



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:  
Churchill, B

Title:  
Underemployment and Job Quality Among Young Australians: A Gendered Analysis Using the HILDA Survey (2009–2022)

Date:  
2025

Citation:  
Churchill, B. (2025). Underemployment and Job Quality Among Young Australians: A Gendered Analysis Using the HILDA Survey (2009–2022). Australian Journal of Social Issues, pp.1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajs4.70043>.

Persistent Link:  
<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/356976>

License:  
[CC BY-NC-ND](#)

ORIGINAL ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

# Underemployment and Job Quality Among Young Australians: A Gendered Analysis Using the HILDA Survey (2009–2022)

Brendan Churchill 

ARC DECRA Senior Research Fellow in Sociology, School of Social and Political Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

**Correspondence:** Brendan Churchill ([brendan.churchill@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:brendan.churchill@unimelb.edu.au))**Received:** 21 May 2024 | **Revised:** 4 May 2025 | **Accepted:** 10 May 2025**Funding:** This work was supported by Australian Research Council (DE220100027).**Keywords:** J13 | job quality | underemployment | youth

## ABSTRACT

Over almost two decades, young people's employment opportunities have been significantly impacted by events like the Global Financial Crisis (2008–2009) and the COVID-19 pandemic (2020–). Thus, underemployment has become a more pervasive and persistent feature of young people's labour market experiences. This research focuses on three forms of underemployment: (1) temporal-; (2) wages- and (3) skills-related underemployment and whether young people who are working less, earning less or using less of their skills are in 'good' or 'bad' quality jobs. Drawing on data from the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey (2009–2022), this research explored three dimensions of job quality: job demands and complexity, job control and job security amongst underemployed employed men ( $n = 6091$ ) and women ( $n = 6331$ ) aged between 20 and 34. The findings indicate that young people who experienced some form of underemployment also had poorer-quality jobs. Critically, all forms of underemployment were associated with less subjective job security. The findings highlight the need to pay greater attention to the types of jobs young people find themselves in, particularly, those in which they are not working at their full capacity.

## 1 | Introduction

Underemployment is one of the most significant challenges facing young people in the labour market today, becoming a 'global normality' in the 21st century (Roberts 2009: 4). It has been conceptualised and operationalised in several ways. Underemployment refers to 'working in a job that is below the employee's full working capacity' (McKee-Ryan and Harvey 2011: 963). It can manifest in subjective and objective forms (Churchill and Khan 2021; McKee-Ryan and Harvey 2011). This research focuses on three distinct forms of underemployment: (1) time-related underemployment, where workers want to work more hours; (2) wage-related underemployment, where workers are underpaid and (3) skills-related underemployment, where workers feel they are not fully

utilising their skills and/or qualifications. While there is some research on the extent of these forms of underemployment (Beck et al. 2024; Churchill and Khan 2021), little is known about how forms of underemployment are associated with job quality, specifically whether being underemployed also means being in a poorer quality job. A substantial body of research has found that nonstandard jobs, such as part-time, casual and temporary contracts, are associated with poorer quality work (Kalleberg et al. 2000; Kauhanen and Nätti 2015; McDonald et al. 2009; Tilly 1996). However, underemployment is not confined to nonstandard employment. Forms of underemployment, like time- or skills-related underemployment, represent mismatches between workers' preferences and working arrangements that can occur within 'standard' jobs. The same is true for wage-related underemployment. This article extends this literature

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2025 The Author(s). *Australian Journal of Social Issues* published by John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd on behalf of Australian Social Policy Association.

by shifting the focus from employment status and contract type to employment (in)adequacy, examining whether mismatches in hours, skills or wages result in poorer job quality.

Job quality refers to the conditions under which work is performed and how these conditions affect workers' well-being (Holman 2013). Job quality is shaped by life stage, social location and opportunity structures (Pocock and Skinner 2017). Young people between 20 and 34 are the focus of this research. This expanded age range reflects the contemporary realities of the labour market in Australia and other Western countries where opportunity structures for young people are declining and entering the labour market has become more challenging following study, requiring more qualifications and longer periods in entry-level jobs (de Fontenay et al. 2020). These challenges continue into what has come to be known as young adulthood (Cuervo et al. 2023), that is, their 20s and early 30s. Underemployment may have lasting consequences for young people at this stage of life, as this period likely encompasses first jobs and formative labour market experiences. Like unemployment, it has the potential to 'scar' future employment, health and well-being (Borland 2020). Research shows that bad jobs are associated with poorer mental health, psychological distress and low job satisfaction (Broom et al. 2006; Butterworth et al. 2013; Carré et al. 2012; Clark 2005; Gallie 2013), while good-quality jobs offer better psychosocial outcomes, greater satisfaction and stronger attachment to work (Butterworth et al. 2013; Drobnič et al. 2010; Findlay et al. 2017). Thus, understanding the quality of jobs that underemployed young people are found in is therefore critical, particularly in contexts where they are more likely to encounter precarious, low-paid or underutilised jobs in the labour market.

This study draws on 13 waves (2009–2022) of nationally representative longitudinal data from the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey to examine how different forms of underemployment are associated with three dimensions of job quality: (1) job demands and complexity; (2) job control and (3) subjective job security (Leach et al. 2010; Strazdins et al. 2004). In adopting this framework, this research provides a more nuanced understanding of how different forms of underemployment are associated with job quality in the Australian labour market. Furthermore, this research considers the intersections of youth and gender. While young men and women report underemployment at similar rates (Churchill 2020), the types of jobs they occupy differ. Gender continues to be a key structuring force in shaping not only access to work but also the kinds of jobs available and the conditions within them. Attending to these gendered patterns elucidates how inequalities, particularly among young women, are reproduced early in working life. It also offers a critical counterpoint to dominant policy narratives that prioritise employment rates over the quality and adequacy of work.

The article is structured as follows. The next section provides an overview of the conceptualisation and measurement of job quality and youth underemployment. The data, variables and analytic approach are then described. Findings from the fixed-effects models are then discussed, followed by a discussion and conclusion.

