



Cornell University
ILR School

Cornell University ILR School
DigitalCommons@ILR

[International Publications](#)

[Key Workplace Documents](#)

December 2001

2001 Labour Overview: Latin America and the Caribbean

International Labour Office, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/intl>

Thank you for downloading an article from DigitalCommons@ILR.

Support this valuable resource today!

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Key Workplace Documents at DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact catherwood-dig@cornell.edu.

If you have a disability and are having trouble accessing information on this website or need materials in an alternate format, contact web-accessibility@cornell.edu for assistance.

2001 Labour Overview: Latin America and the Caribbean

Abstract

[Excerpt] 2001 Labour Overview appears at a difficult time in the world economic situation, aggravated by the events of last 11 September. As short-term indicators have shown, these have had marked repercussions on the economy and employment of most countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.

The present labour situation shows a large and growing deficit in Decent Work, understood as productive jobs in good conditions, with freedom, equality, security and human dignity. In this respect, the present report is making a first effort to calculate the decent work development index, and raises some proposals for reducing the deficit. Moreover, future editions of this publication will increase the indicators in order to make in-depth observations on other aspects related to the idea of a decent work, as enunciated by the Director General of the ILO in 1999.

Finally, analyses indicate that labour prospects are not very encouraging for the coming year. This forces governments, social protagonists and the ILO itself to make a special effort to advance in generating more employment with better labour conditions for everyone.

Keywords

economic growth, employment, unemployment, Latin America

Foreword

2001 Labour Overview appears at a difficult time in the world economic situation, aggravated by the events of last 11 September. As short-term indicators have shown, these have had marked repercussions on the economy and employment of most countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.

First of all, it can be seen that the labour situation has not improved. During the present year, the average unemployment rate in the region remained at a level similar to 2000. However, this is due mainly to the reduction of unemployment in Brazil, while unemployment increased in most other countries in the region.

Brazil's reduced unemployment and the unemployment level maintained in a few other countries was due to a fall in the participation rate. This means that, when considering the greater number of unemployed in some countries and the number of discouraged people who have withdrawn from the labour market in others, total unemployment exceeds last year's levels. Consequently, this has not been a good year for employment.

Both the increased open unemployment in some countries and the reduced participation rate in others, are related to the reduction in economic growth, that fell from 4.1% in 2000 to an estimated 0.9% this year. This is a drastic reduction that can only adversely impact the labour market.

Real wages, both industrial and minimum, rose despite the bad period there had been insofar as employment was concerned. The salary increase was due, on the one hand, to a reduction in the inflation and, on the other, to increased productivity. The fact that the increase in wages had been aligned to productivity indicates that these did not have a significant impact on employment nor on the present unemployment level.

International experience shows that in high and persistent unemployment conditions, governments should intervene in order to alleviate the situation of the most vulnerable groups, since the labour market does not automatically adjust rapidly to acceptable employment levels.

Governmental intervention should favour the least protected population including young people and women, since in the case of the latter not only is unemployment very high but income is also very low, despite the reductions made in the differential in recent years, as shown in the present report.

The present labour situation shows a large and growing deficit in Decent Work, understood as productive jobs in good conditions, with freedom, equality, security and human dignity. In this respect, the present report is making a first effort to calculate the decent work development index, and raises some proposals for reducing the deficit. Moreover, future editions of this publication will increase the indicators in order to make in-depth observations on other aspects related to the idea of a decent work, as enunciated by the Director General of the ILO in 1999.

Finally, analyses indicate that labour prospects are not very encouraging for the coming year. This forces governments, social protagonists and the ILO itself to make a special effort to advance in generating more employment with better labour conditions for everyone.

*Agustín Muñoz V.
Regional Director a.i. for the Americas*

Lima, December 2001

Index

| | |
|---|-----------|
| UNEMPLOYMENT REMAINS CONSTANT DESPITE THE STRONG FALL IN ECONOMIC GROWTH | 4 |
| CHANGES IN ECONOMIC GROWTH EXPECTATIONS | 6 |
| LABOUR MARKET PERFORMANCE | 8 |
| TRENDS OF LABOUR PROGRESS IN 2001 | 14 |
| UNEMPLOYMENT AND GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT PROJECTIONS. 2001-2002 | 19 |
| SPECIAL ISSUES | 22 |
| <i>The disparity in income between men and women has diminished during the decade, but continues being high</i> | 22 |
| <i>Decent Work development index, 1990-2000</i> | 45 |
| <i>Protection to the unemployed: Unemployment insurance in Latin America</i> | 48 |
| STATISTICAL ANNEX | 53 |

UNEMPLOYMENT REMAINS CONSTANT DESPITE THE STRONG FALL IN ECONOMIC GROWTH

Diminished expectations of economic growth

- Latin American expectations of GDP growth in 2001 decreased from 4.5% in October 2000, to 0.9% in the same month in 2001. Thus, the estimated economic growth rate for the present year diminished to practically a fifth of what was initially expected.
- Basically, growth expectations diminished due to the slowdown in global economic growth, as well as to the impact of recent terrorist attacks on the United States. The economic adjustment process from 2000 to 2001 caused the United States and Japan to reduce their growth from 5% to 1.1% and from 1.4% to -0.9% respectively. Furthermore, it is estimated that the GDP growth of the European Union countries will decrease from 3.5% to 1.5% over the same period. According to various specialized international organizations, this will lead to world growth amounting to only 1.5% in 2001, which will put the world on the threshold of a recession.
- The United States' economic slowdown, compared to 2000 caused a decreased growth in 2001 imports (down from 13.5% to 7%), and exports (from 9% to 5%), which will impact 50% of Latin American foreign trade. The level of Mexico's activities will suffer as a result of its close links to the United States, country that concentrates more than 80% of Mexican exports.
- It is estimated that financial uncertainty will give rise to reduced investment in the region. The increased "country risk" of Argentina and Mercosur's trade partners, together with the possibility of a generalized devaluation in the sub-region, have resulted in decreased flows to Latin America.
- Domestic factors must be added to the foreign position; Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru and Uruguay have considerably reduced growth expectations.

Labour performance: Unemployment has been maintained despite lower economic growth

Data regarding a select group of countries in the region for the first nine months this year show that:

- First of all, it is necessary to consider that the *2000 Labour Overview* indicated that Latin America's unemployment rate had reached 8.9% last year. However, changes in the coverage by the Household Survey in Colombia showed a reduced unemployment rate in that country (down from 20.4% to 17.2% in 2000). To this must be added the sudden fall in Brazil's unemployment rate during the last quarter last year and the lowest unemployment rate registered in Peru. These changes meant that the previous estimated regional unemployment (8.9%) diminished to 8.3% in 2000.
- Available figures show that the regional economic growth was 1.3% during the first six months of 2001, which is significantly below the 4.4% registered in the same period in 2000.
- Even with a lower economic growth, the average unemployment rate during the first three quarters of this year (8.3%) is similar to that registered during the same period last year.
- In global terms, the average unemployment rate remained constant as a result of the fall in the participation rate (varying from 56.8% to 56%) in a larger proportion than the reduction of the employment rate (diminished from 52% to 51.5%) from 2000 to 2001 respectively.

- The permanence of the regional unemployment rate from 2000 to 2001 should be the result of diverse unemployment behavior in the countries, since the unemployment rate also varies according to the gender and age of workers.
- Unemployment grew in all countries except Brazil and Ecuador. Data show, on one hand, a reduction in the unemployment rate for Brazil (1.0 percentage point) and Ecuador (3.9 percentage points) in these years and, on the other hand, an increase in the unemployment rate in most countries studied: Argentina (1.0 percentage point), Chile (0.1 percentage point), Colombia (1.5 percentage points), Mexico (0.2 percentage point), Peru (2.1 percentage points) and Uruguay (2.0 percentage points). In these conditions, the regional unemployment remained constant due basically to a reduction in Brazil's unemployment rate.
- The evolution of the unemployment rate by gender was differentiated by country. In Argentina, Colombia, Peru and Uruguay, unemployment rates increased for both men and women, the rate for women being higher than that for men. In Chile and Mexico these rates also increased, the rate for men being greater. In Brazil and Venezuela, unemployment rates by gender decreased. Brazil registered a significantly greater decrease in the unemployment rate for women than that for men.
- Even though the youth rate of unemployment decreased in most countries during the period under review, it continued to be elevated during the present year: Argentina (43%), Brazil (12.7%), Chile (19.5%), Colombia (33.9%), Mexico (4.6%), Peru (15.3%) and Uruguay (36.2%). The average of these youth rates of unemployment represents twice the general unemployment rate for the region.
- The purchasing power of wages increased this year. In real terms it showed a 1.7% increase in industrial wages and 3.0% increase in minimum wages during the first three quarters of 2001 compared to the same quarters in 2000. These wage increases are due, on one hand, to inflation evolution which diminished by 7.5% in the first nine months of 2000 and 5.6% during the same period in 2001 and, on the other hand, to the increase in productivity during the same period.
- To sum up, despite the international and regional situation of economic slowdown, there was no appreciable generalized deterioration in the Latin American labour market between 2000 and 2001. In five of fourteen countries being studied, (Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Trinidad and Tobago), progress was observed, characterized by a constantly maintained level of unemployment and of the informal sector, an increase in real terms of the industrial and minimum wages, as well as an increase in productivity in some of the countries. In others, five maintained last year's labour progress level, resulting from offsetting deterioration by the employment situation and the improvement in wages. Finally, the labour situation of the remaining five countries worsened, as indicated by increased unemployment and informality, as well as the reduction in industry's real wage.

Projections 2001 – 2002

Changes in the region's expected economic performance affect the projections of annual unemployment as shown in the following data:

- It is estimated that, even with a lower economic growth (0.9%), the regional unemployment rate will be around 8.3% in 2001, similar to the one registered in 2000.
- For the year 2002, a regional product growth of 1.5% is expected, that is to say, 0.6 percentage point more than the estimated growth for the present year. Despite the increase in this indicator, it is estimated that the unemployment rate for the year 2002 will be 8.8%, equivalent to a 0.5 percentage point increase compared to the estimated unemployment rate for 2001 (see Figure 9).

CHANGES IN ECONOMIC GROWTH EXPECTATIONS

Over the last nine months, there have been important changes in the estimated growth of the GDP in Latin America for the year 2001. These have varied from the International Monetary Fund's 4.5% estimate in October 2000, down to 3% estimated by ECLAC and the IADB in May 2001, to 2.0% predicted by ECLAC again in July 2001, and down to 0.9% estimated by a group of specialized international organizations in November this year (see Figure 1), all of which implies a significant reduction in expected GDP growth in the region.

The decreased expectation for the region's growth is due to the following:

Slowdown in global growth: The world's major economies (United States and Japan and, to a lesser degree, the European Union) have experienced significant downward trends in their projected production increase, due to the adjustments undergone after a long period of growth characterized by expansion of technology producing sectors. This adjustment process implied a reduction in the prices of technological market stock, followed by a reduction in consumer


levels due to the negative "wealth effect" generated by the fall in the world's stock exchanges. The result of this process has been a reduced growth of the United States and Japan that is expected to diminish from 5% in 2000 to 1.1% in 2001 in the first country, and from 1.4% to -0.9% in the latter, over the same period of time (see Figure 2). Furthermore, it is estimated that the GDP of the European Union countries will diminish from 3.5% to 1.5% during the same period. This means that the growth of world economy will be reduced to 1.5% in 2001 and will reach a similar level in 2002 (World Bank). A slowdown in economic growth is forecast, to be accompanied by a lesser expansion of world trade; decreased growth in volume by almost half, dropping from 12% in 2000 to about 6.5% in 2001 (ECLAC, 2001).

Decrease in international trade: The United States of America represents today a little over 50% of Latin American foreign trade, so that the reduction of its growth would have a devastating impact on trade flows in the region. In fact, the growth of United States imports would decrease from 13.5% to 7% and that of exports from 9% to 5% between the years 2000 and 2001 (ECLAC, 2001). Although this reduction would give rise to a strong regional impact, its intensity would vary from country to country. Thus, for example, Mexico's foreign trade depends on the US market for




FIGURE 1

**LATIN AMERICA
PROJECTED GDP GROWTH FOR 2001
(percentages)**



Source: ILO, based on A: IMF (October 2000); B: Consensus Forecast (December 2000); C: ECLAC (May 2001); D: ECLAC (August 2001); E: IMF (November 2001).

FIGURE 2
UNITED STATES AND JAPAN
GDP GROWTH. CONSENSUS FORECAST, 2000-2001
(percentages)



Source: ILO, based on information from public and private international organizations.

more than 80% of its exports, while Mercosur countries dedicate only 15% of their trade to that market.

Reduction in prices and export levels: A reduction is expected in prices and quantities of regional exportation products as a result of the fall in demand of the world markets. Nevertheless, the greatest impact would be felt in export prices, causing a decrease in the exchange rates, with an income effect that would reduce regional consumption levels even more.

Financial instability: Recent events in Argentina have given rise to uncertainty in international financial markets. These perceived the possibility of eliminating the conversion programme, which provoked an increase in the country risk factor of both Argentina and its trade partners in Mercosur. Moreover, the possibility of generalized devaluation in the sub-region has had an influence on reducing the investment flow to Latin America and on redirecting it. At the present time, 70% of new investments is concentrated in Mexico, while the remaining 30% is basically destined to Brazil. The reduction of the investment flow could have

a negative influence on the region's economic growth, both present and future.


The terrorist attacks of 11 September this year have also contributed to increasing the instability of economies in the most developed countries, especially that of the United States. This had an important effect on economic activity levels and employment in Latin American and Caribbean countries. These impacts were noted in decreased tourism, increased taxes for freight and insurance, and also for maquila related activities and remittances from United States immigrants to some of the countries in the region.

Countries' expected differentiated economic growth behavior

The joint effect of the mentioned factors is added to each country's own contingencies (see Figure 3). With the exception of Ecuador and Venezuela, the prospects of growth of selected countries in the region diminished between October 2000 and September this year.

FIGURE 3

LATIN AMERICA
GDP GROWTH BY COUNTRY IN 2000 AND PROJECTIONS FOR 2001
(percentages)



Source: ILO, based on official country data.

The most significant cases are Argentina, due to its difficulty in responding to the conditions imposed by the financial shield in 2000; Brazil, that, apart from absorbing the effect of its neighboring country, was facing an energy crisis; Peru, that underwent strong political changes this year; and Chile, that suffered a period of reduced growth due to the slowdown in its domestic demand.

Countries with expectations of GDP growth in 2001 showing the greatest reductions compared to performance achieved in 2000 are: Brazil (from 4.5% to 1.4%), Chile (from 5.4% to 3.2%), Mexico (from 6.8% to 0.5%), Peru (from 4.0% to 0.2%) and Uruguay (from 2.0% to -0.4%).

In this respect it should be noted that the changes in the production growth of the countries do not have symmetrical effects on unemployment at the regional level. Given the incidence of unemployment in each country, the region's total unemployment is different from its participation in the regional GDP. For example, Brazil and Mexico represent together about 60% of the region's economically active population (EAP) and, therefore, the behavior of the respective unemployment rates practically determines the gradual development of the regional average. Projections indicate that,

although both countries' economies showed lower growth in 2001 than in 2000, both countries will grow sufficiently in the present year to stimulate greater employment and thus achieve a lower unemployment rate (Brazil) or one similar to that of last year (Mexico).

LABOUR MARKET PERFORMANCE


In order to study the labour performance of countries in the region from 2000 to 2001, consideration must be given to the behavior of total unemployment by gender and age; the participation and occupation rate, as well as changes in the purchasing power of industrial and minimum wages.

Differentiated evolution of unemployment by country

The unemployment rate level for all selected countries during the first three quarters of 2001 remains practically constant as during the similar period last year. This occurs even though the economic growth of 1.3% in the first six months of 2001 is lower than the 4.4% registered during the same period in 2000 in the same countries (see Statistical Annex).

FIGURE 4

**LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES a/
GDP GROWTH AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, 1998-2001
(percentages)**



Source: ILO, based on official country data.

a/ Includes Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The unemployment rate (weighted average) of all the countries studied amounts to 8.3% for the first nine months of 2001. This figure implies a fall of 0.1 percentage point compared to 8.4% registered for the same countries during the same reference period in 2000 (see Figure 4). This reduction is due to the strong decline in Brazil's unemployment rate (down from 7.2% to 6.2%) and in Ecuador (down from 14.9% to 11.0%) during the same period. This contrasted with the recorded increase in the unemployment rates of Argentina (from 15.4% to 16.4%), Colombia (from 17.2% to 18.7%), Chile (from 9.4% to 9.5%), Mexico (from 2.2% to 2.4%) and Uruguay (from 13.4% to 15.4%).

It should be noted that the evolution of the unemployment rate in most of the countries studied follows a downward tendency observed since the second half of 2000. In this respect, among the important factors of the reduced regional unemployment rate is that of Brazil (down from 7.2% to 6.2% during the period), and also the low and relatively constant levels registered by the unemployment rate in Mexico (about 2.3%). Given the high incidence of Brazil's labour force in the region's EAP (42%), the decline in this country's unemployment rate 1.0 percentage point is a very

important stabilizing factor in the region's average unemployment rate from 2000 to 2001.

Unemployment evolution of men and women


The aggregate unemployment tendency is also observed in the evolution of the rates of unemployment according to gender, which had a gradual development differentiated by countries (see Statistical Annex). In Argentina, Colombia, Peru and Uruguay, the unemployment rates increased for both genders, the increase in the rate for women being greater than that for men. These rates also increased in Chile and Mexico, the increase being greater in the rate for men. In Brazil and Venezuela the unemployment rates for men and women declined. However, in Brazil the decline was seen to be significantly greater in the unemployment rate for women.

Youth unemployment is reduced

The youth rate of unemployment registered different behavior depending on the country. In Brazil, unemployment of young workers between 15 and 17 years

FIGURE 5

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
LABOUR SUPPLY AND EMPLOYMENT, 1998-2000 a/
(percentages)



Source: ILO, based on official country data and projections.

a/ Includes Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

of age, and 18 and 24 years of age declined (3.7 and 2.0 percentage points, respectively). The same occurred in Peru (the 14 to 24 year rate declined 2.9 percentage points), Chile (decreased by 0.6 percentage point for 15-19 years of age) and Mexico (declined 0.1 percent point for 12-19 years of age).

However, Argentina's unemployment registered an increase (of 3.5 percentage points for 15-19 year olds), Colombia (unemployment rate for the 12-17 and 18-24 years of age rose 2.7 and 1.7 percentage points respectively), Chile in the 20-24 years of age (3.9 percentage points), Mexico in the 20-24 year old segment (0.5 percentage point) and Uruguay (4.5 percentage points). Even so, the youth rate of unemployment remains high, considering its level is equal to twice (2.0) that of the general unemployment rate.

Participation and occupation rate diminishes

Maintaining the unemployment rate in 2001 (8.3%) –even in conditions of less growth compared to last year– is due to the slowdown in the growth of the labour force and also that of employment during the period (see Statistical Annex). Consequently, the rate

of participation diminished from 56.7% in 2000 to 56.0% (-0.9 tenths) in the same period in 2001. This reduction is similar to that registered by the occupation rate that went from 52% to 51.4% (-0.6 tenths) in the same reference period (see Figure 5).

The evolution of the rates of participation and occupation differs by countries during the period (see Statistical Annex). Data show that in most of these countries the participation rates decrease: Brazil (1.5 percentage points), Chile (1.0), Ecuador (0.9) and Mexico (0.6) where in the last two years it has been lower than the unit. Only in Peru did the fall from 3.1 percentage points result from a recession that lasted for three years. However, the occupation rate has decreased (with the exception of Costa Rica, Ecuador and Venezuela).

The lower unemployment rate in Ecuador (-3.9 percentage points) is due to both the decreased participation rate (-0.9 tenths) and the increase in the occupation rate (2.7 tenths). Unemployment also decreased in Brazil (see Statistical Annex). However, this is due to the fact that the lower participation rate (-1.5 percentage points) is greater than that registered by the occupation rate (-0.9 percentage points).

On the other hand, unemployment is rising in Costa Rica since the increase in the participation rate (2.0 tenths) is greater than that registered by the occupation rate (0.6 tenths). In Argentina, Colombia and Uruguay, greater unemployment is the result of an increase in the participation rate that is, however, accompanied by the decrease in the occupation rate. Finally, the rate of unemployment is increasing slightly in Chile and Mexico, as a result of both countries

having a reduction in the occupation rate that is greater than that of the participation rate (see Box 1).

To sum up, the region's average unemployment situation has not deteriorated from 2000 to 2001. However, this is basically due to Brazil's progress that offset the deterioration felt in this field by most countries.

Box 1

FALL IN THE PARTICIPATION RATE PREVENTED GREATER UNEMPLOYMENT

Adjustment policies to face the Asian crisis and later disparities felt by some Latin American countries had a significant impact on the region's economically active population (EAP) during the last ten years. In fact, the increased labour supply in Latin America remained high until 1997 (3.2% per annum) as a result, among other factors, of the constant rural/urban migration, the rapid incorporation into the labour market of women from all social strata –especially from the poorest sectors– and also, as a result of poverty, a greater number of young people being prematurely forced to join the labour market.

Due to these changes, the total participation rate (ratio between the EAP and the working age population) increased from 55.2% in 1990 to 57.5% in 1997. For its part, the male participation rate increased slightly from 71.8% to 72.2% in these years, while the participation rate for women increased fast from 40.7% to 45.4% between 1990 and 1997 (see Statistical Annex).

The lesser growth of economic activity from 1998 onwards (the annual GDP growth was 1.9% from 1998 to 2001, compared to the 3.6% annual rate registered

in the 1990-1997 period), influenced the decrease of the region's global participation rate. This diminished from 57.5% in 1997 to 56.0% in the first three quarters of 2001.

On one hand, it is noteworthy that the 1.5 percentage points reduction in the participation rate meant that in Latin America, 3.3 million "discouraged" people abandoned the labour market between 1997 and 2001. This phenomenon is especially noticeable in Brazil, where approximately 1.6 million workers left the labour force during the adjustment period.


On the other hand, the 1.5 percentage points fall in the participation rate between 1997 and 2001 prevented an increase in unemployment during this period. In fact, if the participation rate level achieved by 1997 (57.5%) had been maintained to 2001, the unemployment rate would be 10.5% instead of the 8.3% registered at present. Therefore, the reduced participation rate contributed significantly to containing the increase in unemployment (2.2 percentage points) generated by the adjustment to both the effects of the Asian crisis and, later, the imbalances registered in some countries in the region.

The following tendencies by countries were observed in the participation rate of men and women between 1997 and 2001.


The lack of expectation of finding a job meant a reduction in labour participation by both men and women

in countries such as Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico whose labour force represented about 70% of the EAP in the region. Therefore the evolution of the participation rate in these countries was a determinant in the decline of the region's average rate between 1997 and 2001.


ARGENTINA
Total participation rate and by gender, 1997-2001
(percentages)




BRAZIL
Total participation rate and by gender, 1997-2001
(percentages)



CHILE
Total participation rate and by gender, 1997-2001
(percentages)



MEXICO
Total participation rate and by gender, 1997-2001
(percentages)




Source: ILO, based on country Household Surveys.


However, unlike the above-mentioned cases, adjustment policies in Colombia and Panama led to an

expansion of the labour participation rate of both men and women.

COLOMBIA
Total participation rate and by gender, 1997-2001
(percentages)




PANAMA
Total participation rate and by gender, 1997-2001
(percentages)




In Uruguay and Venezuela, the overall participation rate increased. However, this was due exclusively to the sustained increase in labour participation by

women, that offset the negative tendency of men's participation.

URUGUAY
Total participation rate and by gender, 1997-2001
(percentages)



VENEZUELA
Total participation rate and by gender, 1997-2001
(percentages)



Source: ILO, based on country Household Surveys.

Improvement of purchasing power of industrial and minimum wages

Industry's real wages improved due to the lower inflation. At the regional level, industrial wages showed a 1.7% average increase (see Statistical Annex), especially in Mexico (5.1%), Paraguay (3.4%) and Peru (2.4%). The remaining countries showed increases lower than 1.7% except for Uruguay, where real wages in industry decreased by 1%.

The continuing *minimum wages* improvement policy was reflected in the 3% growth of their purchasing power in the first three quarters of 2001 compared to the same period in 2000 (see Figure 6 and Statistical Annex). On the other hand, real minimum wage increased significantly during the first half of the present year in Bolivia (10.4%), Brazil (11.1%), Panama (6.9%) and Venezuela (7.1%).

Finally, it is noteworthy that the increase in real wages in the region is due, in part, to lower inflation. This fell from 7.5% from January to September 2000 to 5.6% during the same period in 2001, and also to the increase in productivity, estimated at 1.6% in the case of formal activities.

TRENDS OF LABOUR PROGRESS IN 2001

The quality of labour performance


Countries show different labour figures comparing the first three quarters of 2001 and a similar period in 2000. This is so because while in some countries the labour market improved, in others it remained the same, though it worsened for most countries affected by the general economic slowdown.

In this respect, two types of improvement were shown by the indicators used to measure labour's market progress. On one hand, a great number of countries underwent deterioration of the unemployment and informality indicators, as a result of a reduction of levels of economic growth achieved in 2001 compared to growth rates of previous years. On the other hand, a generalized positive variation was seen in the purchasing power of both the industrial wage and the minimum wage, as a result of the decreasing tendency of inflation in the region. Thus, the behavior of wage indicators counteracted the employment indicators, thus explaining why the region did not suffer a greater loss in the quality of its labour situation. Finally, productiv



FIGURE 6

**LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES a/
REAL WAGES AND INFLATION, 1999-2001
(annualized rates of growth)**



Source: ILO, based on official country data.

a/ Includes Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

ity indicators, in the countries under study, reflect uneven behavior, with similar number of increases and decreases.

Changes also were not similar for all the countries under study (see Table 1). Despite the tendencies indicated above, there are countries that show improvements in most of the indicators, others retained their relatively stable situation due to indicators while offsetting each other, a third group registered a loss in labour market quality. To show this differentiated behavior, the three groups of countries are presented as related to labour quality in 2001:

High

This classification includes those countries that have undergone positive changes in all or, at least four of the five indicators considered in the classification. In this respect, improvements imply a reduction in open unemployment, keeping informality, the increase in real wages, both industrial and minimum, and the increase in the product per workers employed.

This high performance group includes five countries: Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Trinidad and Tobago. In Brazil and Trinidad and Tobago there was

TABLE 1
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: CLASSIFICATION OF COUNTRIES
ACCORDING TO THE QUALITY OF THE LABOUR MARKET'S BEHAVIOR IN 2001 a/
(variations compared to 2000)

| Countries | Open unemployment | Informality b/ | Industry's Real Wage | Minimum Real Wage | Productivity |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| HIGH | | | | | |
| Barbados | - | o | + | + | o |
| Brazil | - | + | + | + | + |
| Chile | o | o | + | + | + |
| Ecuador | - | + | + | + | - |
| Trinidad and Tobago | - | + | + | + | + |
| MEDIUM | | | | | |
| Costa Rica | + | - | o | + | + |
| Mexico | + | - | + | + | - |
| Panama | + | - | + | + | n.d. |
| Venezuela | - | + | + | + | - |
| LOW | | | | | |
| Argentina | + | o | o | + | o |
| Peru | + | + | + | + | n.d. |
| Colombia | + | + | + | + | - |
| Jamaica | o | + | - | o | o |
| Uruguay | + | o | - | - | o |
| INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION c/ | | | | | |
| Bolivia | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | - | n.d. |
| El Salvador | n.d. | n.d. | n.d. | - | n.d. |
| Honduras | n.d. | + | n.d. | + | n.d. |
| Paraguay | n.d. | n.d. | + | - | n.d. |

Source: ILO, based on data from the Statistical Annex in this report.

a/ Variation in the January-September 2001 period compared to the same period in 2000.

b/ Variation in the incidence of informal employment on the total in the last two periods on which there is available information.

c/ Insufficient information at the time of publishing this report.

