same time. Aladekomo (2004) asserts that casualization as a form of predominant employment practice in Nigeria was occasioned by the collapse of the oil-boom and the introduction of the structural adjustment programme, a development which eventually led to the downsizing and mass retrenchment of skilled people particularly in the urban centres and resulted in numerous cases of unemployment.

Largely, in search of a means of survival, many of these retrenched workers whose status cuts across graduates and non-graduates engaged themselves in trivial jobs along the streets with very infinitesimal pay. This practice continued and gradually started to become popular, as employers saw it as a very cheap means of getting work done. Today, this form of employment relationship has become the in-thing. The bulk of workers in the telecommunications, oil and gas sectors and other sectors of the economy are casual employees. Increasing numbers of workers have found themselves outside the standard purview of collective relations as against advanced countries where the situation has necessitated a readjustment of collective labour relations rules and practices so that the workers concerned can enjoy the fundamental collective labour relations rights of collective bargaining and union representation, as well as protection against exploitation.

Trends in Casual Employment in Australia

Labour restructuring can take different forms in different countries. One prominent aspect in Australia in the last two decades has been a process of casualization, in the sense of an increase in the proportion of employees classified as „casual“ (Campbell and Brosnan 1999; Watson et al. 2003).

Casual jobs are Australia's fastest growing form of employment, with Australia now having the second largest casual workforce in the world after Spain; this has triggered considerable debate as to whether government intervention should be used to improve job security for the growing number of casual workers. (Munn, 2004). The number of casual employees has increased steadily over the past 15 years from 18.9% of all wage and salary earners in 1988 to 27.6% in 2003. Recent years have seen a slowing in the growth of casual employment. In the 5 years between 1993 and 1998, the number of casual positions increased by 35.6%, however in the last 5 years, the number of casual positions has only increased by 15.1%. (Munn, 2004).

In the 10 years to 1998, 69.9% of the net jobs created were casual positions, whereas over the last 5 years, only 33.8% of net jobs created have been casual positions. This is a significant slowing in the rate of growth of casual positions. (Munn, 2004).

Most casual workers are part-time, with casual workers currently representing 13.8% of all full-time employees and 60.4% of all part-time employees. A significant percentage (35.0%) of casual employees is aged between 15 and 24. This is to be expected as this age group is typically studying and not looking for a long-term commitment to the labour market. (Munn, 2004).

Most casual workers are concentrated in just a few occupations, and tend to be relatively low skilled. Retail trade is the main employer of casuals, with 44.2% of all employment in the industry being casual.

The growth in property and business services has seen this industry become the next most significant employer of casuals, with 30.3% of all employment in the industry being casual. (Munn, 2004). With full-time casual employment having grown by 40% under the Howard Government, the trend towards a more casual workforce has now become a political issue.

The Australian Labour Party recently announced its Casual Employment Policy, stating it would legislate to ensure that the Australian Industrial Relations Commission takes into account the need to prevent the misuse of casual employment. Award provisions would be instated to allow casuals employed regularly for a set period of time (probably six months) to be entitled to convert to permanent employment, with employers unable to unreasonably refuse. (Munn, 2004)

In 2001, 57% of casuals had been in their current job more than a year, and the average duration of employment was 2.6 years. Under Labour's policy, if these casuals chose to convert to permanent employment, they would gain entitlements like sick leave and annual leave but would forego their casual loading. (Munn, 2004).

In some industries, conversion rights already exist, but have rarely been used. For example, more than 98% of casual employees in the manufacturing industry have chosen

to maintain their status as casual. It is understood that more than 70% of casual employees want to remain in casual work. In fact in an October 2003 JOB Future/Saulwick Employee Sentiment Survey, it was found that 83% of casual employees are either very or reasonably satisfied with their current job and 78% of casuals felt secure or very secure about their job. (Munn, 2004).

The extent and effects of casualization in Lesotho casualization of labour in Lesotho manifests itself in a number of forms and practices as pertaining to acceptable conditions of employment which run contrary to internationally recognized standards regarding protection of workers' right both individually and collectively at the workplace. Several factors may be blamed for the prevalence of casualization of labour despite labour laws provisions intended to curb the incidence.

Topping the list is high unemployment and underemployment rates which result in workers earning incomes below the internationally stipulated poverty level of at least one US dollars a day. Poor law enforcement by the Labour Administration through under-resourced labour inspectorate in both human and material terms raises some concern. Weak and fragmented trade unions lacking capacity to engage government and employers in meaningful negotiations through social dialogue at both tripartite and bipartite levels contribute to the scenario.

