



Australian
National
University



DETERMINANTS OF INDIGENOUS
LABOUR SUPPLY FOLLOWING A PERIOD
OF STRONG ECONOMIC GROWTH

B.H. HUNTER AND M.C. GRAY

Centre for
Aboriginal Economic
Policy Research
ANU College of
Arts & Social
Sciences

CAEPR WORKING PAPER NO. 81/2012

Series Note

The Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (CAEPR) was established at The Australian National University (ANU) in April 1990. Since 1 January 2010, CAEPR has operated as an academic unit within the Research School of Social Sciences in the College of Arts and Social Sciences at ANU. The Centre is funded from a variety of sources including ANU, Australian Research Council, industry and philanthropic partners, the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, and State and Territory governments.

CAEPR's principal objective is to undertake high-quality, independent research that will assist in furthering the social and economic development and empowerment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people throughout Australia. Its aim is to combine academic and teaching excellence on Indigenous economic and social development and public policy with realism, objectivity and relevance.

CAEPR is Australia's foremost social science research centre focusing on Indigenous economic and social policy from a national perspective.


The Centre's publications, which include the CAEPR Working Paper series established in 1999, aim to report on Indigenous circumstance, inform public debate, examine government policy, and influence policy formulation.

Working Papers are often work-in-progress reports and are produced for rapid distribution to enable widespread discussion and comment. They are available in electronic format only for free download from CAEPR's website:

caepr.anu.edu.au

As with all CAEPR publications, the views expressed in this Working Paper are those of the author(s) and do not reflect any official CAEPR position.

Professor John Taylor
Director, CAEPR
Research School of Social Sciences
College of Arts & Social Sciences
The Australian National University
February 2012



Determinants of Indigenous labour supply following a period of strong economic growth

B.H. Hunter and M.C. Gray

Boyd Hunter is a Senior Fellow and **Matthew Gray** a Professor at the Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Research School of Social Sciences, College of Arts and Social Sciences, The Australian National University.

Working Paper No. 81/2012

ISSN 1442-3871

ISBN 0 7315 4980 5

An electronic publication downloaded from <caepi.anu.edu.au>.

For a complete list of CAEPR Working Papers, see <caepi.anu.edu.au/publications/working.php>.

Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research
 Research School of Social Sciences
 College of Arts and Social Sciences
 The Australian National University

Abstract

This paper provides evidence on changes in the labour force status of Indigenous and other Australians since the mid-1990s, a period of strong macroeconomic growth. The paper expands the standard definitions of labour supply to consider marginally attached workers—people who want to work but who are not currently looking for work. The results suggest that a period of strong demand for labour and improvements in Indigenous education levels are important factors in the strong increases in Indigenous employment rates. However, future progress in increasing Indigenous employment and narrowing the employment gap is likely to require that labour supply issues that discourage people from looking for work—including labour market discrimination and the ongoing high level of Indigenous interaction with the criminal justice system—are addressed.

Keywords: Indigenous employment, Indigenous labour market status, Indigenous socioeconomic status.

Acknowledgments

Previous versions of this paper were presented to the 2011 Australian Conference of Economists, the 2011 Australian Social Policy Conference and the Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research Seminar Series. We are grateful to participants in these conferences and John Taylor for comments on earlier versions of this paper. This research is part of a program of research which has been funded by the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.

Acronyms

ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
ANU	The Australian National University
CAEPR	Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research
CDEP	Community Development Employment Projects
CES	Commonwealth Employment Service
CURF	Confidentialised Unit Record Files
ILO	International Labour Organisation
LFS	Labour Force Survey
NATSIS	National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Survey
NATSISS	National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey
MPHS	Multi-Purpose Household Survey
NILF	not in the labour force
RADL	Remote Access Data Laboratory

Contents

Series Note	2
Abstract	3
Acknowledgments	4
Acronyms	4
Introduction	7
Theoretical and definitional issues and past research	7
Data	8
Changes in Indigenous labour force status between 1994 and 2008	10
Reasons for not looking for work	10
Modelling the determinants of labour force status	11
Analytic approach and empirical model	12
Estimating the determinants of labour force status for Indigenous and general Australian population (parsimonious specification)	12
Results of modelling the determinants of labour force status for Indigenous Australian population (full specification)	15
The role of discrimination	16
Concluding comments	17
Notes	19
References	20
Appendix A. Summary statistics for regression analysis	21
Appendix B. Multinomial logit regression models	25

Tables & Figures

Fig. 1. Labour force status by Indigenous status, females, 1994–2008	9
Fig. 2. Labour force status by Indigenous status, males, 1994–2008	9
Table 1. Reasons not looking for work, marginally attached Indigenous males and females by remoteness status, 2008	11
Table 2. Marginal effects for educational attainment and household size, Indigenous and all Australian females, 2008	13
Table 3. Marginal effects for educational attainment and household size, Indigenous and all Australian males, 2008	13
Table 4. Predicted probability of being in each labour force state family type variables, Indigenous and all Australian women, 2008	14
Table 5. Marginal effects factors available for Indigenous only, 2008	15
Fig. 3. Experience of discrimination in the previous 12 months by labour force status, Indigenous Australians, 2008	16
Table A1. Summary statistics for regressions, Indigenous, 2008	21
Table A2. Summary statistics for All Australian regressions, Australian males and females, 2008	22
Table B1. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, Indigenous females, parsimonious specification, 2008	23
Table B2. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, Indigenous females, full specification, 2008	24
Table B3. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, Indigenous males, parsimonious specification, 2008	25
Table B4. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, Indigenous males, full specification, 2008	26
Table B5. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, all Australian females, 2008	27
Table B6. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, all Australian males, 2008	28

Introduction

There has been a concerted effort by successive Commonwealth, State and Territory governments over several decades to increase the employment rates of Indigenous Australians. Both demand and supply side policies have been used.

Perhaps the majority of policies have operated on the supply side and include raising the human capital of the Indigenous population through education and training, and increasing use of participation requirements as eligibility criteria for receipt of a range of government benefits. While demand-side policies have been less common, policies that have been used include wage subsidies to reduce the costs of employing Indigenous people relative to other workers, imposing Indigenous employment quotas as a condition of government granting approval for a project to proceed or the awarding of government contracts to organisations with substantial number of Indigenous employees, and public sector employment programs.

While Indigenous employment rates are much lower than the non-Indigenous employment rates, a period of strong economic growth combined with these policies have resulted in the non-Community Development Employment Projects (CDEP) employment rate increasing substantially since the mid 1990s. The non-CDEP employment rate of Indigenous males increased from 38 per cent to 59 per cent between 1994 and 2008, and the employment rate of Indigenous females increased from 25 per cent to 43 per cent (Gray & Hunter 2011).

An important factor underlying the relatively low employment rate of Indigenous Australians is a low labour force participation rate. Thus, a key policy question relates to the extent to which the low employment rates of Indigenous Australians are related to not wanting to be in paid employment, and if they want employment whether they are actively looking for work. It is also important, given the strong employment growth since the mid 1990s, to understand the extent to which this has changed. This paper explores these issues using data on Indigenous labour force participation collected in 1994 and 2008. The determinants of labour force status are estimated for Indigenous Australians and compared to determinants of labour force status for the Australian population more generally.

A focus of the paper is people who are not employed, say they would like a job but are not actively looking for work and therefore are not classified as being unemployed. This group, the marginally attached, are a much higher proportion of the Indigenous population than they are for the general Australian population.

The next section presents a detailed descriptive analysis of Indigenous attachment to the labour force. The data and method used are then introduced, followed by the regression analysis. The role of discrimination in keeping Indigenous people marginally attached is reflected upon in the penultimate section. The concluding comments reflect on the implications of the results for policy.

Theoretical and definitional issues and past research

Conventionally in labour economics, the working-age population is categorised as either being in the labour force—which consists of the employed and the unemployed—or ‘not in the labour force’ (NILF). Sometimes the NILF is split into those who want a job but are not actively looking for work, termed ‘marginally attached’, and those who do not want a job, termed ‘other NILF’.

A further distinction is often made between the marginally attached who have given-up looking for work because they believe they cannot find work—termed ‘discouraged workers’—and those who are not looking for paid employment for other reasons.

According to standard economic theory, labour force status is determined in a two-stage process. In the first stage individuals decide whether or not they wish to supply their labour to the market. In the second stage a combination of factors determines whether or not individuals are employed, including labour demand conditions, incentives to search for work, and willingness to accept job offers. The decision to supply labour to the market will depend on a range of factors including the social and economic conditions facing individuals and their families, the level of unemployment benefits, macro-economic conditions, and the level of labour demand in the local labour market.