Notes: The symbols refer to variations in the characteristics indicated. The signs indicate: + Increase - Decrease or o Constant. The colors reflect the nature of the changes.

■ Positive
■ Negative
□ Neutral

n.d.: Information not available.



improved performance in all indicators with the exception of the informal sector, which increased. In the case of Brazil, the improvement in labour performance is particularly noticeable since it was a year of marked economic slowdown. In Ecuador, a country that attained a GDP growth far higher than the average (4.5% compared to the regional average of 0.9%) both employment and wage indicators reflect an advance, while productivity is suffering a setback. Chile presents a stable level in unemployment and informal sector indicators, and increases in the minimum wage, the industrial wage and productivity. Barbados, however, shows progress due to the reduction in open unemployment and the increase in both industrial and minimum real wages. In this country the informal sector and productivity remained unchanged.

Medium

In this category, the behavior of employment, wages and productivity indicators varies from country to country. While some indicators improve, others deteriorate, thus offsetting each other and maintaining the labour performance relatively balanced.

Four countries belong to the segment showing an intermediate level of development: Costa Rica, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela. In all of them, the real minimum wage increased while open unemployment increased in the first three countries. Costa Rica also registered improvement in the informal sector and productivity indicators, while Mexico showed an increase in the industrial wage and a reduction in productivity.

In Panama, open unemployment is increasing, even though informality is decreasing, and the purchasing power of the industrial and minimum wages increased. Finally, in Venezuela, open unemployment reduction and an increase of the industrial wage are offset by greater informality and a decrease in the product per worker.

Low

This group considers those countries that have suffered a setback in their labour situation as a result of

the deterioration in the indicators under study. It includes Argentina, Colombia, Jamaica, Peru and Uruguay. All of them, except Jamaica, underwent increases in unemployment. Both Peru and Colombia registered greater levels of informality that were offset by an improved purchasing power in the industrial and minimum wages. Though, in Colombia productivity decreased. In Argentina, informality, real wage and productivity levels remained constant, and the increase in the minimum wage is due basically to a deflation of -0.8%. Uruguay faces the greatest setback. To an increase in unemployment is added a reduction in the industrial and minimum real wages, while the informal sector and productivity do not vary.

In despite the international and regional economic slowdown, there was not a remarkable generalized deterioration of the labour market in Latin America and the Caribbean between 2000 and 2001. In five of the fourteen countries covered by this study (Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Trinidad and Tobago), progress can be detected by reduced or constant unemployment, reduced informality in some of them, an increase in terms of industrial and minimum real wages, as well as increased productivity. In five others, last year's level was maintained as a result of the deteriorated employment situation being offset by the improvement in wages. Finally, the labour situation of the five remaining countries worsened, as indicated by increased unemployment and informality, as well as a fall in the real industrial wage.

The increase of open unemployment in most countries (see Table 1), requires the putting into practice of effective employment policies in order to moderate its impact, especially for the group of workers earning the lowest wages. In this respect, it is known that in times when the rhythm of economic growth is reduced or modified, the labour market does not automatically regulate the unemployment level. Thus, in a period of low economic growth such as at present, government intervention is very important through direct employment programmes and policies permitting an increase in the employment level and, therefore, reducing the unemployed within a short period (see Box 2).



Box 2

ACTIVE EMPLOYMENT POLICIES AS AN ANSWER TO THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

For some time active employment policies were set aside on the understanding that they had to do with intervention of a kind of social assistance that made no improvement in the functioning of the labour market. However, in recent years many Latin American countries have started to reconsider their worth in the face of the severe crisis. The increase in unemployment that in some cases exceeded double-digit rates, was not alien to this upsurge. When the unemployment rate is persistently high, governments should intervene in some way to alleviate the situation of the most vulnerable groups.

This view, stating that these policies are adequate only in periods of crisis, hardly presents even a partial vision of their potential. In a wider view, active policies can be utilized also in more stable periods with a composition and in magnitudes different to those implemented during the crisis. That is how the recent Nobel Prize winner for Economics understands it, (Joseph Stiglitz, *Employment, social justice and societal well-being*, ILO, Geneva, November, 2001), and who observed that, in periods of economic growth, transition, crisis or, even recession, markets do not rapidly and automatically achieve full employment and, moreover, it is almost universally recognized that governments play an important role in facilitating the creation of jobs and maintaining the economy at full employment levels.

Argentina and Chile are two countries that are implementing important programmes of this type. In Argentina, programmes were introduced during the second half of the 1990s to combat the persistent high unemployment rates (exceeding 14%, equivalent to two million people). Chile, for its part, began implementing these programmes in 1999 when faced with the rapid increase in unemployment as a result of the Asian crisis (the number of unemployed doubled from

331,000 in the third quarter of 1997 to 664,000 in the same quarter in 1999, the highest point of the crisis).

Work and Labour Emergency-Community Development are the most important programmes being carried out in Argentina at this time. Both programmes concentrate 85% of the beneficiaries of active policies. The *Work Programme's* objective is to give temporary work to the poor unemployed workers in order to alleviate the impact of the reduced income on their households and to improve their employability. Beneficiaries of the programme are the unemployed over 16 years of age with low labour qualifications and great difficulty entering the labour market. Those who participate in the programme receive a monthly subsidy of 160 dollars and are covered by work related accidents and health insurance. The *Labour Emergency-Community Development Programme* has two lines of action: a) developing activities aimed at community service, and b) public works and manufacturers for the community. All the projects must include training for their beneficiaries so as to increase their employability and self-employment opportunities. The target population is the unemployed and unskilled poor but, in these cases, they must be over 18 years of age, heads of families and 60% of the beneficiaries should be women. Benefits consist in 120 dollars for the first action line and 160 dollars for the second one, both having work related accidents coverage and free training.

In Chile, early programmes consisted on creating direct jobs at municipal level. They developed very quickly, since 100,000 jobs were created in less than a year. Later assessments indicate that the lack of focus and efficiency converted them mainly into social assistance programmes, which attracted, to a certain degree, people who were until then outside the labour market. During 2000, faced with incipient economy reactivation and with the additional objec-

tive of regaining fiscal balance, the number of programme beneficiaries was gradually reduced. Nevertheless, towards the end of the year, it was clear that the economic growth was not creating enough jobs, and so the programmes were reactivated, but with a different nature. By the third quarter of 2001, the programmes had already created 150,000 jobs.

Over this subject, some comments should be made. In the first place it was not supposed to be a matter of dealing with jobs created exclusively by the public sector, trying to promote a more stable entry in the labour market through the programmes. In the second place, it had to be prevented that the programmes generated an artificial increase in the labour force, so it was decided to give priority to the unemployed heads of families. In the third place, it looked for a better geographical distribution of available resources, thus, distribution is now being based on unemployment rates and poverty levels. Finally, it was expected that the programmes gradually improved the employability of the workers.

Insofar as the employment programmes components were concerned, an immediate start was made in carrying out public works (by private concessionaires). These had an impact during the first months of 2000, but by the third quarter of the same year they no longer generated new jobs. Nevertheless, among the most important programmes there is a learning and hiring bonus (which, by September 2001, concentrated 28% of the total jobs generated) and that of investment in the community, that represented 16%. The bonus had a maximum time span of four months, during which a subsidy of up to 40% of a minimum monthly salary was given to each new worker contracted plus a one time only payment of 50,000 pesos (equivalent to 75 dollars) to finance training costs. The programme gives priority to applications offering work contracts for at least two months (minimum requisite), with a salary level of from one to two minimum wages in regions having the highest levels of unemployment. The programme considering investment in the community fosters both physical and/

or social works of local scope, provided that these are characterized by the intensive use of labour force and contribute to improve the community surroundings. Monthly pay per worker is from one to two minimum wages. Should these works be executed through private firms, the labour force, inputs and services to be carried out are partially financed from two to four months. Programmes carried out through nonprofit organizations or through the municipalities count with financing for labour and partial payment for inputs, and the financing period is four months.

In periods of economic growth and sufficient job creation with low unemployment rates, active employment policies should concentrate on improving employability of those laid off, unemployment that, for the most part of it, is of a frictional nature. However, in situations of very high unemployment when economies are not generating new jobs, active policies try to reduce, as much as possible, the high unemployment levels. Therefore, in these situations it is imperative that programmes achieve significant coverage, which requires an important financial and organizational effort.

One way of estimating the magnitude of the effort carried out is to calculate the reduction in the unemployment rate resulting from the application of the programmes, in the cases of Argentina and Chile. In both countries, the coverage of programmes shows important variations throughout the year, since they try to moderate the unemployment cycles. Considering annual averages, in Argentina, unemployment was reduced by 0.8 percentage points in 1999, 0.6 in 2000 and 0.7 percentage points in 2001. In Chile, levels were higher: 1.0 percentage point in 1999, 0.7 points in 2000 and 1.5 percentage points in 2001. Although these percentages overestimate the programmes effect on the unemployment rate (because the programmes may have attracted persons who were not active in the labour market), undoubtedly they constitute an important initiative in a crisis context, particularly when they were aimed principally at heads of poor families.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT PROJECTIONS. 2001-2002

The strong economic slowdown affecting economies in the region in the first three quarters of this year severely limit the possibilities for improving the labour situation in Latin America and the Caribbean in 2001.

Projections indicate that the Latin American GDP will grow by 0.9% this year (November 2001). This means that the region's economic growth in 2001 will be a quarter of that registered in 2000 (4.1%). On the other hand, a moderate recovery is expected in 2002 with a GDP growth rate of 1.5%, which will give rise to an increased participation rate. As a result, the unemployment rate is estimated to be 8.3% in 2001 and 8.8% in 2002.


2001 Projections

Projections estimate, first of all, that the regional GDP growth rate during the second semester of the present year (0.5%) will be lower than that registered in the first quarter (1.3%), which will result in an annual economic growth of 0.9% in 2001 (see Statistical Annex).

Secondly, projections show that during the second semester of 2001, the slowdown in economic growth would have a negative effect on the compressed participation rates at the beginning of the following year, that will diminish more slowly than the occupation rates of the overall countries (see Statistical Annex). Thus, the estimated regional unemployment rate for the second semester (8.4%) will be greater than that

FIGURE 7


LATIN AMERICA UNEMPLOYMENT RATE AND GDP GROWTH OBSERVED IN 2000 AND PROJECTED FOR 2001 (percentages)



Source: ILO, based on official country data and projections.

FIGURE 8

**LATIN AMERICA
UNEMPLOYMENT RATE BY COUNTRY IN 2000
AND PROJECTION FOR 2001
(percentages)**



Source: ILO, based on official country data and projections.

registered in the first part of the year (8.3%). Consequently, the projected unemployment rate for the region will reach 8.3% in 2001, similar to the level reached in 2000 (see Figure 7).

Noteworthy is the fact that projections show that the unemployment rate will be maintained from 2000 to 2001, considering that this year the economic growth will be significantly less than last year. As indicated, this may be due to the decline in the participation rate in 2001 (that occurs despite recovery during the second half of the year) and also the relative stagnation of the occupation rate.

Finally, projections show that maintaining the regional unemployment rate from 2000 to 2001 would be the result of diverse unemployment behavior in the selected countries. In fact, data shows on the one hand a decline in Brazil's unemployment rate (1.0 percentage point) and that of Ecuador (-3.9 percentage points) over these two years and, moreover, an increase in the unemployment rate in the rest of the countries:

Argentina (1.0 percentage point) Chile (0.1 percentage point), Colombia (1.5 percentage points), Mexico (0.2 percentage point) and Uruguay (2.0 percentage points) (see Figure 8). In this respect, the maintenance of the unemployment rate from 2000 to 2001 is due exclusively to Brazil's performance, given the great importance of the EAP (42%) in that country of the regional total.

2002 Projections

For the coming year it is estimated that the regional product growth will be 1.5% and that the unemployment rate will be around 8.8%, equivalent to a 0.5 percentage point increase compared to the estimated unemployment rate for 2001 (see Figure 9).

The foreseen unemployment evolution is due basically to a reversal in the tendency of determinants in the unemployment rate seen in 2001. For next year, an increase is expected in the participation rate levels of

each country. Conversely, given the moderate growth expected, the employment rate most probably will not move or will grow at a much lower rate than the participation rate, which may result in an unemployment increase.


However, these expectations are not the same in all countries, as a result of the diverse growth levels of the GDP expected for next year (see Statistical Annex). In fact, for 2002 a greater economic growth is expected in Chile, rising from 3.2% to 3.5%, Argentina from -1.6% to 0.4%, Colombia from 2.2% to 2.5%, Mexico, from 0.5% to 2.0%, Peru from 0.2% to 3.0% and Uruguay from -0.4% to 1.5%. Growth will remain stagnant in Brazil (at 1.4%). Finally, a decrease will be registered in the indicators for Ecuador (from 4.5% to 3.0%) and Venezuela (from 3.2% to 2.0%).

Estimated development of the product will have different effects on the unemployment rate of the mentioned countries. For the group of countries with expected GDP increases compared to 2001, a reduction in the unemployment rate is expected for 2002. Thus, this indicator will diminish in the cases of Argentina (falling from 16.9% to 16.7%), Chile (from 9.3% to 9.0%), Colombia (from 18.4% to 18.0%) and Uruguay from 15.2% to 14.8%). Mexico will be the only country that, despite its higher growth, will suffer an increase in the unemployment rate (2.5% to 2.7%).

In all the other cases it is estimated that the unemployment rate will rise as a result of the lower rhythm of growth. This will generate an increase in the unemployment rate in Brazil (from 6.3% to 7.1%), Ecuador (from 11.3% to 11.5%) and Venezuela (from 13.8% to 13.9%).

FIGURE 9

LATIN AMERICA: GDP GROWTH AND UNEMPLOYMENT, 1999-2002*
(percentages)



Source: ILO, based on official country data and projections.
* Estimates.

SPECIAL ISSUES

The disparity in income between men and women has diminished during the decade, but continues being high

Wage differentials continue being one of the most persistent disparities between men and women, and are therefore the central issue in nearly all discussions on providing equal opportunities and no discrimination for reasons of gender in the labour world. ILO Convention N° 100 (1951), establishing the principle of *equal remuneration for equal work* was ratified by 154 countries throughout the world, including 31 of the 35 member States of the ILO in Latin America and the Caribbean. In a year when this Convention celebrates its 50th Anniversary, one of the sections of this *Labour Overview* edition is dedicated to the issue of differences in incomes between men and women in Latin America.

The purpose of this study is, first of all, to assess the income gap and its ongoing development during the decade of the 1990s. Secondly, to detect some of the factors that have influenced it. Among these can be cited the different structural composition of the male and female labour force (for example, their different possibilities of access to formal and informal jobs), the number of hours worked by women and men, their age and educational level.

Two basic dimensions were considered in the discussion on advances made toward gender equality in matters of income. On the one hand, in order to assess the degree of direct gender-based discrimination, a study was made to analyze the magnitude and development of the income gap within the most possible homogenous occupied groups, while also supervising other variables such as the number of working hours and the schooling level and age of both men and women workers. On the other hand, in order to study the more general issue of equal opportunities between men and women, it is fundamental to consider also the possibilities of their respective access to and permanence in better-paid types of employment.

The analysis showed here suggests that the main advances made during the decade referred to the first of these two dimensions. In fact, the income gap per

working hour between men and women, although significantly diminished in each occupational segment, continues to be large. Unequal opportunities of access by men and women to better quality jobs derived, among other things, from problems of employment structure, occupational segmenting by gender and unequal distribution of domestic and family responsibilities, resulted in the permanence of large gaps in aggregate remuneration that is reflected in significant differences in monthly incomes.

The data used refers to figures on employment and work income of different occupied groups by gender, age and education, obtained from household surveys in 15 countries (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela) for the 1999-2000 period. As a point of reference, the non-agricultural EAP of these countries amounted to 103 million people and represents 92% of the total non-agricultural EAP of Latin America at the end of the 1990s.

It is also important that the results of this study be considered with caution. This is because the data from the household surveys –that are commonly used in this type of analyses, because they cover wide segments of occupation in a significant number of countries– are less accurate than those from surveys of establishments.

In order to carry out a comparison of men and women's income, it was established an overall analysis of the non-agricultural employment and the work income average per hour and per month for the main occupation of each of the defined occupational groups. In this respect, the occupied men or women that appear without any data in one of the variables under analysis and their unpaid families were not considered (see Annex, Table 1).

The evolution of the work income gap between men and women falls within a context of real remuneration

growth of non-agricultural workers from 1990 to 2000. When considering the figures from ten Latin American countries, it can be noted that there is an increase in real remuneration of private wage earners in eight of them and also of those workers in the public sector. To sum up, a real work income growth is registered when considering the total of non-agricultural workers (including the informal sector) in seven of the ten countries. Moreover, the minimum wage increased in real terms in all countries during the 1990s.

Specifically, the increase in minimum wage appears to have had an important effect on the increase in remuneration for domestic service (an activity in which women predominate), which partly explains the large reduction in the income gap between occupied men and women in the informal sector during the period under study.

The conclusions reached by the study are as follows:

- The real remuneration growth was, on the average, greater between women than between men, which resulted in a reduced work income gap for the first compared with the second.
- The ratio of income per working hour for women and men respectively has increased significantly during the decade from 0.68 in 1990 to 0.78 in 2000. In other words, the income gap per working hour between men and women decreased by 32% in the first year and 22% in the second. This shows that, despite the progress made in matters of women's wages, the income gap per working hour for women compared to men continues to be elevated at the end of the last decade.
- On the other hand, when comparing the monthly income for women and men as a complementary indicator to the previous one, it can be seen to rise from 0.59 to 0.66 during the decade. It is noteworthy that when using this ratio, it registers an important decrease in the monthly income gap during the decade (from 41% in 1990 to 34% in 2000), although this magnitude is significantly higher than the income gap per working hour.
- The difference between the two indicators is due to the shorter working days average for women (39.9 weekly hours compared to 46.8 weekly hours for men) according to data at the end of the 1990s. Thus, for example, a comparison of the *income per working hour* for men and women was 0.78 in 2000. However, the comparison of a *monthly income* amounts to only 0.66 given the differential of the working days indicated.
- In some occupational segments the weekly income gap has been significantly reduced between women and men, as in the case of microenterprises and the public sector. In various countries, income per working hour for women exceed those for men in these same segments.
- When calculating the income gap between wage earners, it is important to note whether this includes domestic service or not. If it is not included, the income gap between women and men is reduced. In fact, the income gap of overall wage earners by working hour is 18%. Nevertheless, if we exclude domestic service, the income gap is reduced to 4%. These indicators corresponded respectively to 26% and 12% at the beginning of the decade.
- Data on overall wage earners (excluding domestic service) by the more homogeneous occupational groups, show the persistence of an important gap per working hour. This reaches almost 30% in the most qualified segments of employment, and to approximately 20% in the less qualified segments. This indicates that, far from diminishing, the wage differentials between men and women tend to increase as the size of the enterprise increases as well as the women/men workers' schooling levels raises.
- An increase in the educational level generates higher remuneration for both men and women. However, the income gap between men and women tends to expand instead of closing when faced with the increase of workers' schooling.
- Likewise, the work income gap between men and women increases significantly as the age of the

workers increases. The greatest wage differentials between older workers with higher education indicates greater difficulties facing women and their access to well-paid jobs.

Diminished aggregate income gap of women/men in the 1990s

The difference between income average for women and for men diminished during the past decade. Considering the data for non-agricultural workers of the overall 15 countries studied, it can be seen that the ratio between the income per working hour for women and men increased from 0.68 at the beginning of the decade (1990-1993) to 0.78 at the end of it (1998-2000). In other words, the income gap per working

hour between women and men in non-agricultural sectors decreased from 32% to 22% during this period (see Table 1a).

An estimate of the gap between income average for women and men produces an important difference in the calculation, depending on whether the remuneration is considered by working hour or by month. Generally, the gap is significantly greater (in all categories) when measured with monthly income than in the case of income per working hour. In fact, when calculating the relation of income for men and women with monthly data, the indicator increases from 0.59 at the beginning of the decade to 0.66 at the end of it. In this case, the income gap decreases from 41% to 34% over the same period (see Annex, Table 2).

TABLE 1a

**LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR INCOME AVERAGE
IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS, 1990-2000
(men/women ratio)**

| Country and period | Women/Men Ratio 1990-1993 | Women/Men Ratio 1999-2000 |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Argentina ^{a/} | | 0,94 |
| Brazil | 0,63 | 0,72 |
| Colombia ^{b/} | 0,77 | 0,91 |
| Costa Rica | 0,81 | 0,90 |
| Chile | 0,69 | 0,74 |
| Ecuador ^{c/} | 0,73 | 0,74 |
| El Salvador | 0,65 | 0,70 |
| Honduras | 0,57 | 0,68 |
| Mexico | 0,78 | 0,85 |
| Nicaragua ^{c/} | 0,56 | 0,69 |
| Panama | 0,85 | 0,88 |
| Paraguay ^{d/} | 0,59 | 0,78 |
| Peru ^{e/} | 0,72 | 0,84 |
| Uruguay | 0,73 | 0,81 |
| Venezuela | 0,80 | 0,85 |
| Total countries ^{f/} | 0,68 | 0,78 |

Source: ILO, based on country Household Surveys.

^{a/} Greater Buenos Aires.

^{b/} Ten metropolitan areas.

^{c/} Urban area.

^{d/} Asuncion metropolitan area.

^{e/} Metropolitan Lima.

^{f/} Weighted average for EAP in each country compared to the total.

Significant differences in income for women/men between employment segments

When comparing the income ratio between women and men in different employment segments, it can be seen that there are lesser differences in microenterprises and in the public sector with a working hour income ratio equal to 0.97 in both cases at the end of the decade (see Figure 1a). In the latter sector the relation is even higher at 1.0, that is, women exceed men in income average in some countries (El Salvador, Honduras and Uruguay). The high proportion of female employment in teaching might explain in good part this situation.

Moreover, important advances are found considering the differences in income of those workers employed in large labour segments (see Annex, Table 1). The women/men income gap per working hour between those workers employed in the informal sector is the one with a greater reduction, falling from 46% to 34%, that is to say, diminishing 12 percentage points over the decade. In the formal sector, the reduction of the gap is more moderate (6 percentage points), but the

magnitude is lower than that existing between informal workers. In the public sector the improvement is only one percentage point. Nevertheless, given the reduced gap, it can be affirmed that the evolution of this indicator shows that significant progress has been achieved in this sector, in balancing wages of men and women by working hour (see Figure 1a).


Evolution of wage differences between wage earning women and men in the 1990s

Changes in the women/men work income gap are particularly pertinent between wage earners that represent 71% of the total non-agricultural employment at the end of the decade.

Considering the overall wage earners in the private sector (including domestic service) the income gap per working hour decreased from 31% to 24%, that is to say the ratio rose from 0.69 to 0.76. Including the public sector, the gap decreased from 26% to 18% in the 1990s, that is, the income ratio between men and women rose from 0.74 to 0.82 (see Annex, Table 2).

FIGURE 1a

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR INCOME RATIO IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS, 1990-2000 (women/men ratio)



Source: ILO, based on data from Household Surveys conducted in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

Nevertheless, some important differences are seen among wage earners.

In the first place, the income gap per working hour between women and men increased significantly when comparing the situation of microenterprises with that of larger enterprises. In both cases, the income gap between women and men was reduced. However, the difference in income by enterprise size remained almost unchanged during the decade. In fact, in microenterprises (with up to five workers only), wage earning women received, on the average, 97% of the income per working hour of wage earning men, while this percentage reached only 88% in larger enterprises with more than five workers, at the end of the 1990s. The 9 percent difference between these two occupational groups is the same as it was at the beginning of the decade.

Secondly, there is the effect of the wages of those working in domestic service over the relation between the average wage earning women and men in the private sector. Considering that this group is of special importance to female occupation in Latin America, that it comprises almost exclusively women workers (94% of the total), and that its wage level is generally speaking less than the income average of wage earners and workers generally; when taking all this into consideration while making calculations, it diminishes the wage-earning women average remuneration, thus increasing the income gap between men and women. Data shows that if, for overall private wage earners, the women/men working hour income ratio is 0.76 at the end of the decade, when excluding domestic service, the calculation rate rises to 0.91, which makes a difference of 15 percentage points (see Table 2a).

TABLE 2a

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR INCOME AVERAGE
OF NON-AGRICULTURAL WAGE EARNERS, 1990-2000
(women/men ratio)

| Categories of Workers | | Period | |
|-----------------------|---|-------------|-------------|
| | | 1990-1993 | 1998-2000 |
| 1. | Wage earners in enterprises with up to 5 workers | 0,91 | 0,97 |
| 2. | Wage earners in enterprises with more than 5 workers | 0,82 | 0,88 |
| 3. | (1+2) Total non domestic wage earners in the private sector | 0,83 | 0,91 |
| 4. | Private wage earners (including domestic workers) | 0,69 | 0,76 |
| 5. | Wage earners in the public sector | 0,96 | 0,97 |
| 6. | (3+5) Total wage earners excepting domestic service (private+public) | 0,88 | 0,96 |
| 7. | (4+5) Total wage earners (private+domestic+public) | 0,74 | 0,82 |

Source: ILO, based on data from Household Surveys conducted in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

Box 3

EVOLUTION OF THE INCOME GAP BETWEEN WOMEN AND MEN IN THE INFORMAL SECTOR: THE CASE OF BRAZIL

In order to evaluate the differential change in the women/men income per working hour in the informal sector, it is not enough just to observe the income relation in each of its components, but also necessary to analyze the employment composition in each sector, the amount of working hours and the incomes according to gender. An example is given in the figures for Brazil.

In Brazil, as generally in Latin America, incomes for women by working hour in the informal sector showed a significant increase in the 1990s, rising to 45.9% in 1990 to 59.4% of incomes for men. This improvement was also shown in the main segments that make up the informal sector, such as wage earners in small enterprises with up to five workers (which rose from 91.5% to 96.9%) and self-employed workers (which rose from 64.2% to 77.4%). In domestic service, however, a slight decrease was observed in the relation of income per working hours between women and men, diminishing from 83.2% in 1990 to 81.0% in 1999.

WOMEN/MEN INCOMES PER WORKING HOUR IN THE INFORMAL SECTOR

| | 1990 | 1999 |
|------------------|------|------|
| Small enterprise | 91.4 | 96.7 |
| Self-employed | 64.2 | 77.4 |
| Domestic Service | 83.2 | 81.0 |
| Informal sector | 45.9 | 59.4 |

Source: ILO, based on PNAD (IBGE) data (Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios, Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística).

It is interesting to note that the level of the relation between women's income per working hour and men in the informal sector is lower than the existing in small enterprises, in domestic service and for self-employed workers. This is due to the fact that it includes information relating to employment and hours worked in each of the segments, as well as average wages.

Where employment is concerned, in 1999 male occupation in the informal sector was distributed in small

enterprises and in self-employed works 35.1% and 61% respectively, while the workers in domestic service reached only 3% of the total. The employment composition for women shows a very different participation: in domestic service (46.5%), small enterprises in the same sector (16.3%), and self-employed workers (37.2%).