## 2 | Background

Job quality is a multidimensional concept that refers to the employment conditions under which work is performed and the extent to which those conditions enhance or diminish workers' well-being. Job quality encompasses job characteristics such as autonomy, working hours, job security and opportunities for career progression (Findlay et al. 2013; Holman 2013). Poor-quality work is associated with negative health and well-being, including stress, anxiety, job dissatisfaction and reduced overall life satisfaction (Cooke et al. 2013). These risks are not evenly distributed across the labour force; the more exposed one is to precarious work, the greater exposure to low or poorer quality work they face (Kalleberg 2018). Young people and women are disproportionately concentrated in such positions (Churchill 2020), frequently occupying roles with limited security and autonomy (Kalleberg 2018). Student employment may be one such site where these inequalities begin to form. Zhong et al. (2025) have found that student workers, especially women, are over-represented in low-paid and insecure employment. These roles mirror later labour market inequalities and highlight how gendered patterns of occupational sorting begin early in young people's working lives. This paper focuses on three core components of job quality that have been widely adopted in empirical research: (1) job demands and complexity; (2) job control and (3) job security (Leach et al. 2010; Strazdins et al. 2004). These dimensions capture how different aspects of work contribute to, or detract from, the overall quality of the job.

*Job demands and complexity* refer to the physical, cognitive and emotional requirements of work. Jobs with high demands wherein workers do not have sufficient resources are associated with increased stress, burnout and poor mental health (Demerouti et al. 2001; Bakker and Demerouti 2017). However, a demanding job is not always associated with a 'bad' job. Jobs that involve varied and stimulating tasks can enhance learning, motivation and job satisfaction, provided they are balanced with adequate autonomy and support (Gallie et al. 2012; Holman 2013). In terms of job demands and complexity, jobs that are poorer in quality tend to be jobs that are repetitive and involve high workloads, which are often found in casualised and feminised occupations such as care, hospitality and retail (Adamson and Roper 2019; McGann et al. 2016). Conversely, jobs that are higher in quality are stimulating and complex but do lead to strain. *Job control* encompasses the degree to which workers can influence their tasks, schedules and work-related decisions. High job control has been associated with improved mental health, job satisfaction and work-life balance (Gallie et al. 2004; Karasek and Theorell 1990). Conversely, low job control, which is often associated with casual and lower-paid jobs, exacerbates the effects of high demands and undermines worker autonomy (Vidal 2013). *Job security* refers both to objective aspects (e.g., job permanency, work schedules) and subjective perceptions (e.g., feeling like one is employed in an insecure job). Insecure work has been consistently associated with poorer mental health, financial stress and lower job satisfaction (Butterworth et al. 2011). The social and psychological consequences of insecure employment may also extend beyond the workplace, affecting relationships, housing security and overall well-being (Gallie et al. 2012). More secure

jobs, in contrast, offer predictability and continuity, providing workers with greater work and life stability.

Job quality is not randomly distributed across the labour market. According to dual labour market theory, jobs are segmented into two markets: a primary market of secure, well-paid jobs with opportunities for advancement and a secondary market of low-paid, unstable jobs with limited progression (Doeringer and Piore 1971). Young people and women are more likely to be located in the secondary labour market, where poor-quality work is most concentrated (Kalleberg 2018). It is in this secondary labour market, where nonstandard jobs are most likely to be found, which are poorer in quality, compared to more standard forms of employment (Kalleberg et al. 2000). While research has explored the relationship between nonstandard employment and job quality (Kalleberg et al. 2000; McDonald et al. 2009; McGovern et al. 2004), far less attention has been paid to how forms of employment, for example, underemployment, may be associated with poor job quality. Underemployment is a mismatch between a worker's capacity, preferences or expectations and their actual job (Churchill and Khan 2021; McKee-Ryan and Harvey 2011). This includes time-related underemployment (i.e., working fewer hours than desired), skills-related underemployment (i.e., working in a job below one's qualification level) and wage-related underemployment (i.e., earning less than expected for a given role or level of qualification) (McKee-Ryan and Harvey 2011). Crucially, underemployment can occur even within full-time, permanent positions, making it a hidden but consequential mechanism of poor job quality. In this way, underemployment challenges the conventional association between contract type and job quality, suggesting that poor-quality conditions can persist even in 'standard' jobs.

Young people are particularly vulnerable to underemployment due to their marginal position in the labour market and the broader structural forces shaping contemporary employment (Cuervo et al. 2023; Denny and Churchill 2016). Since the Global Financial Crisis (2008–2009), there has been a steady increase in youth underemployment (Churchill 2020), driven by lower rates of job creation, rising competition between cohorts of workers and the increasing casualisation of entry-level roles (Borland and Coelli 2021; de Fontenay et al. 2020). These patterns have been exacerbated by rising credentialism (Churchill and Khan 2021) and labour market 'crowding out' (Borland and Coelli 2021; de Fontenay et al. 2020), which have made it more likely that young people will find themselves in inadequate jobs—that is, jobs where their skills are underutilised or that fail to provide sufficient hours or pay.

While previous Australian governments promoted the notion of young people being either 'earning or learning' (Treasury 2014) as a de facto youth unemployment policy, this approach often overlooks the issue of job quality and risks entrenching long-term scarring effects (Borland 2020). Much of the focus in both research and policy has been on nonstandard employment and its job quality. Yet, this neglects the reality that many of the jobs young people occupy, whether permanent or casual, are structured in ways that restrict autonomy, progression and stability. As Yates (2017) argues, 'youth jobs' are often low-paid, insecure and constructed as temporary, even when the employment contract appears standard. Underemployment, in this context,

becomes part of a broader pattern of employment inadequacy, suggesting the need for a more critical approach to the kinds of work young people are doing.

Gender mediates these effects. Women are more likely to find themselves in part-time, casual and lower-paid roles in feminised sectors with limited career advancement (Charlesworth et al. 2011; Churchill 2020). Policymakers have done little to address the systemic barriers that channel young women into poorer quality jobs. These issues are frequently framed in policy and public discourse as temporary or transitional experiences, or as outcomes of personal 'choice', rather than structural inequality. This is similar to how young people are framed. As Bessant et al. (2017) observe, youth employment policies often pathologise young people, positioning them as deficient rather than structurally disadvantaged.