Within this framework, individuals will become discouraged workers if they want to work but, because the costs of searching for work combined with the perceived poor chances of finding work, they do not search for work (Blundell, Ham & Meghir 1998). The marginally attached or discouraged workers are sometimes called the ‘hidden unemployed’.

The probability of a person being marginally attached (or a discouraged worker) will also be affected by other factors that influence their wellbeing when not participating in the labour force. The costs of searching for employment may be quite considerable as they include both the time involved, monetary costs and psychological impacts of the failure to find employment. Family factors, such as household composition, child care responsibilities, and difficulties with child care are also likely to play an

important role. Any analysis of Indigenous labour force status needs to take account of Indigenous-specific social and cultural factors, the behaviour of potential employers, and the interaction between labour supply and demand factors.

Much of the existing research has focused on discouraged workers rather than the broadly defined marginally attached. This literature has tended to focus on the role of the business cycle in determining aggregate labour demand, and therefore the costs and benefits of searching for work (Bowen & Finnegan 1969; Clark & Summers 1980; Hunter & Gray 2001). Local labour market conditions are thought to be important as they affect the level of labour demand, and so have a role in explaining the labour market dynamics of the marginally attached. Personal characteristics are likely to be important, if they affect the demand for an individual's labour or the preference for supplying one's labour.

There has been some previous research into marginal attachment of Indigenous Australians (Hunter & Gray 2001; Taylor & Hunter 1998). This research, based on data from the 1994 National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Survey (**NATSIS**), found that Indigenous Australians were much more likely to be marginally attached to the labour market than non-Indigenous Australians (Hunter & Gray 2001; Taylor & Hunter 1998). Hunter and Gray (2001) found that Indigenous adults were about three to four times more likely to want to work but not be actively looking for work than in the rest of the population.

Therefore, given the objective of understanding the extent to which the relatively low employment rate of Indigenous Australians is due to a lack of desire to be in paid employment, it is important to include a separate category for the marginally attached in the analysis. The focus on marginal attachment rather than discouraged workers is for several reasons. The marginally attached are a much larger group than discouraged workers who constitute only a very small proportion of the working-age population. Second, the boundaries between discouraged workers and the other marginally attached are blurred. The International Labour Organization (**ILO**) recognises that, while its own official definition attempts to exclude personal reasons, it may be difficult to draw a clear distinction as respondents may find it difficult to separate their personal circumstances from the level of labour demand they face (Hussmanns, Mehran and Verma 1990).¹

There is evidence from several different countries that the marginally attached are more likely than the other NILF to move into employment but less likely than the unemployed to move into employment (for Australia, see Breunig & Mercante 2010; Gray, Heath & Hunter 2005; for Canada,

see Jones & Riddell 1999, 2006; for Europe, see Brandolini, Cipollone & Viviano 2006).

The CDEP scheme has been an important institutional feature of the Indigenous labour market over the last three decades. Historically, communities have received a grant of a similar size to their collective unemployment benefit entitlement to undertake community-defined work along with an on-cost component to ensure that program participants are employed in community development work (identified at the community level). CDEP participants are expected to work at least part-time for their entitlements. However, changes since 2008 have meant that CDEP has increasingly become more like the mainstream Work for the Dole scheme or a standard labour market program than a community development scheme.²

In this paper the CDEP employed are combined with the unemployed. The labour force states examined are: employment (excluding CDEP), unemployment plus CDEP, marginal attachment, and other NILF.

Data

The analysis in this paper is based on data from the 2008 National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey (**NATSISS**) and for the general Australian population from the 2008–09 Multi-Purpose Household Survey (**MPHS**).³ Data from the 1994 NATSIS is used to analyse trends in Indigenous labour force status.

The 2008 NATSISS (and earlier versions including the 1994 NATSIS) is the main social survey with a large Indigenous sample. Both surveys identify CDEP employment—something which the censuses, the other potential data source, only do partially at a national level. The 2008–09 MPHS is used because it is broadly comparable with the 2008 NATSISS and both surveys were collected at about the same time.


The 2008 NATSISS is a general social survey of the Indigenous population. Data was collected about 13,300 Indigenous people living in 6,900 households. The sample includes both children and adults, with interviews conducted with up to two Indigenous persons aged 15 years or older from each household and up to two Indigenous children aged 0–14 years (with data for children provided by via proxy interview with an adult in the household). The household members interviewed were randomly selected.⁴ Interviews were conducted over the period from August 2008 to April 2009.

The 1994 NATSIS has a broadly similar survey design, coverage and methodology to the 2008 NATSISS and estimates of labour force status from the two surveys are

FIG. 1. Labour force status by Indigenous status, females, 1994–2008

Notes: Population aged 18–64 years. Estimates are weighted. The proportion of Indigenous females who work in the CDEP scheme was 4.9% in 1994 and 3.9% in 2008.

Sources: 1994 NATSISS; 2008 NATSISS; 2008–09 MPHS.

FIG. 2. Labour force status by Indigenous status, males, 1994–2008

Notes: Population aged 18–64 years. Estimates are weighted. The proportion of Indigenous males who work in the CDEP scheme was 4.9% in 1994 and 3.9% in 2008.

Sources: 1994 NATSISS; 2008 NATSISS; 2008–09 MPHS.

comparable. One difference is that the 1994 NATSISS includes people living in non-private dwellings (e.g. jails, nursing homes) whereas the 2008 NATSISS was collected only from those living in private dwellings. In this paper all estimates from the 1994 NATSIS exclude those in non-private dwellings. The 1994 NATSIS and 2008 NATSISS collected data from all areas of Australia including very remote areas.⁵

The MPHS was conducted from July 2008 to June 2009 in both urban and rural areas in all States and Territories. In contrast to the 1994 NATSIS and 2008 NATSISS it excluded very remote parts of Australia. The 2008–09 MPHS consisted of two samples, the ‘main sample’ and a ‘crime sample’. The information necessary to identify marginal attachment was only asked of the respondents in the main sample who were aged 18 years or older. There were 13,035 respondents aged 15 or older years in private dwellings in the main sample.

The measures of labour force status available from the 1994 NATSIS and 2008 NATSISS are generally comparable to those in the 2008–09 MPHS. There however are several differences. The 2008 NATSISS does not collect information on availability to start work, and so the marginal attachment definition does not include the standard Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) criteria that a person be available to start work. A consistent definition is applied to the NATSISS and MPHS data. The 2008–09 MPHS only identifies marginal attachment for respondents aged 18 years or older. In order to allow comparisons between the Indigenous and general Australian population, the analysis is restricted to respondents aged 18–64 years.

The 1994 NATSIS, 2008 NATSISS and 2008–09 MPHS Confidentialised Unit Record Files (CURF) have been accessed through the ABS Remote Access Data Laboratory (RADL). Use of these data sets is subject to a number of restrictions, including on the geographic disaggregation. For the 2008 NATSISS there are significant restrictions on the level of geographic information that can be included in statistical models which is limited to a ‘remoteness by state’ variable which does not map to the standard ABS geographic remoteness classification. In effect it means that one has to choose between identifying remote areas and more disaggregated geographic controls.

Changes in Indigenous labour force status between 1994 and 2008

This section provides an overview of changes in Indigenous labour force status between 1994 and 2008. Over this period the non-CDEP employment rate of the Indigenous population increased from 31.1 per cent to 50.5 per cent. There were increases for both Indigenous men and

women, with the non-CDEP employment rate increased by 18 percentage points from 25.0 per cent to 42.9 per cent for Indigenous women (Fig. 1) and by 21 percentage points from 37.9 per cent to 58.8 per cent for Indigenous men (Fig. 2). These increases are very substantial. To put them in context, the increase in the employment rate for the working-age Australian population as a whole for men during this period increased by 5 percentage points, and for women it increased by 10 percentage points.

For Indigenous women, the large increase in non-CDEP employment has been accompanied by substantial decreases in the proportion of marginally attached and other NILF. The decrease in the proportion of the working-age population unemployed was relatively modest, falling from 16.5 per cent in 1994 to 12.9 per cent in 2008. Indigenous female labour supply has expanded to meet the demand for additional workers in the broader economy.

For Indigenous men, the large increase in employment has been accompanied by a large fall in the proportion unemployed (from 36.8% in 1994 to 19.8% in 2008). There has been only a slight decrease in the proportion marginally attached or other not in the labour force.