Another contributory factor is HIV and AIDS pandemic which causes spouses (especially household bread winners) to die forcing the remaining family members to look for work and take any job at whatever cost in order to survive, thus contributing to the prevalence of triangular employment relationship.

Casual labour in the Construction and Building Subsector in Lesotho

The Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHWP) a US \$ 4 billion mega project had a significant impact on Lesotho economy. The construction subsector has through spillover effect benefited enormously from LHWP and has become unusually large, accounting for 23% of GDP (2004) as opposed to a share of less than 10% in most countries. In 2004 there were 225 enterprises in construction subsector employing 8300 workers. (Bodibe, 2006). The Lesotho Highlands Development Authority is one of the promoters of disguised employment in the form of independent contractors. The employees on the payroll of LHDA dealing with rehabilitation of Mohale Dam were assigned the status of independent contractors and a separate regulatory instrument in the form of terms of Reference was developed for their control.

On being denied annual remuneration increments enjoyed by other LHDA employees, the affected workers (so called independent contractors) referred their claim to the Directorate of Dispute Prevention and Resolution (DDPR). These practices reflect an element of unclear terms of employment, which borders on casualization of labour.

Emergence of disguised employment and unclear terms of employment fuels casualization of labour prevalent in the construction subsector which by its very nature is prone to workers being laid off at each stage of construction. (Bobibe, 2006).

Casualization in the Mozambican Economy

Casual work in the Mozambican context encompasses a type of employment whether related by written or verbal contract, in which the employment relationship is not durable but for a defined period of work. (Bobibe, 2006). Ordinarily, the contract is used to accomplish defined tasks for a defined period.

The main signifier of casual work is the duration of the employment relationship and the type of tasks to be performed. Thus casual work can be defined as work for a fixed duration and defined tasks to be performed. The concept should be understood in its wider context. For example employment of worker to load and offload ships has no lasting scope of service yet legislation allows a work contract to last a maximum period of 2 years, subject to one renewal.

Implicitly an employment contract can last for 4 years, even though work is not performed on a continuous basis. This means that the duration of a casual contract can be for a short or long duration. Thus, it is possible to find casual employment whose tasks last for days, months, or even long periods of up to two years. In the extreme a casual contract can last up to an interpolated period 15-20 years. Before economic liberalization through the Economy Reform Programme, casual work was found in pre-determined sectors. In those days the extent of casual employment was very low because fixed permanent employment was protected by law.

A substantial number of workers lost their jobs due to economic liberalization and privatization of state assets. Economic stagnation and obsolete equipment fuelled retrenchments as companies sought to curb or contain labour cost. It is also during this time that casualization was intensified in the economy. (Bobibe, 2006). Casualization is concentrated in agriculture, international cargo terminals, manufacturing, construction, transport, domestic service and informal sector. Seasonality of production, and work and demand patterns, drive companies to rely on temporary and casual work. For example, soda and beverage manufacturing peaks during summer. When there is increased demand accordingly employment also increases during these peak periods.

The informal sector also has a large degree of casual employment. People making a living in the informal sector are those who have lost employment (Bobibe, 2006). They are "employed" as employees of counter huts, bars, driver, collectors and other tasks.

Private sector employment is low as a proportion of total employment-around. The uncertainty of business constitutes the strong reason to hire casual workers. To foreign companies the uncertainty is of a double nature. First, they share the same uncertainty faced by national companies. In the second instance they have to adapt to culture, economy

and laws of the host country. As such, they are reluctant to engage full time employees during the initial years of operation.

Foreign companies also rely extensively on expatriates rather than enter into long term employment contracts with local labour. Casual labour also provides much needed flexibility without high financial and social commitments. The downside of casual employment is both the worker and the employer are reluctant to invest in skill formation which negatively affects productivity of the workforce.

The Effects of Casualization on South African Construction Workers

The construction industry has experienced a boom since 2001 realizing substantial increases in both output and employment (Bobibe, 2006). Total output increased by 49% between 2001 and 2005, driven by construction of residential property for the rich. Construction also saw a record improvement in total employment which increased by 72% during the period under review.

The quality of employment has rapidly declined. Still, construction's contribution to total GDP is around 2% and its share of total employment is 5%. Permanent jobs have dropped substantially from 2001 to 2006 and are replaced by casual jobs, making construction the only sector in South Africa to rely heavily on irregular employment. Permanent employment increased by 22% between 2001 and 2006 but the share of full time employment shrunk from 50% of total employment in construction to 38% in 2006.