Despite the significant costs and consequences of underemployment, very little is known about the types of jobs underemployed young people occupy, and whether they are better or worse than those of their *adequately* employed peers. Moreover, existing research rarely examines how different forms of underemployment intersect with multiple aspects of job quality, especially from a youth and gendered perspective. This study addresses these gaps by shifting the focus from employment form (e.g., casual vs. permanent) to employment mismatch, and from status-based definitions of work to dimensions of job quality.

## 2.1 | Research Focus, Rationale and Expectations

This study seeks to address a critical research gap by examining how three forms of underemployment (1) time-; (2) skills- and (3) wage-related underemployment are associated with job quality among young workers in Australia. Unlike prior research that has focused predominantly on employment contracts or employment status, this study foregrounds forms of underemployment or more specifically, employment mismatch or underemployment, as a key determinant of job quality. It does so by applying Leach et al.'s (2010) three-dimensional framework, job demands and complexity, job control and job security, to underemployment using nationally representative panel data. In doing so, this study makes several contributions. First, it expands the underemployment literature by examining how forms of underemployment are associated with different aspects of job quality. Second, it brings a gender-sensitive, youth-focused lens to the analysis, showing how underemployment and its impact on job quality are patterned by broader labour market inequalities. The study uses fixed-effects models on 13 waves of data from the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey. The research questions are as follows:

1. Are young underemployed men and women in poorer-quality jobs?
2. Are there differences across types of underemployment (e.g., time-, wage- and skills-underemployment) and dimensions of job quality?
3. Are there gender differences in the experience of job quality across these different forms of underemployment?

Based on prior research, we expect that all forms of underemployment will be associated with poorer job quality, but that the specific dimensions affected may vary by underemployment type. We also expect gendered differences, as young women are more likely to occupy roles that combine low pay, low autonomy and high insecurity, consistent with secondary labour market segmentation and the persistence of gendered job structures (Doeringer and Piore 1971; Tilly 1996; Warren and Lyonette 2018).

### 3 | Data and Method

#### 3.1 | Data and Sample

To answer the research questions, data from the Household Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey—a household panel study with a focus on dynamics in three key research areas: family and household, income and welfare and labour—will be analysed. HILDA commenced in 2001, and data are collected yearly. The reference population for the initial wave was all members in private dwellings across Australia. From the sampling frame, 11,693 households were identified, and interviews with 7682 responding households were completed, resulting in a 66% household response rate for Wave 1. From the responding households, 13,969 responding persons over the age of 15 were interviewed. A top-up sample was introduced in 2011, which added 4009 people from 2153 households to correct for under-representativeness, including migrant populations and address bias arising from nonrandom attrition (see Watson 2011 for more details). Attrition in the HILDA Survey is similar to international household panels such as the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) (Watson 2011). To address any further attrition issues, this research uses population weights provided by the data providers to attenuate attrition bias (Watson and Wooden 2004).

The sample includes all respondents aged 20–34 ( $n = 4623$  men and  $n = 4807$  women) who were employed (excluding the self-employed) in any year between 2009 and 2022. The analysis uses an unbalanced panel, meaning that participants could enter or leave the study over time. This reflects the reality that young people often move in and out of employment or survey participation. Some respondents joined the study later through relationships or household changes, while others left due to factors like moving away or household dissolution. This approach allows the research to use all available responses across the 13 waves of data to track changes in their employment conditions over time. The characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1.

#### 3.2 | Dependent Variables

Following Leach et al. (2010), job quality was conceptualised and operationalised across three domains from the 12 job quality measures in the Self-Completion Questionnaire, which have adopted or adapted from previous surveys (see Summerfield et al. 2016): (1) job demands and complexity; (2) job security and (3) job control. *Job demands and complexity* were derived from the following five measures: ‘My job is more

stressful than I had ever imagined’; ‘I fear that the amount of stress in my job will make me ill’; ‘My job is complex and difficult’; ‘My job often requires me to learn new skills’ and ‘I use my skill in current job’. *Job control* was derived from the following three measures: ‘I have the freedom to decide how I do my own work’; ‘I have a lot of say about what happens on my job’ and ‘I have freedom to decide when I do my work’. *Job security* was derived from the following measures: ‘I have a secure future in my job’; ‘Company I work for will still be in business in 5 years’ and, ‘I worry about the future of my job’. Each item originally used a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from (1) ‘strongly disagree’ to (7) ‘strongly agree’. In constructing the last domain, job security, the measure ‘I worry about the future of my job’ was reverse-coded.

Each domain was constructed by summing the selected variables and dividing the total score by the number of variables to create a composite score ranging from 1 to 7. All three job quality domains—*job demands and complexity*, *job control* and *job security*—had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.7 or higher, indicating that individual measures were closely related within each domain. Higher scores on *job demands and complexity* indicate poorer job quality, and lower scores on *job control* and *job security* indicate poorer job quality.

#### 3.3 | Key Independent Variables

The main dependent variable was underemployment status, which was derived from a variable that asked whether respondents would prefer to work: (1) fewer hours, (2) about the same and (3) more hours. Underemployment was derived from those who indicated they would like to work more hours. *Wage-related underemployment* was a binary indicator: (0) respondent was not underpaid; (1) respondent was underpaid. In this instance, underpaid was operationalised as those who were being underpaid at least 20% lower than the median wage of the occupation they were working in. This was derived from average weekly earnings in the respondent’s main job. *Skills-related underemployment* was derived from an attitudinal measure, ‘I use many of my skills and abilities in my current job’. This was asked on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The variable was operationalised as a binary exposure and dichotomised into (1) not using skills if they answered between 1 and 4, or (0) using skills if they answered between 5 and 7.