Between 1994 and 2008 there was narrowing of the gap in employment rates between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians, although there is still an ongoing significant disadvantage in labour force status experienced by that population in 2008.⁶

Reasons for not looking for work

This section explores the reasons that Indigenous people who are marginally attached to the labour force give as to why they are not looking for work. According to the standard ABS definition, as discussed above, discouraged workers are those who wish to have a job but are not actively seeking work because they believe that no suitable work is available. In the 2008 NATSISS survey there are four reasons for not looking for work which are directly related to a lack of employment opportunities and would result in classification as a discouraged worker:

- lacks schooling, training, skills or experience
- no jobs in locality or in line of work
- no jobs with suitable hours, and
- no jobs at all.

In non-remote areas, around 11 per cent of marginally attached Indigenous females and males are discouraged workers (Table 1). In contrast, well over one-quarter of remote marginally attached can be classified as discouraged (26.6% and 38.5% of females and males respectively). The higher incidence of discouraged workers

TABLE 1. Reasons not looking for work, marginally attached Indigenous males and females by remoteness status, 2008

Reason not looking for work	Non-Remote		Remote	
	Females (%)	Males (%)	Females (%)	Males (%)
Lacks schooling, training, skills or experience	3.4	3.9	5.9	4.6
No jobs in locality or in line of work	2.7	3.7	10.8	20.0
No jobs with suitable hours	3.3	0.2	3.3	0.0
No jobs at all	1.7	3.4	6.6	13.9
Other employment reasons	2.0	1.7	1.3	2.5
Own short term illness or injury	2.6	11.1	1.0	10.2
Own long-term health condition or disability	7.4	43.8	10.2	15.4
Pregnancy	4.7	—	3.2	—
Studying or returning to studies	9.5	11.5	2.9	2.3
Welfare payments or pension affected	2.5	4.6	1.6	2.1
Moved house or on holidays	1.9	2.3	0.7	6.0
Ill health of other family member	56.4	5.0	46.4	3.8
Childcare	6.9	4.6	3.5	3.5
Other family considerations	17.6	6.0	13.5	4.0
Has a job to go to	1.8	1.3	1.2	2.4
Other reason	9.7	8.4	7.2	13.7
Number of respondents	476	153	203	81

Note: Estimates are weighted. Respondents were able to nominate more than one reason for not looking for work. Population aged 18–64 years.
Source: 2008 NATSISS.

in remote areas reflects the fact that in many remote areas there are few jobs available, although it should be recognised that the majority of discouraged workers in remote areas give reasons other than a lack of employment opportunities.

The main reasons marginally attached Indigenous females give for not looking for work are family related, particularly the ill health of a family member. For example, in non-remote areas 56.4 per cent give ill health of a family member, 17.6 per cent give other family considerations and 6.9 per cent give child care as a reason for not looking for work. In remote areas 46.4 per cent were not looking for work because of the ill health of other family members, 13.5 per cent because of other family considerations and 3.5 per cent because of child care. Own ill health also is an important reason, with 7.4 per cent of females in non-remote and 10.2 per cent in remote areas giving this reason.

The most common reason given by marginally attached Indigenous males was because of their own ill health or injury (43.8% in non-remote areas and 15.4% in remote areas). In non-remote areas another important reason for not looking for work was studying or returning to studies (9.5% of females and 11.5% of males). In remote areas this reason was rarely given.

The list of reasons for not actively looking for work despite wanting a job in the 2008 NATSISS differs to the reasons collected in the 2008–09 MPHS. This means that it is not possible to directly compare the reasons not looking for work for the Indigenous and Australian population, although it is possible to make some broad comparisons.

Of those indicating that they are marginally attached among the overall Australian population, 22.2 per cent of females and 24.2 per cent of males are classified as discouraged workers (estimated from the 2008–09 MPHS). The proportion of the Australian population of marginally attached who are discouraged workers is about twice that for Indigenous marginally attached in non-remote areas, but less than for the Indigenous population of marginally attached in remote areas. Of course, the Indigenous population are more likely to be marginally attached to the labour force than the Australian population as a whole.

Modelling the determinants of labour force status

This section describes the analytic approach and empirical model used to estimate the determinants of the labour force status of the Indigenous population and the general Australian population.

Analytic approach and empirical model

The labour force states modelled are: employed; unemployed (including CDEP); marginally attached; and other NILF.⁷ As the dependent variable is not continuous, ordinary least squares regression is inappropriate and it is necessary to use a technique appropriate for a dependent variable with only four possible values. Multinomial logit was chosen because the three possible outcomes are categorical rather than ordinal.

The model is estimated using two different sets of variables or specifications. The first involves estimating the determinants of labour force status for Indigenous females and males using the 2008 NATSISS and for the general Australian population of females and males using the 2008–09 MPHS. This *parsimonious specification* is restricted to variables which are available on both the 2008 NATSISS and the 2008–09 MPHS.

The second set estimates the determinants of labour force status for Indigenous females and males using a much wider range of explanatory variables that are available from the 2008 NATSISS (but not the 2008–09 MPHS). Hereafter we refer to this as the *full specification*.

The explanatory variables included in the parsimonious specification—which are designed to compare the determinants of labour force status of the Indigenous population to those of the general Australian population—includes human capital and demographic variables. The second specification expands this set to include all of the variables which economic theory suggests will be related to labour force status (Killingsworth 1983) or which previous empirical studies have shown to be important determinants, including some indigenous-specific variables (e.g., Beggs & Chapman 1990; Breusch & Gray 2004; Doiron 2004; Gray et al. 2006; Gray, Hunter & Lohar forthcoming; Hunter & Daly 2008; Le & Miller 2000). The remainder of this section provides a rationale for the empirical specification used.

Age is included to capture possible life cycle effects and as a measure of potential labour market experience. ‘Age squared’ is included to allow for a possible non-linear relationship between age and labour force status. Human capital is measured using highest level of educational attainment (specified using dummy variables for degree or higher level qualification, other post-school qualification, Year 12 secondary schooling, Year 10 or 11 secondary schooling, and Year 9 or less secondary schooling). Family structure has been found to be related to labour force status, and family structure effects are captured via variables for having a partner and having dependent children; the effects of single versus couple parent families are captured by interacting the partner and dependent children variables. Household size is also included because

larger households may have disruptive environments that make labour supply more difficult. For women, it can also be a proxy for fertility (information that is not available for the 2008 NATSISS). The effects of geographic location are controlled for through a set of dummy variables that interact State or Territory of residence with geographic remoteness (‘remoteness by state’). One important geographic issue that these variables control for are the differential local labour market conditions that are associated with demand-side rather than individual-level characteristics. The analysis uses the most disaggregated available level of geography in an attempt to control for relevant demand-side factors.

The second estimates, based on data only available for the Indigenous population, include a number of additional variables. These are whether the respondent: speaks an Indigenous language; lives in a household with both Indigenous and non-Indigenous residents; has a severe or profound disability (or disability status not determined); lives in a multi-family household; was arrested in the last five years; engaged in hunting and gathering (for food or medicinal products); lives in a ‘traditional’ homeland; and/or lives in a neighbourhood that had substantial problems identified.⁸

Separate estimates of the determinants of labour force status are provided for the Indigenous population and the Australian population. Both are estimated separately for males and females who are aged 18–64 years.

Estimating the determinants of labour force status for Indigenous and general Australian population (parsimonious specification)

This section presents the results of estimates of the determinants of labour force status for the Indigenous population and the general Australian population (parsimonious specification). The models appear to be well specified, with the estimated effects consistent with economic theory and previous empirical studies. The summary statistics are presented in Appendix A and the estimation results in Appendix B.

As the multinomial logit model results themselves are not straightforward to interpret, the estimation results are interpreted in terms of predicted probabilities and marginal effects. Marginal effects are used to assist in the interpretation of explanatory variables with the exception of the family structure variables (having a partner and the dependent child measure) which are illustrated using predicted probabilities.

The marginal effects are calculated as the effect of a one unit change in an explanatory variable from its sample average on the probability of being in each of the labour force states after 12 months, holding all other variables

TABLE 2. Marginal effects for educational attainment and household size, Indigenous and all Australian females, 2008

Educational attainment	Employed (%)	Unemployed (%)	Marginally attached (%)	Other NILF (%)
Indigenous females				
Degree plus	51.8	-9.0	-16.9	-25.9 *
Other qualifications	44.3	-3.6	-12.7	-28.0 *
Year 12	37.4	-5.1	-12.7	-19.7 *
Year 10 or 11	22.9	-1.4	-5.9	-15.7 *
Household size	-4.0	1.0	1.7	1.4 *
Base probabilities	43.0	13.3	17.3	26.4
All Australian females				
Degree plus	26.8	-1.7	-8.0	-17.1 *
Other qualifications	23.3	-1.4	-6.6	-15.3 *
Year 12	17.1	-2.2	-4.4	-10.6 *
Year 10 or 11	13.3	-0.5	-3.7	-9.0 *
Household size	-1.6	0.1	0.2	1.2 *
Base probabilities	74.0	2.6	8.6	14.8

Notes: The base probabilities show the predicted probability holding constant all explanatory variables at their mean value. * indicates that at least one of the underlying coefficients for that variable is statistically significant at the 5% or better confidence level.