In just five years casual employment replaced full time employment in construction, increasing by a whopping 93%. Casual employment now constitutes the bulk of employment in construction at 62% of total employment. This means that the sharp increase in employment in construction is driven by exponential growth of casual employment. Workers in construction are given a raw deal due to the poor conditions of employment. A vast majority of workers in the sector do not have written contracts; paid leave and medical aid benefits. This in part is explained by the drop in union density which decreased from 22% to 14%. As a result workers are at the mercy of the employers and the precarious and unstable nature of the job intensifies workers' vulnerability and susceptibility to employer power (Bobibe, 2006).

Casualization of Labour in the Zambian Economy

There have been cries from the labour movement in Zambia that workers have been given a raw deal for their services rendered. Besides low salaries, one important issue which has been a source of contention of late is casualization of labour, especially in the post-privatization era. This phenomenon is relatively new in the labour sector; the practice is enhanced by an increase in the number of foreign investors coming to invest in Zambia and employ Zambian workers. Because of high unemployment levels and as a mere cost saving measure, most of these foreign investors have opted to employ some of their Zambian workers on casual basis, a situation which has displeased Government alike. (Lifuna, 2005). Government has time and again voiced out its concerns over the many

foreign owned factories and companies employing their Zambian workers on casual basis. As the trend takes root in the Zambian labour sector, some labour movement leaders blamed the government and accused it of abetting casualization. It is acknowledged that, ending casualization in itself is not easy and needs the concerted efforts of all stakeholders.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examines the relationship between casualization and labour utilization in organisations within a global perspective. The study observed that casualization of labour is against the campaign of full employment and decent work for all and it is an assault on workers' rights. Therefore, government must make policies and regulations that will give signs of hope to the plight of casual/contract workers in Nigeria. Such policies should emphasize equity in the terms and conditions of work between casual workers and permanent workers as long as they perform equal job in the organization. Also, in some instances where casual workers are been used in the organization, there should be government enforcement that will ensure that those casual workers are being converted to fulltime staff within a reasonable period in service. In addition, labour casualization is a big challenge for trade unions in their bid to protect and advance workers' rights for decent work in contemporary Nigerian societies. The following recommendations were proffered

- i. Nigerian government should promote effective labour management relationship as against commercial-employment relationship that is becoming the order of the day in many Nigerian organizations.
- ii. There is need for Nigerian government to enact new laws and policies that will eschew all forms of employment irregularities and workplace exploitations in the context of labour casualization in Nigeria. This will be a positive response to the plights of casual workers who are being maltreated or exploited day-by-day in the course of work engagement. It will also serve as a way of fostering the horizon of democracy in Nigeria towards a caring employment for all.

References

- Adewusi, A. O. (2015). Remuneration of casual workers in selected foreign-owned manufacturing industries in Southwest, Nigeria. *European Journal of Business*, 1(5).
- Aladekomo, F. O., (2004). Casual labour in a Nigeria urban centre. *Journal of Social Science*, 9, 207-213
- Animashaun, O. (2007). Casualization and casual employment in Nigeria: Beyond contract. *Labour Law Review*, 1(4), 14-34.
- Anugwon, E. E., (2007). Globalization and labour utilization in Nigeria: Evidence from the construction industry, Dakar. *Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa*.

- Bamidele, R. (2010). *Casualization and labour utilization in Nigeria*. Department of Sociology and psychology, Fountain University Osogbo, Osun State.
- Basso, P., (2003). *Modern times, ancient hours: Working in the twenty-first century*. London: Verso.
- Bodibe, O. (2006). The extent and effects of casualization in Southern Africa: Analysis of Lesotho, Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe. *Research Report for the Danish Federation of Workers*, November, 2006.
- Campbell, I. (2004). *Casual work and casualization: how does Australia compare*. Sydney: Labour and industry centre for workplace culture change.
- Campbell, I. & Brosnan, S. (1999). *Casual work and casualization: Labour and industry*. Sydney: Centre for Workplace Culture changes.
- Cheadle, H. (2006). Regulated Flexibility: Revisiting the LRA and BCEA Concept. Paper unpublished Mimeo: University of Cape Town.
- Day, M. & Buultjens, J. (2007). *Casual employment and commitment: A case study in the hospitality industry*. <http://www.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/departments/Strategy%20and%20Human%20Resource%20Management/airaanz/proceedings/auckland2007/066.pdf>
- Fajana, S. (2005). *Industrial relations in the oil industry in Nigeria*.
- Fapohunda, T. M. (2012). Employment casualization and degradation of work in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*.
- Fleetwood, S. (2007). Why work–life balance now? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(3), 387–400.
- Fourie, E. S. (2008). *Non-standard workers: The South African Context, international law and regulation by the European Union*. <http://www.saflii.org/za/journals/PER/2008/23.html>
- Grimshaw, D., Ward, K., Rubery, J. & Beynon, H. (2008). Organizations and the transformation of the internal labour market. *Work, Employment and Society*, 15(1), 25–54.
- Hall, R. (2000). *You value what you pay for: Enhancing employer's contribution to skill formulation and use*. Sydney: Düsseldorf Skills Forum.