Insofar as the length of the working day is concerned, on the average women work fewer hours than men. Thus, in the informal sector, while men work 46.5 hours, women work 38.7. However, this average hides important differences between those employed by small enterprises (where women work 92% of the hours worked by men) and those who are self-employed (where the ratio is 74%).

Finally, there are also important differences in matters of wages between those making up the informal sector where, generally, domestic service is the worst paid segment. This also happens in the case of Brazil, as shown in the following table. In this country, taking =100 as the baseline of working hour income average in domestic service (that is practically the same as that of women).

It can be noted that the income average per working hour in small enterprises are 2.19 times that of domestic service and the income average of self-employed was 4.94 times that of domestic service in 1990. In the case of small enterprises this ratio was reduced to 1.52 times, while in the case of self-employed workers the relation to the income average for domestic service had fallen to 2.97 times in 1999. This indicates a relative improvement in domestic service income compared to the other two groups, derived basically from the increase in the minimum wage. Given the majority presence of women in domestic service, this results in an increase in the women/men income ratio in the informal sector. Therefore, although there was no improvement regarding the income of women com-

INCOMES PER WORKING HOUR RELATING TO THE INFORMAL SECTOR
(total domestic service = 100)

| Brazil | Small Enterprise | | | Domestic Service | | | Self Employed | | | Informal Sector | | |
|--------|------------------|-----|-----|------------------|----|-----|---------------|-----|-----|-----------------|-----|-----|
| | M | W | T | M | W | T | M | W | T | M | W | T |
| 1990 | 225 | 206 | 219 | 119 | 99 | 100 | 558 | 358 | 494 | 477 | 219 | 370 |
| 1999 | 159 | 154 | 152 | 121 | 98 | 100 | 318 | 246 | 297 | 267 | 159 | 322 |

M: Men W: Women T: Total

Source: ILO, based on PNAD (IBGE) data (Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios, Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística).

pared to that of men in domestic service, but rather deterioration, the relative improvement in domestic

service income generally had an important impact on the reduction in the wages gap in the informal sector.

Thirdly, it is noticeable the scarce difference between women and men income per working hour in the public sector; the relation was, in this case, 0.97 at the end of the decade. This proportion has hardly changed in the period under study, since the ratio was 0.96 at the beginning of it. The high women/men income relation per working hour in the public sector is manifested in nearly all countries except Nicaragua, (where the ratio is 0.64), Brazil and Ecuador (0.80). In various of these the average for women exceeds that for men (see Annex, Tables 3 and 4).

In fourth place, when analyzing the most homogeneous working groups, the persistence of a significant working hour wage gap between wage earners is observed. Considering a group of six countries (Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela), in the year 2000 it was observed that this gap was approximately 30% in the most qualified working segments (managers and supervisors 28%, professionals and technicians 27%), and approximately 20% in lesser qualified segments (artisans and factory workers 24%, traders and salespeople 23%, service workers

TABLE 3a

**LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES a/
WORKING HOUR WAGE ACCORDING TO OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS**
(non domestic wage earners 2000)

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| Managers and administrators | 0,72 |
| Professionals and technicians | 0,73 |
| Office workers | 0,90 |
| Traders and salespeople | 0,77 |
| Transportation workers | 0,96 |
| Artisans and factory workers | 0,76 |
| Blue collar workers and day labourers | 0,83 |
| Service workers | 0,80 |

Source: ILO, based on data from Household Surveys conducted in Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela.

20%, blue collar workers and day labourers 17%). Only between office workers (where a large percentage of women workers is concentrated) and transportation workers (representing a very small percentage of women workers), is the gap 10% or lower (see Table 3a).

When studying the wage relation between women/men of all wage earners, the incidence of each one of its components is outstanding. At the end of the 1990s this ratio (working hour) stood at 0.76 for overall private wage earners and at 0.91 when excluding domestic service from this group. Considering the overall public and private sector wage earners, the relation is 0.82 for the total and 0.96 when excluding domestic service.

The gap between the working hour income of wage earning women and men has been greatly reduced, although differentiated, in the decade of the 1990s. This reduction was 7 percentage points considering the total of private wage earners and 8 when excluding domestic service from the calculation. In the public sector, the income gap remained unchanged and at a lower level and for the overall wage earners, the income gap was also reduced to 8 percentage points.

Women/men income ratio by branches economic activity

Differences in the income relation between women and men are significant among branches of economic activity. In some of these the ratio cannot be calculated due to the low sampling of women in the working sectors (electricity, construction and transportation).


Considering the total of wage earners (excluding domestic service), the lower differences in the income average per working hour are found in the finance and services branches. In both sectors, the wage ratio stands at 0.98 at the end of the decade (see Annex, Table 6). Moreover, in these branches, in various countries the wages average for women per working hour exceed that of men (see Figure 2a).

In the case of the financial sector, this data shows a 10 percentage points improvement during the decade, since the working hour relation between women and men was 0.88 in 1990.

In the case of the services sector, changes in the decade were less accentuated (7 percentage points) which means that in 1990 the working hour income ratio was

FIGURE 2a

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
WORKING INCOME DIFFERENTIAL PER WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR OF
PRIVATE NON-AGRICULTURAL WAGE EARNERS, ACCORDING TO BRANCH OF ACTIVITY a/
(women/men ratio)



Source: ILO, based on data from Household Surveys conducted in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

a/ Does not include data from the Electricity, Construction and Transportation sectors, since the values obtained are not representative samplings in the case of women.

0.91. In turn, among self-employed workers in the services sector, the difference in working hour income is significantly higher: the ratio of 0.76 in 2000 being equal to a gap of 24%.

The greatest gap between remuneration for women and men wage earners is found in the industrial sector, where the wages per working hour for women corresponded to 0.76 of men's wages at the end of the decade. This figure represents a reduction of 8 percentage points over the decade, since in 1990 women earned 68% of what men earned per working hour in this sector.

In the retail sector, the income of wage earning women corresponded to 0.81 of that of men, and in self-employed workers to 0.76. In the case of this sector, the decrease in the gap was 7 percentage points, in the financial sector of 10 points, and in services of 7. In these two latter sectors, this advance resulted even when the wage relation per working hour had amounted to high levels at the beginning of the decade.

Wage differential and educational level


When considering the factor of education exclusively, the acquisition of a greater school attendance level by women does not necessarily reduce the income work difference between them and men. Rather the situation tends to be the reverse. The income gap between wage earners (excluding domestic service) with 13 years or more of schooling is significantly greater than

the existing gap between those who had only five years of schooling (see Annex, Tables 7 and 8). The increased gap is seen also when including the workers' age in the analyses, as will be seen later on. The negative relation of the women/men income gap with increased education and age suggests that this could be due to a differentiated access of women and men to jobs requiring a high educational level and ample work experience. In this respect, the data are encouraging since they show that these differences have also been reduced during the 1990s. Nevertheless, it should be noted that conclusions on this matter would require a type of analysis that exceeds the possibilities of the present study.

In the lowest educational stretch, women received 82% of men's income per working hour, while in the upper stretch (13 or more years of schooling) this percentage is reduced to 74% (8 percentage points less) at the end of the decade. The same situation is shown at the beginning of the 1990s, except that in these years the difference in income between the educational levels was somewhat less (3 percentage points).

This tendency is not so clear when breaking down data by enterprise size. In microenterprises the women/men income ratio deteriorates as the educational level rises until it reaches 12 years of school attendance (from 0.89 to 0.85), when it grows much more in the last stretch from 13 and more years of schooling (from 0.85 to 0.94). In the case of larger enterprises with more than five workers, the situation reverses. The

FIGURE 3a
VARIATION IN WOMEN/MEN WAGE RATIO ACCORDING TO
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF NON DOMESTIC SERVICE WAGE EARNERS, 1998-2000
(women/men ratio)



Source: ILO, based on data from Household Surveys conducted in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

relation improves until 12 years of school attendance (from 0.75 to 0.80) and then begins to decrease in the last stretch of schooling (from 0.80 to 0.73). The combination of these two tendencies results in an increase in the income gap as the educational level increases (see Figure 3a).

The increase in school attendance levels shows a significant increase in income for both men and women. Nevertheless, the magnitude of this variation differs also significantly according to the gender of the worker. Taking as a baseline (100) the income average of wage earning men and also of women with lower amounts of schooling (up to five years) in the biennium 1998-2000, has proved that the index for men rises to 430 when the educational level reaches 13 years and more. However, that of women reaches only 399. These values are below those given at the beginning of the decade, when the amounts were 484 and 464 respectively (see Table 4a). These indicators show, on the one hand, a possible devaluation in the number of years of schooling as a progress factor in wages and, on the other, that for each level of schooling, the progress is lower in the case of women compared to men. It is obvious that other factors, and not only education, play a part in the remuneration level. Among these are the type of labour entry and different occupations than can be carried out at a certain educational level. In the case of women, this would seem to include their incorporation into lower remunerated jobs due to cultural factors or discrimination.

Income gap and age of workers

The work income gap increases significantly as the worker's age increases. This situation is seen in all occupational categories analyzed for the total non-agricultural employment from 20 to 60 years of age (considered in the analysis were three age groups: 20-24 years old, 25-39 years old and 40-60 years old).

For all non-agricultural workers employed, the income gap per working hour between young men and women was 13%, rising successively to 17% and to 26% in the two other age groups at the end of the decade. In other terms, women received 87% of the men's income received in the 20-24 years of age group, and this proportion decreased successively to 83% and to 74% for the 25-39 years old group and for 40-60 years old, respectively.

The differences between the formal and informal sectors were also significant. In the formal sector, in the first two age levels, the gaps are reduced: women received 97% and 93% respectively of the men's income per working hour; at the older levels (40 years old and more) this proportion decreased to 82%. In turn, in the informal sector, among the youngest workers, women received 75% of men's income per working hour and this proportion is further reduced to 69% at the 35-39 years old level and down to 65% for those at the 40 years old and more level.

TABLE 4a


LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
VARIATION OF WOMEN/MEN WORK INCOME OF NON-DOMESTIC AND
NON-AGRICULTURAL WAGE EARNERS WHEN INCREASING THE SCHOOLING LEVEL, 1990-2000
(level up to 5 years of schooling in microenterprise and for each gender = 100)

| | Up to 5 years | From 6 to 9 years | From 10 to 12 years | From 13 + years |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Period 1990 - 1993 | | | | |
| Men | 100 | 124,3 | 209,1 | 482,8 |
| Women | 100 | 128,1 | 203,8 | 464,4 |
| Period 1998 - 2000 | | | | |
| Men | 100 | 118,4 | 170,5 | 430,0 |
| Women | 100 | 115,0 | 167,4 | 397,8 |

Source : ILO, based on country Household Surveys.

FIGURE 4A

**VARIATION IN WAGE RATIO ACCORDING TO AGE STRETCHS OF
WOMEN/MEN NON-AGRICULTURAL WORKERS, 1998-2000**
(women/men ratio)



Source: ILO, based on data from Household Surveys conducted in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

It is noteworthy, however, that the incidence of the age factor in the increase of the income gap between men and women is more accentuated in the formal sector (especially among public workers). In the overall formal sector, the difference in the gap seen between the first and last age levels was, at the end of the decade, 15 percentage points; in the informal sector this difference was 10 percentage points and in the public sector 23 percentage points.

Among private wage earners (excluding domestic service), the income gap per working hour income gap is very small in the first two age levels (women receiving 99% and 95% respectively of men's income), this rising in the 40 years old and more group (where women receive 83% of men's pay). In the public sector, among the youngest workers (20-24 years old) no difference is seen in the income average per working hour between men and women, and from 25 years of age on, the gap is slightly larger than that seen in the private sector (women receiving 94% of men's income per working hour between 25 and 39 years of age, and 82% after 40 years old and more).

The incidence of the age factor in the increased wage gap between men and women was reduced during the decade. While, in 1990, for all non-agricultural workers (excluding domestic service) the income gap per working hour for the youngest workers to those over 40 years of age was 19 percentage points, at the

end of the decade this had reduced to 13 percentage points.

The same occurred, although in different proportions, in all segments of employment studied. In the formal sector, the difference in the income gap per working hour for the youngest workers to those over 40 years of age was 21 percentage points in 1990, but this decreased to 15 percentage points at the end of the decade. In the informal sector the difference was 13 points at the beginning of the decade and 10 points at the end of it. Among private wage earners (excluding domestic service) the difference was 20 points which was reduced to 15 points, and in the public sector, the 37 points at the beginning of the decade decreased to 23 points at the end of it (see Figure 4a).

To sum up, the data presented indicates an improvement in the wage ratio between men and women. The same is related, among other factors to the significant increase in the schooling levels of women. However, a more definitive conclusion in this respect would require an analysis of the matter of cohorts by age. On the other hand and as has been indicated already in previous studies, the greatest wage differences between older workers also indicate the greatest difficulties women have in being promoted in their jobs over the evolution of occupation. In other words, these show their greatest difficulties to mobilization, promotion and access to better waged jobs throughout their working life.

Income differentials by country: a comparative analysis

The relation of women/men's income per working hour (considering total non-agricultural wage earners) improved during the decade in all countries covered by this study. Based on data regarding this ratio, we can see the relative position of countries in matters of income differences at the beginning and end of the 1990s (see Table 5a).

On one hand, the women/men income gap per working hour registered a significant dispersal among the countries studied. At the beginning of the decade, the gap varied from a minimum of 15% (in Panama) to a maximum of 44% (in Nicaragua). In other words, the income relation between women and men increased from a minimum of 0.56 in Nicaragua to a maximum of 0.85 in Panama. This latter was equal to a difference of 29 percentage points between the country showing the greater level of equality and that showing the greatest level of disparity according to this indicator.

At the end of the 1990s not only was the income gap reduced in all countries, but also the heterogeneity observed among them. The ratio of women/men income varied from a minimum of 0.68 in Honduras to a maximum of 0.91 in Colombia (see Table 1a). This is equivalent to a difference of 23 percentage points among countries that respectively present the greatest and least disparity level of income between men

and women (6 percentage points less than at the beginning of the decade).

On the other hand, when classifying the countries considered in this study into four groups (Table 5a), according to the level of the relation achieved between average women and men's income per working hour (high, medium-high, medium-low and low), a significant improvement can be observed in most of them. The changes were as follows:

In the group with a *high ratio* (from 0.81 to 0.91) there were only two countries (Costa Rica and Panama) in 1990. However, the number of countries in this group increased to seven (Colombia, Costa Rica, Panama, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela) by the end of the decade.

The group with a *medium-high ratio* (from 0.71 to 0.80) comprised five countries (Paraguay, Ecuador, Chile, Brazil and El Salvador) in 2000. Three of these countries (Brazil, Chile, El Salvador) were in the medium-low and one of them (Paraguay) in the low at the beginning of the 1990s.

In the group with a *medium-low ratio* (from 0.61 to 0.70) there are only two countries (Honduras and Nicaragua) at the end of the decade.

Finally, in the group with a *low ratio* of women/men's income average per working hour (from 0.51 to 0.60) no countries were registered at the end of the 1990s, although three of them (Paraguay, Honduras and Nicaragua) belonged to this stratum in 1990.

TABLE 5A
LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
EVOLUTION OF THE WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR INCOME RATIO
IN THE NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS, 1990-2000 a/
(women/men ratio)

| Women/men income ratio 2000/1990 b/ | High | Medium-High | Medium-Low | Low |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| High | Costa Rica Panama | Colombia Mexico Peru Uruguay Venezuela | | |
| Medium-High | | Ecuador | Brazil Chile El Salvador | Paraguay |
| Medium-Low | | | | Honduras Nicaragua |
| Low | | | | |

Source: ILO, based on data from Household Surveys in countries studied.

a/ Includes total non-agricultural occupation.

b/ The women/men income ratio corresponding to the following classifications with their respective ranges:

| CLASSIFICATION | RANGE |
|----------------|-------------|
| High | 0.81 - 0.91 |
| Medium-High | 0.71 - 0.80 |
| Medium-Low | 0.61 - 0.70 |
| Low | 0.51 - 0.60 |



TABLE 1

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR INCOME AVERAGE
IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS, 1990-2000
(women/men ratio)

| Country & period | Private sector wage earners (nd) a/ | | | Public Sector | Total wage earners (nd) (Private +Public) | Self-employed | Employers | Informal Sector | Formal Sector | Total Non-agricultural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------------|
| | Up to 5 workers | More than 5 workers | Total private wage earners (nd) | | | | | | | |
| Argentina b/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2000 | 1.05 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.04 | 0.94 | 0.54 | 0.86 | 0.99 | 0.94 |
| Brazil | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.91 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.64 | 0.75 | 0.46 | 0.78 | 0.63 |
| 1999 | 0.97 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.80 | 0.93 | 0.78 | 0.90 | 0.59 | 0.84 | 0.72 |
| Chile | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.93 | 0.83 | 0.84 | * | 0.84 | 0.87 | 0.61 | 0.82 | 0.78 | 0.69 |
| 1998 | 1.04 | 0.93 | 0.92 | * | 0.92 | 0.94 | 0.67 | 0.62 | 0.85 | 0.74 |
| Colombia c/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1992 | 0.92 | 0.87 | 0.90 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.73 | 0.80 | 0.66 | 0.85 | 0.77 |
| 2000 | 1.10 | 0.98 | 1.03 | 1.06 | 1.05 | 0.79 | 0.78 | 0.82 | 0.97 | 0.91 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.86 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.98 | 0.94 | 0.77 | 0.94 | 0.61 | 0.93 | 0.81 |
| 2000 | 0.89 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 1.02 | 1.03 | 0.80 | 0.93 | 0.69 | 1.03 | 0.90 |
| Ecuador d/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.87 | 0.79 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.85 | 0.76 | 1.04 | 0.66 | 0.83 | 0.73 |
| 1998 | 0.86 | 1.02 | 1.03 | 0.80 | 1.01 | 0.79 | 0.70 | 0.64 | 0.88 | 0.74 |
| El Salvador | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.71 | 0.89 | 0.87 | 1.14 | 0.96 | 0.57 | 0.82 | 0.52 | 0.95 | 0.65 |
| 1999 | 1.34 | 1.03 | 1.12 | 1.27 | 1.25 | 0.31 | 0.94 | 0.67 | 0.66 | 0.70 |
| Honduras | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.60 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 1.19 | 1.09 | 0.45 | 0.23 | 0.43 | 0.99 | 0.57 |
| 1999 | 0.87 | 0.83 | 0.89 | 1.08 | 1.01 | 0.57 | 0.65 | 0.54 | 0.89 | 0.68 |
| Mexico | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.94 | 0.82 | 0.85 | 0.95 | 0.89 | 0.80 | 0.87 | 0.68 | 0.83 | 0.78 |
| 2000 | 0.88 | 0.84 | 0.87 | 1.08 | 0.97 | 0.79 | 0.83 | 0.74 | 0.88 | 0.85 |
| Nicaragua d/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1993 | 0.61 | 0.70 | 0.62 | 0.74 | 0.69 | 0.42 | 0.46 | 0.49 | 0.65 | 0.56 |
| 1999 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.86 | 0.64 | 0.81 | 0.53 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.82 | 0.69 |
| Panama | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.86 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.78 | 0.62 | 0.57 | 0.96 | 0.85 |
| 1999 | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 0.90 | 1.01 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.70 | 0.96 | 0.88 |
| Paraguay e/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.90 | 1.01 | 0.98 | 0.86 | 0.98 | 0.67 | 0.80 | 0.50 | 0.88 | 0.59 |
| 1998 | 1.21 | 1.13 | 1.19 | 0.91 | 1.13 | 0.76 | 0.73 | 0.70 | 0.97 | 0.78 |
| Peru f/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 1.44 | 0.86 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.63 | 1.34 | 0.64 | 0.88 | 0.72 |
| 2000 | 1.28 | 0.91 | 0.99 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 0.70 | 1.07 | 0.94 | 0.89 | 0.84 |
| Uruguay | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.70 | 0.83 | 0.81 | 1.14 | 0.90 | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.52 | 0.88 | 0.73 |
| 1999 | 0.85 | 0.89 | 0.88 | 1.12 | 0.95 | 0.82 | 0.85 | 0.63 | 0.94 | 0.81 |
| Venezuela | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.84 | 0.96 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.74 | 0.81 | 0.63 | 0.89 | 0.80 |
| 1999 | 0.93 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 1.02 | 0.77 | 0.86 | 0.74 | 0.95 | 0.85 |
| Total countries g/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990-1993 | 0.91 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.96 | 0.88 | 0.68 | 0.80 | 0.54 | 0.81 | 0.68 |
| 1998-2000 | 0.97 | 0.88 | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.77 | 0.85 | 0.66 | 0.87 | 0.78 |

Source: ILO, based on special tabulations of country Household Surveys. Figures refer to the weighted average of 15 Latin American countries with a labour force equal to 92% of the total non-agricultural EAP in the region.

a /nd: Not domestic. Domestic service excluded.

b /Greater Buenos Aires.

c /Ten metropolitan areas.

d /Urban area.

e /Asuncion Metropolitan area.

f /Metropolitan Lima.

g /Weighted average of EAP in each country.

*The public sector is included in the private one.

TABLE 2
LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING MONTH INCOME AVERAGE
IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS, 1990-2000
(women/men ratio)

| Country & period | Private sector wage earners (nd) a/ | | | Public Sector | Total wage earners (nd) (Private +Public) | Self-employed | Employers | Informal Sector | Formal Sector | Total Non-agri-cultural |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| | Up to 5 workers | More than 5 workers | Total private wage earners (nd) | | | | | | | |
| Argentina b/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2000 | 0.86 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.76 | 0.82 | 0.72 | 0.49 | 0.65 | 0.76 | 0.72 |
| Brazil | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.81 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.65 | 0.74 | 0.44 | 0.67 | 0.38 | 0.67 | 0.53 |
| 1999 | 0.89 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.67 | 0.82 | 0.57 | 0.81 | 0.49 | 0.72 | 0.61 |
| Chile | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.82 | 0.70 | 0.77 | * | 0.77 | 0.70 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 0.69 | 0.61 |
| 1998 | 0.86 | 0.84 | 0.82 | * | 0.72 | 0.70 | 0.69 | 0.52 | 0.77 | 0.65 |
| Colombia c/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1992 | 0.88 | 0.83 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 0.86 | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.66 | 0.78 | 0.74 |
| 2000 | 0.95 | 0.86 | 0.90 | 0.81 | 0.90 | 0.56 | 0.74 | 0.66 | 0.83 | 0.75 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.80 | 0.76 | 0.77 | 0.90 | 0.86 | 0.51 | 0.82 | 0.47 | 0.84 | 0.69 |
| 2000 | 0.76 | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.52 | 0.79 | 0.51 | 0.91 | 0.73 |
| Ecuador d/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.80 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.65 | 0.96 | 0.60 | 0.75 | 0.66 |
| 1998 | 0.77 | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.55 | 0.78 | 0.65 |
| El Salvador | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.71 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 1.02 | 0.91 | 0.52 | 0.81 | 0.53 | 0.88 | 0.64 |
| 1999 | 1.30 | 0.99 | 1.08 | 1.11 | 1.17 | 0.29 | 0.99 | 0.67 | 0.64 | 0.68 |
| Honduras | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.65 | 0.86 | 0.82 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 0.35 | 0.22 | 0.38 | 0.87 | 0.52 |
| 1999 | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.84 | 0.90 | 0.91 | 0.41 | 0.65 | 0.44 | 0.80 | 0.58 |
| Mexico | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.82 | 0.80 | 0.62 | 0.75 | 0.56 | 0.74 | 0.68 |
| 2000 | 0.77 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.88 | 0.83 | 0.62 | 0.73 | 0.59 | 0.76 | 0.71 |
| Nicaragua d/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1993 | 0.62 | 0.64 | 0.60 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.43 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.59 | 0.53 |
| 1999 | 1.03 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 0.60 | 0.79 | 0.50 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.79 | 0.67 |
| Panama | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.94 | 0.54 | 0.70 | 0.52 | 0.89 | 0.79 |
| 1999 | 1.01 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.81 | 0.94 | 0.48 | 0.71 | 0.59 | 0.89 | 0.78 |
| Paraguay e/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.85 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 0.68 | 0.86 | 0.62 | 0.90 | 0.52 | 0.71 | 0.57 |
| 1998 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 0.76 | 0.96 | 0.61 | 0.75 | 0.59 | 0.83 | 0.67 |
| Peru f/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 1.20 | 0.71 | 0.79 | 0.72 | 0.79 | 0.50 | 1.13 | 0.53 | 0.71 | 0.59 |
| 2000 | 1.04 | 0.81 | 0.85 | 0.78 | 0.85 | 0.51 | 1.08 | 0.76 | 0.77 | 0.70 |
| Uruguay | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.59 | 0.71 | 0.69 | 0.84 | 0.73 | 0.59 | 0.67 | 0.40 | 0.69 | 0.57 |
| 1999 | 0.72 | 0.75 | 0.74 | 0.85 | 0.78 | 0.71 | 0.70 | 0.51 | 0.75 | 0.64 |
| Venezuela | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.79 | 0.91 | 0.88 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.59 | 0.80 | 0.54 | 0.82 | 0.72 |
| 1999 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 0.93 | 0.86 | 0.93 | 0.59 | 0.80 | 0.61 | 0.84 | 0.74 |
| Total countries g/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990-1993 | 0.82 | 0.73 | 0.75 | 0.82 | 0.78 | 0.52 | 0.72 | 0.46 | 0.71 | 0.59 |
| 1998-2000 | 0.88 | 0.80 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.57 | 0.78 | 0.55 | 0.75 | 0.66 |

Source: ILO, based on special tabulations of country Household Surveys. Figures refer to the weighted average of 15 Latin American countries with a labour force equal to 92% of the total non-agricultural EAP in the region.

a /nd: Not domestic. Domestic service excluded.

b /Greater Buenos Aires.

c /Ten metropolitan areas.

d /Urban area.

e /Asuncion Metropolitan area.

f /Metropolitan Lima.

g /Weighted average of EAP in each country.

* The public sector is included in the private one.