Source: Calculated from summary statistics and coefficient estimates reported in Appendices A and B of this paper.

TABLE 3. Marginal effects for educational attainment and household size, Indigenous and all Australian males, 2008

Educational attainment & household size	Employed (%)	Unemployed (%)	Marginally attached (%)	Other NILF (%)
Indigenous males				
Degree plus	33.2	-15.7	-6.1	-11.4 *
Other qualifications	29.1	-9.9	-7.0	-12.2 *
Year 12	24.8	-8.7	-7.0	-9.1 *
Year 10 or 11	15.3	-2.8	-4.9	-7.6 *
Household size	-3.2	1.2	0.7	1.3
Base probabilities	62.2	17.7	8.5	11.7
All Australian males				
Degree plus	9.2	-1.9	-2.7	-4.6 *
Other qualifications	10.7	-1.5	-3.1	-6.1 *
Year 12	6.1	-1.0	-1.4	-3.7 *
Year 10 or 11	4.8	0.1	-1.2	-3.7 *
Household size	-1.4	0.1	0.4	0.9
Base probabilities	89.2	2.1	3.6	5.2

Notes: The base probabilities show the predicted probability holding constant all explanatory variables at their mean value. * indicates that at least one of the underlying coefficients for that variable is statistically significant at the 5% or better confidence level.

Source: Calculated from summary statistics and coefficient estimates reported in Appendices A and B of this paper.

TABLE 4. Predicted probability of being in each labour force state family type variables, Indigenous and all Australian women, 2008

Family type	Employed (%)	Unemployed (%)	Marginally attached (%)	Other NILF (%)
Indigenous females				
Single	36.9	13.3	19.8	30.1
Couple	47.3	12.5	15.8	24.4
Couple with kids	47.3	12.5	15.8	24.4
Single mother	36.9	13.3	19.8	30.1
All Australian females				
Single	76.5	3.6	6.8	13.0
Couple	78.3	2.3	4.9	14.6
Couple with kids	58.7	2.3	11.6	27.4
Single mother	51.4	6.1	17.4	25.0

Source: Calculated from summary statistics and coefficient estimates reported in Appendices A and B of this paper.

at their average value. In the case of binary variables, the marginal effect is the effect of having the characteristic, given that all other variables are at their average value. The marginal effects for each variable sum to zero across the labour market states since each respondent must be in one, and only one, labour force state.

The marginal effects for the education variables and household size are presented in Tables 2 and 3 for females and males respectively. Educational attainment is strongly related to labour force status for both the Indigenous population and the general Australian population, but the effect is stronger for the Indigenous population than the Australian average—a finding that is consistent with other studies (Gray, Hunter & Lohar in press).

Having a degree is associated with an almost 50 percentage point increase in the probability of an Indigenous female being employed (non-CDEP) relative to Indigenous females who did not stay at school past Year 9. The converse of this is that those with a degree are significantly less likely to be in the other labour force states, especially the other NILF and marginally attached categories. Having a degree among Australian females more generally is associated with a 26.8 percentage point higher probability of being employed (again relative to those who did not stay at school past Year 9). For Indigenous females the increases in educational attainment are associated with substantial increases in labour supply (the other NILF and marginal attachment both decrease). There are also increases in labour supply for the general Australian female population.

The difference between the effects of educational attainment on labour force status for Indigenous and all Australians is less marked for males than females, but this is consistent with higher base employment probabilities for

Indigenous males (and associated higher levels of labour force participation rates). For Indigenous males, increase in educational attainment is associated with quite large decreases in unemployment as well as an increase in the proportion of the population who want to work (unemployed or marginally attached). The decrease in the proportion unemployed is greater for Indigenous males than females. For the general Australian male population increases in educational attainment are associated with only relatively small decrease in the proportion who do not want to work, reflecting the high level of wanting to work amongst the male population.

Household size has no significant effect on labour force status among all Australians, but has a small depressing effect on employment prospects of Indigenous females and male and associated small mostly positive effects on other labour force status (i.e. including marginal attachment).

The labour force probabilities associated with various family types are reported in Table 4. The marginal effects for these variables are hard to interpret because changes in family type are reflected in changes in two or more of the variables. The probability of being in the various labour force states is reported separately for single people with no children, couples with and without children and finally sole parents.

Family-type variables are very important determinants of marginal attachment and labour force status more broadly for Indigenous females and the general Australian female population. Indigenous single mothers have much higher rates of marginal attachment and other NILF than other groups. Overall, the pattern of determinants of labour force status for Indigenous women is similar to the pattern for the female Australian population.

TABLE 5. Marginal effects factors available for Indigenous only, 2008

Marginal effect factor	Employed (%)	Unemployed (%)	Marginally attached (%)	Other NILF (%)
Indigenous females				
Mixed household	18.8	-5.2	-5.8	-7.8 *
Severe disability	-28.4	-0.2	3.9	24.7 *
Arrested in last 5 years	-23.4	8.9	11.2	3.3 *
Hunting and gathering	2.5	3.4	-3.6	-2.3 *
Lives in homeland	-6.0	5.0	2.3	-1.3 *
Neighbourhood has problems	5.8	1.5	0.5	-7.8 *
Indigenous males				
Mixed household	17.2	-11.8	-3.8	-1.6
Severe disability	-46.0	-8.2	9.3	44.9 *
Arrested in last 5 years	-18.3	10.9	3.9	3.5 *
Hunting and gathering	5.2	0.9	-1.7	-4.4 *
Lives in homeland	-8.3	6.4	0.6	1.3 *
Neighbourhood has problems	6.0	-3.2	-1.9	-0.9 *

Notes: The base probabilities show the predicted probability holding constant all explanatory variables at their mean value. * indicated that at least one of the underlying coefficients for that variable is statistically significant at the 5% or better confidence level.

Source: Calculated from summary statistics and coefficient estimates reported in Appendices A and B of this paper (only using NATSISS regressions).

The family-type variables are not statistically significant for Indigenous males or the general Australian male population.

Results of modelling the determinants of labour force status for Indigenous Australian population (full specification)

This section presents the estimates of the determinants of labour force status for Indigenous males and females using the more detailed specification (i.e. the second, full specification).

Given that the coefficient and marginal effects for the variables included in both the first and second specifications are similar (for the Indigenous population), only the estimates for the variables included in the second specification but not included in the first (parsimonious) specification are reported in this section. The underlying coefficient estimates are presented in Appendix B. Marginal effects are used to illustrate the impact of explanatory variables on labour force status (Table 5).


Living in a household which has both Indigenous and non-Indigenous members (a mixed household) is estimated to be associated with a substantially higher employment rate for both Indigenous females and males compared to living in a household in which all members are Indigenous. For Indigenous women, those who live in a mixed household are estimated to be 18.8 percentage points more likely to be employed and 5.2 percentage points less likely

to be unemployed, 5.8 percentage points less likely to be marginally attached and 7.8 percentage points less likely to be other NILF. Living in a mixed household has a similar impact: Indigenous men are 17.2 percentage points more likely to be employed. Indigenous men in mixed households are less likely to be unemployed (11.8%), marginally attached (3.8%) and other NILF (1.6%). One explanation for this result is that mixed households have more diverse social networks (by definition they have some connections in both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities) which may enhance job search information and opportunities (Gray & Hunter 2005).

Having a severe or profound disability is estimated to significantly reduce employment prospect and increases likelihood of marginal attachment—especially for males whose employment prospects fall by 46.0 percentage points, while the probability of being marginally attached increases by 9.3 percentage points and the probability of being other NILF increases by 44.9 percentage points. This is consistent with the reasons given for not looking for work (Table 1).