#### 3.4 | Controls

Variables measuring the respondents’ socio-demographic background and characteristics about their employment were added to the models as statistical controls. *Age* was included as a continuous variable, ranging from 20 to 34. *Educational qualification* measured respondents’ highest level of education attained: a tertiary qualification, including a bachelor’s degree, Master’s or PhD (1), a diploma or advanced diploma (2), certificate-level qualification (I, II, III) or Year 12 (senior high school) and below. *Relationship status* measured whether respondents were (1) married; (2) cohabiting; (3) separated, divorced or widowed and (4) single and had never married. *Parenthood status* was a

**TABLE 1** | Descriptive statistics.

	Men		Women		Range
	<i>Proportion</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Proportion</i>	<i>Mean</i>	
Job quality—demands and complexity		4.01 (0.1)		3.93 (0.1)	1–7
Job quality—control		4.16 (0.1)		3.96 (0.1)	1–7
Job quality—security		5.10 (0.1)		5.19 (0.1)	1–7
Time-related underemployment					
<i>Not time-related underemployed</i>	81.52		81.83		
<i>Time-related underemployed</i>	18.48		18.17		
Wage related underemployment					
<i>No, not wage-underemployed</i>	77.33		71.56		
<i>Yes, wage-underemployed</i>	22.67		28.44		
Skills-related underemployed					
<i>Using skills</i>	74.79		74.88		
<i>Not using skills</i>	25.21		25.12		
Educational qualifications					
<i>Bachelor's degree and above</i>	23.13		34.24		
<i>Advanced diploma, diploma</i>	33.61		30.04		
<i>Certificate-level</i>	26.70		23.88		
<i>Year 12 or below</i>	16.56		11.85		
Studying status					
<i>Not studying</i>	80.08		76.35		
<i>Studying, full-time</i>	11.20		12.87		
<i>Studying, part-time</i>	8.72		10.78		
Relationship status					
<i>Married</i>	26.63		31.28		
<i>Cohabiting</i>	29.69		30.71		
<i>Separated, divorced, widowed</i>	1.55		2.78		
<i>Single, never married</i>	42.12		35.23		
Parenthood status					
<i>Not a parent</i>	68.15		58.60		
<i>Is a parent</i>	31.85		41.40		
Health status					
<i>Does not have a chronic health condition</i>	85.00		82.63		
<i>Has a chronic health condition</i>	15.00		17.37		
Occupation					
<i>Managers</i>	11.32		8.5		
<i>Professionals</i>	20.4		32.25		
<i>Tech/trades</i>	26.68		5.14		
<i>Comm/Personal</i>	7.77		17.19		

(Continues)

TABLE 1 | (Continued)

	Men		Women		Range
	Proportion	Mean	Proportion	Mean	
<i>Clerical admin</i>	6.56		19.46		
<i>Sales</i>	6.31		11.66		
<i>Machinery</i>	9.04		1.22		
<i>Labourer</i>	11.92		4.57		
Industry					
<i>Agriculture</i>	2.71		0.8		
<i>Mining</i>	3.31		1.13		
<i>Manufacturing</i>	10.21		3.4		
<i>Electricity, Gas, Water, Waste</i>	1.39		0.4		
<i>Construction</i>	18.4		2.06		
<i>Wholesale Trade</i>	3.32		1.55		
<i>Retail Trade</i>	9.54		13.09		
<i>Accommodation, Food Services</i>	5.63		8.26		
<i>Transport, Postal, Warehousing</i>	4.79		1.72		
<i>Information Media, Telecomms.</i>	1.72		1.8		
<i>Financial, Insurance Services</i>	3.27		4		
<i>Rental, Hiring, Real Estate</i>	1.00		1.69		
<i>Professional, Scientific Tech Services</i>	8.36		9.08		
<i>Administrative Support Services</i>	2.91		3.43		
<i>Public Administration, Safety</i>	6.27		6.1		
<i>Education and Training</i>	5.07		11.74		
<i>Health Care Social Assistance</i>	5.19		23.88		
<i>Arts, Recreation Services</i>	2.03		2.17		
<i>Other Services</i>	4.9		3.67		
Contract arrangements					
<i>Permanent and fixed term</i>	76.47		73.50		
<i>Casual</i>	23.53		26.50		
Percent unemployed last year		7.80 (0.14)		6.14 (0.12)	0–100
Percent NILF last year		7.80 (0.15)		19.74 (0.15)	0–100

Note: proportions (%), unlabelled) and means (with SDs in parentheses). Source: Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) (2009–2022).

binary variable measuring whether respondents were not parents (0) or were parents (1). *Long-term health condition* was a binary variable measuring whether respondents did not have a long-term health condition or chronic illness (1) or did have a chronic illness. *Average weekly working hours* were a continuous variable measuring respondents' hours in their main job. *Occupation* was a categorical variable measuring respondents' occupational status based on the Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO) (see Summerfield et al. 2016). *Industry* was entered as a categorical variable measuring what industry the respondents' job was in,

based on the Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC) (see Summerfield et al. 2016). *Contract arrangements* were a binary variable capturing whether respondents were employed (0) permanently or on a fixed-term contract, or (1) casually. *Job tenure* was a continuous variable that measured how long a respondent had been in their current main job in years. *Percentage of time spent unemployed last year* and *percentage of time spent not in the labour force last year* were continuous variables, ranging from 0 to 100. *Studying status* was a categorical variable: (0) not studying; (1) in full-time study and (2) in part-time study.

**TABLE 2** | Fixed effects estimates of time-related underemployment and job quality, men and women, HILDA 2009–2022.

	Job demands				Job control				Job security			
	Model 1A		Model 1B		Model 2A		Model 2B		Model 3A		Model 3B	
	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.
Time-related underemployment												
<i>Not hours-underemployed</i>	REF		REF		REF		REF		REF		REF	
<i>Hours underemployed</i>	-0.12	**	-0.18	***	0.07	***	-0.01		-0.08		-0.13	***
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.22		0.25		0.21		0.20		0.28		0.24	
<i>N</i>	4623		4807		4623		4807		4623		4807	

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ . \*\* $p < 0.01$ . \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ . REF = Reference category. All models adjusted for education, studying status, relationship status, parenthood status, health status, occupation, industry, contract, percentage of time spent unemployed or not in the labour last year. Source: Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) (2009–2022).

### 3.5 | Analytic Approach

Descriptive analysis of the sample was undertaken, and then fixed-effects regression techniques were applied to the data. Fixed effects regression models estimate within-person changes over time by comparing each individual to themselves across different observation points rather than comparing them to other respondents in the sample (Allison 2009). This methodological approach significantly reduces the risk of bias arising from unobserved, time-invariant heterogeneity, for example, personality traits, early life experiences that may simultaneously influence employment outcomes and perceptions of job quality (Bell and Jones 2015). By effectively treating each participant as their own control, fixed effects analyses yield robust estimates of how variations in underemployment status are associated with corresponding changes in perceived job quality over time (Allison 2009).