TABLE 3

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR WAGE AVERAGE
IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS, 1990-2000
(women/men ratio)

| Country & period | Non-domestic wage earners in Private sector | Wage earners including domestic in Private sector | Wage earners in Public sector | Total non-domestic wage earners (private+public) | Total wage earners (priv.+public+domestic) |
|---------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Argentina a/ | | | | | |
| 2000 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.04 | 1.00 |
| Brazil | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.81 | 0.64 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.68 |
| 1999 | 0.88 | 0.68 | 0.80 | 0.93 | 0.75 |
| Chile | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.84 | 0.84 | * | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| 1998 | 0.92 | 0.91 | * | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Colombia b/ | | | | | |
| 1992 | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.82 |
| 2000 | 1.03 | 0.94 | 1.06 | 1.03 | 0.96 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.83 | 0.70 | 0.98 | 0.94 | 0.82 |
| 2000 | 0.93 | 0.82 | 1.02 | 1.03 | 0.93 |
| Ecuador c/ | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.83 | 0.61 | 0.83 | 0.85 | 0.69 |
| 1998 | 1.03 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 1.01 | 0.80 |
| El Salvador | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.87 | 0.65 | 1.14 | 0.96 | 0.74 |
| 1999 | 1.12 | 0.89 | 1.27 | 1.25 | 0.99 |
| Honduras | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.86 | 0.54 | 1.19 | 1.09 | 0.75 |
| 1999 | 0.89 | 0.69 | 1.08 | 1.01 | 0.81 |
| Mexico | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.85 | 0.79 | 0.95 | 0.89 | 0.84 |
| 2000 | 0.87 | 0.82 | 1.08 | 0.97 | 0.91 |
| Nicaragua c/ | | | | | |
| 1993 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.74 | 0.69 | 0.69 |
| 1999 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.64 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Panama | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.94 | 0.70 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.83 |
| 1999 | 1.01 | 0.83 | 0.90 | 1.01 | 0.87 |
| Paraguay d/ | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.98 | 0.62 | 0.86 | 0.98 | 0.65 |
| 1998 | 1.19 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 1.13 | 0.89 |
| Peru e/ | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.96 | 0.75 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.80 |
| 2000 | 0.99 | 0.88 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 0.89 |
| Uruguay | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.81 | 0.67 | 1.14 | 0.90 | 0.78 |
| 1999 | 0.88 | 0.77 | 1.12 | 0.95 | 0.85 |
| Venezuela | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.93 | 0.87 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.90 |
| 1999 | 0.99 | 0.90 | 0.98 | 1.02 | 0.95 |
| Total countries f/ | | | | | |
| 1990-1993 | 0.83 | 0.69 | 0.96 | 0.88 | 0.74 |
| 1998-2000 | 0.91 | 0.76 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.82 |

Source: ILO, based on special tabulations of country Household Surveys. Figures refer to the weighted average of 15 Latin American countries with a labour force equal to 92% of the total non-agricultural EAP in the region.

a/ Greater Buenos Aires.
b/ Ten metropolitan areas.
c/ Urban area.

d / Asuncion Metropolitan area.
e/ Metropolitan Lima.
f/ Weighted average of EAP in each country.

* The public sector is included in the private one.

TABLE 4
LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING MONTH WAGE AVERAGE
IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS, 1990-2000
(women/men ratio)

| Country & period | Non-domestic wage earners in Private sector | Wage earners including domestic in Private sector | Wage earners in Public sector | Total non-domestic wage earners (private+public) | Total wage earners (priv.+public+domestic) |
|---------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Argentina a/ | | | | | |
| 2000 | 0.81 | 0.72 | 0.76 | 0.82 | 0.75 |
| Brazil | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.71 | 0.58 | 0.65 | 0.74 | 0.61 |
| 1999 | 0.80 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.82 | 0.66 |
| Chile | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.77 | 0.65 | * | 0.65 | 0.65 |
| 1998 | 0.82 | 0.72 | * | 0.72 | 0.72 |
| Colombia b/ | | | | | |
| 1992 | 0.84 | 0.78 | 0.85 | 0.86 | 0.79 |
| 2000 | 0.90 | 0.84 | 0.81 | 0.90 | 0.85 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.77 | 0.62 | 0.90 | 0.86 | 0.73 |
| 2000 | 0.82 | 0.69 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.79 |
| Ecuador c/ | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.77 | 0.59 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.66 |
| 1998 | 0.92 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.74 |
| El Salvador | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.84 | 0.70 | 1.02 | 0.91 | 0.77 |
| 1999 | 1.08 | 0.92 | 1.11 | 1.17 | 1.00 |
| Honduras | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.82 | 0.58 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 0.76 |
| 1999 | 0.84 | 0.68 | 0.90 | 0.91 | 0.77 |
| Mexico | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.78 | 0.71 | 0.82 | 0.80 | 0.75 |
| 2000 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.88 | 0.83 | 0.77 |
| Nicaragua c/ | | | | | |
| 1993 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.64 |
| 1999 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.60 | 0.79 | 0.79 |
| Panama | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.90 | 0.68 | 0.90 | 0.94 | 0.79 |
| 1999 | 0.96 | 0.80 | 0.81 | 0.94 | 0.82 |
| Paraguay d/ | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.90 | 0.64 | 0.68 | 0.86 | 0.65 |
| 1998 | 1.03 | 0.80 | 0.76 | 0.96 | 0.77 |
| Peru e/ | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.79 | 0.65 | 0.72 | 0.79 | 0.68 |
| 2000 | 0.85 | 0.81 | 0.78 | 0.85 | 0.81 |
| Uruguay | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.69 | 0.54 | 0.84 | 0.73 | 0.62 |
| 1999 | 0.74 | 0.60 | 0.85 | 0.78 | 0.66 |
| Venezuela | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.88 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.84 |
| 1999 | 0.93 | 0.85 | 0.86 | 0.93 | 0.88 |
| Total countries f/ | | | | | |
| 1990-1993 | 0.75 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 0.77 | 0.67 |
| 1998-2000 | 0.82 | 0.68 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.73 |

Source: ILO, based on special tabulations of country Household Surveys. Figures refer to the weighted average of 15 Latin American countries with a labour force equal to 92% of the total non-agricultural EAP in the region.

a/ Greater Buenos Aires.
b/ Ten metropolitan areas.
c/ Urban area.

d/ Asuncion Metropolitan area.
e/ Metropolitan Lima.
f/ Weighted average of EAP in each country.

* The public sector is included in the private one.

TABLE 6
LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR INCOME AVERAGE,
BY BRANCHES OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY, 1990-2000
(women/men)

| Country & period sectors (*) | Industry | Commerce | Finance | Services | Total private wage earners (nd) |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------|
| Argentina a/ | | | | | |
| 2000 | 0.81 | 0.72 | 0.76 | 0.82 | 0.75 |
| Brazil | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.71 | 0.58 | 0.65 | 0.74 | 0.61 |
| 1999 | 0.80 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.82 | 0.66 |
| Argentina b/ | | | | | |
| 2000 | 0.89 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Brazil | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.59 | 0.70 | 0.82 | 0.91 | 0.81 |
| 1999 | 0.67 | 0.77 | 0.73 | 0.97 | 0.88 |
| Chile | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.75 | 0.88 | 0.73 | 0.80 | 0.84 |
| 2000 | 0.85 | 0.68 | 0.84 | 0.89 | 0.92 |
| Colombia c/ | | | | | |
| 1992 | 0.77 | 0.81 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 0.90 |
| 2000 | 0.89 | 0.98 | 1.30 | 1.03 | 1.03 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.81 | 0.75 | 0.74 | 1.06 | 0.83 |
| 2000 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 1.08 | 1.00 | 0.93 |
| Ecuador d/ | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.83 | 0.73 | 0.92 | 0.89 | 0.83 |
| 1998 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 1.35 | 1.05 | 1.03 |
| El Salvador | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.87 |
| 1999 | 0.72 | 0.82 | 1.59 | 1.08 | 1.12 |
| Honduras | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.68 | 0.65 | 1.27 | 0.90 | 0.86 |
| 1999 | 0.81 | 0.65 | 1.28 | 1.02 | 0.89 |
| Mexico | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.85 | 1.03 | 0.85 |
| 2000 | 0.76 | 0.86 | 0.79 | 0.95 | 0.87 |
| Nicaragua d/ | | | | | |
| 1993 | 0.77 | 0.68 | 1.07 | 0.54 | 0.62 |
| 1999 | 0.90 | 0.88 | 1.11 | 0.52 | 0.86 |
| Panama | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.86 | 0.90 | 1.12 | 0.70 | 0.94 |
| 1999 | 0.93 | 0.84 | 1.23 | 0.91 | 1.01 |
| Paraguay e/ | | | | | |
| 1990 | 1.12 | 0.70 | 0.97 | 1.09 | 0.98 |
| 1998 | 1.33 | 1.11 | 1.23 | 1.11 | 1.19 |
| Peru f/ | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.68 | 0.69 | 1.53 | 0.80 | 0.96 |
| 2000 | 1.14 | 0.55 | 0.90 | 1.28 | 0.99 |
| Uruguay | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.68 | 0.75 | 0.57 | 1.00 | 0.81 |
| 1999 | 0.75 | 0.87 | 0.67 | 0.82 | 0.88 |
| Venezuela | | | | | |
| 1994 | 1.04 | 0.86 | 0.92 | 0.80 | 0.93 |
| 1999 | 0.99 | 0.90 | 1.09 | 1.12 | 0.99 |
| Total countries g/ | | | | | |
| 1990-1993 | 0.68 | 0.74 | 0.88 | 0.91 | 0.83 |
| 1998-2000 | 0.76 | 0.81 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.91 |

Source: ILO, based on special tabulations of country Household Surveys. Figures refer to the weighted average of 15 Latin American countries with a labour force equal to 92% of the total non-agricultural EAP in the region.

a / Domestic service excluded.

b / Greater Buenos Aires.

c / Ten metropolitan areas.

d / Urban area.

e / Asuncion Metropolitan area.

f / Metropolitan Lima.

g / Weighted average of EAP in each country.

* No data is included on the Electricity, Construction and Transportation sectors since the results obtained are not representative sampling in the case of women.

TABLE 7

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR INCOME AVERAGE, ACCORDING TO
ENTERPRISE SIZE AND EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF NON-AGRICULTURAL AND NON-DOMESTIC WAGE EARNERS, 1990-2000
(women/men ratio)

| Country & period | Wage earners in enterprise with up to 5 workers | | | | Wage earners in enterprise with more than to 5 workers | | | | Total non-domestic wage earners | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| | Up to 5 years of schooling | From 6 to 9 years | From 10 to 12 years | From 13 and more years | Up to 5 years of schooling | From 6 to 9 years | From 10 to 12 years | From 13 and more years | Up to 5 years of schooling | From 6 to 9 years | From 10 to 12 years | From 13 and more years | |
| Argentina b/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2000 | 0.94 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.09 | 0.87 | 0.96 | 0.81 | 1.00 | 0.86 | 0.96 | 0.85 | 1.00 |
| Brazil | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.61 | 0.66 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.58 | 0.64 | 0.68 | 0.66 | 0.57 | 0.64 | 0.81 |
| 1999 | 0.92 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 0.59 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.69 | 0.63 | 0.81 | 0.75 | 0.69 | 0.63 | 0.88 |
| Chile | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 1.10 | 0.89 | 0.87 | 0.63 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.84 | 0.58 | 0.80 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 0.58 | 0.84 |
| 2000 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.91 | 0.99 | 0.79 | 0.84 | 0.90 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 0.83 | 0.88 | 0.69 | 0.92 |
| Colombia c/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1992 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.81 | 0.90 | 0.88 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 0.70 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.71 | 0.90 |
| 2000 | 0.94 | 1.12 | 0.81 | 1.06 | 0.95 | 0.78 | 0.96 | 0.86 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.87 | 1.03 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.73 | 0.82 | 0.93 | 0.69 | 0.84 | 0.76 | 0.79 | 0.74 | 0.81 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.74 | 0.83 |
| 2000 | 0.79 | 0.86 | 0.84 | 0.70 | 0.98 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.72 | 0.91 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.93 |
| Ecuador d/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.33 | 1.01 | 0.79 | 1.03 | 0.66 | 0.75 | 0.84 | 0.49 | 0.53 | 0.82 | 0.84 | 0.50 | 0.83 |
| 1998 | 0.69 | 0.62 | 0.82 | 0.96 | 0.52 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 0.82 | 0.59 | 0.84 | 0.94 | 0.84 | 1.03 |
| El Salvador | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.51 | 0.69 | 0.77 | 0.92 | 0.76 | 0.83 | 0.84 | 0.79 | 0.67 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.79 | 0.87 |
| 1999 | 1.52 | 1.34 | 1.29 | 2.32 | 0.93 | 1.62 | 1.05 | 1.22 | 1.04 | 1.66 | 1.13 | 1.17 | 1.12 |
| Honduras | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.50 | 0.56 | 0.72 | 0.58 | 0.77 | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.71 | 0.65 | 0.81 | 0.93 | 0.71 | 0.86 |
| 1999 | 0.64 | 0.78 | 0.98 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.74 | 0.83 | 0.89 |
| Mexico | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.79 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.87 | 0.79 | 0.82 | 0.85 | 0.81 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.80 | 0.85 |
| 2000 | 0.74 | 0.80 | 0.91 | 0.93 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.88 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 0.78 | 0.87 |
| Nicaragua d/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1993 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.68 | 0.83 | 0.74 | 0.59 | 0.57 | 0.65 | 0.82 | 0.64 | 0.62 |
| 1999 | 1.14 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 0.90 | 0.76 | 0.87 | 0.70 | 0.94 | 0.79 | 0.88 | 0.72 | 0.86 |
| Panama | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.53 | 0.67 | 0.86 | 0.68 | 0.77 | 0.89 | 0.82 | 0.78 | 0.69 | 0.85 | 0.82 | 0.77 | 0.94 |
| 1999 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.87 | 0.80 | 0.87 | 0.77 | 0.84 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.84 | 0.81 | 1.01 |
| Paraguay e/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.84 | 0.65 | 1.18 | 0.86 | 1.06 | 0.62 | 0.98 | 0.78 | 0.95 | 0.62 | 0.98 |
| 1998 | 1.18 | 1.09 | 0.84 | 1.20 | 1.16 | 0.86 | 1.02 | 0.95 | 1.32 | 0.92 | 0.99 | 0.93 | 1.19 |
| Peru f/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.76 | 1.29 | 2.41 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.71 | 1.02 | 0.63 | 0.58 | 0.83 | 1.31 | 0.62 | 0.96 |
| 2000 | 0.63 | 0.88 | 1.10 | 1.77 | 0.63 | 0.61 | 1.00 | 0.78 | 0.64 | 0.70 | 1.04 | 0.84 | 0.99 |
| Uruguay | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.64 | 0.84 | 0.39 | 1.07 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.75 | 0.69 | 0.73 | 0.78 | 0.68 | 0.71 | 0.81 |
| 1999 | 0.74 | 0.83 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.77 | 0.82 | 0.77 | 0.67 | 0.66 | 0.81 | 0.77 | 0.67 | 0.88 |
| Venezuela | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.69 | 0.78 | 0.84 | 0.97 | 0.87 | 0.86 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.77 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.84 | 0.93 |
| 1999 | 0.79 | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.99 | 0.79 | 0.78 | 0.88 | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.93 |
| Total countries g/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990-1993 | 0.81 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 0.75 | 0.67 | 0.73 | 0.70 | 0.67 | 0.70 | 0.75 | 0.71 | 0.67 | 0.83 |
| 1998-2000 | 0.89 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.94 | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.73 | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.74 | 0.91 |

Source: ILO, based on special tabulations of country Household Surveys. Figures refer to the weighted average of 15 Latin American countries with a labour force equal to 92% of the total non-agricultural EAP in the region.

a /Domestic service excluded.

b /Greater Buenos Aires.

c /Ten metropolitan areas.

d /Urban area.

e /Asuncion Metropolitan area.

f / Metropolitan Lima.

g /Weighted average of EAP in each country.

TABLE 8

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING MONTH INCOME AVERAGE, ACCORDING TO
ENTERPRISE SIZE AND EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF NON-AGRICULTURAL AND NON-DOMESTIC WAGE EARNERS, 1990-2000
(women/men ratio)

| Country & period | Wage earners in enterprise with up to 5 workers | | | | Wage earners in enterprise with more than 5 workers | | | | Total non-domestic wage earners | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| | Up to 5 years of schooling | From 6 to 9 years | From 10 to 12 years | From 13 and more years | Up to 5 years of schooling | From 6 to 9 years | From 10 to 12 years | From 13 and more years | Up to 5 years of schooling | From 6 to 9 years | From 10 to 12 years | From 13 and more years | |
| Argentina b/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2000 | 0.81 | 0.77 | 0.74 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.67 | 0.79 | 0.71 | 0.78 | 0.69 | 0.81 |
| Brazil | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.71 | 0.76 | 0.56 | 0.53 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.52 | 0.56 | 0.60 | 0.61 | 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.71 |
| 1999 | 0.81 | 0.78 | 0.72 | 0.54 | 0.67 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.57 | 0.71 | 0.67 | 0.64 | 0.56 | 0.80 |
| Chile | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.92 | 0.69 | 0.78 | 0.60 | 0.64 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.54 | 0.67 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 0.54 | 0.77 |
| 2000 | 0.66 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 0.84 | 0.75 | 0.73 | 0.82 | 0.62 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.80 | 0.62 | 0.82 |
| Colombia c/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1992 | 0.81 | 0.87 | 0.77 | 0.81 | 0.83 | 0.81 | 0.80 | 0.66 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.80 | 0.66 | 0.84 |
| 2000 | 0.84 | 0.92 | 0.73 | 1.01 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.84 | 0.77 | 0.82 | 0.78 | 0.90 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.65 | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.50 | 0.78 | 0.72 | 0.75 | 0.64 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.73 | 0.63 | 0.77 |
| 2000 | 0.66 | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.56 | 0.81 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.67 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.77 | 0.66 | 0.82 |
| Ecuador d/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.39 | 0.90 | 0.74 | 0.99 | 0.67 | 0.72 | 0.80 | 0.44 | 0.56 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.46 | 0.77 |
| 1998 | 0.67 | 0.60 | 0.73 | 0.76 | 0.53 | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.70 | 0.59 | 0.81 | 0.83 | 0.71 | 0.92 |
| El Salvador | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.58 | 0.68 | 0.74 | 0.79 | 0.74 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.74 | 0.69 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.74 | 0.84 |
| 1999 | 1.67 | 1.20 | 1.22 | 2.33 | 0.89 | 1.67 | 1.00 | 1.19 | 1.05 | 1.67 | 1.07 | 1.09 | 1.08 |
| Honduras | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.55 | 0.62 | 0.67 | 0.62 | 0.71 | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 0.64 | 0.82 |
| 1999 | 0.46 | 0.60 | 0.66 | 0.72 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.83 | 0.91 | 0.87 | 0.80 | 0.84 |
| Mexico | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.71 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.76 | 0.71 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.68 | 0.72 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.68 | 0.78 |
| 2000 | 0.64 | 0.71 | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.68 | 0.71 | 0.79 | 0.68 | 0.70 | 0.72 | 0.81 | 0.68 | 0.77 |
| Nicaragua d/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1993 | 0.57 | 0.63 | 1.01 | 0.82 | 0.62 | 0.77 | 0.70 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.64 | 0.80 | 0.61 | 0.60 |
| 1999 | 1.17 | 1.06 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.88 | 0.76 | 0.84 | 0.70 | 0.95 | 0.80 | 0.87 | 0.71 | 0.86 |
| Panama | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.56 | 0.74 | 0.90 | 0.61 | 0.74 | 0.83 | 0.78 | 0.75 | 0.67 | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.74 | 0.90 |
| 1999 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.93 | 0.77 | 0.81 | 0.72 | 0.82 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.83 | 0.77 | 0.96 |
| Paraguay e/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.54 | 0.72 | 0.78 | 0.62 | 0.98 | 0.79 | 0.97 | 0.52 | 0.79 | 0.77 | 0.88 | 0.55 | 0.90 |
| 1998 | 0.85 | 0.96 | 0.83 | 1.09 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.81 | 0.89 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.80 | 1.03 |
| Peru f/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 0.62 | 1.07 | 2.02 | 0.40 | 0.31 | 0.61 | 0.86 | 0.54 | 0.42 | 0.70 | 1.09 | 0.53 | 0.79 |
| 2000 | 0.67 | 0.73 | 0.82 | 1.61 | 0.70 | 0.58 | 0.88 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.62 | 0.87 | 0.74 | 0.85 |
| Uruguay | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | 0.50 | 0.72 | 0.35 | 0.84 | 0.64 | 0.68 | 0.67 | 0.57 | 0.61 | 0.68 | 0.61 | 0.58 | 0.69 |
| 1999 | 0.63 | 0.71 | 0.66 | 0.68 | 0.64 | 0.71 | 0.67 | 0.56 | 0.55 | 0.70 | 0.66 | 0.57 | 0.74 |
| Venezuela | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | 0.63 | 0.74 | 0.79 | 0.86 | 0.81 | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.78 | 0.88 |
| 1999 | 0.76 | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.98 | 0.73 | 0.74 | 0.82 | 0.78 | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.89 |
| Total countries g/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990-1993 | 0.71 | 0.79 | 0.77 | 0.66 | 0.59 | 0.68 | 0.64 | 0.59 | 0.62 | 0.70 | 0.65 | 0.59 | 0.75 |
| 1998-2000 | 0.79 | 0.75 | 0.74 | 0.76 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.59 | 0.71 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.59 | 0.82 |

Source: ILO, based on special tabulations of country Household Surveys. Figures refer to the weighted average of 15 Latin American countries with a labour force equal to 92% of the total non-agricultural EAP in the region.

a / Domestic service excluded.

b / Greater Buenos Aires.

c / Ten metropolitan areas.

d / Urban area.

e / Asuncion Metropolitan area.

f / Metropolitan Lima.

g / Weighted average of EAP in each country.

TABLE 9

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR INCOME AVERAGE, ACCORDING TO
AGE STRETCHS IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS, 1990-2000
(women/men ratio)

| Country & period | Wage earners in Private sector (nd) a/ | | | Public Sector | Total wage earners (nd) (Private + Public) | Self-employed | Employers | Informal Sector | Formal Sector | Total Non-agricultural |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|---------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|------------------------|
| | Up to 5 workers | More than 5 workers | Total private wage earners (nd) | | | | | | | |
| Argentina b/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 1.12 | 1.08 | 1.09 | 1.08 | 1.09 | 0.87 | 1.41 | 1.14 | 1.09 | 1.10 |
| 25-39 | 1.02 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 1.16 | 1.03 | 0.93 | 0.34 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 0.94 |
| 40-60 | 1.01 | 1.08 | 1.05 | 0.85 | 1.06 | 0.92 | 0.58 | 0.76 | 1.02 | 0.93 |
| Brazil | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 1.26 | 0.92 | 0.69 | 1.12 | 0.50 | 0.90 | 0.74 |
| 25-39 | 0.88 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.88 | 0.71 | 0.87 | 0.53 | 0.85 | 0.72 |
| 40-60 | 0.82 | 0.70 | 0.71 | 0.61 | 0.77 | 0.56 | 0.68 | 0.46 | 0.70 | 0.58 |
| 1999 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.84 | 0.98 | 0.89 | 1.09 | 0.66 | 0.96 | 0.81 |
| 25-39 | 0.99 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 0.83 | 0.98 | 0.82 | 0.92 | 0.62 | 0.91 | 0.79 |
| 40-60 | 0.82 | 0.78 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.84 | 0.73 | 0.88 | 0.60 | 0.77 | 0.69 |
| Chile* | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.77 | 1.09 | 1.02 | * | 1.02 | 0.98 | 1.95 | 0.49 | 1.17 | 0.86 |
| 25-39 | 0.97 | 0.83 | 0.84 | * | 0.84 | 1.09 | 0.65 | 0.77 | 0.79 | 0.77 |
| 40-60 | 0.97 | 0.80 | 0.81 | * | 0.81 | 0.68 | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.72 | 0.61 |
| 2000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.73 | 0.57 | 0.60 | * | 0.60 | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.93 | 0.57 | 0.68 |
| 25-39 | 1.11 | 0.91 | 0.91 | * | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.84 | 0.69 | 0.88 | 0.80 |
| 40-60 | 0.99 | 0.95 | 0.92 | * | 0.92 | 0.91 | 0.66 | 0.58 | 0.86 | 0.71 |
| Colombia c/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1992 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.99 | 0.94 | 0.96 | 1.24 | 0.98 | 1.06 | 0.72 | 0.79 | 0.96 | 0.88 |
| 25-39 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 1.01 | 0.95 | 0.77 | 0.87 | 0.72 | 0.90 | 0.85 |
| 40-60 | 0.80 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.65 | 0.78 | 0.62 | 0.78 | 0.70 |
| 2000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 1.35 | 1.05 | 1.14 | 1.87 | 1.19 | 0.96 | 0.39 | 1.08 | 1.12 | 1.09 |
| 25-39 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.10 | 0.91 | 1.09 | 0.81 | 1.13 | 0.85 | 1.04 | 0.99 |
| 40-60 | 1.09 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 0.86 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 0.73 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 0.85 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.86 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.87 | 0.57 | 0.64 | 0.99 | 0.87 |
| 25-39 | 0.91 | 0.83 | 0.84 | 0.99 | 0.95 | 0.89 | 1.29 | 0.66 | 0.96 | 0.87 |
| 40-60 | 0.63 | 0.69 | 0.65 | 0.97 | 0.91 | 0.59 | 0.53 | 0.57 | 0.87 | 0.75 |
| 2000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.91 | 1.13 | 1.09 | 0.98 | 1.09 | 0.77 | 1.58 | 0.76 | 1.13 | 1.01 |
| 25-39 | 0.90 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 1.09 | 1.05 | 0.97 | 0.92 | 0.73 | 1.06 | 0.95 |
| 40-60 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.66 | 0.91 | 0.63 | 0.99 | 0.84 |
| Ecuador d/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.69 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.99 | 0.92 | 1.10 | 0.96 | 0.67 | 0.92 | 0.84 |
| 25-39 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 0.71 | 0.78 | 0.62 | 0.88 | 0.76 |
| 40-60 | 0.62 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.81 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 1.01 | 0.73 | 0.74 | 0.67 |
| 1998 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 1.00 | 1.09 | 1.12 | 1.28 | 1.15 | 0.89 | 0.62 | 0.73 | 1.05 | 0.87 |
| 25-39 | 0.77 | 1.12 | 1.08 | 0.83 | 1.04 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.65 | 0.97 | 0.82 |
| 40-60 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.78 | 0.89 | 0.74 | 0.73 | 0.64 | 0.80 | 0.68 |
| El Salvador | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.73 | 0.90 | 0.88 | 1.23 | 0.93 | 0.68 | 0.66 | 0.52 | 0.95 | 0.74 |
| 25-39 | 0.73 | 0.92 | 0.90 | 1.10 | 0.98 | 0.48 | 0.94 | 0.50 | 0.99 | 0.69 |
| 40-60 | 0.61 | 0.88 | 0.86 | 1.16 | 1.01 | 0.61 | 0.74 | 0.54 | 0.97 | 0.59 |
| 1999 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 1.54 | 0.98 | 1.10 | 1.09 | 1.04 | 0.46 | 0.21 | 1.30 | 0.72 | 0.83 |
| 25-39 | 0.73 | 0.92 | 0.90 | 1.10 | 0.98 | 0.48 | 0.94 | 0.50 | 0.99 | 0.69 |
| 40-60 | 0.61 | 0.88 | 0.86 | 1.16 | 1.01 | 0.61 | 0.74 | 0.54 | 0.97 | 0.59 |

TABLE 9 (Continued)