Having been arrested in the last five years has been found to substantially decrease employment prospects (Borland & Hunter 2000). This paper confirms these findings. For Indigenous females, having been arrested in the last five years has little effect on the desire to work with little change in other NILF, but is associated with quite big increases in marginal attachment (11.2 percentage points) and

FIG. 3. Experience of discrimination in the previous 12 months by labour force status, Indigenous Australians, 2008



Source: 2008 NATSISS.

unemployment (8.9 percentage points). For Indigenous males, the decrease in employment associated with having been arrested (18.3 percentage points) is accompanied by a big increase in unemployment (10.9 percentage points) and smaller increase in marginal attachment (3.9 percentage points) and other NILF (3.5 percentage points).

Living in a household with more than one family is not significant for any of the labour force states analysed (once household size is taken into account) and so is not shown in Table 5. Having participated in hunting and gathering or living in homelands is only weakly related to the likelihood of being marginally attached. For females, hunting and gathering (non-market production) is actually associated negatively with marginal attachment and is clearly not an impediment to labour supply. Living in a homeland is associated with a slightly higher probability of marginal attachment for females, but not males. This may be associated with the fact that living on homelands is more common in remote areas where the labour market is less well developed.

Living in a neighbourhood with problems is statistically significant for both Indigenous and females, and is estimated to be associated with a slightly higher probability of being employed (5.8% for women and 6.0% for men). The reason for this finding is unclear, but it is probably the case that being employed influences a person’s perception of the neighbourhood in which they live.

The role of discrimination

This section provides data about the possible role of discrimination in marginal attachment. If employers discriminate against certain Indigenous people in terms of employment (or recruitment), then such people may become discouraged from looking for work or being otherwise marginally attached. Discrimination is based on a self-report measure from the 2008 NATSISS, with multiple reasons provided for instances of discrimination experiences over the previous 12 months.

Whether Indigenous females and males experienced any discrimination in the previous 12 months by labour force status is identified at Fig. 3. The unemployed report having experienced more discrimination than other Indigenous people, but there is no significant difference between the other labour force states. Even CDEP scheme workers, who tend to be employed in the Indigenous domain or the Indigenous community sector, have rather high rates, with three-tenths reporting having experienced some form of discrimination in the last 12 months. The higher rate of discrimination experienced by the unemployed is understandable in that they must search for work, and this search will bring them into contact with potential employers and other circumstances where they may experience discrimination. The unemployed are more likely to nominate the reason for discrimination as being associated with the workplace than other Indigenous people. Given that many people have to go through a period of unemployment to

find work, it is not possible to discount the possibility that more Indigenous people stay outside the labour force, either as marginally attached or other NILF, in order to avoid the exposure to discrimination.

Notwithstanding, the inescapable conclusion is that far too many Indigenous people experience discrimination irrespective of their labour force status. However, it does not appear that the marginally attached report experiencing discrimination more than those in other labour force states. Therefore, it is at best only a partial explanation for marginal attachment of the Indigenous population.

Concluding comments

Between 1994 and 2008, it is estimated that the non-CDEP employment rate increased by around 20 percentage points for both Indigenous males and females. This is a much bigger increase in employment than has occurred for the Australian population as a whole (Gray & Hunter 2011).

This paper has explored some implications of changing employment conditions for Indigenous labour force status more generally. For Indigenous women, the increases in employment have been associated with a big decrease in the proportion who are classified as NILF (i.e. marginally attached or other NILF) and a large fall in the proportion unemployed or in CDEP. For Indigenous men, the increase in employment has been much more associated with a reduction in the proportion unemployed or in CDEP, with the NILF proportion having fallen only slightly.

There is some evidence that the gap in marginal attachment of Indigenous compared to other Australians has declined since the mid 1990s. In 1994, Indigenous people were between three and four times more likely to be marginally attached than other Australians. By 2008, Indigenous Australians were twice as likely to be marginally attached to the labour force than the Australian population at large.

The reason for being marginal attached varies by the accessibility of the area. In non-remote areas, there is a considerable concentration of marginal attachment among for Indigenous males with a long term health condition or disability (over 40% giving this reason). Own short term illness or injury is also an important factor in the incidence of marginal attachment in these areas. Although many remote residents also give reasons that relate to their own personal circumstances (including poor health), the lack of labour demand (or rather the perceived lack of labour demand) is the major factor in explaining why Indigenous men do not want to work. For Indigenous women, the most common reasons for being marginally attached in both remote and non-remote areas are caring responsibilities

and other family conditions. The lack of available jobs is less of an issue than it is for Indigenous males.

Gray and Hunter (2011) explore the several reasons for the improvement in Indigenous employment vis-à-vis other Australian employment: consistently strong macro-economic conditions between 1994 and 2008; the changes to the income support system/policies which have emphasised the importance of paid employment (especially unsubsidised paid employment); increases in educational participation and attainment of the Indigenous population relative to that of the non-Indigenous population; and the fact that wage subsidies are now only available for Indigenous job seekers and a small minority of other Australians (e.g. those with a disability).⁹ The statistical modelling in this paper confirms that educational attainment continues to be an important determinant of labour force status and that it is a more substantial factor for the Indigenous population than for the non-Indigenous population. That is, recent improvements in Indigenous education appears to have enhanced Indigenous productivity vis-à-vis other Australian workers (Altman, Biddle & Hunter 2009).

This paper confirms the argument that sustained macroeconomic growth is particularly important for Indigenous jobseekers (Hunter 2010). New jobs need to be created so that Indigenous people can find work without displacing others already in work. Improving educational attainment has put Indigenous people in a better position to compete for these new jobs; however there is plenty of scope for further improvement in the skills of Indigenous Australians as the rates of return for education in terms of employment is still much higher than they are for other Australians. Furthermore, educational attainment is associated with a significant increase in labour supply of Indigenous workers—both in absolute terms and relative to other Australians.

Supply-side constraints are more important than ever before because the strength of the Australian economy has led to a reasonable level of jobs growth for almost two decades. In all likelihood, many Indigenous people with the characteristics or skills that employers demand have already found work. Unless policy can address the underlying barriers to Indigenous participation in the mainstream economy, we are unlikely to see further substantial improvements in Indigenous labour market participation. This paper has highlighted personal issues (such as poor health) as well as locational factors (such as the buoyancy of the local labour market). Supply-side or personal issues remain very important after all the controls for the demand-side factors are controlled for as much as the data allows.

Indigenous-specific factors associated with economic participation were important, but not always in the direction that some theoretical models might lead us to expect. Involvement with the criminal justice system is associated with lower attachment to the workforce, but hunting and gathering was actually associated with greater economic engagement. Clearly, engagement in the customary economy is not inconsistent with participation in the mainstream economic system. One apparent anomalous finding was that living in areas with neighbourhood problems was associated with greater labour force participation, especially among Indigenous females. This is not evidence that neighbourhood problems should be (or could be) used as a policy instrument; neighbourhood problems are complex and are likely to be associated with higher levels of arrest and other social issues that mitigate against many Indigenous people supplying labour.

Another complicating factor undermining Indigenous economic engagement is that discrimination is a common experience among many Indigenous people. Even if policy manages to augment Indigenous economic participation, this may not translate into employment gains as the unemployed tend to experience higher levels of labour market discrimination.

While we have sound empirical and theoretical reasons for concluding that policy needs to renew its focus on the supply-side (in addition to augmenting labour demand through addressing Indigenous skill deficits), there is no easy policy solution. For example, the increasing conditionality of welfare on job search and economic engagement has arguably improved Indigenous labour supply and employment outcome, but there may be limits to the extent that this conditionality can be extended. The complex reality of Indigenous people and their families need to be understood before economic participation can be optimised. Until these underlying, and somewhat intractable, barriers are addressed, there is likely to be limited progress in further closing the gap(s) between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians.