## 4 | Findings

### 4.1 | Descriptive Analysis

In Table 1, the descriptive statistics of the sample used are presented. The means for the three domains of job quality highlight the gendered differences in job quality for young men and women. Young men have more demanding and complex jobs and more control over when and where they work, but women seemingly have higher levels of job security. There was no gender difference in time- and skills-related underemployment. Women are more likely to experience wage-related underemployment. How underemployment status and job quality intersect is further explored in the fixed effects regressions.

### 4.2 | Fixed-Effects Regression Models of Time-Related Underemployment and Job Quality

Table 2 presents the results of the fixed-effects models examining time-related underemployment. Models 1A and 1B indicate that there is a statistically significant association between time-related underemployment and job demands and complexity in

both men and women. Men also reported lower job demands ( $\beta -0.12$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) than when they were not in time-related underemployment. Women in time-related underemployment reported lower job demands ( $\beta -0.18$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) than when they were not time-related underemployed. Model 2A shows that men in time-related underemployment reported slightly greater job control ( $\beta 0.07$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), whereas the coefficient for women was negative and not significant. For job security (Model 3A), there was no significant association for men, but women in time-related underemployment (Model 3B) experienced reduced perceived job security ( $\beta -0.13$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

### 4.3 | Fixed-Effects Regression Models of Wage-Related Underemployment and Job Quality

Table 3 presents the fixed-effects models for wage-related underemployment. Models 4A and 4B show that both men ( $\beta -0.17$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and women ( $\beta -0.22$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) in wage-related underemployment reported significantly lower job demands than when they were adequately paid. In terms of job control, only women experienced a significant reduction ( $\beta -0.09$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), as shown in Models 5A and 5B. There was no statistically significant association between wage-related underemployment and job control for men. Models 6A and 6B show that both men ( $\beta -0.12$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and women ( $\beta -0.12$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) reported lower levels of job security when underpaid compared to when they were not underpaid.

### 4.4 | Fixed-Effects Regression Models of Skills-Related Underemployment and Job Quality

Table 4 presents the results for skills-related underemployment. Models 7A and 7B show that both men ( $\beta -0.93$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and women ( $\beta -0.97$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) in jobs where their skills were underutilised reported significantly lower job demands. Models 8A and 8B indicate a similar pattern for job control: men ( $\beta -0.50$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and women.

( $\beta -0.48$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) experienced significantly less autonomy compared to when they were using their skills. Finally,

**TABLE 3** | Fixed effects estimates of wage-related underemployment and job quality, men and women, HILDA 2009–2022.

	Job demands				Job control				Job security			
	Model 4A		Model 4B		Model 5A		Model 5B		Model 6A		Model 6B	
	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.
Wage-related underemployment												
<i>Not underpaid</i>	REF		REF		REF		REF		REF		REF	
<i>Underpaid</i>	-0.17	**	-0.22	***	-0.05		-0.09	***	-0.12	***	-0.12	***
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.19		0.21		0.19		0.20		0.27		0.15	
<i>N</i>	4623		4807		4623		4807		4623		4807	

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ . \*\* $p < 0.01$ . \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ . REF = Reference category. All models adjusted for education, studying status, relationship status, parenthood status, health status, occupation, industry, contract, percentage of time spent unemployed or not in the labour last year. Source: Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) (2009–2022).

**TABLE 4** | Fixed effects estimates of skills underemployment and job quality, men and women, HILDA 2009–2022.

	Job demands				Job control				Job security			
	Model 7A		Model 7B		Model 8A		Model 8B		Model 9A		Model 9B	
	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.	$\beta$	Sig.
Skills-underemployment												
<i>Using skills</i>	REF		REF		REF		REF		REF		REF	
<i>Not using skills</i>	-0.93	***	-0.97	***	-0.50	***	-0.48	***	-0.35	***	-0.24	***
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.36		0.35		0.14		0.20		0.27		0.27	
<i>N</i>	4623		4807		4623		4807		4623		4807	

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ . \*\* $p < 0.01$ . \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ . REF = Reference category. All models adjusted for education, studying status, relationship status, parenthood status, health status, occupation, industry, contract, percentage of time spent unemployed or not in the labour last year. Source: Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) (2009–2022).

models 9A and 9B show that men ( $\beta -0.35$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and women ( $\beta -0.24$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) in skills-underemployment also felt notably less secure in their jobs.

## 5 | Discussion

Drawing on 13 annual waves of data from the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey (2009–2022), this study investigates the relationship between forms of underemployment and job quality among young Australian workers aged between 20 and 34, with a gender focus. The research focused on three types of underemployment: (1) time-related underemployment; (2) wage-related underemployment and (3) skills-related underemployment. The study sought to understand whether exposure to any of these forms of underemployment was associated with being in a ‘good’ or ‘bad’ job. Job quality was operationalised across three dimensions: (1) the level of psychological demands and complexity of work, such as the pace, volume and mental demands; (2) the level of job control over work and (3) the level of subjective job security. The models were stratified to explore the gendered dimensions of underemployment and job quality.

It was expected that all forms of underemployment would be associated with poorer job quality, and that this would be uniform across both genders. The findings of this research are largely in line with these expectations, with some important gendered nuances.

A key contribution of this study lies in its conceptualisation of underemployment as a distinct and analytically meaningful category and experience, rather than simply a subset of nonstandard employment. Much of the existing literature on job quality has focused on the quality of casual, part-time or temporary work (Kalleberg 2018; Tilly 1996). This research challenges that assumption by focusing on underemployment, which can occur across both standard and nonstandard employment arrangements and its relationship to job quality. In doing so, it shifts the analytical lens from employment status or contract type to employment (in)adequacy, expanding our understanding of job quality as a multidimensional construct shaped by workers’ experiences of demand, control and security, regardless of employment form.

This shift also reflects broader patterns in the youth labour market, where poor-quality jobs are not confined to casual or

temporary work but are distributed across the labour market, which has been especially true for young people since the Global Financial Crisis (de Fontenay et al. 2020). Yates (2017) argues that the roles young people occupy are often treated as inherently temporary and of lesser value, regardless of their qualifications or preferences, because 'youth labour' is structurally positioned as flexible and low-cost. In this view, underemployment is not simply a reflection of mismatch at the individual level, but a socially patterned outcome of how youth jobs are constructed in the broader labour market. This helps explain the persistence of employment inadequacy across contract types and reinforces the importance of centring job quality, rather than employment rates alone, in labour market research and policy.