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR INCOME AVERAGE, ACCORDING TO
AGE STRETCHS IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS, 1990-2000
(women/men ratio)

| Country & period | Wage earners in Private sector(nd) a/ | | | Public Sector | Total wage earners (nd) (Private +Public) | Self-employed | Employers | Informal Sector | Formal Sector | Total Non-agricultural |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|------------------------|
| | Up to 5 workers | More than 5 workers | Total private wage earners (nd) | | | | | | | |
| Honduras | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.27 | 1.12 | 0.55 | 0.24 | 0.46 | 1.06 | 0.69 |
| 25-39 | 0.54 | 0.84 | 0.77 | 1.03 | 0.97 | 0.43 | 0.56 | 0.44 | 0.98 | 0.61 |
| 40-60 | 0.56 | 1.12 | 0.96 | 1.40 | 1.26 | 0.42 | 0.34 | 0.42 | 1.03 | 0.55 |
| 1999 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.57 | 0.92 | 0.93 | 1.12 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 1.24 | 0.61 | 0.94 | 0.82 |
| 25-39 | 0.86 | 0.84 | 0.87 | 1.04 | 0.96 | 0.54 | 0.59 | 0.52 | 0.91 | 0.71 |
| 40-60 | 0.88 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 1.07 | 1.01 | 0.54 | 0.65 | 0.53 | 0.90 | 0.63 |
| Mexico | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 1.11 | 1.02 | 1.04 | 1.20 | 1.07 | 1.14 | 1.04 | 0.85 | 1.06 | 1.00 |
| 25-39 | 0.79 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.92 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 0.70 | 0.84 | 0.81 |
| 40-60 | 0.92 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.94 | 0.85 | 0.68 | 0.91 | 0.62 | 0.78 | 0.70 |
| 2000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.88 | 0.97 | 0.98 | 1.30 | 1.01 | 0.86 | 2.15 | 0.79 | 1.01 | 0.96 |
| 25-39 | 0.93 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 1.17 | 1.01 | 0.83 | 1.02 | 0.80 | 0.94 | 0.92 |
| 40-60 | 0.84 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.78 | 0.71 | 0.69 | 0.85 | 0.79 |
| Nicaragua d/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1993 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.55 | 1.15 | 0.86 | 0.99 | 0.90 | 0.69 | 0.58 | 0.63 | 1.02 | 0.83 |
| 25-39 | 0.59 | 0.66 | 0.59 | 0.78 | 0.69 | 0.73 | 0.55 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.71 |
| 40-60 | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.53 | 0.68 | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.62 | 0.69 | 0.51 | 0.60 |
| 1999 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 0.93 | 1.17 | 1.01 | 0.96 | 0.00 | 0.85 | 1.14 | 0.99 |
| 25-39 | 0.97 | 1.02 | 0.90 | 0.83 | 0.89 | 0.38 | 0.82 | 0.52 | 0.92 | 0.72 |
| 40-60 | 0.75 | 0.79 | 0.61 | 0.40 | 0.53 | 0.60 | 0.58 | 0.63 | 0.60 | 0.51 |
| Panama | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.84 | 0.96 | 0.94 | 1.28 | 1.02 | 0.90 | 0.53 | 0.57 | 1.04 | 0.78 |
| 25-39 | 1.02 | 1.06 | 1.05 | 0.98 | 1.04 | 0.72 | 0.78 | 0.62 | 1.04 | 0.96 |
| 40-60 | 0.52 | 0.78 | 0.75 | 0.91 | 0.88 | 0.71 | 0.41 | 0.57 | 0.83 | 0.79 |
| 1999 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 1.40 | 1.20 | 1.22 | 1.04 | 1.20 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.76 | 1.15 | 1.01 |
| 25-39 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 0.92 | 1.00 | 0.74 | 1.19 | 0.75 | 0.99 | 0.93 |
| 40-60 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.89 | 0.88 | 0.93 | 0.75 | 0.54 | 0.69 | 0.90 | 0.85 |
| Paraguay e/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.77 | 1.11 | 0.88 | 1.29 | 0.98 | 0.79 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 1.22 | 0.64 |
| 25-39 | 0.83 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.79 | 0.93 | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.56 | 0.91 | 0.69 |
| 40-60 | 1.34 | 0.96 | 1.07 | 0.88 | 1.05 | 0.57 | 0.75 | 0.52 | 0.80 | 0.57 |
| 1998 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 1.03 | 0.97 | 1.03 | 1.20 | 1.05 | 0.60 | 0.17 | 0.72 | 0.96 | 0.81 |
| 25-39 | 0.94 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 0.98 | 1.04 | 0.65 | 0.68 | 0.62 | 1.01 | 0.79 |
| 40-60 | 1.05 | 1.44 | 1.35 | 0.81 | 1.11 | 0.73 | 0.72 | 0.66 | 0.96 | 0.71 |
| Peru f/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 1.28 | 1.01 | 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.59 | 0.99 | 0.79 |
| 25-39 | 1.68 | 0.79 | 0.98 | 1.10 | 1.04 | 0.64 | 0.36 | 0.70 | 0.82 | 0.73 |
| 40-60 | 1.16 | 1.09 | 1.04 | 0.86 | 0.98 | 0.62 | 2.62 | 0.63 | 1.11 | 0.75 |
| 2000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.85 | 0.89 | 0.91 | 0.69 | 0.91 | 0.58 | 0.64 | 0.93 | 0.88 | 0.89 |
| 25-39 | 1.17 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 0.76 | 0.94 | 0.66 | 0.96 | 0.88 | 0.86 | 0.78 |
| 40-60 | 2.39 | 1.03 | 1.22 | 1.31 | 1.22 | 0.76 | 1.14 | 1.00 | 1.09 | 0.95 |
| Uruguay | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 1.08 | 0.92 | 0.94 | 1.41 | 0.99 | 0.76 | 0.98 | 0.65 | 0.99 | 0.87 |
| 25-39 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 1.24 | 0.96 | 0.77 | 0.90 | 0.55 | 0.94 | 0.82 |
| 40-60 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.78 | 1.07 | 0.88 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.56 | 0.84 | 0.70 |

TABLE 9 (Continued)

LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
RATIO BETWEEN WOMEN/MEN WORKING HOUR INCOME AVERAGE, ACCORDING TO
AGE STRETCHS IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS, 1990-2000
(women/men ratio)

| Country & period | Wage earners in Private sector (nd) a/ | | | Public Sector | Total wage earners (nd) (Private +Public) | Self-employed | Employers | Informal Sector | Formal Sector | Total Non-agricultural |
|---------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------------|
| | Up to 5 workers | More than 5 workers | Total private wage earners (nd) | | | | | | | |
| 1999 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 1.01 | 0.90 | 0.92 | 1.49 | 0.98 | 0.52 | 3.10 | 0.67 | 0.98 | 0.87 |
| 25-39 | 0.84 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 1.22 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.68 | 1.01 | 0.90 |
| 40-60 | 0.74 | 0.87 | 0.83 | 1.04 | 0.91 | 0.76 | 0.79 | 0.60 | 0.89 | 0.75 |
| Venezuela | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.82 | 1.04 | 0.99 | 0.85 | 0.97 | 1.07 | 1.79 | 0.79 | 1.00 | 0.93 |
| 25-39 | 0.88 | 1.02 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.66 | 0.97 | 0.88 |
| 40-60 | 0.69 | 0.84 | 0.79 | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.65 | 0.77 | 0.58 | 0.75 | 0.69 |
| 1999 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.96 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1.08 | 0.87 | 1.11 | 0.86 | 1.06 | 0.98 |
| 25-39 | 0.90 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.77 | 1.01 | 0.74 | 0.97 | 0.87 |
| 40-60 | 0.87 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.91 | 0.94 | 0.76 | 0.71 | 0.70 | 0.87 | 0.80 |
| Total countries g/ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90-93 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 1.18 | 0.96 | 0.83 | 1.09 | 0.60 | 0.95 | 0.81 |
| 25-39 | 0.88 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.93 | 0.90 | 0.74 | 0.85 | 0.59 | 0.86 | 0.76 |
| 40-60 | 0.83 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.61 | 0.79 | 0.53 | 0.74 | 0.62 |
| 98-00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 0.99 | 0.97 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.86 | 1.12 | 0.75 | 0.97 | 0.87 |
| 25-39 | 0.97 | 0.94 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 0.80 | 0.94 | 0.69 | 0.93 | 0.83 |
| 40-60 | 0.92 | 0.83 | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.90 | 0.75 | 0.81 | 0.65 | 0.82 | 0.74 |

Source: ILO, based on special tabulations of country Household Surveys. Figures refer to the weighted average of 15 Latin American countries with a labour force equal to 92% of the total non-agricultural EAP in the region.



a /Domestic service excluded.

b /Greater Buenos Aires.

c /Ten metropolitan areas.

d /Urban area.

e /Asuncion Metropolitan area.

f /Metropolitan Lima.

g /Weighted average of EAP in each country.

*The public sector is included in the private one.

Decent Work development index, 1990-2000

The ILO's role is to help the generation of new opportunities of decent work so as to improve the situation of people in the labour world that presently is undergoing great changes. In this respect, the priority is to promote opportunities for men and women to enable them to get decent and productive jobs in conditions of freedom, equality, safety and human dignity.

When tackling this matter, the ILO considers economic and social development as two mutually strengthening aspects of the same process, as shown in the Organization's four basic objectives (ILO, 1999): The effective application of *International Labour Standards* provides basic rules and a development framework. The *improvement of work and income conditions* is a factor helping to achieve a respectable standard of living and full personal development. The *expansion of social protection* permits a minimum protection level and a guaranteed income; and the *strengthening of social dialogue* develops mechanisms for social interlocutors to create institutions for a vigorous and flexible labour market to contribute to peace and long-lasting social stability. Decent work is the meeting point for these four basic objectives.

The following analysis is necessarily of a partial nature, considering that it touches only some of the components of decent work. In fact, when estimating the "Decent work development index" data are included which cover only the situation of employment and social protection of workers in Latin America during the 1990-2000 period. The index comprises seven indicators referring to *employment* components (unemployment rate, informality), *income* (industrial wage, minimum wage and women/men income gap) and *social protection* of workers (social security coverage and number of working hours).

The index registers improvements in decent work conditions in a country when the unemployment and informality rates diminish, when the purchasing power of both the industrial and the minimum wages im-

proves, and the income gap between men and women is reduced. Also, when it widens social protection coverage and the number of effective working hours in each country is adjusted to national legislation and to the development of the effective labour situation in the region.

Decent work development in Latin America is analyzed from two perspectives that are complementary. The first refers to the evolution of the absolute level of decent work development in each country, measured in terms of variations progress, reversal or stagnation shown by the decent work development index in the final year of the analyzed period as being greater, lower or equal to that registered at the first year of the period. The second perspective concerns changes undergone in each country's position compared to other countries in the region, changes that would allow to analyze the relative development of each country in matters of decent work during the past ten years.

The decent work development index was drawn up through basic indicators (see Statistical Annex) of unemployment, informality and social security coverage, as well as the number of working hours (see *2000 Labour Overview*). In order to measure the purchasing power of the industrial and minimum wages in comparable units in different countries, a reference was used on the number of months necessary to acquire a standard car with an average industrial wage, and the number of kilos of bread that can be bought in each country with a minimum wage (see *2000 Labour Overview*). Figures on the evolution of the income gap between men and women appear in the section on special issues in this Report.

From the variations seen in the seven indicators considered, the following tendencies were observed in countries of the region during the years 1990-2000 (see Table 1b). Countries are arranged in five strata (from greater to lesser) according to the valid decent work index at the beginning of the 1990s.



The evolution of the *absolute level* of decent work indicators in each of the fifteen countries analyzed is shown in a table not very encouraging for the 1990-2000 period. In fact, seven countries recorded progress in decent work conditions (Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Panama and Paraguay) and conditions remained constant in two others (Bolivia and Peru).

In the other six countries, indicators showed a reversal in the 1990s (Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Mexico, Uruguay and Venezuela). It is noteworthy that the EAP of these six countries represents about 75% of the all Latin America and the Caribbean. Therefore, the lowered indicators for these countries necessarily affect the region's average labour performance.

Insofar as the factors contributing to improvement of decent work conditions are concerned, the following should be noted. First of all, the income gap between men and women decreased in all countries studied. The increase in the industrial and minimum wages is another indicator of this improvement in living conditions for workers in most countries. On the other hand, the evolution of unemployment and informality,

together with the reduced social protection coverage, were factors of generalized worsening of decent work conditions in countries during the past decade.

In the group of countries that registers advances in decent work conditions a definite progress pattern does not exist. In all of them the income gap between women and men is reduced and the number of working hours diminishes. In addition, in most of the countries increases are observed in industrial and minimum wages, even when these are offset by increases in informality and reductions of social security coverage. In this group of countries the progress registered by Chile and Costa Rica stands out, with great performance indicators in employment, wages, income gap and working hours. In Panama, the purchasing power of wages increases and the unemployment is reduced, while El Salvador reports a decrease in unemployment and informality as well as in women/men income gaps.

Countries that did not register any variations in their decent work development indices showed positive evolution in some indicators that were offset by the negative performances of others. In Peru, the de-

TABLE 1b

**LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
EVOLUTION OF THE ABSOLUTE LEVEL OF DECENT WORK BY LEVELS
1990-2000**

| Relative level of progress 1990 <i>a/</i> | Country/Period | Variation 1990-2000 |
|---|----------------|---------------------|
| Higher | Brazil | - |
| | Costa Rica | + |
| | Mexico | - |
| Medium-High | Argentina | - |
| | Chile | + |
| | Panama | + |
| | Uruguay | - |
| Medium | Ecuador | - |
| | Venezuela | - |
| Medium-Low | Colombia | + |
| | Honduras | + |
| | Peru | o |
| | Bolivia | o |
| Low | El Salvador | + |
| | Paraguay | + |

Source: ILO, based on the Statistical Annex.

+ Means improvement in decent work index.

o Means maintenance of decent work index.

- Means worsening of decent work level.

a/ To measure the decent work index, the following indicators were used: the urban unemployed rate, the income gap between men and women, the formal sector's percentage of total non-agricultural employment, the purchasing power of the industrial and minimum wages expressed in measurement units comparable to other countries' percentage of social coverage of wage earners, and the number of working hours in each country.

creased income gap and higher wages are offset by increased unemployment, reduced social protection coverage and an increase in the informality level. In turn, Bolivia showed an increase in the purchasing power of industrial and minimum wages, together with higher unemployment and informality rates, and an increase in the number of effective working hours.

In countries with decreased decent work development indices, unemployment and informality showed an increase. In the case of Argentina and Ecuador, to the employment deterioration was added the reduced real purchasing power of the industrial and minimum wages, as well as the lower social coverage. Brazil also manifested this tendency although the industrial wages improved in real terms. For their part, the poor performance of Mexico and Uruguay are showed by the lower purchasing power of wages in both countries. Finally, in Venezuela's labour performance, the only positive factor recorded was the unemployment maintained and the decrease in the income gap between men and women.

The relative level of decent work development is obtained by comparing the position of each country with that of the rest during the 1990-2000 period. Table 2b displays the situation of each one during the year 1990 (above) and 2000 (to the left) in five ordered strata (from higher to lower) in both years. Countries located along the diagonal maintained in the year 2000 the same decent work development level achieved in 1990. Those located below the diagonal suffered

deterioration, and those appearing above improved their relative position.

In the group of fifteen countries studied, certain stability is shown when comparing the positions achieved in 2000 with those registered in 1990.

Three countries show important improvements in labour performance. In fact, Chile and Panama have risen from the relative *medium high* level in 1990 to *high* in 2000, as a result of the reduced deficit in decent work achieved in the 1990s. On the other hand, El Salvador, that formed part of the group of countries at the *low* level in 1990, improved the decent work development index, rising to the *medium* level in 2000.

Eight countries retained their positions at the beginning of the 1990s. This can be seen in the case of countries with *high* decent work development indicators (Costa Rica and Mexico), *medium* (Venezuela), *medium-low* (Colombia, Honduras and Peru) and *low* (Bolivia and Paraguay).

Four countries show a fall in their relative labour progress positions. Brazil fell from *high* in 1990 to *medium high* in 2000. Argentina and Uruguay fell from *medium high* to *medium*, in those years. This deterioration also affected Ecuador, which had a poor relative performance falling from *medium* in 1999 to *low* in 2000, as a result of which the indices show an increased in decent work deficit during the decade.

TABLE 2b

**LATIN AMERICA: SELECTED COUNTRIES
EVOLUTION OF THE RELATIVE LEVEL OF DECENT WORK, 1990-2000**

| 2000/1990 | High | Medium-High | Medium | Medium-Low | Low |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| High | Costa Rica Mexico | Chile Panama | | | |
| Medium-High | Brazil | | | | |
| Medium | | Argentina Uruguay | Venezuela | | El Salvador |
| Medium-Low | | | | Colombia Honduras Peru | |
| Low | | | Ecuador | | Bolivia Paraguay |

Source: ILO, based on data from the Statistical Annex.

Protection to the unemployed: unemployment insurance in Latin America

An important part of the Latin American labour force is suffering from unemployment. Approximately one out of ten workers is actually unemployed. For this reason, governments have traditionally responded to this situation by applying a set of policies and programmes that, on one hand, protect the income of unemployed workers and, on the other, permit them to be more easily relocated in other jobs.


Policies for granting benefits in cash or goods to the unemployed while also protecting the job can be classified as active and passive. The first represents those in which there is initiative and discretionary governmental action. In this group qualify policies such as employment services (information and labour intermediation), training and instruction, programmes giving rise to direct employment and subsidies for generating private employment. On the other hand, passive policies imply programmes and regulations that act automatically once the unemployment contingency arises. In this area classify unemployment insurance, early retirement plans and individual unemployment compensation funds.

Countries generally adopt a combination of active and passive policies depending on economic and institutional factors. Countries which traditionally have benefited from an extensive social strata protection system, such as the European ones, generally have privileged wide passive programmes through unemployment insurance. A method of assessing the importance of policies one way or another is to determine the fiscal expense allotted to each one of them. For example, countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have given greater average weight to passive policies (1.85% of the GDP) than to the active (0.95%). On the other hand, in Latin America, active policies appear to be more pertinent, as shown in the cases of Chile and Brazil (see Figure 1c). Moreover, it is important to note that the consolidated expenditure of both policy types is substantially lower in countries in the region when compared to the United States, the OECD or the European Union.



FIGURE 1c

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PROTECTION FOR UNEMPLOYED ACTIVE AND PASSIVE POLICIES, circa 1995 - 2000 (percentages)



Source: ILO, based on OECD and country data.

Unemployment insurance in the region

Unemployment insurance is not widespread among the countries in the region. On the other hand, a limited number of these do have this plan, although in some cases it is more of a sort of social assistance programme for the unemployed rather than a real insurance as such. Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Uruguay and Venezuela have plans for protecting the income of the unemployed in a kind of insurance or social assistance form (see Table 1c). Recently, Chile introduced an important reform that is described further on.

Unemployment insurance plans in the region are of a contributory nature, financed by employed and/or employers' contributions, as well as governmental contributions. The benefits are of a defined nature and have a variable duration (from 3 to 12 months) that, in turn, depends on the length of time the contributions were made. Some plans establish requirements for the beneficiary with the purpose of reducing the moral risk or eventual abuse of the plan. Beneficiaries, for example, must attend training courses or, after a time of unemployment, sometimes be forced to

accept job offers that are not necessarily related to their training nor their labour experience.

Programme administration is State run through specific social security organizations (such as the Social Insurance Bank in Uruguay) or linked to institutions that administer a set of programmes for the unemployed (for example, the Employment Fund in Argentina).

Performance of unemployment insurance programmes

It is difficult to establish a performance pattern for unemployment insurance programmes in Latin America considering that each plan depends on the characteristics and peculiarities of how the local labour market works. However, various studies show that the programme has a limited coverage due to its contributory nature. Moreover, the restrictions of the labour market itself and of the social institutionality reveal its scarce adaptability to demands made on it. An example of this is the case of Argentina, that with informal employment exceeding 49% and an unem

TABLE 1c

LATIN AMERICA CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE/UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAMMES, 1997-2001

| Country | First Law & Law in force | Wage earners coverage | | Contributions (% Wage) | | | Conditions (Months of insurance or contributio) | Benefits | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------|---------------|---|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | Totalid | Part | Insured | Employer | State | | % Of income | Playment period (Weeks) | Waiting period (days) |
| Argentina | 1967, 1991, 1995 | ^{a/} x | | 0 | 1,5 | 0 | 12 | 60 | 17-52 | 0 |
| Brazil | 1965, 1986, 1990, 1996 | x | | 0 | 0 | ^{b/} | 36 | 1-3 salario mínimo | 17 | 0 |
| Chile Until 2001 | 1937, 1981, 2001 | x | | 0 | 0 | ^{b/} | 12 | ^{f/} | 26-52 | 0 |
| Chile 2002 | | ^{c/} x | | 0,6 | 2,4 | ^{d/} | 12 | 50 | 4-21 | 0 |
| Ecuador | 1951, 1988 | | ^{e/} x | 2,0 | 1,0 | 0 | 24 | ^{f/} | | 60 |
| Uruguay | 1944, 1981 | | ^{g/} x | 0 | 0 | ^{b/} | 6 | 50-60 | 26 | 0 |
| Venezuela | 1990 | | ^{h/} x | 0,7 | 1,5 | 0 | 12 | 60 | 13-26 | 30 |

Source: ILO, based on Mesa-Lago, Carmelo and Bertranou, Fabio (1998) and updated for Chile by data from the Ministry of Labour and Social Security (2001).

a / Excludes public workers.

b / Complete cost. In Uruguay this is theoretically financed by general contributions, actually by governmental transfers and taxes. In Brazil, it is financed by the State, at least for the first year.

c / Excludes workers in private houses who already have their own protection system.

d / There exists a fiscal contribution amounting to more than 6 billion pesos in May 2001.

e / Retirement pension for workers between 60 and 65 years of age.

f / Fixed monthly sum.

g / Private waged employment, excluding the banking sector, agriculture and domestic service workers.

h / Workers in the private and public sectors with fixed term contracts, who are covered by the social security system. Excludes employees in private houses.

Note: Mexico has an unemployment insurance plan for unemployed workers between 60 and 64 years old.



ployment rate that reached double digits during the 1990s, the programme has not exceeded coverage of 7.4% of the unemployed during its best year (1994). Moreover, data shows the programme's low adaptability to the evolution of the unemployment cycle (see Figure 2c).

Other important problems of these programmes refer to inconsistency between the insurance objectives and the validity of other regulations for protecting the income of the unemployed. For example, in financial terms, severance pay represents, in many countries, a greater compensation than what the insurance does. On the other hand, with unemployment insurance certain labour market restrictions can be reduced and, moreover, can benefit from the advantages of the automatic anti-cyclic behavior of this mechanism.

A recurring problem has been the low connection of insurance to other programmes for protecting the unemployed such as, for example, training programmes and national services of employment. This has weakened the programme's effectiveness in achieving their objectives. Moreover, in countries like Brazil, the insurance provides disproportionate

coverage to young workers seeking work for the first time and/or those under high unemployment. This leads to pondering whether the insurance is really an ideal instrument for covering this contingency in the case of young workers.


Reform in Chile: Does it mark the beginning of a new generation of reforms?

In 2001, Chile introduced a new legislation that could lead to a new generation of reforms in unemployment insurance matters. The new plan, to be implemented in 2002, is a mixed scheme that combines an obligatory savings plan based on Individual Unemployment Accounts –that are the workers' patrimony– with a Joint Fund that operates as a source of complementary financing for the payment of benefits, while the worker is unemployed. This means that there exists a co-responsibility component for financing, since the worker also concurs with his own contributions to the system's financing. In turn, the worker contributes to the control of pressures on the equilibrium of the Joint Unemployment Fund, since it is established that one of the conditions for acceding to this fund is having completely spent his own resources.



FIGURE 2c

**ARGENTINA
COVERAGE AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES
ON SOCIAL SECURITY'S PART
(percentages)**



Source: ILO, based on official data from Argentina.

The financing of unemployment insurance is of a tripartite nature, based on monthly sums contributed by employers, workers and the State (see Figure 3c). The monthly contribution that the unemployment insurance demands is equal to 3% of the worker's wage: 0.6% from the worker that is deposited entirely in his Individual Unemployment Account, 2.4% in charge of the employer which is distributed as follows: 1.6% contributed to the Individual Account and 0.8% to the Joint Fund. The fiscal contribution is destined to finance the Joint Fund.

It covers all workers comprehended under the Labour Code's clauses, whether they are temporary workers or they have indefinite contracts. An exception is made on domestic workers, who have their own system to protect them. Insofar as benefits are concerned, once twelve contributions have been made, the insurance makes payments for any occurrence (dismissal, resignation, retirement or death of the worker). Benefits vary according to the reason for the job separation. For example, when due to the needs of the enterprise, five monthly wages are granted with decreasing amounts calculated on the basis of the latest remunerations. These are financed with


accumulated resources in the Individual Unemployment Account and, in the event these are totally spent, they are complemented by the Joint Fund. In the case of other causes of unemployment, the worker has the right to withdraw the accumulated resources in his Individual Unemployment Account from 1 to 5 monthly drafts, according to the periods quoted. In case of a worker's death, the resources are given to the heirs.

The administration is entrusted to an entity that makes the collection and pays the benefits, which is selected through open public bidding, for a 5 to 10 year period. A bipartite Committee will be established, without administrative faculties, to represent the users. Overall control falls on the Superintendence of Pension Funds Administrators.

Finally, it must be emphasized that this new plan is an innovation in the region's social security reforms, having various integrated elements such as a joint fund, individual savings, tripartite contributions and being managed by a sole operator (unlike multiple managers as is the case of old-age, disability and survival and health insurance).

FIGURE 3c

FINANCING, ADMINISTRATION AND BENEFITS OF THE NEW UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IN CHILE



Source: Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Chile (2001).

1/ The law establishes a fixed amount according to the average expenditure of severance allowance of the last years.

Statistical Annex



TABLE 1-A

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: OPEN URBAN UNEMPLOYMENT. 1985-2001
(average annual rates)

| Country | 1985 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2000 | 2001 | |
|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------------------|-------------|----|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | Up to the third quarter | m/ | |
| Argentina a/ | 6.1 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 9.6 | 11.5 | 17.5 | 17.3 | 14.9 | 12.9 | 14.3 | 15.1 | 15.4 | 16.4 | o/ |
| Bolivia a/ | 5.7 | 7.2 | 5.9 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 7.5 | 7.4 | ... | ... | |
| Brazil b/ | 5.3 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 6.2 | m/ |
| Chile c/ | 17.0 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 7.8 | 6.6 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 9.8 | 9.2 | 9.4 | 9.5 | m/ |
| Colombia d/ | 13.8 | 10.5 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 11.2 | 12.4 | 15.2 | 19.4 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 18.7 | m/ |
| Costa Rica a/ | 7.2 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 6.2 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.8 | o/ |
| Dominican Republic i/ | ... | ... | 19.6 | 20.3 | 19.9 | 16.0 | 15.8 | 16.5 | 15.9 | 14.3 | 13.8 | 13.9 | ... | ... | |
| Ecuador a/ | 10.4 | 6.1 | 8.5 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 10.4 | 9.3 | 11.5 | 15.1 | 14.1 | 14.9 | 11.0 | m/ |
| El Salvador a/ | ... | 10.0 | 7.5 | 6.8 | ... | 7.0 | 7.0 | 5.8 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 8.0 | 6.6 | ... | ... | |
| Honduras a/ | 11.7 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 4.0 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 5.2 | ... | ... | ... | |
| Mexico e/ | 4.4 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | m/ |
| Nicaragua a/ | 3.2 | 7.6 | ... | 14.4 | 17.8 | 17.1 | 16.9 | 16.0 | 14.3 | 13.2 | 10.7 | 9.8 | ... | ... | |
| Panama f/ | 15.7 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 18.2 | 15.6 | 15.8 | 16.4 | 16.9 | 15.4 | 15.6 | 13.6 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 16.6 | |
| Paraguay g/ | 5.1 | 6.6 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 5.3 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 9.4 | 10.0 | ... | ... | |
| Peru h/ | 10.1 | 8.3 | 5.9 | 9.4 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 9.5 | n/ |
| Uruguay | 13.1 | 9.2 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 8.4 | 9.2 | 10.8 | 12.3 | 11.6 | 10.2 | 11.8 | 13.6 | 13.4 | 15.4 | m/ |
| Venezuela a/ | 14.3 | 11.0 | 10.1 | 8.1 | 6.8 | 8.9 | 10.3 | 11.8 | 11.4 | 11.3 | 14.9 | 13.9 | 14.1 | 13.9 | o/ |
| Latin America j/ | 9.5 | 8.2 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 8.8 | 8.4 | 9.3 | 9.9 | 9.3 | 9.4 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 11.1 | 11.4 | |
| k/ | 8.3 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 7.4 | 7.9 | 7.5 | 8.1 | 8.9 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 8.3 | |
| The Caribbean l/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Barbados | 18.7 | 15.0 | 17.3 | 23.0 | 24.3 | 21.9 | 19.7 | 15.6 | 14.5 | 12.3 | 10.4 | 9.3 | ... | ... | p/ |
| Jamaica | 25.0 | 15.3 | 15.7 | 15.4 | 16.3 | 15.4 | 16.2 | 16.0 | 16.5 | 15.5 | 15.7 | 15.5 | ... | ... | p/ |
| Trinidad & Tobago | 15.7 | 20.0 | 18.5 | 19.6 | 19.8 | 18.4 | 17.2 | 16.2 | 15.0 | 14.2 | 13.1 | 12.5 | ... | ... | n/ |

Source: ILO, based on country Household Surveys.

a/ National Urban.

b/ Six metropolitan regions.

c/ Country total.

d/ Seven metropolitan areas. Annual average from 1985 to 1999. From 2000 the overall was modified to 13 metropolitan areas.

e/ Country total until 1998. From 1999 includes only Quito, Guayaquil and Cuenca.

f/ 39 Urban areas.

g/ Asuncion.

h/ Metropolitan Lima. Since 1996 corresponds to National Urban. 2001 Figure corresponds to Metropolitan Lima, April-September.

i/ Includes hidden unemployment.

j/ Arithmetic average.

k/ Weighted average.

l/ Not included in the average, since the methodology used in the Caribbean to measure open unemployment differs from that applied in other countries in the region.

m/ Average for the first three quarters of the year.

n/ First quarter.

o/ Up to the third quarter.

p/ Second quarter.