Notes

1. A further reason for not analysing discouraged workers is that it is not possible to get comparable data for Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. The list of reasons for not looking for work which respondents were given to choose from in the 2008 NATSISS differ to the standard Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) questions used in the Labour Force Survey (and the Multi-Purpose Household Survey). For details of the concepts underlying measurement of labour force status in the Australian context, see ABS (2006).
2. Full details of the recent changes to the CDEP scheme are available at <centrelink.gov.au/internet/internet.nsf/services/cdep.htm>
3. The MPHS does not include information on Indigenous status and hence the general Australian estimates in this paper may include a small number of Indigenous respondents to that survey.
4. Population benchmarks are based on Indigenous estimated residential population data from the 2006 Census.
5. In the 1994 NATSIS there are respondents who were classified as being 'other NILF' using the standard ABS labour force definitions but who were registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service (CES). In this paper we classify this group as being marginally attached as registration at an employment service demonstrates a level of attachment to the labour force. An alternative would be to classify this group as being unemployed. This would result in the proportion of marginally attached in 1994 being reduced by 7.5 and 5.3 percentage points for females and males respectively and a corresponding increase in the proportion unemployed.
6. An alternative source of data on trends in Indigenous employment rates is the Labour Force Survey (LFS) which provides estimates of Indigenous employment data from the mid 1990s. The LFS estimates include CDEP employment as employment. Estimates of non-CDEP employment can be generated using administrative data on the number of CDEP participants to estimate non-CDEP employment. According to the LFS the non-CDEP employment rate of Indigenous men increased from 30% in 1997 to 47% in 2008 and for Indigenous women from 23% to 37%. For both men and women non-CDEP employment gradually increased over the entire period. The increases in non-CDEP employment are substantial and are consistent with the estimated trends made using the 1994 NATSIS and 2008 NATSISS (i.e. not statistically significantly different at the 5% confidence level).
7. As a sensitivity test, the regression models were also estimated treating CDEP participants as employed. The regression results for this specification are substantively unchanged.
8. While the 2008 NATSISS includes information on all hunting and gathering activities, including those conducted for cultural and social reasons, the focus in this paper is where such activities contribute to non-market production within the household. The reason is that this production may change the attachment to the labour market by providing direct substitutes for goods that might otherwise be purchased in the market using wages or transfer payments. This does not deny the significance of other reasons for hunting and gathering activities, but is an attempt to recognise that we have some reason to suspect that labour force status is more likely to be affected when non-market goods are involved.
9. Thus reducing the relative cost of Indigenous workers and 'shuffling' them up the job queue.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2006. *Labour Statistics: Concepts, Sources and Methods*, cat. no. 6102.0.55.001, ABS, Canberra.
- Altman, J.C., Biddle, N. and Hunter, B.H. 2009. 'Prospects for "Closing The Gap" in socioeconomic outcomes for Indigenous Australians?', *Australian Economic History Review*, 49: 225–51.
- Beggs, J. and Chapman, B. 1990. 'Search efficiency, skill transferability and immigrant unemployment rates in Australia', *Applied Economics*, 22 (2): 249–60.
- Blundell, R., Ham, J. and Meghir, C. 1998. 'Unemployment, discouraged workers and female labour supply', *Research in Economics*. 52: 103–31.
- Borland, J. and Hunter, B.H. 2000. 'Does crime affect employment status?—The case of Indigenous Australians', *Economica*, 67; 123–144.
- Bowen, W.G. and Finnegan, T.A. 1969. *The Economics of Labour Force Participation*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Brandolini, A., Cipollone, P. and Viviano, E. 2006. 'Does the ILO definition capture all unemployment?' *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 4: 153–79.
- Breunig, R. and Mercante, J. 2010. 'The accuracy of predicted wages of the non-employed and implications for policy simulations from structural labour supply models', *Economic Record*, 86 (272): 49–70.
- Breusch, T. and Gray, E. 2004. 'New estimates of mothers' forgone earnings using HILDA data', *Australian Journal of Labour Economics*, 7: 125–50.
- Clark, K.B. and Summers, L.H. 1980. 'Labour force participation: Timing and persistence', in R. Cross (ed.), *Unemployment Hysteresis and the Natural Rate Hypothesis*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Doiron, D. 2004. 'Welfare reform and the labour supply of lone parents in Australia: A natural experiment approach', *Economic Record*, 80 (24): 157–76.
- Gray, M.C., Heath, A. and Hunter, B.H. 2005. 'The labour force dynamics of the marginally attached', *Australian Economic Papers*, 44: 1–44.
- and Hunter, B. 2005. 'The labour market dynamics of Indigenous Australians', *Journal of Sociology*, 41: 389–408.
- and — 2011. 'Changes in Indigenous labour force status: Re-establishing employment as a social norm?', *CAEPR Topical Issue 9/2011*, CAEPR, ANU, Canberra, available at <caepr.anu.edu.au/Publications/topical.php>.
- , — and Lohar S. (in press). 'Increasing Indigenous employment rates', Closing the Gap Clearinghouse Issues Paper, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and Australian Institute of Family Studies, Canberra.
- Gray, M. Qu, L., Renda, J. and de Vaus D. 2006. 'Changes in the labour force status of lone and couple Australian mothers, 1983–2005', *Australian Journal of Labour Economics*, 9 (4): 395–416.
- Hunter, B.H. 2010. 'Revisiting the relationship between the macroeconomy and Indigenous labour force status', *Economic Papers*, 29: 320–32.
- and Daly, A. 2008. 'Interactions between crime and fertility in the labour supply of Indigenous Australian women', *CAEPR Working Paper No. 40*, CAEPR, ANU, Canberra, available at <caepr.anu.edu.au/Publications/working.php>.
- and Gray, M.C. 2001. 'Indigenous labour force status re-visited: Factors associated with the discouraged worker phenomenon', *Australian Journal of Labour Economics*, 4: 115–37.
- Husmanns, R., Mehran, F. and Verma, V. 1990. *Surveys of Economically Active Population, Employment, Unemployment and Underemployment*, International Labour Organization, Geneva.
- Jones, S.R.G. and Riddell, W.C. 1999. 'The measurement of unemployment: An empirical approach', *Econometrica*, 67: 147–62.
- and — 2006. 'Unemployment and non-employment: Heterogeneties in labor market states', *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 88: 314–23.
- Killingsworth, M. 1983. *Labor Supply*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Le, A. and Miller, P. 2000. 'An evaluation of inertia models of unemployment', *Australian Economic Review*, 33 (3): 205–20.
- Taylor, J. and Hunter, B.H. 1998. *The Job Still Ahead: Economic Costs of Continuing Indigenous Employment Disparity*, Office of Public Affairs, ATSI, Canberra.

Appendix A.

Summary statistics for regression analysis

TABLE A1. Summary statistics for regressions, Indigenous, 2008

Variable	Female		Male	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	37	12	37	13
Age ²	1,534	993	1,544	1,005
Degree plus	0.071	0.256	0.046	0.208
Other qualification	0.240	0.427	0.254	0.436
Year 12	0.117	0.322	0.121	0.327
Year 10 or 11	0.333	0.471	0.312	0.463
NSW Inner Regional	0.046	0.210	0.043	0.204
NSW Outer Regional	0.028	0.164	0.028	0.164
Vic Total	0.174	0.379	0.166	0.372
Qld Major Cities	0.022	0.147	0.022	0.148
Qld Inner Regional	0.019	0.138	0.021	0.144
Qld Outer Regional	0.031	0.173	0.030	0.172
Qld Remote	0.071	0.258	0.087	0.282
WA Non-Remote	0.072	0.258	0.056	0.230
WA Remote	0.077	0.267	0.078	0.268
NT Remote	0.118	0.322	0.134	0.341
Other Non-Remote	0.239	0.427	0.237	0.425
Other Remote	0.042	0.201	0.049	0.216
Has partner	0.528	0.499	0.637	0.481
Has dependent child	0.604	0.489	0.455	0.498
Partner and child	0.324	0.468	0.373	0.484
Indigenous language	0.198	0.398	0.252	0.434
Household size	3.831	2.092	3.733	2.164
Mixed household	0.346	0.476	0.389	0.488
Profound disability	0.087	0.283	0.075	0.264
Disability undetermined	0.449	0.497	0.448	0.497
Multi-family household	0.130	0.337	0.118	0.323
Arrested in last 5 years	0.102	0.303	0.245	0.430
Hunting and gathering	0.313	0.464	0.507	0.500
Lives on homelands	0.235	0.424	0.279	0.449
Neighbourhood problem	0.767	0.423	0.741	0.438
Number of observations	3,680		2,769	

Notes: Population aged 18–64 years.
Source: 2008 NATSIS.

TABLE A2. Summary statistics for all Australian regressions, Australian males and females, 2008

Variable	Female		Male	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	41	13	42	13
Age ²	1858	1072	1889	1051
Degree plus	0.267	0.442	0.220	0.414
Other qualification	0.261	0.439	0.343	0.475
Year 12	0.168	0.374	0.171	0.376
Year 10 or 11	0.232	0.422	0.188	0.391
Qld and major city	0.106	0.308	0.112	0.316
Qld and inner regional	0.038	0.191	0.034	0.182
Qld and outer regional	0.026	0.158	0.031	0.174
NSW and inner regional	0.050	0.219	0.043	0.202
NSW and outer regional	0.011	0.105	0.016	0.125
Vic and major city	0.155	0.362	0.153	0.360
Vic and inner regional	0.040	0.196	0.040	0.195
Vic and outer regional	0.009	0.092	0.007	0.081
Tas and inner regional	0.057	0.231	0.046	0.209
Tas and outer regional	0.019	0.138	0.021	0.145
SA and major city	0.095	0.294	0.091	0.287
SA and inner regional	0.011	0.106	0.013	0.115
SA and outer regional	0.012	0.107	0.016	0.124
ACT	0.043	0.203	0.040	0.196
WA and major city	0.104	0.305	0.114	0.318
WA and outer regional	0.014	0.120	0.021	0.143
NT	0.042	0.201	0.038	0.192
Has partner	0.581	0.493	0.592	0.492
Has dependent child	0.418	0.493	0.328	0.469
Partner and child	0.296	0.457	0.311	0.463
Household size	2.683	1.327	2.625	1.390
Number of observations	5,176		4,677	

Note: Population aged 18–64 years.