The findings demonstrate that underemployment is associated with poorer job quality for young people. Across all three forms—time-, wage- and skills-related—underemployed youth report lower levels of subjective job security. This suggests that underemployment has not only material and economic consequences but also affective ones as it contributes to uncertainty and anxiety about work. This research suggests job insecurity is a likely mechanism that explains the negative relationship between underemployment and mental health outcomes (Churchill, Ervin, et al. 2025), underscoring the need to centre job security in youth employment policy. Yet these effects are not experienced equally. While both men and women in wage- and skills-related underemployment report decreased job security, only young women who are time-related underemployed report significantly lower job security. This suggests that time-related underemployment impacts women differently from men and that young women seeking additional hours may feel particularly insecure about their jobs, reflecting the ongoing structural disadvantage that shapes women's labour market participation. These findings align with long-standing research showing that women, especially in feminised sectors, are more likely to be concentrated in roles with limited security and progression (Charlesworth et al. 2011; Warren and Lyonette 2018). This might explain why young women turn to side-hustles and other entrepreneurial activities (Allen and Finn 2023; Churchill, Farrugia, et al. 2025)

Job demands and complexity also decline across all three forms of underemployment, with both men and women reporting engagement in less mentally or physically demanding roles. These jobs are likely to be more routine, repetitive and lacking in challenge. While lower demands may alleviate short-term work stress, they also limit opportunities for development, stimulation and advancement (Gallie 2013; Holman 2013). The consistency of these patterns across gender suggests a shared structural experience of underutilisation when young workers are not fully engaged through their hours, pay or skills.

The relationship between underemployment and job control is more differentiated. In time-related underemployment, young men report more job control; however, there is no difference for women. In the case of wage-related underemployment, only young women experience a significant reduction in job control. This is particularly concerning given that job control is closely linked to job satisfaction, retention and career development (Gallie et al. 2004). Wage underemployment not only results in a loss of wages but also entrenches gendered inequalities in

workplace power and agency by constraining young women's ability to negotiate and shape their working conditions.

Skills-related underemployment is unique among all forms of underemployment studied in this research. Unlike time- and wage-related underemployment, which tends to affect some aspects of job quality more than others and vary by gender, skills underutilisation is uniformly associated with lower job demands, reduced autonomy and heightened job insecurity for both young men and women. This suggests that when young people are unable to use their qualifications and capabilities at work, they face not just underemployment, but a compounding form of job inadequacy. These jobs tend to be undemanding, offer little job control and leave young workers feeling insecure. The persistence of these negative outcomes aligns with research linking skill underutilisation to psychological distress and dissatisfaction (Leach et al. 2010) and is particularly concerning in light of increased occupational downgrading among young people since the Global Financial Crisis (de Fontenay et al. 2020). Compared to other types of underemployment, skills-related underemployment is more persistent and impacts multiple areas of job quality. It highlights a key problem in the labour market: the failure to match young people's education and abilities with appropriate and meaningful work.

These findings carry significant implications for contemporary labour market policy. First and most critically, governments and policymakers must rethink the way they conceptualise and address underemployment. Underemployment is often conceptualised narrowly as time-related underemployment, but underemployment is a broader phenomenon that encompasses a mismatch between one's employment conditions and preferences, including wage- and skills-related underemployment (Churchill and Khan 2021; McKee-Ryan and Harvey 2011). Second, time-related underemployment is often a secondary issue to unemployment and too often it is viewed through the prism of productive capacity (Commonwealth of Australia 2023), but as the results of this research show, it is more than an economic issue, but a workplace well-being one. Third, effective policy responses must go beyond merely increasing employment rates among young people to ensuring that jobs are adequate in that they provide young people with control, security and complexity, particularly for young women. The overt focus on 'earning or learning' (Commonwealth of Australia 2023) renders underemployment and the importance of job quality invisible among young age groups. Finally, governments must consider the potential 'scarring effects' of poor initial labour market experiences (Borland 2020). Policy should focus on enabling access to decent work from the start of young people's careers rather than encouraging young people to take any job.

These findings also carry specific gendered implications. They point to the need for greater attention to gender equality in the workplace during early adulthood, a critical life stage that shapes women's long-term economic security. As the results are net of occupation, industry and contract type, they reflect inequalities that persist within jobs, occupations and industries, not just across them. This underscores the importance of examining workplace practices and cultures in feminised occupations. For example, large numbers of qualified young women work as dental assistants and child carers, which are jobs that

involve skilled labour but remain underpaid and offer little job control (Cortis et al. 2023). Dental assistants, for example, have been described as ‘cleaners’ or ‘hand-holders’ (Cortis et al. 2023: 47), reflecting the devaluation of these roles because they are associated with care and gendered assumptions about women’s work. The findings suggest that underemployment is not simply the result of mismatches but is structurally embedded in the types of jobs young women enter. This echoes Yates’ (2017) argument that youth jobs are often constructed as low-value and disposable—a dynamic that is seemingly compounded in jobs in highly feminised occupations. Addressing underemployment, therefore, requires rethinking how work is structured: ensuring women’s skills are recognised and used, and that jobs offer fair pay and secure conditions, including adequate hours.

Finally, while the use of fixed effects models is a strength in that it accounts for unobserved, time-invariant individual characteristics, it also introduces some limitations. Fixed effects models rely on within-person change over time and therefore exclude individuals whose underemployment status or job quality remain stable across the observation period. As a result, some potentially relevant between-person variation is not captured. Moreover, fixed effects models do not account for time-varying unobserved confounders, which may bias estimates if unmeasured variables change over time and influence both underemployment and job quality. These limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. Future research could apply complementary longitudinal approaches, such as random effects models or structural equation modelling, to test the robustness of these associations.