TABLE 2-A

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER, 1990-2001
(annual rates)

| Country | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 |
|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Latin America | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Argentina a/ | 7.3 | 5.8 | 6.7 | 10.1 | 12.1 | 18.8 | 18.4 | 15.7 | 12.9 | 15.1 | 15.4 | 17.2 |
| Men | 7.4 | 5.6 | 6.5 | 8.5 | 10.7 | 16.5 | 16.8 | 13.4 | 12.2 | 16.9 | 17.2 | 17.5 |
| Women | 7.3 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 12.7 | 14.5 | 22.3 | 20.9 | 19.2 | 15.2 | 13.8 | 14.0 | 16.9 |
| Bolivia b/ | 7.2 | 5.9 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 4.4 | ... | 8.0 | 7.6 | ... |
| Men | 6.8 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.9 | ... | ... | 6.8 | 6.5 | ... |
| Women | 7.8 | 6.3 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 4.5 | ... | ... | 9.3 | 8.9 | ... |
| Brazil c/ | 4.3 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 6.2 |
| Men | ... | 4.8 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.3 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 5.9 |
| Women | ... | 4.9 | 6.0 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 4.8 | 6.1 | 6.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.0 | 6.8 |
| Chile d/ | 7.4 | 7.1 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 7.8 | 6.6 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 9.7 | 9.2 | 9.5 |
| Men | 6.6 | 6.1 | 5.0 | 5.3 | 6.5 | 5.5 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 5.7 | 9.3 | 8.7 | 9.3 |
| Women | 9.2 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 10.3 | 8.9 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 7.6 | 10.5 | 10.0 | 10.1 |
| Colombia e/ | 11.0 | 10.8 | 11.2 | 9.1 | 9.9 | 9.0 | 11.6 | 13.4 | 15.9 | 19.9 | 17.2 | 18.7 |
| Men | 8.3 | 7.8 | 8.1 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 9.2 | 10.5 | 12.9 | 17.1 | 15.1 | 16.6 |
| Women | 14.7 | 14.8 | 15.0 | 12.7 | 14.0 | 12.1 | 14.8 | 16.9 | 19.5 | 23.2 | 19.9 | 21.0 |
| Costa Rica b/ | 5.4 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 5.3 | 5.8 |
| Men | 4.9 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 3.8 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 5.4 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 5.2 |
| Women | 6.2 | 13.3 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 7.6 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 8.2 | 6.4 | 6.7 |
| Dominican Republic b/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ... | 19.6 | 20.3 | 19.9 | 16.0 | 15.8 | 16.7 | 15.9 | 14.3 | ... | 15.3 | ... | ... |
| Men | ... | 12.5 | 11.7 | 11.4 | 10.0 | 10.2 | 10.2 | ... | ... | ... | 9.8 | ... |
| Women | ... | 33.1 | 34.9 | 34.8 | 26.9 | 26.2 | 28.7 | ... | ... | ... | 22.8 | ... |
| Ecuador b/ | 6.1 | 8.1 | 8.9 | 8.3 | 7.1 | 6.9 | 10.4 | 9.3 | 8.5 | ... | ... | ... |
| Men | 4.3 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 5.5 | ... | 7.4 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Women | 9.1 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 11.5 | 9.3 | 8.8 | ... | 12.1 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| El Salvador b/ | 9.9 | 7.5 | 8.7 | 9.9 | 7.7 | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 8.0 | 6.6 | ... |
| Men | 10.1 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 11.8 | 8.4 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 9.0 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 9.9 | ... |
| Women | 9.8 | 6.6 | 8.3 | 6.8 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 5.5 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 3.7 | ... |
| Honduras b/ | 6.9 | 7.1 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 4.0 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 3.7 | ... | ... |
| Men | 9.6 | 13.1 | 9.8 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 10.7 | 11.8 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 3.7 | ... | ... |
| Women | 5.2 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 5.1 | 3.1 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 5.1 | 3.8 | ... | ... |
| Mexico f/ | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 6.3 | 5.5 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Men | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 6.1 | 5.3 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 2.4 |
| Women | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.5 |

TABLE 2-A (Continued)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER. 1990-2001
(annual rates)

| Country | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 |
|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Panama g/ | ... | 20.0 | 18.2 | 15.6 | 15.8 | 16.4 | 17.0 | 15.4 | 15.5 | 11.6 | 15.3 | ... |
| Men | ... | 12.8 | 10.8 | 9.7 | 10.7 | 10.8 | 11.0 | 13.3 | 12.4 | 8.8 | 12.0 | ... |
| Women | ... | 22.6 | 22.3 | 20.2 | 20.4 | 20.1 | 20.0 | 18.2 | 19.7 | 16.7 | 18.1 | ... |
| Paraguay h/ | 6.6 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 5.6 | 9.2 | 6.4 | 13.9 | 9.4 | 10.0 | ... |
| Men | 6.6 | 5.4 | 6.4 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 9.1 | 4.7 | 11.1 | 9.6 | 9.9 | ... |
| Women | 6.5 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 5.7 | 9.3 | 8.2 | 11.7 | 9.3 | 10.2 | ... |
| Peru i/ | 8.5 | 5.8 | 9.4 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 7.0 | 9.5 |
| Men | 6.5 | 4.8 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 6.4 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 8.5 |
| Women | 11.4 | 7.3 | 12.5 | 12.2 | 11.8 | 8.7 | 9.1 | 10.1 | 9.6 | 9.2 | 7.1 | 10.8 |
| Uruguay j/ | 9.2 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 8.4 | 9.2 | 10.8 | 12.4 | 11.6 | 10.2 | 11.8 | 13.9 | 15.6 |
| Men | 7.3 | 7.1 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 8.4 | 10.5 | 9.2 | 8.1 | 9.8 | 10.9 | 11.2 |
| Women | 11.8 | 11.3 | 11.9 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 13.7 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 12.7 | 14.0 | 17.2 | 20.3 |
| Venezuela b/ | 11.0 | 10.1 | 8.1 | 6.8 | 8.9 | 10.3 | 11.8 | 11.4 | 11.3 | 14.9 | 13.9 | 13.9 |
| Men | 11.4 | 9.5 | 8.1 | 7.1 | 8.2 | 8.9 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 13.6 | 13.2 | 13.2 |
| Women | 10.4 | 8.6 | 5.9 | 5.5 | 9.6 | 12.9 | 14.5 | 14.2 | 13.6 | 17.1 | 14.8 | 14.7 |
| The Caribbean l/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Barbados | 15.0 | 17.3 | 23.0 | 24.3 | 21.9 | 19.7 | 15.6 | 14.5 | 12.3 | 10.4 | 9.3 | ... |
| Men | 10.1 | 13.2 | 20.2 | 21.3 | 17.6 | 16.5 | 12.4 | 11.3 | 8.4 | 7.7 | 7.4 | ... |
| Women | 20.3 | 21.4 | 26.1 | 27.7 | 26.4 | 23.0 | 18.9 | 17.8 | 16.4 | 13.3 | 11.5 | ... |
| Jamaica | 15.3 | 15.4 | 15.7 | 16.3 | 15.4 | 16.2 | 16.0 | 16.5 | 15.5 | 15.7 | ... | ... |
| Men | 9.1 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 10.9 | 9.6 | 10.8 | 9.9 | 10.6 | 10.0 | 10.0 | ... | ... |
| Women | 20.4 | 22.2 | 22.8 | 22.4 | 21.8 | 22.5 | 23.0 | 23.5 | 22.1 | 22.4 | ... | ... |
| Trinidad & Tobago | 20.0 | 18.5 | 19.6 | 19.8 | 18.4 | 17.2 | 16.2 | 15.0 | 14.2 | 13.1 | ... | ... |
| Men | 17.8 | 15.7 | 17.0 | 17.6 | 16.1 | 15.1 | 13.2 | 12.3 | 11.3 | 10.9 | ... | ... |
| Women | 24.2 | 23.4 | 23.9 | 23.4 | 22.3 | 20.6 | 21.0 | 19.4 | 18.9 | 16.8 | ... | ... |

Source: ILO, based on country Household Surveys.

a/ Greater Buenos Aires. May 2001.

b/ National Urban.

c/ Six metropolitan areas. January-September 2001.

d/ National total.

e/ Seven metropolitan areas. June of each year.

As from 2000, 13 metropolitan areas.

f/ 43 Urban areas. January-September.

g/ Metropolitan region.

h/ Asuncion.

i/ Metropolitan Lima. National Urban as from 1996.

j/ Montevideo. Mobile average January-September.

l/ The methodology used by Caribbean countries to measure open unemployment differs from that applied by other countries in the region.

TABLE 3-A

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT. 1990-2001
(annual rates)

| Country | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 |
|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Latin America | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Argentina a/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 21.7 | 16.3 | 16.4 | 26.8 | 32.3 | 46.6 | 44.3 | 39.7 | 35.0 | 35.9 | 39.5 | 43.0 |
| 15-24 | 15.2 | 12.3 | 13.0 | ... | 21.2 | 30.1 | 31.1 | 27.2 | 24.4 | 26.4 | ... | ... |
| Bolivia b/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10-19 | 13.3 | 13.1 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 7.0 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 20-29 | 9.5 | 7.3 | 7.0 | 8.2 | 4.5 | 5.4 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Brazil c/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-17 | ... | 11.6 | 14.4 | 12.2 | 11.9 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 14.3 | 18.8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 14.1 |
| 18-24 | ... | 9.1 | 11.2 | 10.3 | 9.6 | 9.3 | 10.5 | 11.4 | 14.0 | 14.5 | 14.7 | 12.7 |
| Chile d/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 15.9 | 13.7 | 12.6 | 13.0 | 16.8 | 15.8 | 15.0 | 19.9 | 20.8 | 27.6 | 26.1 | 30.0 |
| 20-24 | 12.0 | 12.4 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 11.9 | 10.1 | 12.2 | 13.6 | 15.1 | 19.8 | 20.1 | 19.5 |
| Colombia e/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12-17 | ... | 25.9 | 22.5 | 26.6 | 25.7 | 23.3 | 26.1 | 32.8 | 35.4 | 37.9 | 33.6 | 36.3 |
| 18-24 | ... | 20.8 | 21.4 | 17.4 | 18.9 | 18.2 | 22.0 | 26.1 | 29.5 | 35.7 | 32.2 | 33.9 |
| Costa Rica f/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12-24 | 10.4 | 14.1 | 9.3 | 10.2 | 9.8 | 13.5 | 13.9 | 13.1 | 12.8 | 14.9 | 10.9 | ... |
| Ecuador f/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-24 | 13.5 | 18.5 | 17.3 | 15.7 | 14.9 | 15.3 | 20.0 | 19.4 | 22.6 | ... | 17.4 | ... |
| El Salvador f/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-24 | 18.6 | 14.6 | 14.3 | 14.4 | 13.5 | 13.3 | 13.1 | 14.6 | 15.0 | 13.9 | 14.3 | ... |
| Honduras f/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10-24 | 10.7 | 12.3 | 6.6 | 9.7 | 6.7 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 8.7 | 10.0 | 10.0 | ... | ... |
| Mexico g/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12-19 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 6.9 | 7.3 | 8.3 | 13.1 | 11.5 | 8.4 | 7.0 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 5.3 |
| 20-24 | ... | ... | 4.4 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 4.6 |
| Panama h/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-24 | ... | 38.8 | 37.0 | 31.6 | 31.1 | 31.9 | 34.8 | 31.5 | 31.7 | 29.5 | 32.6 | ... |
| Paraguay i/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 18.4 | 9.0 | 14.1 | 9.8 | 12.3 | 10.8 | 29.1 | 13.7 | ... | 21.2 | ... | ... |
| 20-24 | 14.1 | 9.5 | 7.3 | 8.8 | 5.5 | 7.8 | 12.6 | 12.7 | ... | 13.4 | ... | ... |
| Peru j/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14-24 | 15.4 | 11.2 | 15.8 | 16.1 | 13.7 | 11.2 | 14.9 | 14.5 | 14.1 | 14.2 | 18.2 | 15.3 |
| Uruguay k/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14-24 | 26.6 | 25.0 | 24.4 | 23.3 | 25.5 | 25.5 | 28.0 | 26.8 | 26.1 | 27.1 | 31.7 | 36.2 |
| Venezuela l/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-24 | 18.0 | 15.8 | 13.4 | 13.0 | 15.9 | 19.9 | 25.4 | 23.1 | 21.9 | 26.6 | 25.3 | ... |
| The Caribbean m/ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Barbados | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-24 | ... | 33.8 | 36.4 | 43.2 | 41.7 | 37.8 | 27.5 | 28.9 | 27.4 | 21.8 | 18.4 | ... |
| Jamaica | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-24 | 30.7 | 29.2 | 28.3 | 29.5 | 28.9 | 34.1 | 34.4 | 34.2 | 33.3 | 34.0 | ... | ... |
| Trinidad & Tobago | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-24 | 36.4 | 34.2 | 34.8 | 38.9 | 39.9 | 31.0 | 28.5 | 35.3 | 25.8 | 23.7 | ... | ... |

Source: ILO, based on country Household Surveys.

a/ Greater Buenos Aires. May 2001.

b/ National Urban. 1996 (15-25 years).

c/ Six metropolitan areas. First quarter of 2001.

d/ National total.

e/ Seven metropolitan areas. June of each year.

f/ Nation Urban.

g/ 41 Urban areas.

h/ Metropolitan region.

i/ Asuncion.

j/ Metropolitan Lima. National Urban as from 1996. First quarter of 2001.

k/ Montevideo. January-September 2001 average.

l/ National Urban.

m/ The methodology used by Caribbean countries to measure open unemployment differs from that applied by other countries in the region.

TABLE 4-A

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: URBAN PARTICIPATION RATES. 1990-2001 a/
(percentages)

| Country | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Latin America | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Argentina b/ | 40.6 | 40.9 | 41.6 | 43.8 | 43.3 | 45.1 | 44.2 | 42.2 | 42.2 | 42.6 | 42.6 | 42.8 |
| Bolivia | 51.2 | 51.5 | 50.6 | 52.6 | 53.7 | 55.0 | 56.5 | 52.5 | ... | 56.8 | 56.1 | ... |
| Brazil c/ | 63.8 | 61.1 | 59.5 | 58.7 | 59.3 | 59.3 | 59.6 | 58.5 | 58.2 | 57.1 | 58.0 | 56.5 |
| Chile d/ | 53.0 | 53.0 | 54.3 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 54.9 | 54.5 | 54.4 | 55.1 | 54.4 | 53.7 | 52.7 |
| Colombia e/ | 58.4 | 59.5 | 60.8 | 60.1 | 60.0 | 59.9 | 59.7 | 59.9 | 62.2 | 63.1 | 63.5 | 63.9 |
| Costa Rica | 53.2 | 51.8 | 50.4 | 51.7 | 53.3 | 54.5 | 52.2 | 53.8 | 55.3 | 54.8 | 54.8 | 56.8 |
| Dominican Republic f/ | ... | 55.0 | 58.9 | 57.4 | 53.3 | 51.9 | 53.2 | ... | ... | ... | 57.0 | ... |
| Ecuador g/ | 52.3 | 56.8 | 58.9 | 57.5 | 55.6 | 55.7 | 55.8 | 56.6 | 55.4 | 56.3 | 56.8 | 55.9 |
| El Salvador f/ | 55.0 | 52.6 | 54.2 | 54.6 | 55.5 | 54.1 | 52.9 | 53.0 | 55.7 | 54.0 | 54.5 | ... |
| Honduras m/ | 50.1 | 48.9 | 50.7 | 49.7 | 50.1 | 51.5 | 54.7 | 55.6 | 54.8 | 56.5 | ... | ... |
| Mexico h/ | 51.8 | 53.3 | 53.8 | 55.2 | 54.7 | 55.0 | 55.4 | 56.2 | 56.6 | 55.8 | 56.3 | 55.7 |
| Nicaragua | ... | ... | ... | 48.8 | 48.3 | 48.7 | 46.9 | 52.2 | 40.8 | ... | ... | ... |
| Panama i/ | 56.7 | 58.7 | 61.9 | 61.8 | 62.7 | 63.1 | 61.7 | 63.1 | 63.9 | 61.2 | 60.9 | ... |
| Paraguay j/ | 60.9 | 62.2 | 61.0 | 62.9 | 63.9 | 70.5 | 66.0 | 63.7 | 60.6 | 58.5 | 62.9 | ... |
| Peru k/ | 59.6 | 55.9 | 57.1 | 60.1 | 59.7 | 62.4 | 60.4 | 63.3 | 65.4 | 66.9 | 64.4 | 60.3 |
| Uruguay l/ | 59.6 | 59.5 | 59.5 | 59.0 | 60.5 | 62.1 | 61.6 | 60.2 | 61.4 | 61.4 | 59.6 | 60.6 |
| Venezuela m/ | 59.4 | 59.8 | 59.3 | 57.9 | 59.0 | 61.6 | 62.2 | 63.8 | 65.1 | 66.8 | 64.5 | 65.9 |
| The Caribbean | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Barbados | 67.3 | 65.2 | 66.2 | 66.3 | 67.4 | 68.2 | 67.4 | 67.5 | 67.7 | 67.7 | ... | ... |
| Jamaica | 66.9 | 68.1 | 69.1 | 68.3 | 69.2 | 69.0 | 67.7 | 66.6 | 65.6 | 64.5 | ... | ... |
| Trinidad & Tobago | 55.9 | 58.5 | 60.0 | 59.5 | 59.4 | 60.2 | 60.5 | 60.3 | 61.2 | 60.8 | ... | ... |

Source: ILO, based on country Household Surveys.

- a/ Figures for the 1990-2000 period are annual averages. The periods indicated in the country notes are considered for the year 2001.
b/ National Urban. May 2001.
c/ Six metropolitan regions. January-September 2001 average.
d/ National total. January-September 2001 average.
e/ Thirteen metropolitan areas. January-September 2001.

- f/ National Urban.
g/ Three metropolitan regions. January- September 2001 average.
h/ 41 Urban areas. January-September 2001 average.
i/ Metropolitan region.
j/ Asuncion.
k/ Metropolitan Lima. National Urban as from 1996. March-August 2001, Metropolitan Lima.
l/ Montevideo. January-September 2001 average.
m/ National total. January-September 2001 average.



TABLE 5-A

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: URBAN EMPLOYMENT RATES. 1990-2001 a/
(percentages)

| Country | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Latin America | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Argentina b/ | 37.6 | 38.2 | 38.7 | 39.6 | 38.3 | 37.2 | 36.6 | 35.9 | 36.8 | 36.5 | 36.4 | 35.8 |
| Bolivia | 47.5 | 48.5 | 47.8 | 49.5 | 52.0 | 53.0 | 54.2 | 50.2 | ... | 52.5 | 51.9 | ... |
| Brazil c/ | 61.1 | 58.1 | 56.6 | 55.6 | 56.3 | 56.6 | 56.4 | 55.2 | 53.8 | 52.8 | 53.9 | 53.0 |
| Chile d/ | 49.1 | 49.3 | 50.9 | 52.4 | 51.6 | 51.2 | 51.6 | 51.5 | 51.6 | 49.1 | 48.8 | 47.9 |
| Colombia e/ | 52.3 | 53.5 | 54.6 | 55.0 | 54.6 | 54.6 | 53.0 | 52.5 | 52.7 | 50.8 | 52.6 | 51.9 |
| Costa Rica | 50.3 | 48.7 | 48.2 | 49.6 | 51.0 | 51.4 | 48.8 | 50.6 | 52.3 | 51.4 | 51.9 | 53.8 |
| Dominican Republic f/ | ... | 44.2 | 46.9 | 46.0 | 44.8 | 43.7 | 44.4 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Ecuador g/ | 49.1 | 52.0 | 53.7 | 52.4 | 51.3 | 51.4 | 50.0 | 51.3 | 49.0 | 47.8 | 48.8 | 49.7 |
| El Salvador f/ | 49.5 | 48.7 | 50.5 | ... | 51.6 | 50.3 | 49.8 | 49.0 | 51.5 | 49.7 | 48.9 | ... |
| Honduras m/ | 46.6 | 45.4 | 48.2 | 46.9 | 48.1 | 48.1 | 51.1 | 52.7 | 51.6 | 53.6 | ... | ... |
| Mexico h/ | 50.3 | 51.8 | 52.3 | 53.3 | 52.7 | 51.6 | 52.4 | 54.1 | 54.7 | 54.4 | 55.1 | 54.4 |
| Nicaragua | ... | ... | ... | 40.1 | 40.0 | 40.5 | 39.4 | 44.7 | 35.4 | ... | ... | ... |
| Panama i/ | 45.4 | 46.9 | 50.6 | 52.2 | 52.8 | 52.8 | 51.3 | 53.4 | 53.9 | 52.9 | 51.6 | ... |
| Paraguay j/ | 56.9 | 59.0 | 57.8 | 59.7 | 61.1 | 66.8 | 60.6 | 59.2 | 56.6 | ... | ... | ... |
| Peru k/ | 54.7 | 52.6 | 51.7 | 54.2 | 54.4 | 57.5 | 55.6 | 58.0 | 60.0 | 61.6 | 59.7 | 54.6 |
| Uruguay l/ | 54.1 | 54.2 | 54.1 | 54.0 | 54.9 | 55.4 | 54.0 | 53.2 | 55.1 | 54.1 | 51.5 | 51.2 |
| Venezuela m/ | 52.8 | 53.7 | 54.5 | 54.0 | 53.8 | 55.3 | 54.8 | 56.5 | 57.8 | 56.8 | 55.5 | 56.8 |
| The Caribbean | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Barbados | 54.7 | 55.4 | 54.7 | 51.1 | 51.0 | 53.3 | 54.1 | 57.0 | 57.9 | 59.4 | ... | ... |
| Jamaica | 50.2 | 57.7 | 58.3 | 57.8 | 57.9 | 58.4 | 56.7 | 55.9 | 54.8 | 54.5 | ... | ... |
| Trinidad & Tobago | 47.1 | 46.8 | 48.9 | 47.8 | 47.6 | 49.1 | 50.1 | 50.5 | 52.0 | 52.2 | ... | ... |

Source: ILO, based on country Household Surveys.

a/ Figures for the 1990-2000 period are annual averages.

The periods indicated in the country notes are considered for the year 2001.

b/ National Urban. May 2001.

c/ Six metropolitan regions. January-September 2001 average.

d/ National total. January-September 2001 average.

e/ Thirteen metropolitan areas. January-September 2001.

f/ National Urban.

g/ Three metropolitan regions. January-September 2001 average.

h/ 41 Urban areas. January-September 2001 average.

i/ Metropolitan region.

j/ Asuncion.

k/ Metropolitan Lima. National Urban as from 1996.

March-August 2001, Metropolitan Lima.

l/ Montevideo. January-September 2001 average.

m/ National total. January-September 2001 average.