Source: 2008–09 MPHS.

Appendix B.

Multinomial logit regression models

TABLE B1. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, Indigenous females, parsimonious specification, 2008

Variable	Unemployed		Marginally attached		Other NILF	
	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat
Age	-0.076	-2.38	-0.129	-4.31	-0.210	-8.41
Age ²	0.001	1.51	0.001	3.42	0.003	9.30
Degree plus	-1.935	-6.24	-3.062	-8.36	-3.093	-11.99
Other qualification	-1.193	-6.77	-1.884	-11.44	-2.477	-16.34
Year 12	-1.148	-5.48	-1.780	-8.97	-1.813	-10.44
Year 10 or 11	-0.605	-3.69	-0.866	-5.85	-1.167	-8.99
NSW Inner Regional	-0.229	-0.62	-0.052	-0.18	0.008	0.03
NSW Outer Regional	1.087	2.58	0.972	2.61	1.183	3.31
Vic Total	-0.332	-1.18	0.019	0.08	-0.012	-0.05
Qld Major Cities	-0.147	-0.34	-0.521	-1.41	-0.642	-1.49
Qld Inner Regional	-0.273	-0.53	-0.040	-0.10	0.460	1.24
Qld Outer Regional	-0.573	-1.25	0.111	0.33	-0.307	-0.88
Qld Remote	0.638	2.13	-0.689	-2.28	0.653	2.53
WA Non-Remote	-0.107	-0.33	-0.009	-0.03	0.053	0.19
WA Remote	0.551	1.98	-0.232	-0.91	-0.251	-0.96
NT Remote	0.435	1.57	-0.684	-2.53	0.148	0.59
Other Non-Remote	-0.529	-1.94	-0.283	-1.25	0.125	0.55
Other Remote	0.968	2.92	0.431	1.38	0.317	1.01
Has partner	-0.397	-2.25	-0.596	-3.11	-0.605	-4.09
Has dependent child	-0.003	-0.01	0.838	4.78	0.580	3.73
Partner and child	-0.385	-1.70	-0.277	-1.23	0.123	0.65
Household size	0.165	5.34	0.189	6.20	0.147	5.27
Constant	1.115	1.75	2.252	4.02	3.376	6.66
Number of observations	3,680					
Pseudo R ²	0.1429					

Note: Robust standard errors are used to calculate the t-statistics.
Source: 2008 NATSISS.

TABLE B2. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, Indigenous females, full specification, 2008

Variable	Unemployed		Marginally attached		Other NILF	
	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat
Age	-0.112	-3.38	-0.157	-5.11	-0.240	-9.27
Age ²	0.001	2.42	0.002	4.21	0.003	9.97
Degree plus	-1.738	-5.55	-2.807	-7.59	-2.890	-11.03
Other qualification	-1.103	-6.03	-1.772	-10.50	-2.359	-15.11
Year 12	-0.902	-4.20	-1.576	-7.76	-1.629	-9.14
Year 10 or 11	-0.528	-3.11	-0.774	-5.13	-1.052	-7.94
NSW Inner Regional	-0.368	-0.97	-0.085	-0.29	-0.014	-0.05
NSW Outer Regional	0.558	1.28	0.674	1.73	0.941	2.54
Vic Total	-0.499	-1.73	-0.073	-0.31	-0.130	-0.54
Qld Major Cities	-0.206	-0.48	-0.545	-1.41	-0.757	-1.68
Qld Inner Regional	-0.239	-0.44	0.022	0.05	0.504	1.31
Qld Outer Regional	-0.793	-1.69	0.050	0.14	-0.490	-1.36
Qld Remote	-0.086	-0.27	-0.861	-2.69	0.368	1.34
WA Non-Remote	-0.457	-1.36	-0.181	-0.65	-0.121	-0.44
WA Remote	-0.273	-0.90	-0.482	-1.71	-0.589	-2.10
NT Remote	-0.545	-1.77	-0.988	-3.27	-0.412	-1.52
Other Non-Remote	-0.695	-2.47	-0.302	-1.28	0.005	0.02
Other Remote	0.341	0.96	0.161	0.48	0.020	0.06
Has partner	0.099	0.50	-0.124	-0.59	-0.194	-1.17
Has dependent child	0.084	0.43	0.904	5.02	0.647	4.07
Partner and child	-0.455	-1.94	-0.320	-1.39	0.056	0.29
Speaks and Indigenous language	0.656	4.31	0.078	0.48	0.431	3.06
Number of persons in household	0.135	3.29	0.191	5.14	0.160	4.47
Mixed household	-0.850	-5.24	-0.765	-5.27	-0.727	-5.59
Severe disability	0.969	3.94	1.191	5.41	1.678	9.00
Disability – level undetermined	0.545	4.35	0.463	4.20	0.417	4.02
Multi-family household	-0.022	-0.11	-0.011	-0.06	-0.197	-1.07
Arrested in last 5 years	1.281	6.71	1.244	7.12	0.848	4.57
Hunting and gathering for food or medicine	0.192	1.46	-0.268	-2.07	-0.146	-1.27
Lives on homelands	0.500	3.79	0.273	2.09	0.098	0.82
Problems in neighbourhood	-0.026	-0.18	-0.111	-0.86	-0.414	-3.66
Constant	1.424	2.14	2.432	4.16	3.915	7.37
Number of observations	3,680					
Pseudo R ²	0.1777					

Note: Robust standard errors are used to calculate the t-statistics.

Source: 2008 NATSISS.

TABLE B3. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, Indigenous males, parsimonious specification, 2008

Variable	Unemployed		Marginally attached		Other NILF	
	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat
Age	0.016	0.50	-0.047	-1.19	-0.072	-2.18
Age ²	-0.001	-1.60	0.001	1.17	0.002	3.77
Degree plus	-2.226	-4.46	-1.639	-3.93	-2.747	-6.22
Other qualification	-1.114	-6.70	-1.514	-7.04	-1.868	-10.48
Year 12	-0.979	-5.17	-1.637	-5.58	-1.529	-6.04
Year 10 or 11	-0.401	-2.84	-0.892	-4.84	-0.983	-6.23
NSW Inner Regional	-0.016	-0.05	-0.264	-0.56	-0.532	-1.24
NSW Outer Regional	0.132	0.32	0.002	0.00	0.806	1.99
Vic Total	-0.560	-1.86	-0.008	-0.02	-0.132	-0.41
Qld Major Cities	-0.817	-1.61	-1.295	-1.63	-0.471	-0.87
Qld Inner Regional	-0.314	-0.71	-0.727	-1.05	0.234	0.48
Qld Outer Regional	-0.703	-1.57	-1.408	-2.17	-0.772	-1.84
Qld Remote	0.714	2.41	-0.968	-2.03	-0.558	-1.54
WA Non-Remote	-0.255	-0.72	0.269	0.65	-0.178	-0.46
WA Remote	0.714	2.37	0.194	0.48	-0.215	-0.58
NT Remote	1.398	4.88	0.464	1.23	0.185	0.53
Other Non-Remote	-0.554	-1.92	-0.208	-0.59	-0.006	-0.02
Other Remote	0.959	2.88	0.041	0.09	-0.195	-0.48
Has partner	-0.328	-2.07	-0.531	-2.51	-1.034	-5.73
Has dependent child	-0.114	-0.52	0.369	1.32	-0.002	-0.01
Partner and child	-0.250	-0.98	-0.760	-2.32	-0.227	-0.80
Household size	0.119	3.95	0.130	3.08	0.165	4.01
Constant	-0.316	-0.51	-0.127	-0.17	-0.021	-0.03
Number of observations	2,769					
Pseudo R ²	0.1584					

Note: Robust standard errors are used to calculate the t-statistics.

Source: 2008 NATSISS.