## 6 | Conclusion

This research investigated the relationship between time-, wage- and skills-related underemployment and job quality. Yates (2017: 475) reminds us that ‘the labour market conditions which young people experience are neither accidental nor natural but rather the result of conflict over how production and social reproduction occur’. Over the last two decades, economic events like the Global Financial Crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic have significantly diminished young people’s employment opportunities relative to others in the Australian labour force. As a result, young people find themselves working below their full capacity—working less, earning less and using their skills less. This also means that they are working in jobs that are of poorer quality. This has an impact on their sense of job security and potentially their health, well-being and their future. Youth underemployment has been under-researched and rendered largely invisible in wider policies and programmes about young people and their labour market futures. However, these findings are critical to informing the current Australian Labor Government’s White Paper on Full Employment, *Working Future*, (Commonwealth of Australia 2023: 29) in which ‘inclusive full employment’—the idea that ‘everyone who wants a job should be able to find one without having to search too long’ is at its centre. The White Paper recognises job quality as an important dimension to achieving inclusive full employment, and as this research has shown, young people who find themselves in full-time employment do not always find themselves working to their capacity or with sufficient job quality and sometimes both. This is particularly true

of young Australian women. Future research could also consider the impact of being underemployed and being in a ‘bad’ job, and how this impacts young people as they age across the life course, especially women, including the impacts on future jobs, family formation, as well as health and well-being.

### Author Contributions

**Brendan Churchill:** conceptualization, investigation, funding acquisition, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing, methodology, formal analysis, project administration.

### Acknowledgements

Open access publishing facilitated by The University of Melbourne, as part of the Wiley - The University of Melbourne agreement via the Council of Australian University Librarians.

### Ethics Statement

The author has nothing to report.

### Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

### Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the Australian Data Archive. Restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under licence for this study. Data are available in the Australian Data Archive with the permission of the Australian Government Department of Social Services.

### References

- Adamson, M., and I. Roper. 2019. “‘Good’ Jobs and ‘Bad’ Jobs: Contemplating Job Quality in Different Contexts.” *Work, Employment and Society* 33, no. 4: 551–559.
- Allen, K., and K. Finn. 2023. “#GirlBossing the University Side Hustle: Entrepreneurial Femininities, Postfeminism and the Veneer of ‘Female Success’ in Times of Crisis.” *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 27, no. 3: 333–351. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13675494231177160>.
- Allison, P. 2009. *Fixed Effects Regression Models*. SAGE Publications.
- Bakker, A. B., and E. Demerouti. 2017. “Job Demands–Resources Theory: Taking Stock and Looking Forward.” *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 22, no. 3: 273–285.
- Beck, V., T. Warren, and C. Lyonette. 2024. “Is any Job Better Than no Job? Utilising Jahoda’s Latent Deprivation Theory to Reconceptualise Underemployment.” *Work, Employment and Society* 39, no. 2: 404–425. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170241254794>.
- Bell, A., and K. Jones. 2015. “Explaining Fixed Effects: Random Effects Modeling of Time-Series Cross-Sectional and Panel Data.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 3, no. 1: 133–153. <https://doi.org/10.1017/psrm.2014.7>.
- Bessant, J., R. Farthing, and R. Watts. 2017. *The Precarious Generation: A Political Economy of Young People*. Routledge.
- Borland, J. 2020. “Scarring Effects: A Review of the Australian and International Literature.” *Australian Journal of Labour Economics* 23, no. 2: 173–188.
- Borland, J., and M. Coelli. 2021. “Is It ‘Dog Days’ for the Young in the Australian Labour Market?” *Australian Economic Review* 54, no. 4: 421–444.