TABLE 6-A

LATIN AMERICA: NON-AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT STRUCTURE. 1990-2000
(percentages)

| Countries/Years | Informal Sector | | | | Formal Sector | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|--|------|
| | Total | Independent Worker a/ | Domestic Service | Micro-enterprises b/ | Total | Public Sector | Small, medium and large private enterprises c/ | |
| Latin America | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 42.8 | 22.2 | 5.8 | 14.7 | 57.2 | 15.5 | 41.7 |
| | Men | 39.4 | 21.6 | 0.5 | 17.3 | 60.6 | | |
| | Women | 47.4 | 23.2 | 13.8 | 10.4 | 52.6 | | |
| 1995 | <i>Total</i> | 46.1 | 24.0 | 7.4 | 14.8 | 53.9 | 13.5 | 40.4 |
| | Men | 42.7 | 23.9 | 0.8 | 18.0 | 57.3 | | |
| | Women | 51.0 | 24.1 | 17.0 | 9.9 | 49.0 | | |
| 2000 | <i>Total</i> | 46.9 | 24.6 | 6.7 | 15.6 | 53.1 | 13.0 | 40.1 |
| | Men | 44.5 | 25.3 | 0.6 | 18.7 | 55.5 | | |
| | Women | 50.3 | 23.7 | 15.4 | 11.2 | 49.7 | | |
| Argentina | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | <i>Total</i> | 52.0 | 27.5 | 5.7 | 18.8 | 48.0 | 19.3 | 28.7 |
| | Men | 49.8 | 28.2 | 0.5 | 21.2 | 50.2 | | |
| | Women | 55.5 | 26.5 | 14.3 | 14.7 | 44.5 | | |
| 1998 | <i>Total</i> | 49.3 | 22.7 | 6.4 | 20.3 | 50.7 | 12.7 | 38.0 |
| | Men | 48.0 | 24.1 | 0.3 | 23.6 | 52.0 | | |
| | Women | 51.4 | 20.4 | 15.8 | 15.2 | 48.6 | | |
| Brazil | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 40.6 | 20.3 | 6.9 | 13.5 | 59.4 | 11.0 | 48.4 |
| | Men | 36.1 | 19.6 | 0.5 | 16.0 | 63.9 | | |
| | Women | 47.6 | 21.3 | 16.7 | 9.6 | 52.4 | | |
| 1995 | <i>Total</i> | 46.5 | 23.8 | 9.5 | 13.2 | 53.5 | 15.1 | 38.4 |
| | Men | 42.1 | 25.1 | 0.9 | 16.0 | 57.9 | 12.5 | 45.4 |
| | Women | 52.8 | 21.8 | 21.6 | 9.4 | 47.2 | 18.8 | 28.5 |
| 1999 | <i>Total</i> | 47.1 | 24.0 | 9.4 | 13.7 | 52.9 | 14.2 | 38.8 |
| | Men | 43.8 | 26.4 | 0.9 | 16.4 | 56.2 | 11.4 | 44.9 |
| | Women | 51.6 | 20.7 | 20.9 | 10.1 | 48.4 | 17.9 | 30.4 |
| Chile | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 37.9 | 20.9 | 5.4 | 11.7 | 62.1 | 7.0 | 55.1 |
| | Men | 33.5 | 21.3 | 0.2 | 12.0 | 66.5 | | |
| | Women | 45.9 | 20.1 | 14.7 | 11.1 | 54.1 | | |
| 1996 | <i>Total</i> | 38.8 | 18.9 | 7.1 | 12.8 | 61.2 | 11.8 | 49.4 |
| | Men | 34.0 | 19.9 | 0.3 | 13.7 | 66.0 | | |
| | Women | 46.3 | 17.4 | 17.7 | 11.2 | 53.7 | | |
| 2000 | <i>Total</i> | 38.0 | 19.7 | 5.9 | 12.5 | 62.0 | 10.8 | 51.2 |
| | Men | 34.3 | 20.8 | 0.1 | 13.5 | 65.7 | 8.6 | 57.0 |
| | Women | 44.5 | 17.8 | 16.0 | 10.7 | 55.5 | 14.6 | 40.9 |
| Colombia | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 45.7 | 24.1 | 2.0 | 19.5 | 54.3 | 9.6 | 44.7 |
| | Men | 45.1 | 22.6 | 0.1 | 22.3 | 54.9 | | |
| | Women | 46.6 | 26.3 | 5.0 | 15.2 | 53.4 | | |
| 2000 | <i>Total</i> | 55.6 | 32.2 | 5.3 | 18.1 | 44.4 | 7.0 | 37.3 |
| | Men | 54.7 | 32.6 | 0.5 | 21.6 | 45.3 | 6.1 | 39.1 |
| | Women | 56.7 | 31.8 | 11.2 | 13.7 | 43.3 | 8.1 | 35.1 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 41.2 | 18.9 | 5.8 | 16.4 | 58.8 | 22.0 | 36.8 |
| | Men | 37.7 | 19.1 | 0.3 | 18.3 | 62.3 | | |
| | Women | 47.5 | 18.6 | 15.8 | 13.1 | 52.5 | | |
| 1995 | <i>Total</i> | 43.3 | 18.5 | 5.0 | 19.7 | 56.7 | 17.4 | 39.3 |
| | Men | 40.4 | 17.8 | 0.3 | 22.3 | 59.6 | | |
| | Women | 48.3 | 19.9 | 13.3 | 15.1 | 51.7 | | |
| 2000 | <i>Total</i> | 45.2 | 19.7 | 6.0 | 19.5 | 54.8 | 16.4 | 38.5 |
| | Men | 42.2 | 20.1 | 0.5 | 21.6 | 57.8 | 15.0 | 42.8 |
| | Women | 50.1 | 18.9 | 15.1 | 16.1 | 49.9 | 18.7 | 31.2 |

TABLE 6-A (Continued)

LATIN AMERICA: NON-AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT STRUCTURE. 1990-2000
(percentages)

| Countries/Years | Informal Sector | | | | Formal Sector | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|--|------|
| | Total | Independent Worker a/ | Domestic Service | Micro-enterprises b/ | Total | Public Sector | Small, medium and large private enterprises c/ | |
| Ecuador | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | Total | 55.6 | 35.4 | 5.0 | 15.3 | 44.4 | 18.7 | 25.7 |
| | Men | 51.7 | 32.6 | 0.7 | 18.4 | 48.3 | | |
| | Women | 62.1 | 39.9 | 12.1 | 10.1 | 37.9 | | |
| 1995 | Total | 63.7 | 33.6 | 5.2 | 25.0 | 36.3 | 14.2 | 22.0 |
| | Men | 60.0 | 29.6 | 0.7 | 29.8 | 40.0 | | |
| | Women | 69.2 | 39.4 | 11.8 | 17.9 | 30.8 | | |
| 2000 | Total | 51.6 | 31.0 | 5.3 | 15.3 | 48.4 | 17.6 | 30.7 |
| | Men | 51.1 | 31.6 | 0.9 | 18.6 | 48.9 | 14.1 | 34.8 |
| | Women | 52.4 | 30.1 | 11.8 | 10.5 | 47.6 | 22.8 | 24.8 |
| Honduras | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | Total | 57.6 | 37.3 | 7.1 | 13.3 | 42.4 | 14.9 | 27.5 |
| | Men | 45.1 | 25.7 | 0.5 | 18.9 | 54.9 | | |
| | Women | 72.0 | 50.5 | 14.6 | 6.9 | 28.0 | | |
| 1995 | Total | 57.1 | 35.5 | 5.6 | 16.0 | 42.9 | 12.6 | 30.2 |
| | Men | 49.1 | 25.2 | 0.9 | 23.1 | 50.9 | | |
| | Women | 66.3 | 47.4 | 11.1 | 7.8 | 33.7 | | |
| 1999 | Total | 60.7 | 39.6 | 5.5 | 15.6 | 39.3 | 10.1 | 29.2 |
| | Men | 53.3 | 28.6 | 0.7 | 23.9 | 46.7 | 9.4 | 37.3 |
| | Women | 67.6 | 49.8 | 9.9 | 7.9 | 32.4 | 10.6 | 21.7 |
| Mexico | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | Total | 38.4 | 19.0 | 4.6 | 14.8 | 61.6 | 19.4 | 42.3 |
| | Men | 37.6 | 19.1 | 0.7 | 17.8 | 62.4 | | |
| | Women | 39.9 | 18.7 | 12.0 | 9.2 | 60.1 | | |
| 1995 | Total | 43.2 | 20.9 | 5.3 | 17.0 | 56.8 | 16.1 | 40.7 |
| | Men | 42.1 | 19.9 | 1.1 | 21.1 | 57.9 | | |
| | Women | 45.1 | 22.6 | 12.6 | 9.9 | 54.9 | | |
| 2000 | Total | 39.2 | 18.3 | 3.7 | 17.2 | 60.8 | 14.5 | 46.4 |
| | Men | 38.4 | 17.5 | 0.2 | 20.7 | 61.6 | 12.5 | 49.1 |
| | Women | 40.5 | 19.6 | 9.6 | 11.3 | 59.5 | 17.9 | 41.6 |
| Panama | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | Total | 36.0 | 19.8 | 7.9 | 8.3 | 64.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| | Men | 34.6 | 23.8 | 1.0 | 9.7 | 65.4 | | |
| | Women | 38.0 | 14.0 | 17.8 | 6.3 | 62.0 | | |
| 1995 | Total | 37.1 | 20.5 | 7.6 | 9.0 | 62.9 | 25.9 | 37.0 |
| | Men | 35.2 | 23.4 | 1.5 | 10.3 | 64.8 | | |
| | Women | 40.0 | 16.1 | 16.9 | 7.0 | 60.0 | | |
| 2000 | Total | 37.3 | 22.2 | 6.8 | 8.3 | 62.7 | 21.8 | 40.9 |
| | Men | 36.0 | 25.2 | 1.6 | 9.3 | 64.0 | 19.0 | 45.0 |
| | Women | 39.1 | 17.6 | 14.7 | 6.8 | 60.9 | 26.1 | 34.8 |
| Peru d/ | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | Total | 52.7 | 33.4 | 4.9 | 14.5 | 47.3 | 11.6 | 35.7 |
| | Men | 46.3 | 28.9 | 0.6 | 16.9 | 53.7 | | |
| | Women | 62.9 | 40.4 | 11.6 | 10.8 | 37.1 | | |
| 1995 | Total | 55.1 | 33.0 | 4.8 | 17.3 | 44.9 | 9.3 | 35.6 |
| | Men | 48.8 | 26.9 | 0.5 | 21.4 | 51.2 | | |
| | Women | 64.1 | 41.8 | 11.0 | 11.4 | 35.9 | | |
| 2000 | Total | 59.2 | 36.4 | 5.4 | 17.4 | 40.8 | 7.8 | 33.0 |
| | Men | 53.2 | 31.6 | 0.4 | 21.0 | 46.8 | 7.8 | 39.0 |
| | Women | 67.0 | 42.4 | 11.9 | 12.7 | 33.0 | 7.9 | 25.1 |

TABLE 6-A (Continued)

LATIN AMERICA: NON-AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT STRUCTURE. 1990-2000
(percentages)

| Countries/Years | Informal Sector | | | | Formal Sector | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|--|------|
| | Total | Independent Worker a/ | Domestic Service | Micro-enterprises b/ | Total | Public Sector | Small, medium and large private enterprises c/ | |
| Uruguaye/ | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 39.1 | 18.6 | 6.8 | 13.7 | 60.9 | 20.1 | 40.8 |
| | Men | 33.7 | 18.6 | 0.2 | 15.0 | 66.3 | | |
| | Women | 46.6 | 18.5 | 16.2 | 11.8 | 53.4 | | |
| 1995 | <i>Total</i> | 43.3 | 21.9 | 7.4 | 13.9 | 56.7 | 20.0 | 36.7 |
| | Men | 38.4 | 21.9 | 0.2 | 16.3 | 61.6 | | |
| | Women | 49.7 | 21.9 | 17.0 | 10.8 | 50.3 | | |
| 1999 | <i>Total</i> | 43.1 | 22.5 | 7.5 | 13.1 | 56.9 | 17.1 | 39.8 |
| | Men | 39.4 | 24.5 | 0.2 | 14.6 | 60.6 | 16.6 | 44.0 |
| | Women | 47.9 | 19.8 | 7.0 | 11.1 | 52.1 | 17.6 | 34.4 |
| Venezuela | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 38.6 | 22.3 | 3.9 | 12.4 | 61.4 | 22.3 | 39.1 |
| | Men | 38.3 | 22.0 | 0.4 | 15.9 | 61.7 | | |
| | Women | 39.3 | 22.8 | 10.4 | 6.1 | 60.7 | | |
| 1995 | <i>Total</i> | 44.5 | 28.1 | 2.4 | 14.0 | 55.5 | 19.9 | 35.7 |
| | Men | 45.3 | 28.1 | 0.1 | 17.1 | 54.7 | | |
| | Women | 43.0 | 28.0 | 6.4 | 8.6 | 57.0 | | |
| 2000 | <i>Total</i> | 50.6 | 34.5 | 2.3 | 13.8 | 49.4 | 16.1 | 33.3 |
| | Men | 49.2 | 32.1 | 0.2 | 17.0 | 50.8 | 11.8 | 38.9 |
| | Women | 52.7 | 38.1 | 5.6 | 9.0 | 47.3 | 22.6 | 24.7 |

Source: ILO estimations based on data from Household Surveys and other official sources (revised series).

a/ Includes self-employed workers (except clerks, professionals and technicians) and family workers.

b/ Workers employed in enterprises with up to five workers.

c/ Includes enterprises with 6 or more workers.

d/ Metropolitan Lima.

e/ Montevideo.



TABLE 7-A

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: SELECTED COUNTRIES
NON-AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT ACCORDING TO ECONOMIC BRANCH OF ACTIVITY AND
GENDER, 1990-2000 a/
(percentages)

| Country & period | Total | Goods Sector b/ | Manufacturing industry Mining, power and Waterworks | Construction | Services Sector c/ | Commerce | Transport d/ | Financial Enterprises e/ | Services f/ |
|-------------------|-------|-----------------|---|--------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Argentina | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 26.4 | 18.2 | 8.2 | 72.1 | 21.7 | 5.6 | 6.9 | 37.9 |
| Men | 100.0 | 34.2 | 21.4 | 12.8 | 63.6 | 22.3 | 8.1 | 7.2 | 26.0 |
| Women | 100.0 | 13.4 | 13.0 | 0.4 | 86.1 | 20.8 | 1.4 | 6.3 | 57.6 |
| 2000 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 23.9 | 16.8 | 7.2 | 76.1 | 20.9 | 9.1 | 11.7 | 33.7 |
| Men | 100.0 | 31.6 | 20.1 | 11.5 | 68.4 | 21.0 | 13.1 | 12.4 | 21.3 |
| Women | 100.0 | 12.4 | 11.8 | 0.6 | 87.6 | 20.8 | 3.1 | 10.6 | 52.3 |
| Barbados | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 100.0 | 23.2 | 13.5 | 9.7 | 76.8 | 27.3 | 6.6 | 3.8 | 39.1 |
| 1996 | 100.0 | 18.7 | 10.4 | 8.3 | 81.3 | 25.5 | 4.2 | 8.0 | 43.5 |
| Bolivia | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 100.0 | 23.9 | 17.1 | 6.8 | 76.1 | 26.4 | 7.9 | 3.1 | 38.6 |
| 1997 | 100.0 | 30.4 | 21.1 | 9.3 | 69.6 | 30.7 | 8.9 | 4.9 | 25.1 |
| Brazil | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 28.6 | 20.9 | 7.7 | 71.0 | 21.7 | 5.1 | 3.3 | 40.9 |
| Men | 100.0 | 37.9 | 25.5 | 12.4 | 61.6 | 22.2 | 7.8 | 3.5 | 28.1 |
| Women | 100.0 | 14.3 | 13.8 | 0.5 | 85.6 | 20.9 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 60.6 |
| 1995 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 25.0 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 75.0 | 22.6 | 5.0 | 2.1 | 45.0 |
| Men | 100.0 | 34.8 | 20.9 | 13.9 | 65.2 | 23.3 | 7.8 | 2.2 | 31.3 |
| Women | 100.0 | 11.3 | 10.9 | 0.5 | 88.7 | 21.7 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 63.9 |
| 1999 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 25.1 | 16.3 | 8.8 | 74.8 | 22.6 | 5.2 | 1.8 | 44.8 |
| Men | 100.0 | 34.9 | 20.3 | 14.6 | 65.2 | 22.8 | 8.2 | 1.8 | 31.7 |
| Women | 100.0 | 11.9 | 11.1 | 0.8 | 88.2 | 22.3 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 62.7 |
| Chile | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 31.3 | 20.9 | 10.4 | 67.6 | 21.7 | 8.4 | 6.6 | 30.9 |
| Men | 100.0 | 40.7 | 24.8 | 15.8 | 58.2 | 19.3 | 11.9 | 6.3 | 20.7 |
| Women | 100.0 | 15.2 | 14.1 | 1.0 | 83.6 | 25.7 | 2.6 | 7.1 | 48.3 |
| 1996 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 28.0 | 17.7 | 10.3 | 72.0 | 22.6 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 32.9 |
| Men | 100.0 | 36.9 | 20.8 | 16.1 | 63.1 | 20.3 | 12.1 | 7.3 | 22.8 |
| Women | 100.0 | 13.9 | 12.8 | 1.1 | 86.1 | 26.3 | 2.8 | 7.8 | 48.7 |
| 2000 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 28.1 | 18.8 | 9.4 | 71.9 | 22.0 | 8.6 | 8.5 | 32.8 |
| Men | 100.0 | 38.1 | 23.3 | 14.8 | 61.9 | 19.4 | 12.3 | 8.5 | 21.7 |
| Women | 100.0 | 12.9 | 11.9 | 1.1 | 87.1 | 25.9 | 2.9 | 8.5 | 49.8 |
| Colombia | | | | | | | | | |
| 1992 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 31.3 | 25.0 | 6.3 | 68.6 | 28.4 | 6.2 | 7.3 | 26.7 |
| Men | 100.0 | 34.6 | 24.8 | 9.8 | 65.4 | 26.1 | 9.2 | 7.6 | 22.4 |
| Women | 100.0 | 26.2 | 25.3 | 0.9 | 73.7 | 32.0 | 1.4 | 6.9 | 33.4 |
| 2000 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 25.0 | 20.2 | 4.9 | 75.0 | 27.0 | 7.6 | 8.1 | 32.2 |
| Men | 100.0 | 29.3 | 20.9 | 8.4 | 70.7 | 25.4 | 11.8 | 9.0 | 24.4 |
| Women | 100.0 | 19.8 | 19.2 | 0.5 | 80.2 | 29.0 | 2.3 | 7.1 | 41.8 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 34.9 | 26.1 | 8.8 | 64.2 | 21.2 | 5.3 | 4.5 | 33.2 |
| Men | 100.0 | 39.8 | 26.4 | 13.4 | 59.2 | 20.5 | 7.8 | 5.6 | 25.3 |
| Women | 100.0 | 26.0 | 25.5 | 0.5 | 73.3 | 22.4 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 47.4 |
| 1995 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 29.1 | 21.1 | 8.0 | 70.9 | 24.7 | 6.8 | 5.5 | 32.8 |
| Men | 100.0 | 33.3 | 21.0 | 12.3 | 66.7 | 23.5 | 9.5 | 6.5 | 25.9 |
| Women | 100.0 | 21.7 | 21.3 | 0.4 | 78.3 | 27.0 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 45.1 |
| 2000 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 28.0 | 19.4 | 8.6 | 71.2 | 25.4 | 7.5 | 6.1 | 32.1 |
| Men | 100.0 | 34.3 | 20.9 | 13.4 | 64.7 | 24.1 | 10.7 | 6.8 | 23.1 |
| Women | 100.0 | 17.5 | 16.9 | 0.5 | 81.9 | 27.6 | 2.3 | 5.0 | 47.0 |

TABLE 7-A (Continued)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: SELECTED COUNTRIES
NON-AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT ACCORDING TO ECONOMIC BRANCH OF ACTIVITY AND
GENDER. 1990-2000 a/
(percentages)

| Country & period | Total | Goods Sector b/ | Manufacturing industry Mining, Power and Waterworks | Construction | Service Sector c/ | Commerce | Transport d/ | Financial Enterprises e/ | Services f/ | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------|----------|--------------|--------------------------|-------------|------|
| Ecuador | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | Total | 100.0 | 28.1 | 20.3 | 7.7 | 71.9 | 29.4 | 6.1 | 5.0 | 31.4 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 34.6 | 22.6 | 12.0 | 65.3 | 24.5 | 9.0 | 5.9 | 25.9 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 17.2 | 16.6 | 0.6 | 82.8 | 37.6 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 40.5 |
| 1995 | Total | 100.0 | 22.2 | 15.6 | 6.6 | 77.8 | 34.0 | 5.9 | 4.8 | 33.0 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 27.5 | 16.7 | 10.8 | 72.5 | 28.9 | 9.0 | 5.5 | 29.0 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 14.5 | 14.0 | 0.5 | 85.5 | 41.4 | 1.3 | 3.9 | 38.7 |
| 2000 | Total | 100.0 | 26.1 | 18.4 | 7.7 | 73.9 | 33.8 | 6.8 | 5.6 | 27.7 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 33.2 | 20.7 | 12.5 | 66.8 | 31.3 | 10.2 | 6.0 | 19.3 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 15.6 | 14.9 | 0.7 | 84.4 | 37.6 | 1.8 | 5.0 | 40.1 |
| El Salvador | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | Total | 100.0 | 31.4 | 24.8 | 6.6 | 68.6 | 29.7 | 5.8 | 2.9 | 30.2 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 33.6 | 26.3 | 7.3 | 66.4 | 28.0 | 6.0 | 2.2 | 30.2 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 39.4 | 25.9 | 13.5 | 60.6 | 24.9 | 10.6 | 2.1 | 23.0 |
| 1995 | Total | 100.0 | 33.6 | 26.3 | 7.3 | 66.4 | 28.0 | 6.0 | 2.2 | 30.2 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 39.4 | 25.9 | 13.5 | 60.6 | 24.9 | 10.6 | 2.1 | 23.0 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 27.4 | 26.8 | 0.6 | 72.6 | 31.3 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 38.0 |
| 2000 | Total | 100.0 | 30.9 | 24.4 | 6.5 | 69.1 | 33.5 | 6.0 | 4.8 | 24.7 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 36.5 | 23.6 | 12.9 | 63.5 | 27.1 | 11.1 | 6.6 | 18.7 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 25.3 | 25.1 | 0.2 | 74.7 | 40.0 | 0.9 | 3.1 | 30.7 |
| Honduras | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | Total | 100.0 | 33.8 | 25.1 | 8.7 | 66.2 | 29.4 | 4.3 | 2.3 | 30.2 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 42.0 | 26.0 | 16.0 | 57.8 | 24.0 | 7.4 | 2.9 | 23.5 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 24.2 | 23.9 | 0.3 | 75.7 | 35.4 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 38.0 |
| 1995 | Total | 100.0 | 35.6 | 28.0 | 7.6 | 64.4 | 28.7 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 28.8 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 41.6 | 27.6 | 14.0 | 58.4 | 22.8 | 6.4 | 3.9 | 25.3 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 28.8 | 28.5 | 0.3 | 71.2 | 35.4 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 32.9 |
| 1999 | Total | 100.0 | 33.1 | 25.9 | 7.1 | 66.9 | 32.2 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 27.8 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 38.8 | 25.2 | 14.6 | 60.2 | 24.3 | 6.9 | 4.3 | 24.7 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 26.8 | 26.6 | 0.2 | 73.2 | 39.4 | 0.8 | 2.3 | 30.7 |
| Jamaica | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | Total | 100.0 | 25.0 | 16.0 | 8.9 | 75.0 | 26.1 | 5.5 | 6.2 | 37.3 |
| 1996 | Total | 100.0 | 25.6 | 14.6 | 11.0 | 74.4 | 27.0 | 6.6 | 7.4 | 33.4 |
| Mexico | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | Total | 100.0 | 30.0 | 25.0 | 5.0 | 69.9 | 26.0 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 32.4 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 34.8 | 27.6 | 7.3 | 65.1 | 23.9 | 7.5 | 5.8 | 27.9 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 20.9 | 20.2 | 0.7 | 79.1 | 30.0 | 1.9 | 6.1 | 41.1 |
| 1995 | Total | 100.0 | 20.9 | 20.1 | 0.8 | 79.1 | 28.3 | 6.2 | 2.2 | 42.4 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 23.3 | 22.2 | 1.0 | 76.7 | 25.5 | 8.6 | 2.1 | 40.4 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 16.8 | 16.4 | 0.4 | 83.2 | 33.0 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 45.9 |
| 2000 | Total | 100.0 | 30.0 | 29.3 | 0.7 | 70.0 | 26.5 | 6.3 | 1.6 | 35.5 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 24.7 | 33.8 | 0.9 | 65.3 | 23.3 | 9.0 | 1.4 | 31.5 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 21.8 | 21.6 | 0.3 | 78.2 | 32.0 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 42.4 |
| Panama | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | Total | 100.0 | 19.2 | 14.8 | 4.4 | 80.6 | 27.1 | 9.4 | 5.7 | 38.4 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 25.2 | 17.8 | 7.4 | 74.8 | 29.5 | 13.9 | 5.7 | 25.7 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 10.9 | 10.7 | 0.2 | 89.1 | 23.8 | 3.1 | 5.7 | 56.5 |
| 1995 | Total | 100.0 | 21.3 | 13.5 | 7.8 | 78.7 | 26.2 | 9.3 | 6.9 | 36.3 |
| | Men | 100.0 | 28.4 | 15.6 | 12.7 | 71.6 | 26.6 | 13.2 | 6.6 | 25.2 |
| | Women | 100.0 | 10.6 | 10.2 | 0.3 | 89.4 | 25.6 | 3.2 | 7.3 | 53.4 |

TABLE 7-A (Continued)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: SELECTED COUNTRIES
NON-AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT ACCORDING TO ECONOMIC BRANCH OF ACTIVITY AND
GENDER, 1990-2000 a/
(percentages)

| Country & period | Total | Goods Sector b/ | Manufacturing industry Mining, Power and Waterworks | Construction | Services Sector c/ | Commerce | Transport d/ | Financial Enterprises | Services f/ | |
|------------------------------|-------|-----------------|---|--------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|--|
| 2000 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 20.9 | 12.0 | 8.8 | 79.1 | 27.5 | 9.2 | 8.2 | 34.3 | |
| Men | 100.0 | 28.5 | 14.4 | 14.1 | 71.5 | 27.7 | 12.7 | 7.6 | 23.5 | |
| Women | 100.0 | 9.2 | 8.5 | 0.8 | 90.8 | 27.2 | 3.7 | 9.1 | 50.8 | |
| Peru | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 24.4 | 19.7 | 4.7 | 75.6 | 33.2 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 30.1 | |
| Men | 100.0 | 30.1 | 22.3 | 7.7 | 69.9 | 27.1 | 9.9 | 7.4 | 25.6 | |
| Women | 100.0 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 84.5 | 42.7 | 1.3 | 3.3 | 37.2 | |
| 1995 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 25.4 | 20.2 | 5.3 | 74.6 | 32.2 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 26.9 | |
| Men | 100.0 | 31.7 | 23.0 | 8.7 | 68.3 | 24.9 | 11.9 | 10.2 | 21.4 | |
| Women | 100.0 | 16.3 | 16.0 | 0.3 | 83.7 | 42.9 | 1.4 | 4.4 | 35.0 | |
| 2000 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 21.5 | 17.2 | 4.3 | 78.5 | 32.7 | 9.9 | 8.6 | 27.4 | |
| Men | 100.0 | 27.4 | 20.2 | 7.2 | 72.6 | 23.7 | 15.8 | 9.8 | 23.3 | |
| Women | 100.0 | 13.8 | 13.2 | 0.6 | 86.2 | 44.4 | 2.1 | 6.9 | 32.8 | |
| Trinidad & Tobago | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | 100.0 | 28.9 | 15.4 | 13.6 | 71.1 | 20.1 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 34.6 | |
| 1996 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 13.6 | 11.4 | 75.0 | 21.2 | 8.0 | 9.5 | 36.3 | |
| Uruguay | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 31.3 | 24.2 | 7.1 | 68.7 | 18.7 | 5.8 | 5.2 | 39.0 | |
| Men | 100.0 | 37.3 | 25.6 | 11.8 | 62.7 | 19.4 | 8.6 | 5.5 | 29.2 | |
| Women | 100.0 | 22.7 | 22.3 | 0.4 | 77.3 | 17.8 | 1.9 | 4.8 | 52.8 | |
| 1995 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 26.3 | 19.0 | 7.3 | 73.7 | 20.3 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 40.7 | |
| Men | 100.0 | 34.1 | 21.6 | 12.5 | 65.9 | 20.3 | 9.3 | 6.6 | 29.8 | |
| Women | 100.0 | 16.0 | 15.6 | 0.5 | 84.0 | 20.4 | 2.1 | 6.3 | 55.1 | |
| 1999 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 24.4 | 16.0 | 8.4 | 75.6 | 20.4 | 6.4 | 7.6 | 41.2 | |
| Men | 100.0 | 33.3 | 18.8 | 14.5 | 66.7 | 20.7 | 9.2 | 7.6 | 29.3 | |
| Women | 100.0 | 13.0 | 12.5 | 0.5 | 87.0 | 20.0 | 2.7 | 7.6 | 56.6 | |
| Venezuela | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 29.1 | 20.2 | 8.9 | 70.8 | 24.3 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 32.9 | |
| Men | 100.0 | 36.4 | 23.2 | 13.2 | 63.5 | 24.0 | 9.9 | 6.2 | 23.5 | |
| Women | 100.0 | 15.8 | 14.8 | 1.0 | 84.1 | 24.8 | 1.6 | 7.4 | 50.2 | |
| 1995 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 24.9 | 15.6 | 9.3 | 75.1 | 26.6 | 7.2 | 6.6 | 34.4 | |
| Men | 100.0 | 31.6 | 17.5 | 14.1 | 68.4 | 25.7 | 10.3 | 6.5 | 25.8 | |
| Women | 100.0 | 13.4 | 12.3 | 1.1 | 86.6 | 28.3 | 1.8 | 6.9 | 49.3 | |
| 1999 <i>Total</i> | 100.0 | 25.5 | 16.3 | 9.2 | 74.5 | 28.9 | 7.6 | 5.5 | 32.4 | |
| Men | 100.0 | 33.8 | 19.1 | 14.7 | 66.2 | 25.4 | 11.5 | 5.7 | 23.4 | |
| Women | 100.0 | 12.9 | 11.9 | 0.9 | 87.1 | 34.1 | 1.6 | 5.2 | 46.1 | |



Source: ILO, based on country Household Surveys: Argentina (national urban), Barbados (national total), Brazil (urban area), Bolivia (9 major cities), Chile (national total), Colombia (10 metropolitan areas), Costa Rica (national total), Ecuador (urban area), El Salvador (national total), Honduras (national total), Jamaica (national total), Mexico (urban area), Panama (national total), Peru (Metropolitan Lima), Trinidad & Tobago (national urban), Uruguay (national urban) and Venezuela (urban area).

a/ Employed workers, excluding agricultural sector.

b/ Including the manufacturing industry, mining, power, waterworks and construction.

c/ Including commerce, transport, financial enterprises and services.

d/ Transport, storage and communications.

e/ Financial enterprises, insurance, real estate and services rendered to enterprises, including the housing subsector.

f/ Including community, social and personal services.