- Hamilton, D. I. (2006). Contract Staff management system in the construction industry in Nigeria. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 55(1), 1-18.
- International Labour Organization ILO (2007). *Equality at work: Tackling the challenges*. Report of the Director-General. Geneva.
- Kalejaiye, P. O. (2014). The rise of casual work in Nigeria: Who loses, who benefits? Research Review. *An International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*, 8 (1), 156-176
- Kalleberg, R. (1999). *Changing employment relations in the United States*. A Paper Presented at the Meetings of the Society for the Advancement of Socio-economics. Madison: Wisconsin.
- Laplagne, P., Glover, M. & Fry, T. (2005). *The growth of labour hires employment in Australia*. Productivity Commission Staff Working Paper, Melbourne.
- Lifuna, M. (2005). *Casualization: Which way forward?*. Times: zambia.times@Zamtel.zm
- Luswili C. (2009). The effects of investment on employee rights in Zambia: Casualization of Labour, Bachelor of Law thesis, University of Zambia
- Majid, N. (2012). How not to count the employed in developing countries. Employment sector, employment working paper, No. 136, Economic and Labour Market Analysis Department, International Labour Office, Geneva: ILO.
- Munn, C. (2004). *Casualization of the workforce: ANZ economic update*.
- Nicholls, P. L. (2006). *Employment restructuring in public sector broadcasting: The Case of the BBC*. PhD Thesis, University of West of England, Bristol. Ethos Electronic Thesis Online Services. The British Library Board.
- ODonnell, A. (2004). Non-standard workers in Australia: Counts and controversies. *Australian Journal of labour Law*, 17, 1-28.
- Okafor, E. E. (2012). Nonstandard employment relations and implications for decent work deficits in Nigeria. *An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(3), 26.
- Okafor, E. E. (2007). Globalization, casualization and capitalist business ethics: A critical overview of situation in the oil and gas sector in Nigeria. *Journal of the Social Sciences*, 15 (2) 169-179.
- Okafor, E. E. (2010). Sociological investigation of the use of casual workers in selected Asian Firms in Lagos, Nigeria. *Ibadan Journal of the Social Sciences*, 8(1) 49- 64.

- Okafor, E. E. (2011). Youth unemployment and implications for stability of democracy in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 13(1), 358-373.
- Okoye, P. U.1 & Aderibigbe, Y. W. (2014). Comparative assessment of safety climate of casual and permanent construction workers in South-East Nigeria. *International Journal of Health and Psychology Research*, 2(1), 54-66
- Onoyeyan, G. (2015). Casualization of labour in academic libraries: Experience of Babcock University Library. *Open Access Library Journal*, 2, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1101612>.
- Onyeonoru, I. P. (2008). *Labour market in the context of economics sociology: Bringing*
- Pocock, B., Buchanan, J. M. & Campbell, I. (2004). Meeting the challenge of casual work in Australia: evidence, past treatment and future policy. *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 30(1).
- Quinlan, M. (2003). *Flexible work and organizational arrangements - regulatory problems and responses*. Paper presented at the conference Australian OHS Regulation for the 21st Century, National Research Centre for Occupational Health and Safety Regulation & National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, Gold Coast, July 20-22.
- Reilly, P. A. (1998). Balancing flexibility meeting the interests of employer and employee. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 7(1).
- Sheen, V. (2012). *Labour in vain: Casualization Presents a precarious future for workers*. <http://theconversation.com/labour-in-vain-casualisation-presents-a-precarious-future-for-workers-8181>
- Shelley, M. (2008). *The effects of employee's turnover*. e-HOW digest: e-HOW Inc.
- Solaja, O. M. (2015). Labour casualization and trade unionism in Nigeria. *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, 7(4).
- Udeozor, C.T. (2007). *The impact of non-monetary rewards on employees` job satisfaction and performance*. Unpublished Research Thesis.
- Uvieghara, E. E. (2001). *Labour law in Nigeria. Ikeja-Lagos Nigeria: Malthouse Press Ltd.*
- Wandera, H. T. (2011). The effects of short term employment contract on an organization: A case of Kenya forest service. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(21), 184-204.
- Watson, I., Buchanan, I. J & Cambell, C., B. (2003). *Fragmented future: new challenges in working life*. Sydney: Federation Press.
- Wooden, M. & Hawke, A. (1998). Factors associated with casual employment: Evidence from the AWIRS. *Economic and Labour Relation Review, Centre for Applied economic Research and Industrial Relations*, 9(1).