TABLE B4. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, Indigenous males, full specification, 2008

Variable	Unemployed		Marginally attached		Other NILF	
	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat
Age	-0.028	-0.87	-0.077	-1.95	-0.103	-3.01
Age ²	-0.0001	-0.27	0.001	1.79	0.002	4.46
Degree plus	-1.851	-3.69	-1.400	-3.10	-2.625	-5.18
Other qualification	-0.861	-4.99	-1.265	-5.67	-1.672	-8.65
Year 12	-0.703	-3.54	-1.328	-4.40	-1.292	-4.80
Year 10 or 11	-0.238	-1.60	-0.695	-3.66	-0.808	-4.83
NSW Inner Regional	-0.094	-0.26	-0.157	-0.33	-0.374	-0.81
NSW Outer Regional	-0.314	-0.71	-0.061	-0.11	1.047	2.40
Vic Total	-0.581	-1.90	0.054	0.15	-0.022	-0.06
Qld Major Cities	-0.850	-1.53	-1.317	-1.64	-0.535	-0.85
Qld Inner Regional	-0.409	-0.86	-0.497	-0.71	0.690	1.30
Qld Outer Regional	-0.955	-2.06	-1.447	-2.12	-0.610	-1.47
Qld Remote	-0.075	-0.24	-1.191	-2.40	-0.506	-1.22
WA Non-Remote	-0.503	-1.44	0.317	0.74	0.018	0.04
WA Remote	-0.042	-0.13	-0.083	-0.19	-0.174	-0.42
NT Remote	0.295	0.94	0.028	0.07	0.053	0.13
Other Non-Remote	-0.673	-2.29	-0.173	-0.47	0.073	0.22
Other Remote	0.284	0.83	-0.164	-0.35	-0.195	-0.44
Has partner	0.023	0.14	-0.169	-0.74	-0.807	-3.97
Has dependent child	-0.089	-0.39	0.418	1.44	0.174	0.67
Partner and child	-0.312	-1.20	-0.852	-2.55	-0.228	-0.75
Speaks and Indigenous language	0.728	5.03	0.501	2.33	0.510	2.69
Number of persons in household	0.082	2.10	0.123	2.24	0.114	2.19
Mixed household	-0.991	-6.59	-0.759	-3.97	-0.432	-2.54
Severe disability	0.534	1.87	1.977	6.94	3.024	12.89
Disability – level undetermined	0.273	2.25	1.062	6.32	1.160	7.39
Multi-family household	0.129	0.61	0.055	0.18	0.445	1.74
Arrested in last 5 years	0.852	6.78	0.739	4.24	0.633	3.62
Hunting and gathering for food or medicine	-0.030	-0.23	-0.284	-1.69	-0.520	-3.40
Lives on homelands	0.470	3.78	0.202	1.11	0.262	1.64
Problems in neighbourhood	-0.271	-2.09	-0.317	-1.82	-0.180	-1.16
Constant	0.424	0.67	-0.160	-0.20	-0.388	-0.50
Number of observations	2,769					
Pseudo R ²	0.225					

Note: Robust standard errors are used to calculate the t-statistics.

Source: 2008 NATSISS.

TABLE B5. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, all Australian females, 2008

Variable	Unemployed		Marginally attached		Other NILF	
	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat
Age	-0.103	-1.84	-0.233	-6.70	-0.394	-15.20
Age ²	0.001	1.07	0.003	6.87	0.005	16.41
Degree plus	-1.130	-3.04	-1.579	-7.32	-1.932	-12.32
Other qualification	-0.909	-2.54	-1.274	-6.15	-1.682	-10.97
Year 12	-1.375	-3.46	-0.851	-3.94	-1.172	-7.28
Year 10 or 11	-0.384	-1.11	-0.664	-3.37	-0.906	-6.23
Qld and major city	-0.480	-1.41	-0.337	-1.65	0.047	0.31
Qld and inner regional	-0.299	-0.61	-0.228	-0.76	0.418	1.97
Qld and outer regional	-0.713	-1.14	-0.431	-1.25	-0.478	-1.69
NSW and inner regional	-0.218	-0.53	-0.172	-0.65	0.235	1.17
NSW and outer regional	0.131	0.17	0.316	0.72	0.527	1.55
Vic and major city	-0.115	-0.41	0.023	0.14	0.169	1.19
Vic and inner regional	0.099	0.26	-0.148	-0.57	-0.021	-0.10
Vic and outer regional	1.149	1.98	-0.060	-0.11	-0.566	-1.21
TAS and inner regional	-0.606	-1.30	-0.147	-0.62	0.281	1.54
TAS and outer regional	0.246	0.44	0.441	1.34	0.408	1.37
SA and major city	0.305	1.07	-0.152	-0.76	0.027	0.17
SA and inner regional	-0.708	-0.71	-0.012	-0.03	0.159	0.42
SA and outer regional	0.512	0.87	-0.777	-1.46	-0.543	-1.39
ACT	-1.208	-1.98	-0.758	-2.41	-0.666	-2.57
WA and major city	0.153	0.53	-0.189	-0.97	-0.069	-0.44
WA and outer regional	-0.399	-0.54	0.326	0.91	-0.533	-1.20
NT	-1.091	-2.05	-1.105	-3.24	-0.755	-2.98
Has partner	-0.498	-1.96	-0.351	-2.20	0.100	0.89
Has dependent child	0.982	3.98	1.492	8.10	1.342	8.45
Partner and child	-0.633	-1.83	-0.206	-0.95	-0.152	-0.85
Household size	0.067	0.93	0.047	0.94	0.102	2.32
Constant	0.426	0.41	2.766	4.22	5.553	11.10
Number of observations	5,176					
Pseudo R ²	0.115					

Note: Robust standard errors are used to calculate the t-statistics.

Source: 2008–09 MPHS

TABLE B6. Multinomial logit regression of determinants of labour force status, all Australian males, 2008

Variable	Unemployed		Marginally attached		Other NILF	
	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat	Coef.	T-stat
Age	-0.056	-0.98	-0.088	-1.94	-0.198	-5.53
Age ²	0.000	0.49	0.001	2.66	0.003	7.53
Degree plus	-1.304	-3.14	-1.083	-3.80	-1.277	-6.24
Other qualificaiton	-0.932	-2.61	-1.111	-4.45	-1.500	-7.98
Year 12	-0.647	-1.71	-0.529	-1.93	-1.009	-4.76
Year 10 or 11	-0.010	-0.03	-0.432	-1.70	-0.989	-5.10
Qld and major city	-0.831	-2.27	-0.514	-1.92	-0.286	-1.21
Qld and inner regional	0.045	0.11	-0.400	-0.98	0.018	0.05
Qld and outer regional	-2.028	-1.97	-0.410	-0.95	-0.285	-0.75
NSW and inner regional	-0.443	-0.93	-0.485	-1.28	-0.138	-0.44
NSW and outer regional	-0.008	-0.01	0.150	0.37	-0.128	-0.30
Vic and major city	-0.756	-2.28	-0.516	-2.13	-0.057	-0.28
Vic and inner regional	-0.138	-0.33	-0.833	-1.82	-0.074	-0.23
Vic and outer regional	-0.184	-0.23	-0.443	-0.60	-1.541	-1.30
Tas and inner regional	-0.164	-0.37	-0.358	-0.93	0.902	3.68
Tas and outer regional	-0.482	-0.74	-0.152	-0.33	-0.303	-0.66
SA and major city	0.040	0.13	-0.752	-2.40	0.211	0.94
SA and inner regional	0.156	0.26	-1.703	-1.65	-0.892	-1.32
SA and outer regional	0.346	0.63	-0.517	-0.82	0.431	1.18
ACT	-0.625	-1.17	-0.687	-1.53	0.074	0.22
WA and major city	-0.907	-2.41	-1.199	-3.59	-0.345	-1.42
WA and outer regional	-1.682	-1.68	-0.998	-1.62	-0.960	-1.62
NT	-1.532	-2.04	-0.913	-2.07	-0.534	-1.42
Has partner	-1.067	-3.47	-0.995	-4.94	-1.096	-7.43
Has dependent child	0.131	0.23	0.471	1.10	-0.524	-1.03
Partner and child	-0.038	-0.06	-0.829	-1.72	0.186	0.35
Household size	0.059	0.66	0.140	1.81	0.186	3.21
Constant	-0.436	-0.40	-0.575	-0.59	1.054	1.34
Number of observations	4,677					
Pseudo R ²	0.1346					

Note: Robust standard errors are used to calculate the t-statistics.
Source: 2008–09 MPHS.