- Broom, D. H., R. M. D'Souza, L. Strazdins, P. Butterworth, R. Parslow, and B. Rodgers. 2006. "The Lesser Evil: Bad Jobs or Unemployment? A Survey of Mid-Aged Australians." *Social Science & Medicine* 63, no. 3: 575–586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.02.003>.
- Butterworth, P., L. S. Leach, S. McManus, and S. A. Stansfeld. 2013. "Common Mental Disorders, Unemployment and Psychosocial Job Quality: Is a Poor Job Better Than no Job at all?" *Psychological Medicine* 43, no. 8: 1763–1770.
- Butterworth, P., L. S. Leach, B. Rodgers, D. H. Broom, S. C. Olesen, and L. Strazdins. 2011. "Psychosocial Job Adversity and Health in Australia: Analysis of Data From the HILDA Survey." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 35, no. 6: 564–571.
- Carré, F., P. Findlay, C. Tilly, and C. Warhurst. 2012. "Job Quality: Scenarios, Analysis and Interventions." In *Are Bad Jobs Inevitable? Trends, Determinants, and First Responses to Job Quality in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by C. Warhurst, F. Carré, P. Findlay, and C. Tilly, 1–22. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charlesworth, S., L. Strazdins, L. O'Brien, and S. Sims. 2011. "Parents' Jobs in Australia: Work Hours Polarisation and the Consequences for Job Quality and Gender Equality." *Australian Journal of Labour Economics* 14, no. 1: 35–57.
- Churchill, B. 2020. "COVID-19 and the Immediate Impact on Young People and Employment in Australia: A Gendered Analysis." *Gender, Work and Organization* 28, no. 2: 783–794.
- Churchill, B., J. Ervin, L. Ruppner, Y. Taouk, and T. L. King. 2025. "Underemployment and Mental Health Amongst Working-Age Australians: A Gendered Analysis Using the HILDA Survey (2002–2022)." *Health Promotion International* 40, no. 2: daaf030.
- Churchill, B., D. Farrugia, S. Patouras, and K. Allen. 2025. *Side-Hustles: How Young People are Defining Work. Findings From Year 1 of the Side-Hustles Project*, 1–25. University of Melbourne and Deakin University.
- Churchill, B., and C. Khan. 2021. "Youth Underemployment: A Review of Research on Young People and the Problems of Less(Er) Employment in an Era of Mass Education." *Sociology Compass* 15, no. 12: e12921.
- Clark, A. E. 2005. "Your Money or Your Life: Changing Job Quality in OECD Countries." *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 43, no. 3: 377–400.
- Commonwealth of Australia. 2023. "Working Future: The Australian Government's White Paper on Jobs and Opportunities." Canberra: Australian Government.
- Cooke, G. B., J. Donaghey, and I. U. Zeytinoglu. 2013. "The Nuanced Nature of Work Quality: Evidence From Rural Newfoundland and Ireland." *Human Relations* 66, no. 4: 503–527.
- Cortis, N., Y. Naidoo, M. Wong, and B. Bradbury. 2023. "Gender-Based Occupational Segregation: A National Data Profile." *UNSW Social Policy Research Centre, Sydney*: 1–106.
- Cuervo, H., Q. Maire, J. Cook, and J. Wyn. 2023. "Liminality, COVID-19 and the Long Crisis of Young Adults' Employment." *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 58, no. 3: 1–13.
- de Fontenay, C., B. Lampe, J. Nugent, and P. Jomini. 2020. "Productivity Commission Staff Working Paper." In *Climbing the Jobs Ladder Slower: Young People in a Weak Labour Market*. Productivity Commission Staff Working Paper, July. Productivity Commission.
- Demerouti, E., A. B. Bakker, F. Nachreiner, and W. B. Schaufeli. 2001. "The Job Demands-Resources Model of Burnout." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86, no. 3: 499–512.
- Denny, L., and B. Churchill. 2016. "Youth Employment in Australia: A Comparative Analysis of Labour Force Participation by Age Group." *Journal of Applied Youth Studies* 1, no. 2: 5–22.
- Doeringer, P. B., and M. J. Piore. 1971. *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*. D.C. Heath and Company.
- Drobnič, S., B. Beham, and P. Präg. 2010. "Good Job, Good Life? Working Conditions and Quality of Life in Europe." *Social Indicators Research* 99: 205–225.
- Findlay, P., A. L. Kalleberg, and C. Warhurst. 2013. "The Challenge of Job Quality." *Human Relations* 66, no. 4: 441–451. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713481070>.
- Findlay, P., C. Warhurst, E. Keep, and C. Lloyd. 2017. "Opportunity Knocks? The Possibilities and Levers for Improving Job Quality." *Work and Occupations* 44, no. 1: 3–22.
- Gallie, D., A. Felstead, and F. Green. 2012. "Job Preferences and the Intrinsic Quality of Work: The Changing Attitudes of British Employees 1992–2006." *Work, Employment and Society* 26, no. 5: 806–821. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017012451633>.
- Gallie, D. 2013. "Direct Participation and the Quality of Work." *Human Relations* 66, no. 4: 453–474.
- Gallie, D., A. Felstead, and F. Green. 2004. "Changing Patterns of Task Discretion in Britain." *Work, Employment and Society* 18, no. 2: 243–266.
- Holman, D. 2013. "Job Types and Job Quality in Europe." *Human Relations* 66, no. 4: 475–502.
- Kalleberg, A. 2018. *Precarious Lives: Job Insecurity and Well-Being in Rich Democratic Countries*. Polity.
- Kalleberg, A. L., B. F. Reskin, and K. Hudson. 2000. "Bad Jobs in America: Standard and Nonstandard Employment Relations and Job Quality in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 65, no. 2: 256–278.
- Karasek, R. A., and T. Theorell. 1990. *Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity, and the Reconstruction of Working Life*. Basic Books.
- Kauhanen, M., and J. Nätti. 2015. "Involuntary Temporary and Part-Time Work, Job Quality and Well-Being at Work." *Social Indicators Research* 120: 783–799.
- Leach, L., P. Butterworth, B. Rodgers, and L. Strazdins. 2010. "Deriving an Evidence-Based Measure of Job Quality From the HILDA Survey." *Australian Social Policy* 9: 67–86.
- McDonald, P., L. Bradley, and K. Brown. 2009. "'Full-Time is a Given Here': Part-Time Versus Full-Time Job Quality." *British Journal of Management* 20: 143–157.
- McGann, M., K. White, and J. Moss. 2016. "Labour Casualisation and the Psychosocial Health of Workers in Australia." *Health Sociology Review* 25, no. 2: 243–255.
- McGovern, P., D. Smeaton, and S. Hill. 2004. "Bad Jobs in Britain." *Work and Occupations* 31, no. 2: 225–249.
- McKee-Ryan, F. M., and J. Harvey. 2011. "'I Have a Job, but...': A Review of Underemployment." *Journal of Management* 37, no. 4: 962–996.
- Pocock, B., and N. Skinner. 2017. "Good Jobs, Bad Jobs and the Australian Experience." In *Are Bad Jobs Inevitable? Trends, Determinants and Responses to Job Quality in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by C. Warhurst, F. Carré, P. Findlay, and C. Tilly, 61–77. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Roberts, K. 2009. *Youth in Transition: Eastern Europe and the West*. Palgrave.
- Strazdins, L., R. M. D'Souza, L. L. Lim, D. H. Broom, and B. Rodgers. 2004. "Job Strain, Job Insecurity, and Health: Rethinking the Relationship." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 9, no. 4: 296–305.
- Summerfield, M., S. Freidin, M. Hahn, et al. 2016. "HILDA User Manual – Release 15." Melbourne: Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research.
- Tilly, C. 1996. *Half a Job: Bad and Good Part-Time Jobs in a Changing Labor Market*. Temple University Press.

Treasury. 2014. "The 2014–2015 Budget." <https://ministers.treasury.gov.au/ministers/joe-hockey-2015/media-releases/2014-15-budget>.

Vidal, M. 2013. "Postfordism as a Dysfunctional Accumulation Regime." *Work, Employment and Society* 27, no. 3: 494–511.

Warren, T., and C. Lyonette. 2018. "Good, Bad and Very Bad Part-Time Jobs for Women? Re-Examining the Importance of Occupational Class for Job Quality Since the 'Great Recession' in Britain." *Work, Employment and Society* 32, no. 4: 747–767.

Watson, N. 2011. "Methodology for the HILDA Top-Up Sample. HILDA Project Technical Paper Series 1/11." Melbourne: Melbourne Institute.

Watson, N., and M. Wooden. 2004. "Sample Attrition in the HILDA Survey." *Australian Journal of Labour Economics* 7, no. 2: 293–308.

Yates, E. 2017. "Reproducing Low-Wage Labour: Capital Accumulation, Labour Markets and Young Workers." *Industrial Relations Journal* 48, no. 5–6: 463–488.

Zhong, M. R., R. L. Cohen, K. Allen, K. Finn, K. Hardy, and C. Kill. 2025. "Equally Bad, Unevenly Distributed: Gender and the 'Black Box' of Student Employment." *British Journal of Sociology*: 1–13.