TABLE 8-A

LATIN AMERICA: DISTRIBUTION OF WAGE EARNING WORKERS CONTRIBUTING TO SOCIAL SECURITY, BY GENDER. 1990-2000

(percentages)

| Countries/Years | Informal Sector | | | Formal Sector | Total | |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|-------|------|
| | Total | Domestic Service | Small Enterprises a/ | | | |
| Latin America | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 29.2 | 17.6 | 34.7 | 80.6 | 66.6 |
| | Men | 32.5 | 35.5 | 32.5 | 79.1 | 68.4 |
| | Women | 27.0 | 16.6 | 39.5 | 82.8 | 65.1 |
| 1995 | <i>Total</i> | 24.2 | 19.1 | 28.3 | 79.3 | 65.2 |
| | Men | 25.4 | 32.0 | 24.8 | 78.2 | 66.6 |
| | Women | 24.0 | 18.0 | 37.5 | 81.1 | 65.7 |
| 2000 | <i>Total</i> | 26.9 | 23.1 | 29.3 | 79.0 | 64.2 |
| | Men | 26.5 | 31.9 | 26.5 | 77.6 | 65.6 |
| | Women | 27.8 | 22.6 | 37.5 | 81.2 | 62.5 |
| Argentina | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 24.9 | 7.8 | 38.1 | 86.2 | 61.9 |
| | Men | 34.8 | 25.5 | 35.0 | 83.0 | 70.0 |
| | Women | 24.9 | 6.8 | 34.3 | 86.2 | 61.9 |
| 2000 | <i>Total</i> | 21.7 | 6.3 | 26.4 | 70.9 | 55.8 |
| | Men | 25.9 | 0.0 | 26.0 | 71.3 | 59.1 |
| | Women | 17.3 | 6.4 | 27.2 | 70.3 | 51.4 |
| Brazil | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 38.7 | 24.9 | 45.8 | 86.1 | 74.0 |
| | Men | 43.9 | 44.0 | 43.9 | 85.4 | 76.9 |
| | Women | 33.8 | 24.1 | 50.6 | 87.5 | 69.5 |
| 1995 | <i>Total</i> | 27.7 | 20.5 | 34.4 | 82.9 | 66.5 |
| | Men | 30.8 | 39.5 | 30.0 | 81.6 | 70.9 |
| | Women | 25.6 | 19.1 | 44.6 | 85.0 | 61.0 |
| 1999 | <i>Total</i> | 32.3 | 27.1 | 36.8 | 82.0 | 67.0 |
| | Men | 32.5 | 44.0 | 31.4 | 80.2 | 69.8 |
| | Women | 32.0 | 25.8 | 48.6 | 84.7 | 63.7 |
| Chile | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 59.0 | 51.7 | 63.6 | 86.3 | 79.9 |
| | Men | 63.3 | 66.7 | 63.3 | 86.7 | 83.1 |
| | Women | 55.9 | 51.4 | 64.3 | 85.6 | 74.8 |
| 1996 | <i>Total</i> | 56.4 | 46.7 | 62.9 | 87.6 | 67.0 |
| | Men | 60.2 | 52.1 | 60.5 | 87.7 | 83.4 |
| | Women | 53.9 | 46.6 | 67.3 | 87.4 | 75.6 |
| 2000 | <i>Total</i> | 50.9 | 53.8 | 44.9 | 81.2 | 62.8 |
| | Men | 52.3 | 52.1 | 70.1 | 81.1 | 63.8 |
| | Women | 49.7 | 57.4 | 44.5 | 81.5 | 61.0 |
| Colombia | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 25.7 | 12.5 | 27.1 | 77.2 | 62.6 |
| | Men | 25.1 | 51.3 | 25.0 | 74.8 | 60.4 |
| | Women | 26.7 | 10.8 | 32.0 | 81.1 | 66.1 |
| 2000 | <i>Total</i> | 31.6 | 31.2 | 31.8 | 82.2 | 66.1 |
| | Men | 29.4 | 38.1 | 29.2 | 80.5 | 65.8 |
| | Women | 33.5 | 30.8 | 36.3 | 84.3 | 66.4 |
| Costa Rica | | | | | | |
| 1990 | <i>Total</i> | 51.7 | 40.0 | 55.9 | 88.6 | 78.5 |
| | Men | 55.2 | 59.5 | 55.2 | 88.4 | 80.8 |
| | Women | 47.6 | 39.3 | 57.7 | 89.0 | 74.3 |
| 1995 | <i>Total</i> | 49.3 | 35.6 | 53.7 | 90.4 | 79.0 |
| | Men | 50.7 | 31.7 | 51.1 | 90.1 | 80.8 |
| | Women | 47.5 | 35.8 | 59.9 | 90.9 | 76.1 |
| 2000 | <i>Total</i> | 46.7 | 38.7 | 49.9 | 86.5 | 74.9 |
| | Men | 47.9 | 38.5 | 48.1 | 86.3 | 77.2 |
| | Women | 45.7 | 38.7 | 63.2 | 87.0 | 71.5 |



TABLE 8-A (Continued)

**LATIN AMERICA: DISTRIBUTION OF WAGE EARNING WORKERS
CONTRIBUTING TO SOCIAL SECURITY, BY GENDER. 1990-2000**
(percentages)

| Countries/Years | Informal Sector | | | Formal Sector | Total |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|-------|
| | Total | Domestic Service | Small Enterprises a/ | | |
| Ecuador | | | | | |
| 1990 <i>Total</i> | 17.7 | 17.8 | 23.6 | 72.1 | 55.1 |
| Men | 16.3 | 20.8 | 16.1 | 71.1 | 55.5 |
| Women | 19.7 | 17.5 | 32.8 | 74.4 | 54.2 |
| 2000 <i>Total</i> | 14.1 | 17.1 | 12.9 | 48.9 | 39.2 |
| Men | 12.0 | 31.1 | 10.9 | 47.5 | 38.3 |
| Women | 16.6 | 15.5 | 18.0 | 50.9 | 40.4 |
| Mexico | | | | | |
| 1990 <i>Total</i> | 12.7 | 4.2 | 15.3 | 72.9 | 58.5 |
| Men | 12.9 | 20.7 | 12.6 | 70.7 | 57.6 |
| Women | 12.3 | 2.5 | 25.0 | 77.2 | 60.3 |
| 1995 <i>Total</i> | 16.2 | 16.1 | 16.3 | 80.7 | 69.1 |
| Men | 14.0 | 23.6 | 13.4 | 79.3 | 64.5 |
| Women | 19.3 | 15.0 | 25.6 | 83.0 | 78.1 |
| 2000 <i>Total</i> | 14.1 | 11.7 | 14.8 | 82.1 | 66.4 |
| Men | 12.4 | 14.7 | 12.3 | 81.5 | 66.4 |
| Women | 16.6 | 11.6 | 21.6 | 83.1 | 66.4 |
| Peru b/ | | | | | |
| 1990 <i>Total</i> | 22.1 | 17.3 | 23.6 | 66.6 | 53.6 |
| Men | 20.3 | 31.3 | 19.9 | 66.3 | 55.1 |
| Women | 24.2 | 16.3 | 32.8 | 67.2 | 51.0 |
| 1995 <i>Total</i> | 14.6 | 8.6 | 16.8 | 65.8 | 55.1 |
| Men | 15.2 | 4.9 | 15.6 | 67.2 | 54.7 |
| Women | 13.8 | 8.8 | 19.7 | 63.0 | 55.9 |
| 2000 <i>Total</i> | 15.4 | 16.8 | 14.8 | 67.7 | 50.0 |
| Men | 10.7 | 14.6 | 10.6 | 66.8 | 51.0 |
| Women | 20.0 | 16.9 | 23.6 | 69.4 | 48.5 |
| Uruguay c/ | | | | | |
| 1990 <i>Total</i> | 63.6 | 44.8 | 73.0 | 88.9 | 82.6 |
| Men | 70.0 | 42.1 | 70.2 | 88.5 | 85.0 |
| Women | 58.8 | 44.8 | 77.8 | 89.7 | 79.1 |
| 1995 <i>Total</i> | 92.4 | 92.4 | 92.4 | 97.5 | 96.2 |
| Men | 90.8 | 91.7 | 90.8 | 97.1 | 96.0 |
| Women | 93.4 | 92.4 | 95.2 | 98.0 | 96.4 |
| 1999 <i>Total</i> | 94.4 | 95.2 | 93.8 | 97.8 | 97.0 |
| Men | 92.5 | 96.5 | 92.5 | 97.4 | 96.6 |
| Women | 95.5 | 95.2 | 95.9 | 98.4 | 97.4 |
| Venezuela | | | | | |
| 1995 <i>Total</i> | 22.7 | 17.6 | 23.6 | 81.0 | 70.6 |
| Men | 20.7 | 29.8 | 20.6 | 78.2 | 64.9 |
| Women | 26.9 | 17.1 | 35.4 | 85.8 | 81.7 |
| 2000 <i>Total</i> | 28.1 | 30.3 | 27.6 | 81.3 | 69.9 |
| Men | 23.5 | 42.4 | 23.2 | 78.2 | 66.9 |
| Women | 34.6 | 29.8 | 38.2 | 86.1 | 74.5 |

Source: ILO estimations based on data from Household Surveys and other official sources (revised series).

a/ Employed workers in enterprises with up to 5 workers.

b/ Metropolitan Lima.

c/ Montevideo.

TABLE 9-A

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN REAL INDUSTRIAL WAGES. 1990-2001

(index 1980 = 100)

| Country | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | Rate of growth | |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 1999-2000 ^{e/} | 2000-2001 ^{c/} |
| Argentina | 75.0 | 76.0 | 77.0 | 75.7 | 76.5 | 75.6 | 75.5 | 75.1 | 74.9 | 76.2 | 77.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 d/ |
| Barbados | 99.0 | 92.0 | 89.0 | 90.0 | 88.0 | 87.0 | 98.7 | 101.2 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Bolivia | 86.7 | 85.9 | 86.8 | 88.0 | 95.8 | 94.3 | 94.6 | 101.8 | 97.3 | 96.4 | 93.3 | 0.7 | ... |
| Brazil | 96.7 | 90.9 | 98.3 | 108.7 | 113.4 | 124.2 | 128.4 | 132.9 | 135.7 | 130.8 | 128.8 | 2.9 | 1.4 d/ |
| Chile | 105.8 | 112.9 | 118.2 | 122.4 | 128.5 | 133.1 | 142.6 | 146.0 | 149.9 | 153.4 | 155.5 | 3.9 | 1.6 d/ |
| Colombia | 114.8 | 114.1 | 115.6 | 120.9 | 122.0 | 123.6 | 125.2 | 128.8 | 129.1 | 131.1 | 136.1 | 1.7 | 0.4 d/ |
| Costa Rica | 109.7 | 106.1 | 106.8 | 123.0 | 125.7 | 122.9 | 120.9 | 126.2 | 130.7 | 136.3 | 150.3 | 3.2 | 0.1 d/ |
| Ecuador | 74.1 | 77.5 | 84.0 | 94.6 | 102.9 | 113.3 | 119.4 | 116.6 | 112.0 | 102.7 | 97.8 | 2.8 | ... |
| Honduras | 73.4 | 71.9 | 82.7 | 105.4 | 79.9 | 73.9 | 68.9 | 70.8 | 73.2 | 87.7 | ... | ... | ... |
| Mexico | 59.6 | 61.9 | 67.6 | 69.6 | 71.9 | 62.1 | 54.9 | 54.8 | 56.2 | 56.5 | 59.5 | 0.0 | 5.1 d/ |
| Panama | ... | 97.8 | 106.6 | 105.0 | 104.4 | 99.7 | 110.4 | 107.2 | 114.0 | 118.8 | 135.3 | 3.7 | ... |
| Paraguay | 102.4 | 97.7 | 93.8 | 93.6 | 95.4 | 98.8 | 100.3 | 100.8 | 98.9 | 94.9 | 98.3 | -0.4 | 3.4 d/ |
| Peru | 34.4 | 40.7 | 39.1 | 38.2 | 45.2 | 43.5 | 42.4 | 42.3 | 43.0 | 42.1 | 42.4 | 2.1 | 2.4 d/ |
| Uruguay | 110.8 | 115.8 | 117.5 | 123.8 | 122.9 | 115.5 | 114.2 | 113.8 | 116.7 | 118.5 | 117.5 | 0.6 | -1.0 d/ |
| Venezuela | 57.0 | 52.1 | 49.6 | 46.8 | 48.9 | 46.0 | 38.8 | 48.7 | 51.3 | 46.5 | 48.0 | -1.7 | ... |
| Average a/ | 85.7 | 86.2 | 88.8 | 93.7 | 94.8 | 94.2 | 95.7 | 97.8 | 98.8 | 99.4 | 103.1 | 1.8 | 1.6 e/ |
| b/ | 84.7 | 83.4 | 89.1 | 92.8 | 96.4 | 99.4 | 100.3 | 102.8 | 105.1 | 103.5 | 103.3 | 1.8 | 2.1 f/ |

Source: ILO, based on official country figures.

a/ Arithmetic average. Excluding Honduras.

b/ Weighted average. Excluding Honduras.

c/ Preliminary figures.

d/ Variation of the averages of January-September 2001 against the same period of the previous year.

e/ Arithmetic average of countries with information.

f/ Weighted average of countries with information.



TABLE 10-A

LATIN AMERICA: REAL URBAN MINIMUM WAGES. 1990-2001
(index 1980 = 100)

| Country | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | Rate of growth | |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 1990-2000 d/ | 2000-2001 e/ |
| Argentina a/ | 40.2 | 52.9 | 45.3 | 70.0 | 81.1 | 78.5 | 78.4 | 77.9 | 77.3 | 77.8 | 78.6 | 6.9 | 0.8 |
| Bolivia a/ | 16.1 | 26.3 | 26.4 | 28.8 | 31.7 | 31.1 | 31.3 | 32.2 | 37.5 | 41.1 | 43.6 | 10.5 | 10.4 |
| Brazil a/ | 55.4 | 64.8 | 56.5 | 63.9 | 60.8 | 67.1 | 68.9 | 73.2 | 75.7 | 76.8 | 79.0 | 3.6 | 11.1 |
| Chile a/ | 73.3 | 79.9 | 83.4 | 87.5 | 90.8 | 94.8 | 98.8 | 102.3 | 108.3 | 113.1 | 122.2 | 5.2 | 2.8 |
| Colombia a/ | 105.7 | 103.5 | 101.8 | 104.6 | 102.8 | 102.4 | 101.5 | 103.8 | 103.7 | 109.9 | 110.7 | 0.5 | 1.8 |
| Costa Rica b/ | 127.2 | 123.3 | 125.4 | 130.6 | 134.6 | 129.9 | 130.3 | 135.0 | 139.4 | 143.0 | 142.1 | 1.1 | 3.2 |
| Dominican Republic a/ | 65.2 | 76.0 | 89.6 | 85.2 | 90.6 | 91.1 | 91.6 | 92.9 | 96.8 | 101.5 | 101.5 | ... | ... |
| Ecuador a/ | 33.9 | 30.9 | 33.0 | 37.8 | 41.1 | 49.5 | 52.3 | 50.5 | 46.8 | 44.1 | 40.0 | 1.7 | 2.9 h/ |
| El Salvador b/ | 33.9 | 34.6 | 29.2 | 35.9 | 37.3 | 36.8 | 33.5 | 32.0 | 33.1 | 33.8 | 33.1 | -0.2 | -3.6 |
| Guatemala b/ | | 80.1 | 83.2 | 73.4 | 72.2 | 83.0 | 82.2 | 75.2 | 79.0 | 82.0 | 85.7 | 0.8 | 5.8 f/ |
| Haiti | 78.3 | 73.5 | 61.1 | 47.0 | 33.8 | 63.6 | 52.7 | 45.3 | 40.2 | 37.1 | 32.7 | -8.4 | ... |
| Honduras b/ | 81.9 | 83.5 | 100.1 | 100.9 | 82.8 | 80.2 | 79.5 | 78.3 | 79.0 | 76.7 | 79.0 | -0.4 | 2.8 |
| Mexico a/ | 42.0 | 39.6 | 38.3 | 37.8 | 37.7 | 33.3 | 30.5 | 30.1 | 30.1 | 29.8 | 31.2 | -2.9 | 2.1 |
| Panama b/ | 98.4 | 97.1 | 95.5 | 107.2 | 105.8 | 105.6 | 111.4 | 110.0 | 113.0 | 117.1 | 121.6 | 2.1 | 6.9 g/ |
| Paraguay a/ | 132.1 | 125.7 | 114.7 | 110.2 | 113.2 | 112.8 | 103.6 | 107.0 | 105.2 | 101.8 | 106.2 | -2.2 | -5.4 |
| Peru a/ | 21.4 | 14.9 | 15.6 | 12.1 | 14.4 | 14.7 | 15.2 | 26.7 | 29.6 | 28.9 | 32.1 | 4.1 | 1.6 |
| Uruguay a/ | 68.8 | 62.9 | 60.0 | 51.5 | 46.0 | 42.9 | 41.7 | 40.8 | 42.8 | 42.9 | 42.1 | -4.8 | -1.6 |
| Venezuela a/ | 55.2 | 61.5 | 70.2 | 50.8 | 52.7 | 53.7 | 45.9 | 39.9 | 42.9 | 45.4 | 45.0 | -2.0 | 7.1 |
| Average c/ | 68.4 | 69.3 | 67.5 | 68.4 | 67.8 | 70.8 | 69.9 | 70.0 | 71.1 | 73.1 | 73.7 | 0.9 | 3.0 |



Source: ILO, based on official country statistics.

a/ National minimum wage.

b/ Lowest minimum industrial wage.

c/ Arithmetic average.

d/ Annual variation.

e/ Variation of the averages for the period January-September 2001.

f/ Variation of the January-May average.

g/ Variation of the January-August average.

h/ Wages were unified and dollarized as from April 2000.

TABLE 11-A

**LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN:
GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT. 1990-2000**
(annual variation)

| Country | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 a/ | 1990-1999 |
|--|------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|-----------|
| Latin America | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Argentina | -1.4 | 10.0 | 8.9 | 5.8 | 8.3 | -3.1 | 4.4 | 8.0 | 3.8 | -3.4 | -0.5 | 4.0 |
| Bolivia | 4.6 | 5.4 | 1.7 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 3.7 |
| Brazil | -4.7 | 1.1 | -0.3 | 4.5 | 6.2 | 4.2 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 2.6 |
| Chile | 3.7 | 8.0 | 12.3 | 7.0 | 5.7 | 10.6 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 3.6 | -0.1 | 4.9 | 6.7 |
| Colombia | 3.8 | 2.0 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 6.1 | 5.2 | 2.1 | 3.4 | 0.8 | -3.8 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| Costa Rica | 3.5 | 2.3 | 8.6 | 5.9 | 4.8 | 3.9 | 0.6 | 5.6 | 8.2 | 8.0 | 1.7 | 4.8 |
| Dominican | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Republic | -4.9 | 0.8 | 6.4 | 2.0 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 7.2 | 8.3 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 7.8 | 5.5 |
| Ecuador | 3.2 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 1.0 | -9.5 | 2.8 | 1.7 |
| El Salvador | 4.8 | 2.8 | 7.3 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 1.9 | 4.2 |
| Guatemala | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 5.1 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 4.0 |
| Haiti | -0.1 | 0.1 | -13.8 | -2.2 | -8.3 | 5.0 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 1.3 | -1.0 |
| Honduras | 0.8 | 2.7 | 5.8 | 7.1 | -1.9 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 5.0 | 3.3 | -1.5 | 4.8 | 3.2 |
| Mexico | 5.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 1.8 | 4.4 | -6.1 | 5.4 | 6.8 | 5.1 | 3.7 | 7.0 | 3.5 |
| Nicaragua | -0.1 | -0.4 | 0.8 | -0.4 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 4.1 | 7.4 | 4.7 | 3.4 |
| Panama | 7.7 | 9.0 | 8.2 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 4.4 |
| Paraguay | 3.0 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 2.4 | -0.6 | -0.1 | -0.7 | 1.7 |
| Peru | -5.4 | 2.5 | -0.9 | 5.7 | 13.6 | 8.6 | 2.3 | 6.8 | -0.5 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| Uruguay | 0.6 | 2.9 | 6.6 | 2.2 | 5.9 | -1.9 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 4.3 | -3.3 | -1.7 | 2.5 |
| Venezuela | 7.0 | 10.5 | 7.0 | -0.4 | -3.7 | 5.9 | -0.4 | 7.4 | 0.7 | -5.8 | 4.0 | 2.4 |
| The Caribbean | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Barbados | -3.0 | -3.6 | -5.5 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 1.5 |
| Belize | 10.3 | 3.0 | 9.0 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 3.7 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 2.0 | 5.9 | 10.1 | 4.4 |
| Dominica | 6.3 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 0.7 | ... | 2.0 |
| Guyana | -5.0 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 11.8 | 9.6 | 3.2 | 8.6 | 6.7 | -2.2 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 6.1 |
| Jamaica | 5.4 | 0.3 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.8 | -0.3 | -2.2 | -1.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| Trinidad | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| & Tobago | 1.4 | 3.5 | -1.0 | -1.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 5.3 | 7.8 | 5.0 | 3.5 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | -0.3 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 5.2 | 1.1 | 3.7 | 5.2 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 4.1 | 3.1 |

Source: ILO, based on ECLAC data. Official figures were converted into dollars at 1995 constant prices.

a/ Preliminary figures.



TABLE 12-A

**LATIN AMERICA: SEMESTRAL RATES FO UNEMPLOYMENT
PROJECTIONS. 2000-2001 (*)**
(percentages)

| | 1998 | | | 1999 | | | 2000 | | | 2001 | | | 2002 |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------|--------|--------|
| | I | II | Annual | I | II | Annual | I | II | Annual | I | II | Annual | Annual |
| LATIN AMERICA a/ | 8.2 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 8.0 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.8 |
| Selected Countries | 8.1 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 7.9 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.7 |
| Argentina | 13.2 | 12.8 | 13.0 | 14.5 | 14.2 | 14.3 | 15.4 | 14.7 | 15.1 | 16.4 | 17.4 | 16.9 | 16.7 |
| Brazil | 7.8 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 7.1 |
| Chile | 5.7 | 7.0 | 6.4 | 9.5 | 10.2 | 9.8 | 8.8 | 9.5 | 9.2 | 9.3 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 9.0 |
| Colombia | 15.2 | 15.4 | 15.3 | 19.7 | 19.1 | 19.4 | 17.6 | 16.9 | 17.2 | 18.9 | 17.8 | 18.4 | 18.0 |
| Ecuador | 9.0 | 10.9 | 9.9 | 14.3 | 16.0 | 15.1 | 15.8 | 12.5 | 14.1 | 11.6 | 11.0 | 11.3 | 11.5 |
| Mexico | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| Uruguay | 9.8 | 10.6 | 10.2 | 12.2 | 11.4 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 14.1 | 13.6 | 15.3 | 15.1 | 15.2 | 14.8 |
| Venezuela | 11.3 | 11.2 | 11.3 | 15.3 | 14.5 | 14.9 | 14.6 | 13.2 | 13.9 | 14.1 | 13.5 | 13.8 | 13.9 |
| Rest of the region b/ | 8.7 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 9.5 | 8.7 | 9.1 | 7.8 | 8.2 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.8 | 8.4 | 9.3 |

Source: ILO, based on the Employment and Unemployment Projection Model.

a/ Weighted averages.

b/ Including Central American countries, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Paraguay and Peru. These countries represent 11% of the total urban EAP in the region.

(*) Highlighted figures refer to recorded rates of growth. The rest of the figures refer to projections of the "moderate" scene. The combined EAP of selected countries represents 89% of the total urban EAP in the region.

TABLE 13-A

**LATIN AMERICA, GDP ANNUAL RATE OF GROWTH
PROJECTIONS. 2000-2001 (*)**
(annualized proportional variations)

| | 1998 | | | 1999 | | | 2000 | | | 2001 | | | 2002 |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------|--------|--------|
| | I | II | Annual | I | II | Annual | I | II | Annual | I | II | Annual | Annual |
| LATIN AMERICA a/ | 3.6 | 0.9 | 2.3 | -0.8 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.5 |
| Selected Countries | 3.5 | 0.8 | 2.1 | -0.4 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.5 |
| Argentina | 7.3 | 1.4 | 4.3 | -4.0 | -2.0 | -3.4 | 0.7 | -1.9 | -0.5 | -2.2 | -1.0 | -1.6 | 0.4 |
| Brazil | 1.3 | -0.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 3.8 | 5.2 | 4.5 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Chile | 6.9 | 0.0 | 3.4 | -2.9 | 0.9 | -1.0 | 5.8 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.5 |
| Colombia | 3.3 | -2.3 | 0.4 | -6.2 | -2.3 | -5.0 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.5 |
| Ecuador | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.4 | -6.4 | -8.2 | -7.3 | -0.1 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 6.4 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 3.0 |
| Mexico | 5.9 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 2.5 | 4.8 | 3.5 | 7.8 | 5.8 | 6.8 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 2.0 |
| Peru | 0.2 | -0.9 | -0.3 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | -1.7 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 3.0 |
| Uruguay | 4.1 | 2.8 | 4.5 | -1.0 | -5.6 | -2.5 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | -1.3 | 0.5 | -0.4 | 1.5 |
| Venezuela | 5.7 | -6.4 | 4.5 | -8.2 | -5.2 | -2.5 | 1.5 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 2.0 |
| Rest of the region b/ | 5.2 | 1.5 | 3.5 | -3.4 | -3.5 | -1.7 | 4.6 | 5.9 | 3.8 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.5 |

Source: ILO, based on official data and estimations of the IMF, ECLAC, World Bank, IIF and JP Morgan.

a/ Weighted averages.

b/ Including Central American countries, Bolivia, the Dominican and Paraguay. These countries represent 5% of the total GDP in the region.

(*) Highlighted figures refer to recorded rates of growth. The rest of the figures refer to projections of the "moderate" scene. The combined GDP of selected countries represent 95% of the region's total.